

This unedited transcript of a SpeechPathology.com webinar is provided in order to facilitate communication accessibility for the viewer and may not be a totally verbatim record of the proceedings. This transcript may contain errors. Copying or distributing this transcript without the express written consent of SpeechPathology.com is strictly prohibited. For any questions, please contact customerservice@SpeechPathology.com.

Language and Literacy: A Collaborative Approach, Part 1 Recorded July 28th, 2020

Presenter: Angie Neal, MS, CCC-SLP
SpeechPathology.com Course #9398

- [Amy] Once again, welcome to our webinar today. The first in a two-part series on language and literacy, a collaborative approach. This is part one. Our presenter today is Angie Neal. She is an SLP from Greenville, South Carolina, and she has worked in outpatient pediatrics in school settings, but her passion is helping students succeed in an academic setting. Mrs. Neal frequently presents across the U.S. and uses her animated presentation style to share practical strategies that can be quickly and easily implemented. And that is just always the case. So Angie, we're thrilled to have you here today and we're looking forward to this two-part series. I'm gonna hand over the floor to you.

- [Angie] All right. So here we go. First of all, I want to thank you all so much for coming and for your interest in this topic. Language and literacy is something that I'm passionate about and I've really spent the last 15 or so years learning about this, and I am thrilled to share it with you. So just a little bit about me a little bit more of than what she said. So I am Angie Neal. I am in a school-based SLP, and I may sound familiar because I've done a couple of courses before with speechpathology.com. And again, in fact, this is an update that I've done to a previous language and literacy course with the goal being to move us all up from a beginner level, to an intermediate and even advanced level of knowledge about the topic of language and literacy. Now, the way this two-part workshop is designed is to give you what you need to work collaboratively, and supporting literacy.

In essence, what I want to give you is a broad perspective of the background of the other key players and the information about them that may be helpful for you, and then information that's helpful for you to share with your team about the language foundation for literacy. In the hopes that SLPs can one day gain a seat at the literacy table. So in part one, we're going to talk about what you need to know about your key players at who already have a seat at the literacy table. So this includes your

classroom teachers, your special ed teachers, your school psychologist, your ESL teachers to name a few. And what do we need to know about their training and their programs and curriculums. Part two, we're going to talk about what they need to know about us as SLPs. Specifically, we're going to talk a lot about phonemic awareness, phonics, orthographic mapping, vocabulary, and strategies, again that you can implement and share readily and easily. And again, as a quick reminder, these are both 90-minute workshops. So buckle up, here we go. All right. Oops. Here we go, all right. So quick disclosures. I'm on TPT. Any handouts with any of these workshops that are on there, they are for you as a member of speech pathology.com. But if you want to share any handouts with someone who is not a member of speech pathology.com, I encourage you to just direct them to my page.

I'm also getting an honorarium today. I'm a member of ASHA. I'm gonna talk about our roles and responsibilities. I'm also a member and on the board of the South Carolina branch of the international dyslexia association, and I am going to say a word or two about that in part two. Our objectives today are first and foremost, gain a broad understanding of the reading process from a collaborative perspective, as well as to describe the connections between spoken and written language.

Discuss key factors and perspectives in order to consider a collaborative approach and explain the evidence base. The evidence-based instruction as it relates to effective and efficient growth in reading development. The main thing that I hope you take away from this course is that everyone in a school is there for the same purpose, to help students succeed. And literacy is a multifaceted and there is definitely enough work to go around. And so in a time right now, today is July 28th. So in a time where students have been out of a brick and mortar building for about six months, from March 13th until now, or August 20th when we go back. Students have not received typical literacy instruction. And there's a genuine concern that those who weren't behind fell behind and those who were already behind, fell further behind. So there's a tremendous need

to align literacy instruction with the evidence of what we know works in literacy instruction in order to deliver effective and efficient instruction. So I spoke at ASHA in 2019 on the topic of what can SLPs learn from NASA about language and literacy practices. And I wanna share a little bit of that with you, because I think it does a great job of framing this conversation. So to begin. First of all, teaching reading is rocket science. The key word here being science, meaning there is, has been and continues to be extensive research being conducted on how children learn to read and the science behind it is fascinating stuff. Did you know, there's actually about a thousand new scientific articles each year on the science of reading?

Maybe you've read them. So I'm advocating for SLPs to be recognized for the significant contributions that language has on literacy development and to have a seat at the literacy table, both for the students you currently work with, and those you don't. But to explain myself a little bit better. I wanna share a comparison between NASA and literacy. First of all, did you know that NASA actually hires 20 different types of engineers from different fields? So from the fields of aerospace, mechanical engineering, computer engineers, and a whole bunch of other ones. In addition, they also hire other professionals, chemists, mathematicians, biologists, meteorologists, and that just those professionals right there, that's only 60% of their workforce.

They also have project managers, people who support the project managers as well as clerical assistance, and somebody's got to pay everybody. But the one thing NASA requires more than any other degree or background is that that person be a team player, because no one can get a rocket into space alone, not even Elon Musk. In other words, it takes a team of people working together, each one contributing their own unique area of expertise, but they all have the same goal. So what's our mission as SLPs? Well consider this in the United States over half the children have scored at the basic or below basic levels every time the national assessment of educational progress has been administered. Over half. Now, what does that mean? 'Cause that's a big

number, but what does that really translate to at a functional level? What it really translate to, is someone might be able to follow the directions on the back of a Duncan Hines cake box. But, they may not be able to understand the printed and information from their doctor about high blood pressure. Also know this, the majority of all poor readers have an early history of spoken language deficits with 73% of second grade, poor readers having poor phonemic awareness or spoken language problems in kindergarten. And atypical speech sound errors in preschool are predictive of school age phonemic awareness abilities. If more than 10% of the child's speech has atypical errors. The child is likely to have deficits in phonemic awareness, reading and spelling. So our mission is to be part of the solution especially because of the importance that language and development has on literacy development.

We also need to work with school teams to uncover and use the science and the research for the benefit of our students and really society as a whole. Most importantly, we need to help others to understand that whether it's spoken or written it's all language. So the more every person in their school building knows about language, the more we all know about literacy. And what is literacy? Literacy is language, literacy is part of the continuum of language. Literacy is thinking, speaking, reading, writing, and listening, which all have a common denominator of language. So in truth, teachers aren't teaching reading.

They are teachers of language in the print modality, and spoken language provides the foundation for written language. I love this quote from Seidenberg. We read with our eyes, but the starting point for reading is speech, because we don't read and write words. We read and write sequences of symbols that represent the sequences of sounds in spoken words. So for example, we write the sequence of letters that represent the sounds in this order for the word stop. S,t,op, that's stop. However, if we put them in this sequence, p,o,s,t, that would be post. So even though the letters and the phonemes are the same, it's a different word based on the sequence. Now I want

you to think about the word truck. We as SLPs recognize that words are made up of sounds because a huge part of our job is to remediate individual sounds and words in different positions of words. This is our bread and butter. If you ask anyone who's not an SLP, there are not likely to make this connection. Instead, they would likely say that humans simply say words as a whole. Think about that. This actually perpetuates the myth of whole word, reading and spelling. And to that, I wanna share a few important facts, that again I want you to share with others. Here we go. First written language was meant to represent speech, not the other way around. Written language was created to represent speech across space and time. Now think about that written language is what has allows, allows my high schooler to still read the Canterbury tales, even though she didn't want to.

Or Romeo and Juliet, which was written in 1594 or even Where The Crawdads Sing which was written in 2018. It is also what allows us, billions of us to know the story of Harry Potter, even though it was written in Edinburgh Scotland. That wonderful story would have never weighed its way all the way around the world without print. The third thing is, is we are biologically wired for oral language. Meaning we come out of the box preloaded with the ability to develop oral language. But print is a cognitive skill invented by man. So we're not preloaded with the skills necessary to develop the ability to read.

Therefore it must be systematically and explicitly taught. In other words, learning to read is not at all similar to the natural process of how we learn to speak. And this is super important to know and share over and over because this has not always been the prevailing logic behind the theories of how to teach children to read. And this is something you're gonna run into in your collaborative efforts with educators. Now, the biggest difference between speech and print is number one, speech is messy. Speech is full of run on sentences, and even disfluencies, like where we're trying to think of the name of that dude that we met last week and we can't think of his name, but then it

comes to you like five minutes later. That's what I'm talking about. Speeches also fleeting. Once it said, it's gone that word Bible just disappears. Print on the other hand is relatively permanent. As long as the ink is on the paper, the words are still there. Print is also more precise. It's edited over and over in order to communicate exactly the right message. I like to write in my spare time, and that is one of my favorite things about writing. So speech is really and truly like a rough draft. So you can edit it and revise it in real time. But print, ends up on the, as a final copy and it's frozen on the page forever. So the task of beginning reading is simply learning how the sounds and words they've been saying and hearing, relate to this new code for the sounds in words they're learning to read and write.

But there are barriers, okay. There's barriers, we have to overcome in order to effectively share our knowledge about language and its contribution to literacy. So here we get, let's talk about those barriers. So one of the barriers to collaborative literacy is each professional doesn't know what the other one knows or doesn't know. Now there may be assumptions that teachers have been taught the oral language foundation for literacy, how words are formed, the research that supports effective and efficient instruction. However, this is not always the case, at least until recently, for sure. So here's some interesting information.

First of all, only 15%, one, five, 15% of college professors could name all five essential components of reading instruction listed by the National Reading Panel. Now we're gonna talk about the language connection for these five essential components in just a sec. 29% of courses in early reading included only four out of the five of these components, based on their core syllabus, that look and read it. And 22% and only 22% included wait for it, information about strategies for teaching struggling readers. And many of our educators have never even heard of the National Reading Panel. And some of them who have heard of it were actually told that it was biased and therefore they will argue against the findings. So just know that going ahead. Some other

interesting information. 80% of instructors and teacher preparation programs, couldn't explain the difference between phonological awareness and phonics. 80%, that was 2009. Only 29% of faculty could tell you the number of morphemes in the word frogs, that's from 2015. And in the most recent national council of teacher quality report from January of 2020. They interestingly pointed out that undergraduate programs appear to be moving in the right direction. They're improving and teaching the reading research, but the graduate programs have remained stagnant. In addition, half of all programs continue to omit key components. Let me say that again. Half of all programs continue to omit key components of the science and reading most specifically phonemic and phonological awareness.

So there is valuable information that we as SLPs know that educators don't know, even if they have advanced degrees. So SLP preparation programs have done an amazing job in recent years, preparing graduates to know the details of language as it relates to literacy. However, the trick is knowing how to implement it, and how to collaborate using this knowledge when working in a school setting, where there other professionals who also provide reading related instruction, such as your general educators, your special educators, your reading interventionists, your low literacy coach coaches, your school psychologists and so on. So this requires an extremely tactful approach, so as to not step on any toes.

As well as logical information about how to support literacy within a system, places significant constraints on the SLP's time, and thus their ability to do so. Our ability to use this collaboration. Evidence-based practices are also another barrier. Now, and this is how I explain it to non SLP people. Because SLP straddle both the medical and educational settings, we are required to adhere to evidence-based practices, similar to anyone working in a medical setting. On the other hand, despite the fact that IDEA ESSA and the most recent dyslexia legislations across different states. Despite all of those things that teachers, that state that teachers should be using scientifically-based

reading research and evidence-based instruction. There's actually very little understanding by education teams in terms of what that is and how that translates into instruction. So a few of the things that we need to share with teams are number one, evidence-based reading instruction means this. It means that reading, writing, and spelling instruction, that employee's direct instruction of systematic cumulative content with a sequence beginning with the easiest and the most basic elements. And then it needs to progress methodically to the more difficult materials. And that a particular collection of instructional practices have a proven record of success. In other words, we know what works and we know what doesn't. Also evidence-based means that there's reliable, trustworthy, valid evidence.

That when these practices are implemented with fidelity, with a particular group of children. The children can and should be expected to make adequate gains and reading achievement. And most importantly, evidence-based reading instruction includes those five essential components, phonemic awareness, phonics, fluency, vocabulary, and comprehension. Can you tell, I can say that over and over again in my sleep. So all five. Okay. And as we will discuss language again is a big piece of all of them. The other thing, when we're talking about evidence-based practices, and this is a big one, another one you're gonna run into.

So I'm trying to head you off at the past. Is that educational term, teams, excuse me. Educational teams should not rely on statements to begin with these phrases. Well, I think, or I feel, or well I've always. Those phrases should not guide instructional decision making, because the plural of anecdote is not data. Teams must be able to account for not only money well spend on interventions and programs, but time well spent. Because not all programs are evidence-based and every month, month that a student goes without the support they need, the further they fall behind. And SLPs have a great deal of information to share with teams about the science of reading. So we're gonna start with the simple view of reading. Scarborough's reading rope and

again we're gonna talk about the national reading panel a little bit more in depth. Because these are the first bits of information that are beneficial to share with teams. This is what I start with. And again, these may be, fingers crossed, these are familiar to you. But sometimes I think it's helpful to hear someone else explain it in a similar way as to how you might explain it to an educator. So here we go. The first thing that I share when I talk about simple view of reading is this. Any well-founded educational intervention must be based on a sound theory of the causes of a particular form of learning difficulty, which in turn must be based on an understanding of how that given skill is learned by typically developing children, which leads into what is that. And that's the simple view and the simple view of reading states that decoding times language comprehension equals reading comprehension.

Now, the question that I get over and over and again is why is it times, why is it X and not plus. Well, because one plus zero equals one. But one times zero equals zero, or zero times one equals zero. But one times one equals one. In other words, you have to have both sides of the equation. In other words, if you can't decode, but you have adequate language, you're probably gonna struggle with comprehending what you read. By the same token, if you can decode, but you struggle with comprehension, you're likely gonna struggle to comprehend what you read. And if you struggle with both decoding and comprehension, it's more than probable, you're gonna struggle with reading. So if you were in a student study team. I don't know if y'all call them MTSS teams or RTI teams, any kind of team.

But if in that meeting, the teacher says, so, and so is struggling with reading. The very first question to ask is this. If you read it aloud to him, would he understand it. If yes, then it is likely a decoding problem. Which in later elementary is also likely to impact comprehension, but at a young level, it's likely a decoding problem. If the answer is no, then it's likely a language problem and or something else could be cognition, attention, all of those things, or it could be both things. So now let's break these apart. Let's look

specifically at decoding and specifically at language comprehension. And for that, we go to Scarborough's reading room. This teases out the components of each of those parts of the simple view and breaks them into strands that are woven together. So the decoding strand or that bottom strand, the word recognition strand, it's made up of phonemic awareness which falls under the umbrella of phonological awareness. Decoding, which requires phonics, alphabetic principle, better sound knowledge and sight recognition, which is the ability to lift the words off the page effortlessly. It is not, I repeat not the same thing as sight words, and we're gonna talk about that in part two. Now the comprehension strand, oops, sorry. I skipped ahead too fast. The comprehension strand is made up of background knowledge, that's facts, concepts, prior knowledge. It's also made up of language structures, morphology and syntax, ding ding that sounds like us.

Vocabulary, oh there's so much valuable information we as SLPs have in this area. Next is verbal reasoning, inference, prediction, problem solving, comparing, contrasting critical thinking, meta linguists, all of those skills. And then finally, print knowledge, knowledge of what to do with a book, genre specific knowledge, writing from left to right, putting spaces between words, what are the concepts of print. Those things all fall through language comprehension. Now the reading rope states that with practice and instruction, we weave together the components of the word recognition strand until it becomes more and more auto automatic, and we can do it effortlessly and big keyword here, unconsciously.

At the same time, language development through instruction, practice and life experience. That's what allows students to weave the upper strand in more strategic ways. But, if any of these strands are weak, it affects the strength of the whole rope, and the ability of the reader to accurately and effortlessly comprehend what they read. In other words, it impacts a simple view equation. Now consider this in light of the students we work with as SLPs. First, a language disorder, significantly weakens the

upper strand, that language comprehension strand. Which is also one of the reasons why there's a lot of our students with language disorder, who also struggle with reading as well as listening, speaking and writing. Now poor phonemic awareness and spelling pattern knowledge also known as phonics. That leads to weak lower strand or the decoding or the word recognition strand. And again, weakening the whole rope, making fluid skilled reading for meeting difficult. Now remember what I shared earlier too, that the majority of all poor readers have an early history of spoken language deficits. So SLPs are and should be key players when considering both sides of the simple view, as well as the strands of the reading rope. Now let's talk about the National Reading Panel. Now as a little bit of background, the National Reading Panel was a joint effort between the National Institute of Child Health and Development. I like to point out when I say that that these are the same people who recommend car seats, vaccine schedules, cancer treatments, all of those things.

So it's a big deal. This group that was working on this along with the U.S. Department of Education. Now, their findings were published in 2000. So roughly 20 years ago, the panel reviewed 35 years of research. They did a meta analysis. They included replicated studies. So in a nutshell, what they did was they provided the evidence to support what do kids need in order to learn to read. And the findings of the national reading panel, the way they conducted the research and their recommendations. They're so strong that you could have a different opinion. You can have a different opinion about how to teach reading, but you will not find evidence that contradict it. In fact, published studies continued to only reinforce the findings and refine the findings. Which is a tremendous mark of good science. So again, the five essential components of reading instruction, I encourage you to memorize this in your head too, phonemic awareness, phonics, vocabulary, fluency and comprehension. Anyone when you're having a discussion about reading, that's one of the first questions I've asked them, what are the five essential components of reading instruction. Now, when I look at the National Reading Panel and I throw in the simple view and Scarborough's reading

rope. What stands out to me as an SLP? First of all, phonemic awareness. We as SLPs have detailed knowledge, not only a phonemes, but a phonological awareness. Also phonics. This one phonics seems like the last one or the least applicable to SLPs. But I want you to consider that there are rules for how we apply morphemes in print. I'll also add that for many of the students that I work with, especially because I do spend a lot of time working on phonemic and phonological awareness. I find that they develop that proficiency. But they may not ever develop the proficiency with phonics. Which is why it's important to know what the expectation is? What phonic patterns should they have mastered? What does it look like along a continuum of a systematic and explicit instruction? What is their scope and sequence?

Vocabulary, again have a lot to contribute there, same with comprehension. Now fluency, where we have to contribute to fluency? Do we have anything to contribute to fluency. Yes. Once we understand how students become fluent readers and phonological awareness makes a significant contribution to reading fluency. Advanced phonological awareness is actually more closely aligned with reading and connected text, because of the demands placed on working memory. There's more information to come on that topic. But here's why the National Reading Panel findings are so important. Here we go, ever seen this before, or some variation of it before?

This is the eligibility determination. This is on eligibility determination for any kid being considered for any disability. And it says, the determination for eligibility for blank is not the result of lack of appropriate instruction in reading, including the essential components for reading instruction. The term essential components of reading instruction means explicit and systematic instruction in, say it with me, phonemic awareness, phonics, vocabulary, fluency, and comprehension. So the question for school teams is this. How do we determine if our students have received this? How would we know if they had? How would we know if they hadn't? Also, what is systematic and explicit instruction? And as you'll see in the next two slides, I really

break down what it is and what it isn't. Because I think that's very hard for a lot of educators to wrap their head around. Systematic and explicit instruction is instruction that is taught, not tested. It is instruction that builds from one lesson in one grade level to the next, until children have all the skills necessary to walk out our elementary doors as proficient readers and writers who are proficient with the code of language. So it needs to include instruction in phonological awareness in pre-K in kindergarten. Phonological awareness through the advanced levels through second grade and or for any student who needs it.

Systematic and explicit instruction is when the phonemes, phonics and morphology are taught in a logical order. That goes from simple to complex, starting with predictable correspondences, moving to less predictable correspondences. And systematic and explicit instruction should include more than just your common phonics quote, unquote rules, like U follows Q. It should also teach the rules for how we apply grammatical morphemes to the end of words. So just how do we go from run to running? In other words, how do we know, how do we know when to double the final consonant? It should also include the basic syllable shapes and how to divide them. And this is always so much fun for me because how you divide them in print, maybe a little bit different than how you divide them in spoken language, which always makes for a really interesting discussion.

It should also include Greek and Latin roots. Such as is it C-I-A-N, T-I-O-N, S-I-O-N? And those should be taught at later grades because this helps explain both the meaning and the pattern for that sequence of letters. Instruction should also help students understand and differentiate similar sounding, but different looking endings, such as F-L-E or F-U-L or I-S-E, I-Z-E or Y-Z-E. And ideally, it should also include common words from other language that don't follow English, phonics pattern, such as yacht. Yacht is a Dutch word. Debut, debut is a French word and khaki is an Indian word. Because again, once kids leave elementary school, they're no longer getting

instruction about how to make sense of print. Their elementary years must prepare them to walk out the door with everything they will need to decode every word they will encounter for the rest of their lives. I know I'm being dramatic, but it's true. So systematic and explicit instruction is not, it's not give the word list on Monday and test on Friday without any instruction, explanation or directed practice. As the, actually as the International Literacy Association states correcting spelling is not teaching spelling, it's copy editing. Also word lists that don't go from simple to complex, words that don't follow a continuum. You should start with simple CVC then CCBC or CVCC words, and add early simple grammatical morphemes and gradually work up to two syllable words and multi-syllabic words, and so on.

Also shouldn't have word lists that are random, word lists that don't have an organizing concept. I like to use the example of using word lists that go along with a science unit, or maybe if they're reading Charlotte's Web. Because if you're doing that, when you do that, you might have words like web alongside words like salutations, and that's simply a recipe for memorize and forget. Because there is no organizing principle to the words they're learning. Another thing that's not systematic and explicit is when grade levels are not aware of what was taught the grade level before. This is where the role of invented spelling comes into play.

The longer we allow invented spelling to continue the longer, the wrong letter sequences get sorted into longterm memory. However, if you don't know which skills, the suitors should've mastered from the grade level before, or by a certain point in the year, how do you know if they should be spelling that word correctly or not. Also all the missed opportunities, if you're not teaching the meaning of the word along with the spelling of the word. Also systematic and explicit instruction should not stop after second grade. I've had second grade teachers who come to me and say, I say, okay, well, what spelling list are you working on, I can pull out some our words from there. We don't do spelling after Christmas break in second grade. What? So anyway, and

that's because there are many, many words and many, many skills that still need to be taught. So this needs to be part of the instruction from kindergarten through fifth, so that again, when they walk out the doors, they'll have all the tools they need. Also when sight words are just tacked on five extra sight words added to the end of the list or high frequency words, same thing. Instead, they should be putting those words within the pattern list. Because the human brain can memorize no more than a few dozen words. And as the science tells us, we don't learn words as a whole. We do attend to each and every letter, but within fractions of a second, which I'm gonna explain more. In fact, if you use a comprehensive systematic and explicit spelling program, students can actually would learn more words from the fry list, the fry list of a thousand words.

They can learn more and they can learn them faster than if you just tack on five to at the end. So essentially you can learn more than half of the thousand words so roughly 600 of the words by the end of second grade. In contrast, if you just keep tacking on those five extra words at the end of the spelling list, by the end of second grade, they would only have seen not been taught. They would only seen roughly 350 of them. So as I've mentioned in the beginning, I'm hoping so very much that this information gives you a way to share and use the information about systematic and explicit instruction. The National Reading Panel, the simple view of reading and the reading rope.

Because the evidence and the research I've just talked about is important, because it tells us what works. Schools don't need to reinvent the wheel or continue to do what they've always done and expect a different result. Because we can use evidence to reduce reading failure. So let's talk about that. Here's a few of the big ones for students who provided, who were provided explicit and systematic, explicit, systematic, and explicit instruction. By the end of first grade, the number of struggling readers was 75% lower than the comparison school. How many of y'all would like to have 75% better improvement in your reading? Also 90% of children with reading

difficulties will achieve grade level reading, if they receive help by the first grade. Also students taught through an explicit phonics approach, display word scores on word level reading tests that are six and seven standard score points higher than students that are taught phonics skills informally. More importantly, the impact on at-risk readers is 11 points higher than if they were just taught informally. And that difference, that 11 point difference is large enough that it may prevent students from reading the difficulties. But how many kids are we really talking about here? And this is the question that comes up a lot with teachers. You know, why do I need to do this if every kid doesn't need it? Well, let's look at that. How many kids are we talking about? How many kids need the systematic and explicit instruction? Are there just a few of them or how many is it really? Let's look at a class of 24, excuse me, 24 kindergarten students. How many of them do you think will learn to read effortlessly?

Only one. How many will learn to read easily with almost any instruction? You can turn your back to them and they can read it. There's about eight. How many need systematic and explicit instruction? About 10 to 12 of them, and how many of them need the good stuff? How many of them need systematic and explicit instruction with intensive repetition? Two to four. So roughly 12 to 16. So at least half or more of the class. And I wanted to point this out specifically as it relates to kindergarten. Because schools often spend thousands, thousands of dollars asking consultants, this question. Hey, what's the best intervention for our third, fourth graders.

Well save your money. Just know this, the best intervention for third and fourth graders is early identification and intervention in K one and two, and systematic and explicit instruction in all five essential components of reading instruction. You're welcome. Now they can pay you with all the money they've saved. All right, this all leads us to talk about the MTSS triangle. MTSS means multi-tiered system of support. If you're in a school setting, you probably know this. But it's how schools problem-solve concerns with struggling readers. And actually the reason for MTSS and the evidence behind

MTSS is based on a study by Shapiro and Sulty. And what it showed was that 80%, eight, zero, 80% of students should become proficient with tier one instruction. So your general ed core content instruction, 80% should be fine. 15% will or should catch up with tier two, more specific interventions, which means only 5% would be left struggling after tier three. Now, knowing this, if you have, if you or your school have a lot of kids in RTI or MTSS or whatever intervention program you call it. If you have a lot of kids in RTI and MTSS, you don't have a tier two problem. You have a tier one problem. Because key pieces of data, there's key pieces of data that MTSS teams need to track and follow. Number one, how many students are in special education for reading? That should go without saying. Number two, at what grade were they identified with these reading difficulties?

Three, how many kids in special education for reading failed to make progress with the intervention? Four, how long did they spend in these interventions? Because some students are in RTI or whatever intervention program we would call it for years. And often the comment is made whenever you come to these tables, these problem solving tables, but they're making progress. The question should not be, are they making progress, but rather, are we closing the gap? Let me say that again. The question shouldn't be, are they making progress, but are we closing the gap. We also need to figure out what's missing in tier one or even tier two instruction that should prevent them from having to go into special education. Remember it's 5% only 5% should get that tier three, which is sometimes considered special education. Another question is how could the tier one instruction be improved in order to prevent students from needing intervention? Number six, how many students are staffed out of special education on grade level for reading? How many years does it take in special education to close the gap in reading? The bottom line, being the intervention in special education should catch kids up and it should do it quickly. Students should not spend years falling further behind. Think about it as an SLP, I consider a huge part of my job, being working myself out of a job and to get kids back in the classroom as

quickly as possible. This should also be the goal for intervention and special education as well. And the older the students are, the more critical this becomes. Now for some fun stuff 'cause that was kinda heavy. As we started to dig into reading instruction programs and curriculums, I have to start by asking if anyone here has seen the movie ELF? I hope you're smiling because you have seen it. All right in the movie Elf, which I have to watch every year for Christmas, because otherwise it's not Christmas. But there's a scene where buddy the Elf, who's in the city for the first time after having lived only in the North pole. He sees a sign that says world's best cup of coffee. And he walks in and he congratulates everyone. Great job, everybody. Well, that reminds me of how similar this is to some of the reading programs out there.

There's a great sticker on the box that says, this is the best reading intervention program, or this is evidence-based. And that, may not be the case as I am about to share. Now consider this though, consider that many of the people who are purchasing reading or intervention programs are former educators, and who are now working at an administrative level. And as former educators, they may not have received training in research or how to read and interpret research in their teacher prep programs, which we did. Which is one of my favorite nerdy parts of speech school. But anyway. Which was probably more than a few years ago for them to, and they may not have pursued professional development on this topic either.

So the reading programs purchased by school districts may not align with the science of reading or rather the most current insights regarding how children learn to read, in part due to a lack of knowledge about how to read and understand the research in the actual programs. And millions of dollars are spent on what someone else says or someone else tells them is research based. Huge chunks of instructional time, devoted to programs that say, hey I'm the gold standard of research. And the trajectory of a child's life is impacted by these kinds of decisions. Therefore, it is so incredibly critical that SLPs share the science of how to interpret graphs, read charts, understand what

the data table is actually saying. Because, often again the sticker on the box may say research-based and even the publishers claims of assess, excuse me, successful outcomes. Do not always align with the actual findings in this study. Which I'm gonna share more with you in a moment. Now to be 100% fair, teachers are told which programs to use, what strategies to use and what they are and are not allowed to teach. So to be very clear, the use of non-evidence based instruction isn't happening because teachers lack integrity or commitment or motivation, or they're just choosing to ignore evidence of what works. They use this, they use these programs because they don't know any differently or they have been advised this is what they must do. So again, it's not their fault.

Okay. Now let's talk about really quickly before we get into programs. What does ASHA say our role is? Well the role of an SLP in literacy intervention may vary by setting and the availability of other professionals. Your reading teacher, your resource personnel. Because they also provide written language intervention. But regardless of the SLP specific role, it's important that the intervention be collaborative. The key takeaway here being collaborative because SLPs have unique knowledge about language as it relates to the skills for reading and for writing. Those being phonological awareness, semantics, orthography and morphological awareness. But the challenge is, and again, I'm in a school like most of you listening.

The challenge is that we already have a very complex job. We already serve very complex kids who have very complex needs and they're already are not enough of us to go around. So in other words, the system itself is not set up for us to stretch our roles much further. But we can't, we mustn't, we mustn't let what we can't do interfere with what we can do. Because there are things we can do. Even if it's just tweaking a little bit of how we approach the therapy we already provide, or sharing our expertise with school teams. So we can share or collaborate by working on literacy skills with currently identified students. As I mentioned, I do a great deal of phonological

awareness as part of all of my speech groups, more on that in part two. We can also advocate and support tier one instruction based on the research and evidence. That for me, what that means or what that looks like is going into classrooms to provide whole class lessons or interventions. I'm also a real big nerd about sharing the research about the critical components of tier one instruction. But I have to, I'll be honest, it's taking, it's taken a long time for me to be able to share that information. And to share that information it requires building, a lot of trust and having the people around you trust you a good bit. We can also collaborate with this school's problem solving team, your MTSS or RTI team to support evidence-based tier two interventions. We can share that diagnostic prescriptive approach, where we determine the specific need, remediate the specific need, as opposed to just giving a blanket generalized kind of program.

We can also share the developmental continuum, like, especially for phonological awareness. Now, more importantly, one of my favorite things to do is to create curiosity. Because curiosity is that feeling we experienced when we identify that there's gaps in what we know. And we'll say that again. Curiosity is that feeling we experience when we identify gaps in our knowledge.

And when we get curious, that's when we start to look critically, we start to do our own research and we start to make room in our mind to begin to accept new information. But curiosity comes at a price that price is vulnerability. Because it's very hard to admit something you might have been doing is not necessarily all that helpful for students. So for that, I like to say, hey, when you know better, you do better. So also one of the things we can do that is give them the courage to be vulnerable and humble, and let me explain how I do that. The way I do that is to explain a little bit about science in general. That science is not and should never be static. Meaning what we learned from studying something should change how we think about it. And science has changed our thinking about many things such as the world is not flat. Chewing gum does not actually take seven years to digest. Vaccines don't cause autism. Doctors should wash

their hands before going from one patient to another. If you don't know that story, look at the story of Ignaz Semmelweis. Also bloodletting and leeches don't cure illness. And science also informs us that learning to read is not at all like learning to speak. Now on an optimistic note, I can feel the winds are changing in literacy instruction across the U.S. Things are moving in a positive direction slowly but surely. And this is in part due to the fact that reading instruction has been in the news, a lot. Emily Hanford is an investigative journalist with the American Public Media, APM, APM reports. They have a blog, they have a website, podcast, all of those.

She has done an amazing job, bringing the research and the science of reading into the light and to the attention of everyday people. And if you haven't read her articles or listened to her podcast, they are well worth seeking out. Now, in her most recent publication, she digs deep into the three cue system, which is pertinent for us SLPs to know as well. So here we go, the three cues. So there are three cues that teachers traditionally use when helping a student read an unfamiliar word. This is referred to as the three cue system. The first cue is a semantic or a context cue, where the students are encouraged to guess what the word may be based on the context or picture. So a teacher may ask them, does that make sense, after looking at the picture.

The second cue is a syntactic cue, where the student is encouraged to guess a word, that might make sense in the sentence. So they would guess a word and then read it and then say, does it sound right. And the final cue is a letter sound cue. And often they instruct the student to look at the first letter and or the last letter and make a guess. And again, they asked, does it look right. So does it make sense, does it sound right, does it look right. So this type of cueing is important for us to know because students who have difficulty with phonological awareness, which are most of our speech friends. Those students are likely to have had speech difficulties. So kids with phonemic awareness difficulties are likely to have had speech difficulties. Remember that's our kids, that's that 73%. Students who have difficulty with phonemic awareness

are more likely to over rely on the meaning and structure cues because of their difficulty with print. Because of their difficulty with letter sound correspondences. Because of their difficulty with just being aware of the sounds in the words. So they're the ones that are most likely gonna look at the first letter and guess. Now this helps explain, oops, sorry. This helps explain why some students can look pretty good at earlier grades when we ask them to read predictable texts and those predictable texts have strong picture supports. However, when they get in third and fourth grade, guess what? There's less pictures. The sentences are more complex and the words are bigger and more multi-syllabic and what happens, they fall apart. So this is important to keep in mind as part of a collaborative approach so that the red flags aren't overlooked.

This is also why a huge thing that I would advocate for is getting a writing sample as part of the data collection in an MTSS team, or whenever you're doing problem solving. Because this data needs to look closely at whether the student's spelling and writing levels match their reading levels. Because again, in earlier grades, they might look pretty, okay. So again, that's why we wanna get the writing sample. A student's writing is a window into what difficulties are causing a student to struggle with reading. But where did these three cues come from? Why are we doing this?

This is important to know because many educators, they don't even where these cues came from, which only serves to perpetuate the myth. So there are three publications from 1967, before I was born. 1967 that have influenced pretty much every underlying belief about reading. They are learning to read the great debate volume from reading research quarterly and a document from Ken Goodman called Reading: The Psycholinguists Guessing Game. Okay. The first two, those are huge rigorous complex studies. The last one from Ken Goodman is a nine-page pamphlet. So it was easy to photocopy. It's easy for somebody to read and digest and super easy to share. And think about this in 1967 before, I'm sure a handful of y'all were born. We didn't have

Google, much less internet. And I can even remember when photocopiers were about as big as a whole entire room. So which of these three were the easiest to access? Then nine-page pamphlet obviously. But where you stand on how to teach reading, was really influenced by how either you were exposed to this, and from these three studies from 1967. And even if you never read them, you learned or were influenced from someone who was influenced by those three studies. Now, going back, the three cues are attributed to two people in particular. One, Ken Goodman. All right Goodman's, 1967 papers as we talked about, it rejected the idea that reading is, wait for it, a precise process that involves an exact perception of letters and words. And said he actually argued that we predict about what we're gonna read based on the cues we mentioned.

The other one is Marie Clay. Marie Clay developed the same theory as Ken Goodman, but separately or independently of Goodman. Marie Clay built her cueing ideas into a reading intervention program for struggling readers that most of you have heard of called reading recovery, which we're going to talk about later. Both of their theories were based on observational research, as opposed to quantitative research. Both of them believed that letters were the least reliable of the three cues and that the better reader you become, the less you pay attention to the letters, which I'm not really sure how you do that. In other words, they believe you do not have to accurately recognize the word to get meaning from the text. But here's the catch.

If readers really do only guess at words, not actually decode them, but if they only guess at words, how do we learn new vocabulary from what we read? Because we can only guess words that we already have stored in our oral vocabulary. So there's that speech to print connection again. Because in other words, you can't guess a word you've never heard or seen or been exposed to. I was actually reading *Little Fires Everywhere* this summer, and I came across a word neuro-aesthetic. I struggled with that word. It was not in my oral vocabulary. So I had to really slow down or pronounce

each of them. So we, even as proficient readers, this happens to us. So we have to think about as a proficient reader, how do we actually break these skills down? And I, trust me when I say there were no pictures in that book for me to rely on to understand what that was. So again, even if the student actually guesses the right word, guess what, it would take twice as long or twice the cognitive load to guess as it would actually decode the word, and think about the working memory and the reading comprehension. You have to read accurately and efficiently enough to form those little movies in your head while you read, and guessing slows all of that down and completely interrupts that process. And the three cues actually became the foundation for what we now know as the whole language approach.

The whole language approach was a philosophy. A philosophy based on the idea that learning to read comes naturally to humans in the same way that learning to speak develops naturally, only it doesn't as science has proven again and again. And the gist of whole language instruction is meaning-centered, it's hold apart. Where phonics is taught contextually or embedded within a lesson, as opposed to systematic and explicit. And this is what we still see a lot of today. Phonics lessons that are taught as many lessons and little to no instruction in phonemic awareness. Now not long after Goodman's paper came out a young graduate student named Keith Stanovich, and a tremendous follower of Ken Goodman's work.

He actually went out to test this theory and gather more than just observational data in order to prove the theory. However, what Stanovich found was the complete opposite. That it is only poor readers, weak readers who rely on context to facilitate word recognition. Because skilled readers do not need context at all. In fact, the ability to read words quickly and accurately in isolation, word level reading like lists of words, that is the hallmark of a skilled reader. And this is one of the most consistent most well replicated findings in all of reading research. Pause for emphasis. All right subsequent research has found that skilled readers don't scan or sample cues, in an incidental way.

They actually recognize a word as a sequence of specific letter strings. That's how good readers can recognize the difference between house and horse. And the research continues to come to the same conclusion over and over again. The skilled readers do not guess at words. In fact strategies promoted by the three cueing system, again as we mentioned, they model how poor readers approach text rather than how skilled readers do. And the three cue system has only been found to work for a skilled reader. So someone who actually has the skill, only 25% of the time. So if you were buying the reading lottery ticket, which one would you buy? The one with a 25% chance of reading or the 75 to 80% chance of reading. Kilpatrick adds that 52% of students use a word-based strategy, meaning sounding it out or a phonics or a phonological awareness approach. 34% use psycholinguistic guessing, a text based strategy. Again, look at the picture, make a guess, read it again.

The rest can't really tell you what they do. But by the end of third grade, those kids who use the word-based strategy, they outperform the text-based strategy in every single reading measure, including comprehension. And this bit, that little bit of data is probably one of my favorite ones to share. The reason it's one of my favorite ones to share is because the primary argument for not teaching phonemic awareness and phonics is that reading is all about meaning and comprehension. Trust me, I've had this discussion many times. The argument is that reading is all about meaning and comprehension. But to that we have to remind them that meaning and comprehension are only possible, if you can accurately read the words on the page. So we're scientists, which we are we're speech language pathologists, we're scientists. As scientists, we have to ask, what are the studies, that demonstrate that three cues that they're successful, or is there any research, research on the three cues. This space intentionally left blank. Yes I've put that there on purpose, because there is no research, to support that the three cues is beneficial to students in any way. None. In fact, there are no studies of the three cueing as an isolated variable in a published study, comparing students who got good phonics oriented instruction with those who

got the same instruction, plus the three cues. However, this is funny, because of the popularity over the last 30 years it routinely functions as a control group. But in every single case, the three cue in control group, they're weaker by a wide margin. So the question is, why is it still around? And that is a great question. It's because many people strongly believe that the only thing again is important the meaning. And again, I couldn't agree more and I tell them as a speech language pathologist, meaning is a big deal. I couldn't agree more with you. However, the moment you ask a student to pay attention to the picture, or just the first letter, you are drawing their attention away from the very skills necessary to accurately read and remember a word, which is what you have to have in order to discover the meaning and apply it in context. Now, some schools are started to implement systematic and explicit instruction.

But, and this is very important, they are still using the three cues while the student is reading. As a result, students learned that there are. so in the phonics instruction, they're learning, this predictable relationships between words. But then they're instructed not to pay attention to them. Sometimes this is referred to as the phonics patch. Now, warning big warning. Be very sure teachers have very strong feelings about the three cues. Very strong feel, extremely feelings about three cues, and now urge you not to tell them to stop using them cold Turkey. Instead encourage them to flip the three cues. So start by sounding out all of the letters and blending them to form the word, then make sure the word works in the sentence, and then finally check it with the picture.

Now, as we start moving now from ineffective practices to effective and efficient evidence-based practices and the data that's important to share with teams. I want you to keep this in mind. None of this, none of anything that I'm about to say is intended to bash a program. The purpose is to make you aware of the weaknesses. What the programs may not cover, what the limitations are in the research, so that a team can make an informed decision going forward. So first let's talk briefly about

running records. So basically a running record is a subjective method for assessing reading that can be done quickly and frequently. It's a formative assessment as opposed to a summative. And it basically provides a graphic representation of the student's reading abilities. This method was actually developed by Marie Clay. Remember we talked about her with our reading recovery. And it is similar to miscue analysis, which we'll talk about next by Ken Goodman. But basically in a running record, a teacher listens to a student, read a passage and they code the type of error they make. Now, in theory, these errors should reveal student weaknesses that need to be targeted in order to obtain mastery for reading for that grade level about the end of the year.

Only it doesn't. And the subjective piece of this assessment of the running records, that's what stands out the most to me. because nearly every teacher scores it differently. And this is the biggest concern because of how it impacts instruction and growth from one year to the next. So in running records or reading miscue inventory, when they were meeting structural and visual analysis, there are three types of errors, how they score them. Now, the problem is if the child reads pony for horse, that doesn't tell me what I need to teach him, in order to blend the sounds to decode the word horse.

Running records also don't tell us about phonological awareness, which we know is the most common underlying cause of reading problems. Doesn't tell us what phoning graphing correspondences they know or don't know. It doesn't tell us about phonological memory or working memory, although these have a massive impact on a child's learning. They don't help us understand the child's oral vocabulary or rapid automatizing naming. Although these are strong predictors of ongoing difficulties. In essence, they're barely an objective comparison of a child's skill compared to somebody else of the same age. And again, know this, the authors of these two programs, Clay and Goodman. They've actually said that their programs don't

advocate for teachers to use the three cues. When they're talking about the MSV, they're saying MSV is not related to the three cues. They didn't tell them to do that. In fact, they actually did. So what they've done, and this all happened last year. What they've done is they've thrown teachers under the proverbial bus for somehow misinterpreting what they did in fact, actually right, as part of their reading curriculum. And this leads us to now talk about two reading intervention programs, which are widely used by and large they are blanket interventions, meaning they don't address specific needs. They are designed for it to be the same for each child, and there are significant flaws in the research.

The first is reading recovery. That's the one developed by Marie Clay. Now what you need to know about reading recovery is it's for the bottom 20% of first graders, bottom print 20% for first grade. But only the top 10% of those kids go first in getting the instruction. So the bottom 10% struggle along until later in the year. The reason being is that the top 10% would be easier to remediate. But consider this most intervention for first grade, doesn't even start until at least two or three weeks, two or three weeks into the school year at the earliest. And the intervention goes on for 12 to 20 weeks. So that means the bottom 10%, they go roughly half the school year with no specialized support.

And in most schools that have reading recovery, the reading recovery teacher also provides intervention for second grade students. Only it's not one-on-one like they do for first grade. And it still doesn't address specific weaknesses, because they haven't identified what they are. And long story short, the whole program. If you look at the breakdown, it's 30 minutes a day. If you break it all down, it's only between five and eight and a half total hours of work on word level decoding and working with letters, which is not actually phonemic awareness. Phonemic awareness can be done with the eyes closed, 'cause it's all about the sounds. Phonics is when we add the visual symbols that represent those sounds. And five to eight hours simply is not enough for

our kids who are at risk. Those kids that we know have difficulty with both phonics and phonemic awareness. Now, remember to what we said earlier about the determination of eligibility. So how would we answer that question in terms of if they've been provided systematic and explicit instruction and phonemic awareness and phonics, if that was the intervention. Now, what does the research say about reading recovery? Well, first of all, there's significant flaws to the study. Number one, the I3 study was not designed to demonstrate that reading recovery was better or worse than another intervention. So at best this study can't actually be used to argue that it's superior to any other intervention.

Only that reading recovery is more effective than doing nothing. Also, there was no effort to prevent bias. Teachers not only knew who the treatment and control subjects were. The study protocol actually began by providing reading recovery teacher was with the names of students and instructing them who should get the treatment and who should be in the control. And the lowest achieving students, your special ed students, students who were retained, your ELL students, they were systematically excluded from the instruction. And the results, a three standards score point game.

And even if there were some better games found, those results were not found to last. This is in comparison to highly successful programs, interventions that have an average of 12 to 25 standard point gains. And finally again, no longterm significant impact. Now I wanna share all of this because there's an assumption that the programs and interventions being used have viable and reliable research, and they don't. Especially if people don't know what they're looking for in a study. And again, these programs aren't used because people lack integrity or commitment, or they choose to ignore the evidence, it's because they don't know. So now let's talk about LLI leveled, literacy intervention by Fountas and Pinnell. Now that's a small group intervention that uses leveled books, and there's three primary concerns with this. One is the leveling of the books, which I'm gonna explain in a second. The second is the lack of adequately

addressing phonemic awareness and phonics deficiencies, which again, that is a universal cause of reading difficulties. And three similar to reading recovery LLI is based on the three cueing system. So to explain the levels a little bit, if you actually pull out one of the books and decode the books, okay. Look at the first set of leveled books. There's actually 79 different mixed levels of phoneme-grapheme correspondences. There's also four letter spellings like E-I-G-H and neigh. There's different pronunciations of A like in waking versus quack versus back, which the sheet says. There's also consonant blends in two syllable words. So the question you have to ask, when you look at that book is before the student was asked to read all of these words. Have have they been taught, all of these phoneme-grapheme correspondences. If they haven't, the only way to get through that passage is to guess. And again, the consequence of the countering words over and over that don't follow a pattern is the development of that idea that there is no pattern, that words can and should only be memorized.

Which we know is not efficient and effective, especially once you get to third grade and above. Also, if LLI is used as written, because of course any knowledgeable teacher can adapt just about any program to fit any student. But if it's used as written, there is no intervention that targets systematic and explicit instruction in phonemic awareness and phonics. As is the case with reading recovery, the intervention is not focused on the specific weakness, the needs of the student. And unless we can figure out what skills are needed to move from one level to the next, there's no way we can target what they need. So the intervention is really just a moving target. Trying to figure out how to move them from one level to the next. And this is important, no, because the goal should not be, we should not have goals that say the student should move from level A to level B. The focus should be, what skill does the student need to master in order to move from a B to a C or a C to a D and so on. And what does the evidence tell us about LLI? Well, as of 2015 there were no studies of LLI published in a peer-review journal. Also it similarly was not compared to another program. So the best you can

say is it's better than nothing. That doesn't mean it's the best. It just means that it's better than nothing, which I don't think we need to spend millions of dollars on something that's better than nothing. They were also concerns with bias and blindness. The study was funded by Heinemann. The effectiveness was measured using an observational survey that was written for LLI. And guess what? On that survey for LLI, guess what they did great. But what about the objective measure, the DIBELS? Let's talk about those findings. In kindergarten, ELL was the only subgroup that improved and in only one area, nonsense word fluency, two areas, excuse me, and phoneme segmentation.

In first grade three subgroups showed improvement, but in three completely different areas, Hispanic, Latino, that did better on nonsense word fluency, ALL did better, but only on letter name fluency. White, non Hispanic did better, but only on oral reading fluency. And if look at the actual tables, like if you get the book and look at the tables, what you'll see is that the groups weren't even evenly divided. Then by second grade, what you'll see on the tables is almost no one benefits, in any subgroup, in any area of assessment, not even by random chance. Now what's important to note is again, there's no consistent anything.

There is not a consistent improvement in one area, not for one grade level, not for one subgroup, nothing. The only thing that is consistent is that almost no one benefits. And this is without even getting into the concerns regarding the makeup of the, each group. Now here's, what's gonna happen. You're gonna talk to somebody about this, and they say well it's listed in What Works Clearinghouse. That What Works Clearinghouse finds positive effects in general reading achievement. However, keep in mind, only and if you read the fine print, this is what it says. Only two studies out of 10 were actually found to be valid and reliable. Both of these studies just so happened to be funded by Fountas and Pinell and out of the four domains that work, What Works Clearinghouse looks at, alphabetic, fluency, comprehension, general reading achievement. Only one,

which is general reading achievement had positive effects. So the advertisement of, oh we had positive effects, is at best misleading. What Works Clearinghouse also find that there were zero, there was zero efficacy for alphabetic instruction and alphabetic instruction is made up of phonemic awareness, letter identification, phonics, zero efficacy, and barely marginal improvement in fluency from only one study. And again, I share this information, in the hopes that teams are aware or become aware of the shortcomings of program, because we really, I could stand on a table and say this, we shouldn't consider if the child's failure to respond to an intervention. If the intervention isn't designed to remediate the weakness, that's critical for reading. Or if there's not even any evidence that that program should have closed the gap or should have improved it again. I will say it again.

We shouldn't consider it the child's failure to respond to an intervention, if the intervention isn't designed to remediate the weaknesses, that are critical for reading, or if there's not evidence that the program will actually do that. So this leads us to look at the big picture. Let's look at reader's workshop, tier one instruction. In reader's workshop they guide students to read their own books. And that's great, I love that. I find lots of benefits from reading my own books. But the problem is if you can't decode the words.

Also the content of what the child's choosing is important. It's not necessarily best to let them always read Captain Underpants. They need to be reading more complex texts because that will help them get the advanced syntax and vocabulary, text structures and background knowledge that they're gonna need later on. There's also an assumption that kids read best with quote unquote, just write books, but there's no evidence that supports that. In reader's workshop they allow a lot of time to read independently. It's the application of research, which shows that children who spend more time reading the better they become readers. But actually there's no, nothing, no research that correlates with that. Also the last ones that stand out to me are that with

a little guidance and encouragement, students can enjoy, discover the joy of reading. But remember struggling readers don't need a little guidance. They need systematic and explicit instruction. There's also the assumption that children are coming to school with a good foundation of oral language, phonemic awareness and phonics, and that students, if students are motivated enough, they will learn to read with only again, a little guidance. But in truth, if the teacher's approach to reading is built on that assumption and that students are experts of their own learning, then their role is of course to be as minimal as possible. But this leaves our most vulnerable students up a creek without a paddle.

And we are seeing more and more students who are not arriving with a good foundation of oral language. And that's something, if you've heard me talk in speech pathology.com before on poverty and screen time, you've heard me talk about that. Another thing I wanna talk about with this is strategy instruction. Reader's workshop is all about the strategies. The problem is if you don't have the skills to actually read then a strategy is not going to help you. You have to have the skills for decoding automatically unconsciously in order to decode the words. Because strategies must be used consciously.

We have to think about them. And then finally, it's just the general misperception about reading in general, not even specific to reader's workshop, that kids learn a different ways, they don't. This is actually a really big confusion between the words teaching and learning. We teach things, the kids don't learn. I've tried to teach my children how to make a bed really well, but it's not going over well. And my kids have definitely learned things that I haven't taught them such as Tik Tok dances. But we do teach reading in different ways, but there is only one way to learn it. That is through systematic and explicit instruction in the central components of reading. And all proficient readers have the same two basic skills. They can read nonsense words, even if they've never learned phonics and they have ever expanding sight vocabulary. Now,

moving on. We're gonna quickly touch on guided reading 'cause that's one you've probably are very familiar with. The gist of what I want you to understand about guided reading is again, it's all about strategy. It's all about strategy. Also sometimes guided reading is considered a separate thing from reader's workshop and it's not, they are not two separate things. Guided reading is part of reader's workshop. Now, remember when we talked about the simple view and the reading rope. Reading comprehension is a part of decoding and language comprehension. So again, you have to make sure you're not guiding kids to read something or comprehend something they can't read. They have to be able to break that down. Also in guided reading, they're using level texts, they're using the three cues. So again, it's facilitating more and more struggles with reading.

And again, no amount of strategy work can make up for that inability to decode. Finally, this leads us to talk about balanced literacy. What is balanced literacy? How's it compared to structured literacy? Well, balanced literacy is the approach most frequently used in the schools today. The gist of it is, is that they wanted to find a happy medium between those who were in favor of whole language and those who wanted to incorporate all five essential components of reading instruction circa the National Reading Panel.

Now, when the balance is just right in theory, it should work. But you have to think about what that word balance means. To me, what I'd like to see as a balance of what this looks like over the longterm. So in younger grades, the balance might mean more instruction and phonemic awareness and phonics and vocabulary. Where's the balance in upper grades would be more of a balanced between content, vocabulary and strategies. So personally, truly, I want to believe that a balance can achieve a good balance between phonics, phonemic awareness, vocabulary, comprehension in order to arrive at fluency, but this is not happening for the most part. And that's what we see with the results of the NATE results. So again, it's definitely been my experience that

balanced literacy leans way more to the meaning only, or the meaning first camps, which is not helpful for our struggling readers. And what I can tell you is that too little attention paid to phonics and is barely given enough phonemic awareness, and the result of which is again, we're not moving the literacy needle in the U.S. So what's the difference between the two? Well, one is a philosophical orientation and again, the three cues are a huge part of it. Structured literacy is again, is what we need. Explicit and systematic instruction that focuses on those essential components. Also balanced literacy includes word analogy, context, cues, picture cues focused on shared reading, guided reading, whereas structured literacy is deeply rooted in the sounds of language.

And we systematically introduce the letters and letter combinations and it avoids assumptions about what kids may have arrived with and structured literacy is appropriate for all learners because it's built on scope and sequence. So when, when your school or your district or your team is looking for effective and efficient reading instruction. Structured literacy is the way to go because it assumes nothing of the learner, and it provides that systematic and explicit instruction going from simple to complex and all of those areas.

So this brings us to the end of part one, and discussing what we need to know and understand about the different perspectives and methodologies of the various team members and our efforts to collaborate. In part two, I'm gonna talk a lot more and share a lot more about how to share information and ideas about how spoken language is the foundation for written language, in an effort to help them understand our role. At this point, I am going to address the questions and some of them have been up here since I started. So here we go. How do you help a three-year-old preschooler sit down and attend to book reading activities? I work with a lot of severe population and joint book reading is tricky. My first thing is before I can sit down and have joint attention for a book. I wanna have a sit down and have joint attention for play. So I would make sure that I'm getting joint attention for play. And then even with

some of the materials that I use in that play, tie it with the book. I can't remember who it is, but there is a. Some kind of group that puts out a object box that goes with specific books. So if you give a mouse a cookie, it has all those different objects in there. So that's the first one. All right. Next is what is the name of the person who's podcasts and articles we should read? Her name is Emily Hanford, and it's through American Public Media. I'm gonna say it again. Emily Hanford. I highly, highly, highly recommend her three podcasts.

Or you can either listen to them on a podcast or you can read them. Listen to them on podcasts or read them. Next, Phyllis Lindamood introduced her program back in the 60s. She was not a researcher, but she was incredibly intuitive and make it. Lindamood-Bell, that is where I started. That was, I got a grant to attend Lindamood-Bell. I wrote a grant specifically to attend Lindamood-Bell and let's see, my son is 19-years-old now. So I guess that was 20 years ago, I went to my first Lindamood-Bell. Everything that I gained from Lindamood-Bell has propelled me and prepared me extensively. And the research supporting Lindamood-Bell even now is very strong.

So yes, Lindamood-Bell, excellent, great way to start. All right, I missed what you said. It was the main concern with running records. The main concern with running records, subjective. How one teacher scores a running record is different than how another one does. So it's subjective. And so even if you, if spend any time looking at different reading records, you'll see it. Next, do you have pro, suggestions for programs or curriculums that teach structured literacy approach? I'll tell you what stay tuned for part two. We're gonna talk a little bit about that. So stay tuned. What other resources do you recommend for further research in reading? Oh, I would have to say, and they are sitting beside me on my floor. The first one that I would recommend is David Kilpatrick's book. It is called the Essentials of Assessing Preventing and Overcoming Reading Difficulties. This book does not leave the side of my desk ever, and I could

never lend it to anyone because it is full of dog ears and sticky notes and highlights and notes in the margins. I can't recommend this book enough, the David Kilpatrick book. The next book that I would recommend, that may be a little bit easier and is especially really friendly for a speech language pathologist is by Mark Seidenberg. And it's called Language At the Speed of Sight. Highly recommend that one Language At the Speed of Sight. How we read, why so many can't and what can be done about it? I would say those are my top two from there, if you're still hungry. Well it's pretty much once you go to Amazon, it'll pull up all the related books, but those are definitely the first two I recommend and the ones I most highly recommend. All right. Last, awesome presentation.

Thanks for a dynamic style. Summary of evidence of clarity. And thank you all so much for attending. I do love to talk about this stuff. It makes me very happy. I'm such an advocate for improving literacy and having SLPs in our, what we know about language become a part of this. Oh and I got one more question. What age should we start encouraging parents, teachers to start teaching reading? I would definitely say around the age of three. It's not that you're teaching reading. It's you're teaching phonemic and phonological awareness. So paying attention to alliteration, paying attention to the rhyme.

Playing funny word games, pointing out funny things in words. One of my favorite things to do, especially with kindergartners is to teach jokes, jokes that are based on phonological awareness. So especially advanced phonological awareness, and I'll leave you with one of my favorite ones. What do you call a smelly fairy? Stinker Bell. So see what I did there. I added a phony. And so once they start to understand that they get the joke. But also for my articulation kids, that's a great way to practice articulation. So I had just really enjoyed that. And I actually have a dad who was a big fan of corny jokes or dad jokes. So I have a lot of them. What reading program do you recommend? I'm a huge fan of not recommending a specific program, and I'll tell you why. The

reason I don't recommend a specific program is because what makes the difference is not the program, but the knowledge and skills of the person using it. So what I recommend is training. And if I were going to recommend a specific training, I would say letters training by Louisa Moats. And letters training, I forget who does that. But it's spelled L-E-T-R-S, but it's language. It's all about the language. It's all the stuff we already know. And last one. I've heard the music benefits of music and literacy. I would agree a thousand percent. My dad was a minister of music. My mom was an organist and a teacher and a principal actually. So I have to agree that I think there's a lot of benefit to music. My sister is actually an opera singer, so I would agree with you on that. And I think we need to wrap it up now. And so if you have additional questions, anytime my email is on there, and I definitely appreciate your attention. I appreciate your questions. I appreciate you letting me spend 90 minutes with you. And thank you so much.

- [Amy] Thank you so much, Angie, that was great. And I am so looking forward to part two, which is in a couple of weeks from now. I did wanna let our audience know that if you're not able to make the live webinar that day, as usual, we will record it and it'll be available in at least video form couple days after the event. So I think everybody here judging from the enthusiasm about this part one. I think everybody is gonna be trying to get into part two as well Angie, thanks so much. I put a few notes up on the notes pod that's over there below Angie's picture for some of the books and so forth that she mentioned. And I'm gonna go ahead and wrap it up. I hope everybody has a great day. Stay safe out there, and we hope to see you at another webinar again soon. Thanks so much.