Response to Intervention for Language:
A response to intervention approach for language can help identify students at-risk for language, reading, and writing disorders. Current best practice supports using progress monitoring tools as a way to guide the RTI process (Gilliam and Justice, 2010). However, current progress monitoring tools are limited in scope by focus. Benchmark assessments such as AIMSweb Test of Early Literacy can identify students at-risk for reading decoding difficulties. However, these tools are not adept at identifying language-based disorders. Other progress monitoring tools, such as the Tracking Narrative Language Progress are adequate for measuring language growth, but they are difficult for non-speech language pathologists to administer, making them non-practical for school-wide administration. Standardized language screening tools, such as the CELF-4 screener or PLS-5 screener are either too time intensive to administer to all students, or the norms are not appropriate for English Language Learners.
Assesses four language areas correlated to future reading comprehension success and functional classroom performance:

- Auditory Comprehension
- Following Directions
- Categorization (Receptive & Expressive)
- Narrative Language

Measures individual student’s language growth over time

Can be administered by any school personnel 3 times yearly in coordination with other tools (e.g. AIMSweb)

Takes fewer than 5 minutes per student
The KLBA serves several purposes:

1. Differentiate ELL from SLI by measuring growth through an RTI process

2. Monitor group language growth

![Bar chart showing mean scores for different groups across seasons.](chart1.png)

3. Measure individual language growth and serve as measurable data for language IEP goals

![Bar chart showing overall scores for different seasons.](chart2.png)

**Color Coding of Bars:**
- Green: Score in Top 25% of class
- Yellow: Score in 50-75% of class
- Orange: Score in 25-50% of class
- Red: Score in bottom 25% of class
4. Demonstrate effectiveness of instruction by showing mean rate of growth

![Mean Rate of Growth](image)

**Pilot Study (2013-2014)**

During the 2013-2014 school year, a pilot study was conducted by Dr. Angela Anthony at Eastern Illinois University, with the KLBA administered in the fall, winter, and spring. Participants included 114 culturally and linguistically diverse kindergarten students. The Clinical Evaluation of Language Fundamentals Screening, Fifth Edition (CELF-5), was also administered in the winter to examine concurrent validity (i.e. how well an assessment relates to an existing measure).

Preliminary data analysis indicates that the KLBA outcomes are moderately to highly correlated with the CELF-5 Screening ($r = .699$, $p < .01$; $n=114$). In addition, data from this pilot shows growth on individual subtests and total scores across all three time points, as represented in the table below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Comprehension (6)</th>
<th>Following Directions (5)</th>
<th>Categories (10)</th>
<th>Narrative (5)</th>
<th>Total Score (26)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Fall</strong></td>
<td>3.66 (1.74)</td>
<td>3.20 (1.23)</td>
<td>6.32 (2.71)</td>
<td>2.94 (1.44)</td>
<td>16.10 (6.00)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Winter</strong></td>
<td>4.44 (1.65)</td>
<td>3.78 (0.95)</td>
<td>7.62 (2.02)</td>
<td>3.31 (1.38)</td>
<td>19.15 (4.52)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Spring</strong></td>
<td>5.04 (1.36)</td>
<td>4.23 (0.81)</td>
<td>8.40 (1.52)</td>
<td>3.46 (1.24)</td>
<td>21.14 (3.63)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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