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Learning Disabilities

Public Law 94-142:

✓ .... a disorder in one or more of the basic psychological processes involved in understanding or in using language
✓ ... includes such conditions as perceptual handicaps, brain injury, minimal brain dysfunction, dyslexia, and developmental aphasia.
✓ ... does not include children who have learning problems which are primarily the result of visual, hearing, or motor handicaps, or mental retardation, or emotional disturbance or of environmental, cultural, or economic disadvantage.
“Children with dyslexia showed a correlation between the magnitude of increased activation in left temporo-parietal cortex and improvement in oral language ability (Temple et al., 2003, p. 2860).

Treatment was associated with improved reading scores and increased brain activation during both tasks, such that quantity and pattern of activation for children with dyslexia after treatment closely resembled that of controls (Aylward et al., 2003, p 212).”
Central Concern for Reading

However, about 80% of children identified as learning disabled have failed to achieve in reading. Students with LD typically have more difficulty with fluent word reading rather than comprehension (Lerner, 1989; Kavale & Reese, 1992; Stanovich, 1990).
What are phonological skills?

- Pre-reading abilities related to awareness and mental manipulation of speech sounds (phonemes)
- Skills that gradually become integrated during early preschool and school experience.
- Performance requiring these skills can be interpreted to indicate how well children understand the sound structure of language and its relation to written words.
What we know...

Large, convergent literature shows that L1 phonemic awareness predicts word decoding in early grades (Wagner & Torgesen, 1987)
Longitudinal studies show intensive interventions with kindergartners who perform poorly on phonological processing tasks result in word decoding performance in 1st and 2nd grades more similar to that of peers.

(Bus & van Ijzendoorn, 1999; Ehri et al., 2001)
Equivalent demonstrations exist for early readers in many other languages.

Performance in L1 is related to performance in L2.

(Durgunoğlu, Nagy, & Hancin-Bhatt, 1993; Cisero & Royer, 1995; Geva, Wade-Woolley, & Shany, 1997; Riccio, Amado, Jiménez, Hasbrouck, Imhoff, & Denton, 2001; )
Theoretical Developmental Path

Phonological Sensitivity → Detection Of Rhyme → Discrimination Of Onset

Word Knowledge → Letter Knowledge

Word Decoding → Mental Manipulation Of Phonemes → Phonemic Awareness

Working Memory
Generally, though, learning disabilities have been identified when achievement (e.g. reading score) is significantly (e.g., 1.5+ standard deviations) below ability (e.g., IQ) and ability is in the normal range.
Why Discrepancy Criteria Fail
(From: Fletcher, 2002)
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Responsiveness to Instruction as an Indicator of Exceptionality

1. Teachers provide instruction in the curriculum
2. Teachers periodically note progress or lack of progress
3. Teachers try a different approach for those who do not seem to be making progress
4. Instruction continues and, at some point, progress is noted
5. Teachers seek outside help for those who continually show lack of progress, including referral for special education
Teachers-as-Test
(Gerber & Semmel, *Educational Psychologist*, 1984)

- “…agreement between teachers and ‘objective’ instruments may not be an acceptable test of concurrent or predictive validity of teachers-as-test (p. 143).”
- “…referral behavior may indeed reflect an underlying lawfulness in how teachers form judgments about teachability, how these judgments are translated into referrals…and how teacher identification … can appear at once so idiosyncratic but at the same time reliable (p. 145).”
Teachers treat responsive students as “tolerably” similar.
Outside this range, teachers can be successful less “tolerated” students IF they know and can use better methods, or alternatively, provide more minutes of instruction.
Models of RTI

**Problem Solving**

What schools now do. Variable in specific approach, process, procedures, and capacity.

**“Standard Protocol”**

Teaching becomes the test. Must provide high baseline of instruction, standard procedures.

* Adapted from Fuchs, Mock, Morgan & Young, 2003
RTI and Classroom “Tolerance”

RTI implies new effort, professional development, new in-class assessment procedures, and new primary, secondary, and perhaps tertiary interventions.

The net effect is to increase classroom “tolerance.”
Reading First: Multi-Tiered Instruction

- **ALL STUDENTS**
- **SOME (20-30%) STUDENTS**
- **A FEW STUDENTS**
- **2 - 6%**
Reading First: Multi-Tiered Instruction

- Primary (Tier 1) Classroom Instruction
  - Classroom Instruction With Support
    - Secondary (Tier II)
      - Tertiary (Tier III)
        - Outside Support
          - Special Education
Response to Responsiveness

High Quality Instruction

Continuous Monitoring Of Indicators

Continue Intensify
## Teaching Effort Required


<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Researcher</th>
<th>Intervention</th>
<th>Sample Failure</th>
<th>Population Failure</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Foorman</td>
<td>174 hrs.- classroom</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Felton</td>
<td>340 hrs. - groups of 8</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vellutino</td>
<td>35- 65 hrs. 1:1 tutoring</td>
<td>46%</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Torgesen</td>
<td>88 hrs. 1:1 tutoring</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Torgesen</td>
<td>80 hrs. 1:3 tutoring</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Torgesen</td>
<td>91 hrs. 1:3 or 1:5 tutoring</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>1.6%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Scoring below the 30%ile
Rime

• *Example Spanish*: “Pan, Cual palabra rima o suena como pan, flan o sal?”

• *Example English*: “Can, which word rhymes with or sounds like can, pig or man?”
Onset

• *Example Spanish*: “Casa, cual palabra empieza con el mismo sonido que casa, leche o cara?”

• *Example English*: “Pail, which word begins with the same sound as pail, puppy or desk?”
Segmentation

• Example Spanish:
  • Assessor: “sol”
  • Student: s-o-l

• Example English:
  • Assessor: cow
  • Student “c-ow”
Is RTI different for English Learners?

The effects of individual differences in phonological processing abilities on early word reading for monolingual learners is well documented. We do not understand yet how these mechanisms work during bilingual acquisition.
Change in Phonological Measures

- Phoneme elision
- Sound categorization
- Phoneme segmentation
- Blending phonemes - words
- Blending phonemes - nonwords

Graph showing the mean items correct for each grade level from Kindergarten to Fourth Grade.
Development of Spanish Phonological Measures
(Riccio, Amado, Jimenez, Hasbrouck, & Imhoff, 2000)
Project La Patera Schools 2000–2001 SAT-9 Reading
Methods

♦ **Independent measures**: Status on battery of phonological and preliteracy predictive measures, home inventory

♦ **Intervention**: Intensive instruction in phonological skills with teacher and parent training/participation

♦ **Dependent measures**: English word/pseudoword decoding, spelling, SAT9 (end of second grade)
Methods

- **Setting**: Three school districts in California
- **Sample**: Entering kindergarteners (Sept. 2000) 23 intact classrooms with students who are predominantly Spanish-speaking (N=377)
  - 20 English only instruction
  - 5 Bilingual instruction
- 48 % female
- Low SES (>40% below Census poverty level)
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Core Intervention Model

- Small group (4) direct instruction
- Distributed practice (300 mins.)
- Focused on specific skills
- Fast-paced
- “Step-down” correction (re-teaching)
- High motivation
“Step Down” Prompting

“Supply” Question

Binary Choice

Model-Lead

Simple Imitation
Word Identification
1st Grade Pretest

Pre-K | Post-K | Pre-1st
--- | --- | ---
No Intervention | Intervention

Graph showing the progress in word identification from Pre-K to Pre-1st grade with and without intervention.
Word Identification
1st Grade Posttest
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Graph showing progress from Pre-K to Pre-2nd grade, with intervention showing a higher rate of improvement.
Standard Score Gains

Early Kindergarten
Gain by Start of 2nd Grade
Research Questions

♦ How do students most at-risk respond during instruction?

♦ What are the characteristics of those students who are responsive compared to those who are not responsive?
  – Specifically on development of strategies, ongoing fluency, and number of responses during instruction
Participants

- 4 lowest performing students of 19 Kindergarten students (1 class)
- Age: 5 years
- Gender: 2 girls, 2 boys
- Ethnicity: Latino
- Average Family Income: $20,000-$29,000
Microgenetic Procedures

Pretest

Explicit Instruction
2 x 30 min/wk

Probes
(5/session)

Revise Instruction

Post test
(Week 10)
Strategy Development in PA

- Based on cross sectional pilot study with 1-3\textsuperscript{rd} graders (Leafstedt, Richards, & Gerber, 2004)
  - As students become more sophisticated at understanding sound-letter correspondences, strategies become more sophisticated
**Rime**

Sounds the same

Without letter knowledge:
- First sound same
- Last sound same

With letter knowledge:
- First letter/sound same
- Last letter/sound same
- Ending is the same
  - Last consonant & vowel same
Cesar-Responsive

Correct Per Minute

Weeks

Non-Word Fluency (Letters)  Non-Word Fluency (Words)  Timed Segmentation

Benchmarks:
NWF 15
SEG 10

(From: Richards, 2004)
Cesar-Strategies

Rime Strategies
Week 1: “the same…”
Week 6: “They are the same.”
Week 9: “Because /d/”

Segmentation Strategies
Week 1: repeats word
Week 6: segments 1 sound (t-tap)
Week 9: segments 2 sounds (kn-ee)
Cesar-Responses during Instruction

♦ Average responses per minute = 3.68
♦ Observations: Attentive during other students’ responses and questions addressed to others
Perla-Not Responsive

Correct Per Minute

Weeks

Non-Word Fluency (Letters)  Non-Word Fluency (Words)  Timed Segmentation

Benchmarks:
NWF 15
SEG 10

Missing Data
Perla-Strategies

Rime Strategies
Week 1: No response
Week 6: “They are the same.”
Week 9: “They are the same.”

Segmentation Strategies
Week 1: repeats word
Week 6: segments 1 sound (key=“hhh”)
Week 9: segments 1 sounds (cake=“bbb”)

Perla- Responses during Instruction

- Average responses per minute = 2.77
- Observations: off task when not her turn, responds only after being called on only
Responsive Students

♦ Students at-risk who were responsive to intensive intervention
  – Made growth on both fluency measures
  – Progressed in strategy use
  – Integrated information about PA and letter sounds
  – More responses during instruction
Students not responsive

♦ Students who were not responsive
  – Made growth on the nonword fluency but not on the segmentation task
  – Did not reach same strategy level on rime and segmentation tasks
  – Had fewer responses during instruction
Implications for Using RTI

- Students should be assessed in L1. Although cognitive abilities are the same, lack of familiarity with English phonology will underestimate capability.
- Variable knowledge of English, particularly English phonology, in early grades introduces variability (instability) in progress monitoring measures. Judgments about responsiveness after fixed intervals of instruction are subject to error.
- Better to assess responsiveness *during* instructional interventions.
- Assessment of “strategies” may be important, but low proficiency in oral English may underestimate true knowledge.
General discussion

Variables that distinguish students who are responsive from those who are not

- Segmentation fluency
- Use of more sophisticated strategies integrating letter knowledge and PA
- Number of responses during instruction
Implications for intervention

♦ Longer intervention-more than 10 weeks
♦ More frequent instruction-4 days per week
♦ Direct teaching of strategies (i.e., ways of thinking about PA task)
♦ Attention to actual number of responses (perhaps smaller group size-3)
Future Research

- Further investigation of strategies over time to see if do students not responsive develop different strategies or just develop them later in time.
- Incorporate strategies into intervention for students not responding to first level of intervention.
- Conduct research on reading comprehension—learning from text—to assess consequences of slow or unreliable processing of phonological information, low fluency in word reading, and vocabulary.