

Critical Factors Associated with the Utility of Interpreters
During Psycho-educational Evaluations of
Limited English Proficient (LEP)
Children

by

Mai Kao Xiong

A Research Paper
Submitted in Partial Fulfillment of the
Requirements for the
Master of Science in Education Degree
in

Approved: 2 Semester Credits .


Denise Zirkle Brouillard, Ph.D.

The Graduate School
University of Wisconsin-Stout
May, 2007

**The Graduate School
University of Wisconsin-Stout
Menomonie, WI**

Author: Xiong, Mai Kao

Title: *Critical Factors Associated with the Utility of Interpreters
During Psycho-educational Evaluations of Limited English
Proficient (LEP) Children*

Graduate Degree/ Major: MS in Education in School Psychology

Research Adviser: Denise Zirkle Brouillard, Ph.D.

Month/Year: May, 2007

Number of Pages: 24

Style Manual Used: American Psychological Association, 5th edition

ABSTRACT

The Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA) requires that schools provide Limited English Proficient (LEP) students with accommodations during assessments. Typical accommodations include: using commercially translated tests, nonverbal tests, and language interpreters. This literature review examined the problems associated with the utilization of language interpreters during psycho-educational evaluations. The study found that there is a shortage of bilingual school psychologists; therefore, interpreters are used to break down the communication barriers. However, most have not received proper training and have minimal knowledge about the assessment process. Lack of training may lead to inaccuracies in interpretation. In addition, the study found that there is very little empirical research involving the utility of interpreters during psycho-educational evaluations. Recommendations for future research are also included.

The Graduate School
University of Wisconsin Stout
Menomonie, WI
Acknowledgments

I would have not completed this literature review without the help of many important people. I would first like to express my gratitude to Dr. Denise Zirkle Brouillard for her guidance and support throughout this review. Second, I would like to express my appreciation to the School Psychology faculty team and Multicultural Student Services for their expertise and flexibility during this research. Last but not least- a sincere thank you to my husband and children for their patience and support through this process and throughout graduate school.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
ABSTRACT.....	ii
Chapter I: Introduction.....	1
<i>Statement of the Problem</i>	2
<i>Purpose of the Study</i>	2
<i>Research Questions</i>	3
<i>Definition of Terms</i>	3
Chapter II: Literature Review	5
<i>LEP Students</i>	5
<i>Legal Protections</i>	5
<i>Important Assessment Issues</i>	6
<i>Cultural Biases</i>	8
<i>Assessment Accommodations</i>	9
<i>Problems Associated with Using Language Interpreters</i>	10
<i>Current Practices</i>	13
<i>Recommendations Offered in Literature Review</i>	14
Chapter III: Summary and Recommendations.....	17
<i>Limitations</i>	19
<i>Recommendations</i>	6
References.....	22

Chapter I: Introduction

The United States population is growing at a rapid pace and adding to its pool of cultural and linguistic diversity. According to the Office of Immigration (n.d.) between 2000 and 2005, there were more than 300,000 new refugee arrivals to the United States. Some of the larger groups of new arrivals included in this data came from the countries of Bosnia (37,917), Somalia (36,944), and Laos (14,639). The data excluded undocumented immigrants- a large portion of them being from Mexico. These statistics are important to service providers because they will need to construct and implement a more effective way to service people who are new to the American mainstream culture and who are learners of the English language. Immigrants will face difficulty adjusting to the life in America because of a number of things; however, the lack of proficiency in the English language is probably the biggest obstacle to their adjustment. Hence, it is important that within each profession, service delivery methods to the limited English proficient (LEP) group be addressed.

According to Census 2000 (n.d.), the racial and ethnic background in the United States was categorized as follows: White 69.1%; Black 12.1%; American Indian 0.7%; Asian or Pacific Islander 3.7%; Latino 12.5%; biracial 1.5%; and other race 0.2%. Also in the Census 2000 findings, it was reported that almost 47 million households out of over 200 million spoke a language at home other than English. It is difficult to know what the racial and ethnic background breakdown looks like in 2007; however, predications made by the Census Bureau (Bergman, 2004) announced that by 2050, the Hispanic and Asian population would triple. They are also projecting that by that year, the majority group (Non-Hispanic White) may drop to half of the total United States

population (Bergman). Regardless of the predictions, it will be important to track the outcomes of the updated demographics in the next Census report.

School districts who work with large numbers of LEP students have provided accommodations, but accommodations have been debated by researchers. One popular form of accommodation is to use interpreters as liaisons to convey messages between parent and educators and between students and educators. However, there has been evidence that the use of interpreters can create numerous problems because the accuracy of interpretation is not known (Sattler, 2001; Salvia, Ysseldyke & Bolt, 2007). In particular, when school psychologists are faced with assessing LEP children, the most obvious solution is to call in an interpreter. Although it may be the most obvious solution, is it the best solution?

Statement of the Problem

The purpose of this comprehensive literature review is to examine problems that may arise when school psychologists use interpreters during psychoeducational evaluations of students who are limited English proficient.

Purpose of the Study

This study is beneficial to the field of school psychology because the United States is becoming more diversified and the needs of students are always changing. In order for educators to accurately evaluate LEP students, the best and most accurate accommodations must be known. If alternatives or solutions are identified found through this research, school psychologists can use them to improve their current ways of evaluating LEP students.

Research Questions

The questions below will help guide this research; they are:

1. How and to what degree are language interpreters being used in the schools during psychoeducational evaluations?
2. What types of training (if any) have language interpreters had regarding psychoeducational evaluations?
3. What, if any, are the known accuracy rates when language interpreters are used in psychoeducational evaluations with LEP students?
4. What other problems may exist with the use of language interpreters?
5. What are the alternatives to using language interpreters?

Definition of Terms

The terms below were defined by the National Clearinghouse for English Language Acquisition and Language Instruction Educational Programs (NCELA) Glossary (otherwise noted) for clarity of understanding. They are:

Accommodations- “Adapting language (spoken or written) to make it more understandable to second language learners. In assessment, accommodations may be made to the presentation, response method, setting, or timing/scheduling of the assessment” (Baker; Rivera & Stansfield as cited in NCELA Glossary, n.p.).

English Language Learner (ELL)-“English Language Learners (ELLs) are students whose first language is not English and who are in the process of learning English” (n.p.).

Interpreter- “A practitioner who orally translates for parties conversing in different languages...” (Wikipedia, n.d., n.p.).

Limited English Proficiency (LEP)- “The term used by the federal government, most states and local school districts to identify those students who have insufficient English to succeed in English-only classrooms” (Lessow-Hurley as cited in NCELA Glossary, n.d., n.p.)

Psychoeducational Evaluations- “[A] comprehension assessment of a student’s functioning in three primary areas that impact learning and academic functioning. These areas...include: 1) learning aptitude; 2) basic academic skill development, and 3) personality/adjustment factors” (Burgee, n.d., n.p.).

Chapter II: Literature Review

This chapter will first outline the legal protections currently in place for the LEP population and then touch on some cultural biases of the English assessments. An in-depth review of the problems associated with using interpreters during psychoeducational evaluations will also be discussed. Additionally, the chapter will give an overview of how LEP students are presently being served across the nation. The conclusion will consist of research-based suggestions for the use of interpreters during psychoeducational evaluations.

LEP Students

“LEP is the term used by the federal government, and most states and local school districts to identify those students who have insufficient English to succeed in English-only classrooms” (Lessow-Hurley as cited in NCELA Glossary, n.d., n.p.). The terms English Language Learner (ELL) or English Learner (EL) are increasingly being used in place of LEP (NCELA Glossary, n.d.). According to Samuel Ortiz (2004), LEP students specifically have difficulty in the areas of speaking, reading, writing, or understanding English.

Legal Protections

The Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA) 300.532 (a)(2) was established to protect the rights of students and parents during assessment procedures (Salvia, Ysseldyke, & Bolt, 2007). Under IDEA, assessment tools and procedures must measure disability and not English skills. Tests selected for assessment must not be culturally biased or racially discriminatory. IDEA also states that tests must be in the examinee’s native language, when possible. If a child’s lack of proficiency in English is

the only determining factor for a special educational services, the child cannot be placed in special education.

In terms of protection for parents, parents must be notified of the school's intention to enroll their child into special education (IDEA 300.503 b) (Salvia, Ysseldyke, & Bolt, 2007). The notification must be written in the parents' native language. If needed, an interpreter should be provided to convey messages to the parents. In addition, procedural safeguard notification should be given to parents in their native language (IDEA 300.504 c). When parental consent is required for assessment, consent must be obtained in the parents' native language. Most importantly, parents' rights to participate in team meetings are protected under IDEA. Under IDEA 300.345 e, an interpreter should be used at those team meetings if the parents' native language is any other than English.

Important Assessment Issues

According to Stansfield (2001), although there has been research conducted on accommodations for LEP, it is rare that the research involves "experimental design to determine the effects of accommodations on reliability, validity and score comparability" (p.3). Research regarding the use of interpreters in particular is limited. Although a number of commercial models exist for training and using interpreters, there is no empirical validation of their suggested procedures (Acher, 1990). The most crucial reason for the need to study these accommodations are due to the probability that the special education referrals for LEP may be mistaken for a normal process while someone is learning a new language (Lopez, Lamar, & Scully-Demartini, 1997). Numerous research (Ortiz, et al.; Ortiz, Garcia, Wheeler, & Maldonado-Colon as cited by Ortiz &

Yates, 2002) has reported that “studies of referral, assessment, and placement of culturally and linguistically diverse learners in special education reveal that teachers and other personnel are not able to distinguish linguistic differences and characteristics of second language acquisition from language or learning disorders” (p.786).

It normally takes at least two years for students learning English as a second language to develop social and interpersonal communication skills. (Salvia, Ysseldyke, & Bolt, 2007). Furthermore, it will take this group of students another 5-6 years to develop English skills sufficient for proficiency in academics. Those who have developed some English skills after 3-4 years of schooling can still have difficulty when tested in English (Salvia, Ysseldyke, & Bolt). For this reason, it is critical that schools develop alternatives to testing LEP students.

The majority of LEP students were born outside of the United States; therefore, most of the knowledge they will need in order to do well on tests come from what they will have obtained in the classrooms (Salvia, Ysseldyke, & Bolt, 2007). This presents a number of issues. Even when students have become somewhat fluent with their English skills, they may still struggle with low-frequency words, cultural references, or new concepts (Salvia, Ysseldyke, & Bolt). Thus issue this may hinder their ability to take psychoeducational evaluations. Furthermore, “students who are still acquiring English will translate the English material into their native language, process the information, and then translate it back into English” (Salvia, Ysseldyke, & Bolt, p.182) which requires a great deal of time. Timed tests may not be appropriate.

Cultural Biases

There may not be any assessments which are free of cultural biases; however, it is important for educators to factor in these biases when making interpretations of the obtained assessment results. Most English cognitive measures are inappropriate for LEP students for three reasons, according to Lopez, Lamar, & Scully-Demartini (1997):

- The norming and standardization samples typically exclude students from LEP backgrounds
- Assessments do not approximate the cultural backgrounds of LEP students and favor students from majority cultural backgrounds
- Traditional English cognitive measures yield scores that reflect English language knowledge instead of cognitive ability

English psychoeducational evaluations are more a test of English proficiency than they are intellectual measures (Figueora as cited in Lopez, Lamar, & Scully-Demartini, 1997). Most instructions and questions are in English. If the student is not proficient in English then it is almost impossible to obtain an accurate intellectual measurement. Thus, English skills are necessary for psychoeducational evaluations.

Furthermore, psychoeducational evaluations measure students' knowledge of the American culture (Salvia, Ysseldyke, & Bolt, 2007) rather than what it intends to measure- intellectual ability. Once again LEP students, who are probably new to the English language as well as the American culture, will be at a disadvantage.

Another important point to note is that some LEP students may be totally new to the idea of test taking. They may have not had any prior exposure to testing itself nor have any knowledge of the expectations of tests (Salvia, Ysseldyke, & Bolt, 2007). Due

to their lack of experience in testing, students “may be deficient in the ability to employ test-taking skills, choose problem solving strategies, and balance speed power” (Sattler, 2001, p.662).

Assessment Accommodations

Typical accommodations in the schools include the following: using nonverbal tests, testing in the native language using commercially translated tests, and using language interpreters (Salvia, Ysseldyke, & Bolt, 2007). Unfortunately, each alternative method to testing LEP students poses its own sets of problems.

Using nonverbal tests doesn't completely eliminate the effects of language and culture; sometimes language comprehension precedes language production skills (Salvia, Ysseldyke, & Bolt, 2007). Many nonverbal tests still provide oral instructions (Bainter & Tollefson, 2003). A lack of proficiency in English may create obstacles for LEP students because they will not be able to understand what is expected of them.

Translating a test from one language into another can change a number of things that have an effect on the validity and measures of a test. As reported by Salvia, Ysseldyke, & Bolt (2007),

Testing in the student's native language-using commercially translated tests, difficulty of vocabulary can vary from language to language, frequency of the word is different, the difficulty of the content can vary from culture to culture because students from different cultures have not had the same opportunity to learn the info, cannot assume that after the translation psychological demands remain the same (peach, South America achievement measure vs. America

intelligent measure), new sample could result in reordering and renorming producing different psychological demands made by test items in English.
(p. 177)

When translations are used, the tests' validity may be affected (Lopez, Lamar, & Scully-Demartini, 1997). Once tests have been translated, the test may no longer measure the same characteristics or skills intended to measure in the original assessment (Geisinger, 1994 as cited by Lopez, Lamar, & Scully-Demartini). Furthermore, in some languages, there may not be terms equivalent to the original English terminology used in the tests. A substitute term may create a totally different or inaccurate translation (Kapborg & Bertero, 2002).

Problems Associated with Using Language Interpreters

Many of the problems associated with using interpreters may overlap with concerns connected to test translations because these two types of accommodations are closely related. Translating is when someone produces a written format that has been changed from one language to another. Language interpreting is when a person translates orally from one language to another (Kapborg & Bertero, 2002).

The main problem is that there is a shortage of bilingual school psychologists to serve the increasing LEP population in the United States (Ochoa, et al., 2004). In an effort to make up for the shortage of bilingual school psychologists, language interpreters are utilized. Researchers, however, do not recommend the use of interpreters because the accuracy of interpretation is unknown (Salvia, Ysseldyke, & Bolt, 2007). Weiner (n.d.) suggested that:

Unless an interpreter is fully conversant with idiomatic expressions and cultural references in both languages, is familiar with standard procedures in psychoeducational evaluation, and is a stranger to the examinee- the obtained results may be of questionable validity. (p.8)

Yet another obstacle is that the use of interpreters may complicate the testing situation further. Although not intentional, interpreters may omit, add or substitute words during the interpretation process. The changes that occur during interpretation may present the problem of context if the test items have been changed in any way (Lopez as cited by Lopez, Lamar, & Scully-Demartini, 1997). Even though the school psychologist is well aware of the strict rules for administering psychoeducational evaluations, it is impossible for the school psychologist to know whether or not the interpreter is interpreting fully and only what has been read. Thus, it is not possible for school psychologists to control any mistakes that may have been made by interpreters (Kapborg & Bertero, 2002).

Other difficulties that may arise when working with interpreters may include the following (Sattler, 2001):

1. Failure to reveal symptoms-interpreter hearing info about touchy topics may omit details, substitute details, reformulate details, or change the focus of the communication. (ie. Try to make sense out of disorganized statements)
2. Mistrust of interpreter-by parents, child
3. Preaching to examinees-interpreters may preach to parents or examiner about sticking to traditions
4. Dialectical and regional differences

5. Mixture of two languages
6. Changes in difficulty level- difficult to translate
7. Alteration of meaning-translation can alter meaning of words
8. Causing offense with colloquial words- formal vs. colloquial
9. Using interpreters can take very long and can be exhausting for both parties.

(Kapborg & Bertero, 2002)

Even though there is a lack of research concerning the use of interpreters, most agree that using untrained interpreters will weaken the validity of psychoeducational evaluations (Bainter & Tollefson, 2003). Interpreters who have not been properly trained do not have a full understanding of the evaluation procedures and desired outcomes. The lack of knowledge about the evaluation process can cause the interpreter to distort information being communicated (Ric Liamputtong and Ezzy as cited by Kapborg & Bertero, 2002).

It is crucial that interpreters receive basic training in the field in which they are going to interpret for; yet, training for interpreters and translators who work with LEP students is still uncommon. Highly skilled interpreters often receive training at a university educational level and take several years to achieve competency in interpreting for the LEP population (Fradd & Wilen, 1990).

Schools commonly call upon interpreters to fulfill language barriers on an emergency basis. Unfortunately when this is done, most interpreters are untrained. Sometimes their only qualifying skill may be that they can speak the desired language (Fradd & Wilen, 1990). Experience with the language alone does not provide the

interpreter with the sufficient knowledge needed to interpret during the psychoeducational evaluation process.

In addition, being able to speak the language does not mean that interpreters have enough knowledge of the language and culture. Some languages may have different which may be either more respectful or more offensive to use (Fradd & Wilen, 1990). An understanding of these issues will enable the interpreter to assist in helping maintain positive relationships with LEP students and their parents. In conjunction, LEP individuals may not understand the standard form of their native language because it requires formal education. Many LEP individuals lack formal training in their native language. As a result, the standard form of the language may not be completely interpretable (Fradd & Wilen).

Current Practices

In 2004, Ochoa et al conducted an investigation of what school psychologists' current practices were in terms of assessing English Language Learners (ELL) and/or bilingual students. Surveys were sent to a random sample of National Association of School Psychology (NASP) members from 12 states. 1,500 members were sent a survey. Out of the 401 completed surveys, only 223 indicated that they had assessed ELL students. The results were as follows (Ochoa et al., 2004, pp.195-202):

- 36% of respondents indicated they were able to speak another language other than English
- 18 different languages were spoken by the respondents
- 78% reported that they had used interpreters

- 75% used interpreters to translate consent forms, to interpret during parent interviews, to explain test procedures and results, and to explain rights and safeguards to parents
- 65% used interpreters to conduct interviews with students
- Of the respondents who used interpreters only 52% were trained to do so
- 26% used interpreters who have not received any formal training
- Most commonly used measures are primarily nonverbal and projective in nature

Although this research drew a lot on the practice of using interpreters, the respondents also used commercially translated evaluations. Also, as mentioned above, interpreters were used to translate rating scales. This practice, however, is in conflict with the Standards for Educational and Psychological Testing code 9.7 (Ochoa et al., 2004).

Recommendations Offered in Literature Review

“The fundamental principle when assessing students with LEP is to assure that the assessment materials and procedures used actually assess students’ target knowledge, skill, or ability, not their ability to understand and use English” (Salvia, Ysseldyke, & Bolt, 2007, p.175). The most preferred way to assess LEP students is through the use of bilingual school psychologists (Lopez, Lamar, & Scully-Demartini, 1997). The use of bilingual school psychologists would decrease risks for misclassifications and mislabeling (Figueora as cited by Lopez, Lamar, & Scully-Demartini). And yet, in spite of this recommendation, schools have a difficult time finding bilingual school psychologists.

With the shortage of bilingual school psychologists, another recommendation would be to train personnel, implement screening committees, and facilitate consultation activities. Sattler (2001) advises that personnel responsible for referring students should develop a knowledge base of second language acquisition and other factors that impact the cognitive functioning of LEP students. Furthermore, personnel should also know how to use interventions which are culturally sensitive. In addition, they must understand the limitations of psychoeducational evaluations with the LEP student population (Sattler).

Before assessing LEP students, it is important to assess their proficiency level in English through a variety of measures (Lopez, Lamar, & Scully-Demartini, 1997). The different measures consist of (Sattler, 2001):

- Asking the students for their preference in language
- Observe the students' language usage with peers, family members, or school personnel
- Ask parents or teachers what for their opinion of a language preference for the child
- Administer rating scale to assess bilingual verbal ability (ie. Verbal Ability Tests, VAT).

If the student is not proficient enough to be assessed, there are other ways they can be evaluated. Salvia, Ysseldyke, & Bolt (2007) suggests direct observations of the child and interviews with family members and teachers can help identify disabilities which may be based on social function. Other accommodations may be subtle changes that can make huge impacts. Those changes can include having the student be tested in a familiar

setting and allowing more breaks during the test. Other accommodations may be as simple as “reading directions aloud, repeating directions, or clarifying directions” (Stansfield, 2001, p.3).

Using language interpreters should be the last alternative when working with LEP students. When it might be the best option though, there are important recommendations made for using interpreters. It is recommended that the interpreter “be fluent in both the language of the test and the examinee’s native language, ...have expertise in translating, and ... have a basic understanding of the assessment process” (American Educational Research Association, American Psychological Association, and National Council on Measurement as cited in Ochoa, et al., 2004, p.188). Although anyone may be able to interpret, not just anyone can serve as interpreters during the assessment process. It is especially critical that school psychologists do not use family members or friends to interpret. The practice of using people close to the families can violate their confidentiality (Klotz & Canter, 2006).

Training should always be provided to the interpreter. Although most interpreters may have a basic grasp of interpreting expectations, they will need to be trained to be proficient enough to perform more complex interpreting during psychoeducational evaluations (Fradd & Wilen, 1990). The process of translation, cultural communication differences and test administration are important areas of training for training for the interpreters (Lopez, Lamar, & Scully-Demartini, 1997). Interpreters should be trained to remain neutral and impartial during the interpretation process (Fradd & Wilen).

Chapter III: Summary and Recommendations

The Census 2000 reports indicated that approximately 47 million households spoke a language other than English at home. In conjunction, it was predicted that that by 2050, the Hispanic and Asian populations within the United States would triple (Bergman, 2004). The projected increase in these groups would mean that the Hispanic population would rise from 195.7 million to 210.3 million, and the Asian population would increase from 33.4 million to 10.7 million. Since the Census 2000 reports, there has already been a drastic growth in the new refugee arrivals. Between 2000 and 2005, there was a reported influx of 300,000 new refugee arrivals to the United States (Office of Immigration, n.d.).

In conjunction with this growth, schools are required to provide accommodations to LEP students and their families when completing psychoeducational evaluations, as mandated by a number of laws. One of the protections for LEP students and their parents are guaranteed in the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA). IDEA requires schools to use assessment tools and procedures that should measure ability and not students' English skill abilities. IDEA also requires that evaluations be administered in the students' native language. Under IDEA, schools are to send provide written notifications to parents in their native language. Interpreters should be provided to the parents during team meetings as well (Salvia, Ysseldyke, & Bolt, 2007).

Accommodations for LEP during psychoeducational evaluations present a number of general concerns. First, many of the evaluations used do not include LEP children in their norming and standardization samples. Secondly, traditional English evaluations seek answers that require the knowledge of the English language (Lopez, Lamar, &

Scully-Demartini, 1997) and the American culture (Salvia, Ysseldyke, & Bolt, 2007). More specifically, school psychologists have turned to the use of non-verbal, commercially translated tests, and interpreters when assessing LEP students; however, each poses its own set of problems. This research focused particularly on the problems associated with the utilization of language interpreters during psychoeducational evaluations.

The use of interpreters is common even though researchers do not recommend using interpreters for a number of reasons. The validity of results obtained through the use of interpreters may be questionable (Weiner, n.d.). Interpreters may omit, add or substitute words during the interpretation process (Lopez, Lamar, & Scully-Demartini, 1997). Interpreters may be able to speak the desired language but may lack knowledge of the dialectical differences and offensive terms (Sattler, 2001). Moreover, the use of interpreters can take a very long time and can be exhausting for all parties involved (Kapborg & Bertero, 2002). Using interpreters can also cause a loss of rapport between the examiner and examinee.

More importantly, many interpreters are not trained and do not have a full understanding of the evaluation procedure and desired outcomes (Kapborg & Bertero, 2002). Having the skill of only the desired language does not qualify all interpreters for interpreting during psychoeducational evaluations (Fradd & Wilen, 1990). Therefore, it is important that interpreters who are going to work with school psychologists receive basic training in the psychoeducational evaluations first.

Limitations

There is one known limitation to the literature used in this review. Despite the unavailable research regarding accommodations for LEP students, there is very little research in this area which involved experimental findings. Therefore, information concerning the reliability, validity, and score comparability of accommodations are rare (Stansfield, 2001). The main focus of this literature review was on the subject of using language interpreters during psychoeducational evaluations. Similarly, there is also a lacking of experimental research concerning the use of interpreters specifically during psychoeducational evaluations.

Recommendations

Based on the research examined for this literature review, there are three areas related to the utilization of interpreters in psychoeducational evaluations which are most critical for addressing. The areas in need of immediate attention include the following: 1) shortage of bilingual school psychologists (Ochoa, et al., 2004); 2) training for psychoeducational interpreters (Fradd & Wilen, 1990; Lopez, Lamar, & Scully-Demartini, 1997); and 3) experimental research regarding the use of interpreters (Stansfield, 2001). According to the literature examined, these are key pieces that schools and the field of school psychology are lacking.

Given that diversity is rapidly increasing in the United States, there should be a priority for preparing bilingual professionals to meet the needs of the growing LEP population. Professional fields of study, such as education, must develop the means for recruiting, training and retaining bilingual professionals to serve the growing diverse student body. Specifically, school psychology organizations and school psychology

educational programs should actively work to enlist a diverse group of students into graduate training programs. Scholarships and internships could be awarded as incentives to individuals who are bilingual and bicultural. A number of proactive plans can be in place to retain students in the educational or training program, such as mentoring programs, advisement plans, small group assignments, etc. A successful raise in the number of school psychologists will decrease the need for interpreters; thus, the decrease the concerns surrounding the use of interpreters.

Secondly, there needs to be training designed specifically for interpreters who interpret for school psychologists. When bilingual school psychologists are not available, interpreters would be used only as a second choice. It is recommended that interpreters complete specific training before interpreting during any evaluation procedures. In addition to knowing standard interpreting guidelines, they should understand the basics of the school psychology and psychoeducational evaluations. School psychologist interpreters need to know why psychoeducational evaluations are administered to students, including LEP students. Interpreters should be trained to give pertinent information to the school psychologist that would otherwise be lost when there is a communication barrier. Most importantly, interpreters need to know how to avoid inaccurate translations. A proper training guide can assist school psychologists across the nation train their interpreters and steer clear of assessment mishaps.

Finally, research regarding the accommodations for LEP students need to involve experimental designs and implementation. In particular, it would be helpful if the effects of using interpreters during the psychoeducational evaluations would be examined. Empirical research may provide a more accurate representation of how the use of

interpreters affects the validity and reliability of psychoeducational assessments with LEP students. Furthermore, empirical research results may provide valuable feedback in terms of how to develop training models for interpreters. Findings drawn from experimental research will greatly benefit the school psychology field in their advancement to using more appropriate accommodations when assessing LEP students.

Without remedy of these predicaments, school psychologists will continue to experience challenges when assessing LEP students. The promotion and support in these main areas of focus will increase the likelihood of meeting the needs of the rising LEP student population in the schools across the nation.

References

- Abedi, J. & Hejri, F. (2004). Accommodations for students with limited English Proficiency in the National Assessment of Educational Progress. *Applied Measurement in Education*, 17(4), 371-392.
- Ascher, C. (1990). *Assessing bilingual students for placement and instruction*. (Eric Document Reproduction Service No. ED 322273)
- Bainter, T.R. & Tollefson, N. (2003). Intellectual assessment of language minority students: What do school psychologists believe are acceptable practices? *Psychology in the Schools*, 40(6), 599-603.
- Bergman, M. (2004). Census Bureau projects tripling of Hispanic and Asian populations in 50 years; Non-Hispanic Whites may drop to half of total population. *U.S. Census Bureau News*. Retrieved March 30, 2007, from: www.census.gov/Press-Release/www/releases/archives/population/001720.html.
- Burgee, M.L. (n.d.). What is a psychoeducational evaluation? *Internet Special Education Resources*. Retrieved April 15, 2007, from: www.iser.com/psychoed-evaluations.html.
- Fradd, S.H. & Wilen, D.K. (1990). Using interpreters and translators to meet the needs of handicapped language minority students and their families. *NCBE Program Information Guide Series*, 4. Retrieved April 6, 2007, from: www.ncela.gwu.edu/pubs/pigs/pig4.htm.
- Glossary of terms related to the education of linguistically and culturally diverse students. *National Clearinghouse for English Language Acquisition and Language Instruction Educational Programs*. Retrieved March 20, 2007, from:

www.ncela.gwu.edu/expert/glossary.html.

Interpreter (n.d.). *Wikipedia, the Free Encyclopedia*. Retrieved March 20, 2007, from:
<http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Interpreter>.

Kapborg, I. & Bertero, C. (2002). Using an interpreter in qualitative interviews: Does it threaten validity? *Nursing Inquiry*, 9(1), 52-56.

Klotz, M. & Canter, A. (2006). Culturally competent assessment and consultation. *Student Counseling*, 11-14.

Lopez, E.C., Lamar, D., & Scully-Demartini, D. (1997). The cognitive assessment of limited-English-proficient children: Current problems and practical recommendations. *Cultural Diversity and Mental Health*, 3(2), 117-130.

Ochoa, S.H., Riccio, C., Jimenez, S., Garcia de Alba, R., & Sines, M. (2004). Psychoeducational assessment of English language learners and/or bilingual students: An investigation of school psychologists' current practices. *Journal of Psychoeducational Assessment*, 22, 185-208.

Origins and Language (2000). *American Fact Finder*. Retrieved April 3, 2007, from:
<http://factfinder.census.gov>.

Ortiz, A.A. & Yates, J.R. (2002). Response to "Is 'learning disabilities' just a fancy term for low achievement? A meta-analysis of reading differences between low achievers with and without the label." In Bradley, R., Danielson, L., & Hallahan, D.P. (Eds.), *Identification of learning disabilities: Research to practice* (pp. 783-789). New York: Wiley.

Ortiz, S. (2004). *Lecture notes from Cognitive Evaluations- Spring, 2007*. (Available from: Dr. Crystal Cullerton-Sen, 411 McCalmont Hall, Department of Education;

- School Psychology, University of Wisconsin-Stout, Menomonie, WI 54751).
- Race and Ethnicity (2000). *American Fact Finder*. Retrieved April 3, 2007, from:
<http://factfinder.census.gov/>.
- Refugees arrivals: fiscal years 1980 to 2005 (n.d.). *Office of Immigration*. Retrieved April 3, 2007, from: www.dhs.gov.
- Rooney, K.J. (2002). Clinical judgment in the assessment of learning disabilities. In Bradley, R., Danielson, L., & Hallahan, D.P. (Eds.), *Identification of learning disabilities: Research to practice* (pp. 713-723). New York: Wiley.
- Salvia, J., Ysseldyke, J.E., & Bolt, S. (2007). *Assessment in Special and Inclusive Education (10th Ed.)*. Boston: Houghton Mifflin Co.
- Sattler, J.M. (2001). *Assessment of children: Cognitive applications (4th Ed)*. San Diego, CA: Jerome M. Sattler.
- Stansfield, C. (2001). *Accommodations for LEP students*. (Eric Document Reproduction Service No. ED 458289)
- Wiener, I.B. (n.d.). The assessment process (3-25). Retrieved April 3, 2007, from:
http://media.wiley.com/product_data/excerpt/70/04713840/0471384070.pdf.