

IEP Implementation Fidelity: A Literature Review

Kiah Love-Latzke

SPED 696

Minnesota State University Moorhead

Abstract

The use of an Individualized Education Program (IEP) for a student with a disability is mandated under the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act 2004 and is used to determine the educational needs of that child. IDEA defines an IEP as a “written statement for each child with a disability that is developed, reviewed, and revised in accordance with section 1414(d) of this title” (2004). This also ensures that students receiving these services through the IEP must have them available in their least restrictive environment. The least restrictive environment according to IDEA states that “To the maximum extent appropriate, children with disabilities, including children in public or private institutions or other care facilities, are educated with children who are not disabled, and special classes, separate schooling, or other removal of children with disabilities from the regular educational environment occurs only when the nature or severity of the disability of a child is such that education in regular classes with the use of supplementary aids and services cannot be achieved satisfactorily” (2004). With these federal law requirements for students to be serviced in the LRE, this often occurs at least partially in the general education classroom. The classroom teacher is included as a member of the IEP team and is asked to participate in the development of this IEP. This purpose of this inclusion is to support the creation of strategies, necessary aids, and services, as well as program modifications and support of personnel (John, 2002).

Because of this, implementation fidelity is necessary for the success of the IEP. Implementation fidelity describes the extent that the components of an IEP are followed, as mandated by IDEA. If a general education teacher is being tasked to support the IEP goals and objectives, they need to be aware of how to do so, to ensure that they are implementing them

to the degree of fidelity included in the IEP. Without this fidelity in place, students on IEPs will not be receiving the services necessary for them to be successful. For general education teachers to be able to support students in this way, they need to have been given the training and resources to know how to support their growth.

This project will focus on implementation fidelity of IEPs for students with reading disabilities. The project includes a literature review component. This component will begin with a broad understanding of what the current reality of learning disabilities is. It also discusses the current issues with identification of learning disabilities. It then goes on to be made up of research on how IEP goals are being implemented within schools, the issues related to identification and implementation of goals. In addition to the research on IEPs within the school, it will focus on the factors that contribute to the gap between the research being done on the topic and the actual implementation within schools. Finally, it describes what is currently being done within schools to bridge the gap between the research and current practices in classrooms.

In addition to the literature review component, a handbook component will also be included. The purpose of the handbook will include specific IEP goals related to the support of students with reading disabilities. These goals will be taken from real students within a current setting to ensure relevance to the study. Included with each goal, there will be research-based, relevant interventions that could be implemented in support of each of them. The purpose of this handbook is to allow for the success of general educators in supporting the goals of the IEP of students. The interventions will all be included in easy-to-understand explanations and simple to implement options. The reality that this project is based on is the current issues faced

within school districts in implementation of IEP goals and objectives by general education teachers. The system for who and how to implement said goals is unclear and has often led to a failure in the mandated supports to be provided.

IEP Implementation Fidelity: A Literature Review

Students with specific learning disabilities are a category of those defined as receiving special education services under IDEA 2004, making up almost 50% of the the group (Otaiba et al., 2018). The category includes a large range of disorders that include one or more of the basic psychological processes used in understanding or using language, spoken, or written, that can affect the ability to listen, speak, read, write, spell or mathematics (Otaiba et al., 2018). There are still fundamental issues with learning disabilities (LD) including a lack consensus on the definition of LD, challenges related to identification and diagnosis, and a significant group of students with LD who are not benefitting from even the strongest evidence-based academic interventions (Fuchs et al., 2014).

Issues in Identification

When identifying a student with disabilities as having a learning disability, there are a few areas that make it more challenging. The category of learning disabilities is seen as one of the least understood and most debated disability affecting school-aged children, even with its high incidence (Lyon et al., 2001). There are currently many approaches that are used in identification and treatment of students with learning disabilities that are not strongly evidence-based (Fletcher et al., 2019). The reasons that these practices are still in place includes a variety of reasons such as they have roots in historical conceptions, anecdotes, unsystematic observation, as well as evidence-based approaches that have been studied and found to be inadequate (Fletcher et al., 2019). There is also much disagreement in the diagnostic criteria and assessment practices used for identification, as well as the policies and

legal requirements driving the identification of students with learning disabilities (Lyon et al., 2001).

There are three main reasons that the category of learning disabilities is difficult to define. The first issue is that a learning disability is not something that is directly observable (Fletcher et al., 2019). The disability is seen as low achievement but is often unexpected historically with the absence of another circumstance such as another disorder or disability (Fletcher et al., 2019). Another problem when it comes to defining learning disabilities is that the attributes are dimensional (Fletcher et al., 2019). To define a learning disability, it is necessary to look at the characteristics on a continuum of severity, as opposed to an explicit category with clear distinction points (Fletcher et al., 2019). The final concern when it comes to definition is comorbidity. This means that there is a high occurrence of more than one disorder in each student (Fletcher et al., 2019). In these situations, it is not often the case that one disorder causes the other, just that they may be linked, and they meet diagnostic criteria for more than one (Fletcher et al., 2019).

There are also issues specific to identification of students with learning disabilities. When looking at the attributes of a student with learning disabilities, these attributes are not categorical with simple yes or no indicators, but instead are continuous (Fletcher et al., 2019). The areas a learning disability can impact could include one or more of the following: receptive language, expressive language, basic reading skill, reading comprehension, written expression, mathematics calculations, or mathematics reasoning (Lerner & Johns, 2015). These attributes when normally distributed can vary in degree, and not kind, making it harder to be measured (Fletcher et al., 2019). From a measurement perspective, there is no justification for the policies

common at the district, state, and US level in which setting firm thresholds is common (Fletcher et al., 2019). This approach is also flawed in that it does not account for the measurement error and correlation of tests with the continuous nature of the attributes of learning disabilities (Fletcher et al., 2019).

Another issue with identification is regarding the assessment standards that determine eligibility. When looking at the identification assessments, many of these rely on thresholds and cut points. This means that any person who would score below a given threshold is considered to have a learning disability, however the threshold is somewhat arbitrary (Fletcher et al., 2019). An example of this would be if a student were to score one point too high on an IQ-Achievement assessment, they would not qualify to receive services, although their scores could still show great need.

The measures used to indicate attributes of a learning disability are also not independent of each other. Some measures used to indicate these attributes; IQ, Achievement, and instructional response are moderately correlated (Fletcher et al., 2019). Because of this correlation, the impact of the unreliability and measurement error are magnified if there are multiple tests with incorrect correlations of measures (Fletcher et al., 2019).

Translating Issues into School

There are a variety of issues that are translated into the classroom for students with learning disabilities in schools. The current academic success of students with learning disabilities is a major example of the issues that are seen for these students in schools. Two recent studies, the Special Education Elementary Longitudinal Study (SEELS) and the National Longitudinal Transition Study-2 (NLTS-2) in 2008 discovered current issues in academic

achievement of students with learning disabilities (Fuchs et al., 2014). The data found that on the Woodcock-Johnson Passage Comprehension Test, 64% of elementary school students with learning disabilities were scoring below the 20th percentile, and high school students with learning disabilities were found to be an average of 3.4 years behind in reading and 3.2 years in math (Fuchs et al., 2014).

There are multiple issues that current educators are facing in terms of implementation fidelity in the classroom. One issue that is discussed is the reluctance of educators to support students with IEPs in the classroom. Johns discusses that some educators refuse to make the accommodations or accept suggestions from the specialist to make them (2002). General educators are often not trained on how to support individual learning differences in the classroom, or how to study and apply research (Lyon et al, 2001). Because of this, it can seem like a daunting task, easier put off for methods that have been implemented in the past and those that are based off their professional judgment and decision making (McMaster et al., 2014).

Another common issue discussed is the large number of interventions that teachers are expected to implement at one time. One study found that there is a significant difference between the fidelity of interventions and the number of students with IEPs within a classroom (Tilly, 2008). The study found that the teachers with higher fidelity groups had between 1-2 students with IEPs in their classroom, as compared to lower fidelity with 3 or more students on IEPs within a classroom (Tilly, 2008). While ensuring the number of students on IEPs stays below 3 is not always possible, it is then even more important that appropriate teacher support is provided within those settings (Tilly 2008).

Another issue relates to the “contextual fit” of an intervention. This refers to the degree in which an intervention matches the “values, skills, resources, and administrative support” of the educator tasked with implementation (Marshall, 2015, p. 11). The use of contextual fit not only improves implementation fidelity, but also supports the feasibility and acceptability of a program (Marshall, 2015). This also is necessary to create interventions that are sustainable within a program (Marshall, 2015). Finally, it was found that the environment that an intervention is implemented in has a high impact on the effectiveness and fidelity of it (Marshall, 2015).

Research to Practice Gap

Although research continues to grow on how to support students with learning disabilities to be successful, there are still gaps between the research and successful implementation within schools. While almost all children can learn to read if they are taught using appropriate methods, there are clearly many who are not receiving the necessary appropriate instruction (Lyon et al, 2001). Despite the potential benefits that could be seen from evidence-based reforms, they have still had limited impact on practice to date (Cook & Cook, 2016). While this extensive research may exist, teachers are often not trained to study and apply research-based practices throughout their lessons (Lyon et al, 2001).

One major issue in the research to practice gap is the fidelity with which research-based practices are implemented. Educators understand that scientific evidence should be used to inform instructional decisions for students with disabilities as they require highly effective instruction to reach their potential, however this instruction has been negatively influenced by fads and ineffective practices (Cook & Cook, 2016). It is important to understand the necessity

of fidelity when it comes to implementation of research-based practices. Teachers have used instructional approaches they have learned but implemented only parts as they believe they know what will best address their students' needs, and adapt what can be improved, as well as ignoring parts seeming unnecessary (McMaster et al., 2014). With poor implementation fidelity, the uncertainty arises on whether the research-based practice was truly in place, or what the actual impact on student learning outcomes is (McMaster et al., 2014).

There are multiple reasons in which implementation of evidence or research-based practices are not occurring. One of the reasons for this is that those who are implementing these practices are given limited support or partnership in how to implement besides initial in-service trainings on these techniques (Cook & Cook, 2016). Because of this, the educators may run into roadblocks to implementation, or be attempting to implement with fidelity, while in reality they are implementing incorrectly. Another reason is in the challenge that educators are trying to ensure that students meet the academic needs with flexibility to support their students, requiring professional judgement and decision making (McMaster et al., 2014). An additional reason is that the conclusions drawn from research about effectiveness of instructional practices are not always seen as applicable to the unique needs of students with disabilities in that specific setting (Cook & Cook, 2016). These evidence-based practices are then seen as an approach that is derived from studies that although internally valid, do not reflect the contexts within which they teach in their complexity and uniqueness (Cook & Cook, 2016).

Bridging the Gap

With these research-based strategies being so important, there are ways in which we can bridge the gap between research and implementing the strategies in the classroom. One way to support the implementation of IEP goals and objectives is through a multi-tiered system. Response to Intervention (RtI) is one example of a multi-tiered system that can support this practice. RtI is used within an evidence-based core instructional curriculum (Benson, et al., 2020). Within this curriculum, there are also supplemental intervention supports that are put into place for those who are not meeting the academic progressions expected within the core curriculum (Benson, et al., 2020). These supports that are put into place must also be evidence-based and are then used to support the students not meeting the academic requirements from tier 1 interventions. The identification of students at-risk for academic difficulty are systematically assessed, with that data and progress monitoring then used to respond with academic intervention supports (Benson, et al., 2020). These tiers of support allow for opportunities for general educators to provide these research-based interventions within the classroom, not only to students with learning disabilities, but also to other students not making adequate academic progress.

One additional method to bridge the research to practice gap is to ensure that teachers use a balance of teacher judgment and background, educators should attempt to implement the core components of research-based practices faithfully (McMaster et al., 2014). They can then use their knowledge, experience, and student data to adjust on the noncore components of the practice to adapt for their specific students' needs (McMaster et al., 2014). To ensure that educators can do so, they must be provided with that critical academic content,

pedagogical principles, as well as the characteristics of learners necessary to implement the systematic and informed instruction (Lyon et al, 2001).

Another way to bridge the research to practice gap is through preparation and support of general educators implementing the IEP goals and objectives. Lyon et al. found that many teachers are not trained in how to support students' individual differences, or to study and apply research into these contexts (2001). Because of this, educators are unable to support the students with learning disabilities in their classroom effectively or based off this research.

When given the necessary pedagogical principals, critical academic content, and knowledge of the specific learners needs they can ensure more systematic and informed instruction (Lyon et al, 2001). One way that this is currently being achieved is through the Reading Excellence Act.

This act is being implemented in various states by developing intensive programs for students who are at risk of reading difficulties (Lyon et al, 2001). The programs require the use of scientifically based research to accelerate reading instruction for Kindergarten and early elementary school students (Lyon et al, 2001). Some current areas of concern needing to be addressed are that the implementation of these programs is not always done in consultation with the special educators, whom are those typically providing instruction to students with learning disabilities (Lyon et al, 2001). With this it is important to ensure that special educators be included in the process with roles in designing and implementing these early intervention programs (Lyon et al, 2001). Although they may not be able to be involved in the daily classroom instruction, they should still have a role in the process (Lyon et al, 2001). Some ways to ensure this include assistance with early identification and supporting the implementation of specialized interventions within the classroom as well as outside of it (Lyon et al, 2001).

Implementable Intervention Strategies Handbook

With all the previously mentioned issues in terms of the current state of identification of students with learning disabilities, translation of those needs into schools, IEP implementation fidelity, and the research to practice gap the following handbook hopes to support change. The Implementable Intervention Strategies Handbook includes ten research-based interventions to support students with reading disabilities specifically. The handbook also includes common IEP goals or objectives that these interventions could support. The purpose of this handbook is to give general educators concrete examples on how to support students with reading disabilities within the general education classroom. This allows for educators to search the resource by reading need such as decoding, fluency, or comprehension. Within each category there are clearly described intervention options to support students with reading disabilities. This allows for the educator to begin using the intervention without having to go through entire research articles to determine a beneficial strategy to implement within the classroom.

References:

- Al Otaiba, S., Rouse, A. G., & Baker, K. (2018). Elementary Grade Intervention Approaches to Treat Specific Learning Disabilities, Including Dyslexia. *Language, Speech, and Hearing Services in Schools, 49*(4), 829–842. https://doi.org/10.1044/2018_lshss-dyslc-18-0022
- Benson, N. F., Maki, K. E., Floyd, R. G., Eckert, T. L., Kranzler, J. H., & Fefer, S. A. (2020). A national survey of school psychologists' practices in identifying specific learning disabilities. *School Psychology, 35*(2), 146–157. <https://doi.org/10.1037/spq0000344>
- Cook, B. G., & Cook, L. (2016). Leveraging Evidence-Based Practice through Partnerships Based on Practice-Based Evidence. *Learning Disabilities: A Contemporary Journal, 14*(2), 143–157.
- Fletcher, J., Lyon, G. R., Fuchs, L., & Barnes, M. A. (2019). In *Learning disabilities: from identification to intervention* (pp. 9–42). essay, The Guilford Press.
- Fuchs, D., Fuchs, L. S., & Vaughn, S. (2014). What Is Intensive Instruction and Why Is It Important? *TEACHING Exceptional Children, 46*(4), 13–18.
<https://doi.org/10.1177/0040059914522966>
- Individuals with Disabilities Education Act, 20 U.S.C. § 1400 (2004)
- Johns, B. H., Crowley, E. P., & Guetzloe, E. (2017). Planning the IEP for Students With Emotional and Behavioral Disorders. *Focus on Exceptional Children, 34*(9).
<https://doi.org/10.17161/fec.v34i9.6792>

Lerner, J. W., & Johns, B. H. (2015). *Learning disabilities and related disabilities: strategies for success*. Cengage Learning.

Lyon, G. R., Fletcher, J. M., Shaywitz, S. E., Shaywitz, B. A., Torgesen, J. K., Wood, F. B., Schulte, A., & Olson, R. (2001). Rethinking Learning Disabilities. *RETHINKING SPECIAL EDUCATION FOR A NEW CENTURY*, 259–287.

Marshall, S. (n.d.). THE IDENTIFICATION OF CONTEXTUAL FACTORS INFLUENCING TEACHER IMPLEMENTATION OF INTERVENTIONS RELATED TO STUDENTS' INDIVIDUAL EDUCATION PLANS. *Open Access Dissertations*. <https://doi.org/10.23860/diss-marshall-stephanie-2015>

McMaster, K. L., Jung, P.-G., Brandes, D., Pinto, V., Fuchs, D., Kearns, D., Lemons, C., Sáenz, L., & Yen, L. (2014). Customizing a Research-Based Reading Practice. *The Reading Teacher*, 68(3), 173–183. <https://doi.org/10.1002/trtr.1301>

Tilly, W. D. (2014). School-Based Problem-Solving Consultation: Plotting a New Course for Evidence-Based Research and Practice in Consultation. *Handbook of Research in School Consultation*, 17–36. <https://doi.org/10.4324/9780203133170-9>



Implementable Intervention Strategies

By: Kiah Love-Latzke

Possible IEP Goals for the Following Interventions

Goal 1: While reading a passage at his/her instructional level, STUDENT will use knowledge of consonants, consonant blends, irregular vowel teams and prefixes and suffixes to decode unfamiliar words with 90% accuracy.

Goal 2: Given a collection of words with variant vowels, STUDENT will read the words having at least three examples with 80% accuracy.

Goal 3: When presented with a list of CVC words, STUDENT will correctly read the words with 80% accuracy 4 of 5 trials.

Goal 4: Given a collection of selected two-syllable words, STUDENT will read the words having at least three examples with 85% accuracy.

Word Study

- 10 minutes in length
- Components followed five strands: PA; letter-sound instruction; sound analysis and spelling; phonemic decoding; and high-frequency word-reading
- Activities within each strand progressed systematically from easier to more challenging
- Activities follow direct modeling and explanation, guide practice with teacher feedback, and then independent practice
- Active engagement included using materials such as letter tiles, magnetic letters, individual whiteboards, sound boxes etc.
- Each unit focuses on one sound-spelling pattern and one or more new high-frequency words
- Unit length 3-4 lessons including a reteach lesson if objectives not met as measured by mastery tests
- Mastery tests data used to guide next steps:
 - Reteach previous lesson
 - Continue to next lesson but integrate extra practice on items missed
 - Continue to next lesson

Text Reading

- 10-minute segment
- Brief book introduction to focus attention on guiding question (integrating comprehension focus throughout)
- Teach three-part strategy for identification of unknown words:
 - Look for parts you know- check for familiar sound spelling patterns, word endings, or other familiar patterns
 - Sound the word out
 - Check it- put newly decoded into sentence and make sure it makes sense
- Non-decodable and unrecognizable words are provided by teacher
- Model, prompt and monitor self-correct decoding errors that impede meaning

Lesson Progression:

- Provide examples and nonexamples of fluent reading
- Explicitly teach the meaning of punctuation marks, model their interpretation, and guide students to apply them in reading expressively
- Model phrased reading and provide practice in reading phrases (instead of word-by-word)
- Practice fluent reading in familiar text with partners

Possible IEP Goals for the Following Interventions

Goal 1: While reading a passage at his/her instructional level, STUDENT will orally read 100 words per minute with no more than 2 errors with 90% accuracy.

Goal 2: STUDENT will correctly segment at least 19 of 20 unfamiliar words which are 3 or more syllables into syllables by drawing slashes to properly divide the words.

Goal 3: Given unfamiliar fifth grade reading material, STUDENT will fluently and accurately read with fewer than 3 errors per 100 words at a rate of 90 words per minute.

Goal 4: STUDENT will accurately read 4th grade words and phrases and will increase his/her fluency rate from 60 words per minute to 100 words per minute when reading in all settings.

Word Reading

- Necessary because $\frac{1}{4}$ of students in upper elementary do not read words at grade level accurately or fluently
- Lack of automaticity influences text comprehension
- Intervention includes multisyllabic word reading intervention and motivational beliefs training
- Groups of 3-4 students
- 4 times per week, 40 mins each 40 lessons total

Structure of Intervention

Warm Up

- 3 min, taught essential prerequisite skills
 - Vowel patterns, vowel digraphs, r-controlled vowels, diphthongs, and variant correspondences
- Student's practice reading the pattern in isolation and nonsense words until mastery

Afix Bank

- 3 mins explicit instruction of high-frequency affixes
- 3 new prefixes taught each day using most commonly used prefixes and suffixes list
- End with choral reading of all previously learned affixes

Word Play

- 5 mins, focus on assembling or blending word parts
- 5 "spotlight words" (base words) used to build real and pseudo words
- Allow multiple opportunities to work support quick and accurate decoding of unknown words

Word Reading Cont.

Structure of Intervention Cont.

Beat the Clock

- Use lists of multisyllabic words with each word included 3 times throughout
- Practice breaking or segmenting multisyllabic words into parts
- Students underline affixes in each word, then chorally read, with instructor providing feedback
- After practice students are given 2 attempts to read the list and match to improve on previous reading time

Write Word

- 5-8 minutes for encoding practice
- Students write words with two or more syllables with targeted affixes
- Practice should be both real and nonsense words
- Corrective feedback provided on affixes, vowels, and other word parts

Speedy Read

- 5 mins for improving accuracy and rate through timed word-list
- In first 20 lessons word lists are given with specific phonetic patterns
- Second 20 lessons include randomly generated lists from prior words
- Students read list aloud, then given opportunity to read for 30 seconds
- In that time, instructor tracks accuracy and provides corrective feedback
- Student rereads incorrectly pronounced words, then records data on chart to monitor progress

Text Reading

- First 20 lessons- students read sentences developed to have at least 2 multisyllabic words and spotlight words
- Sentences read aloud two times with choral read, echo read, or whisper read procedure
- After lesson 20- reading is of connected text
- Key words are introduced and defined, then student reads passage aloud 2 times in same format

Sight Word Challenge

- Used for sight word acquisition
- 1-3 minutes in length
- Intervention takes place 1-on-1
- Based on 500 high-frequency sight words
 - Presented as lists of words, ordered by frequency of use
- Students have 1 min to read as many words as possible
- Teacher corrects errors by providing correct pronunciation of the word
- After 3 consecutive days of correct pronunciation, the word is removed from the list
- Teacher reviews up to 3 words that were not mastered within the previous 3 days
- Student's progress is monitored and awarded when designated benchmarks are met

Repeated Reading with Multiple Features

- Small group with teacher, and 1-on-1
- 10–12-minute interventions, 3 times/week
- Students are given a passage at their independent level
- Passage is read a total of 3 times
- Student works in a partnership with a stronger and weaker reader working together
- Progress is charted after each timed reading

Structure

First Read

- Choral reading of text
 - Peers and teacher

Second Read

- Alternating reading of text after each sentence

Third Read

- Weaker reader reads with stronger reader helping with unknown words

After the third read, the teacher times the student reading for 1-minute

Neurological Impress Method

- Improves reading fluency
- This method uses auditory process of feedback to strengthen the reading process
- No preparations made about reading material to student prior to reading
- Student and teacher read in rapid-unison
- Student sits slightly in front of teach, reading out of one book together
- Teacher voice is directed towards ear of student at close range
- Teacher or student places finger on the words as they are being read
- Teacher can change from having voice slightly louder and faster to slightly slower
- Reading should continue as long as possible within time available, as long as student doesn't show signs of tiring

Possible IEP Goals for the Following Interventions

Goal 1: After reading or looking at a simple storybook, STUDENT will identify the main idea 80% of the time 4 of 5 trials.

Goal 2: When presented with text on his/her instructional level, STUDENT will use context clues to determine the meaning of unfamiliar words in reading materials with 80% accuracy, as measured by written work samples, by the end of (IEP Date).

Goal 3: Provided with a short text (maximum of five sentences), STUDENT will read and answer structure questions to demonstrate comprehension given 4/5 opportunities.

Goal 4: After reading unfamiliar grade level material, STUDENT will answer [why and how] questions with 80% accuracy.

Peer-Assisted Learning Strategies (PALS)

- 3 sessions per week for approximately 35 minutes each
- After 12 teacher-directed training lessons students begin implementation in partnerships
- Students work together to complete four activities:
 - Partner Reading- Build Fluency
 - Retell- Retell Text in Sequence
 - Paragraph Shrinking- identify the Main Idea
 - Prediction Relay- Make Predictions
- Accommodates academic diversity in the general education classroom
- Allows students to practice critical reading fluency and comprehension skills
- Focuses on retelling events from text in sequence, identifying main ideas, and making predictions
- Allows for frequent opportunities to respond, engage in extended practice, and experience success in reading
- Students work in pairs with a stronger and weaker reader (determined by the teacher)
 - Rank-order students then divide ranking in half and pairs top student in top half with top student in bottom half and continue
- Both students take turns as “coach” and “reader”
- Stronger reader is always First Reader to provide the fluent model
- Coach listens to Reader to provide corrective feedback, and prompts the Reader’s use of comprehension strategies
- The teacher circulates to provide support as needed

Peer-Assisted Learning Strategies (PALS) cont.

Table 1 Description of PALS Activities

Activity (<i>Focus</i>)	How It Works	Correction Procedure
Partner Reading (<i>Build Fluency</i>)	<ul style="list-style-type: none">■ First Reader reads aloud (5 min.).■ Coach follows along and marks 1 point for each sentence read correctly.■ Second Reader reads the <i>same</i> text (5 min.).	<ul style="list-style-type: none">■ Coach points to miscued word and says, "Check it."■ Reader self-corrects or says, "I need help."■ Coach helps Reader.■ Reader rereads the sentence.
Retell (<i>Retell Text in Sequence</i>)	<ul style="list-style-type: none">■ After Partner Reading, Coach asks, "What happened first? What happened next?"■ Second Reader retells (2 min.).■ Pair awards themselves up to 10 points for trying their best.	<ul style="list-style-type: none">■ Coach may give hints or fill in information that Reader does not recall.

Peer-Assisted Learning Strategies (PALS) cont.

Paragraph Shrinking (Identify the Main Idea)

- First Reader continues reading (5 min.).
- After each paragraph, Coach says:
 - ✓ “Name the most important who or what.”
 - ✓ “Say the most important thing about the who or what.”
 - ✓ “Say the main idea in 10 words or less.”
- Coach marks 1 point for each response.
- Second Reader reads and shrinks *new* text (5 min.).
- If Reader needs help, Coach may:
 - ✓ Say “Check it.”
 - ✓ Give a hint.
 - ✓ Provide the answer.
- If Reader says the main idea in more than 10 words, Coach says, “Shrink it.”

Prediction Relay (Make Predictions)

- First Reader continues reading (5 min.).
- Reader starts by making a prediction, then:
 - ✓ Reads a half page.
 - ✓ Checks the prediction.
 - ✓ Makes a new prediction.
- Coach marks 1 point for each step (predict, read, check prediction).
- Second Reader reads and predicts with *new* text (5 min.).
- Coach helps Reader make predictions as needed.

Vocabulary Intervention to Support Comprehension

Structure of Intervention

Self Monitoring

- Goal of how many words would be learned
- Pre- and post- self assessment of attribution statements
 - “Believe”
 - “Evaluate: What do I need to do”
 - “Stay with it”
 - “Think: What can get in the way”

Vocabulary Instruction

- Instructional routine sheets used that include vocabulary words and definitions from the readings
- A simplified definition of the word is presented, brief discussion of the visual representation, use of related words, and discussion models of word-use in text
 - Three vocabulary words are introduced each day plus two previously taught words

Text-Based Reading

- Encourage finding and supporting answers from content of the text
- Refer students back to the text to re-read to answer summarization questions, and literal and inferential questions from text
- Provide scaffolds as needed to restrict amount of text students had to address to find answer
- If no response, ask students to re-read, then re-ask questions and direct students to the paragraph, sentence, and/ or word level of text

Conclusion of Self-Monitoring

- Students are then assessed on pre-established vocabulary goal identified by that student at the start of the lesson
- Then self-assess implementation of their attribution statements

Vocabulary Intervention to Support Comprehension cont.

- 2-3 students per intervention
- Eight 30-minute sessions within a two-week period (one additional day for assessments)
- 4 sections to each intervention
 - Introduction to self-monitoring (2-3 mins)
 - Vocabulary instruction (10 mins)
 - Text-based reading (15 mins)
 - Conclusion of self-monitoring (2-3 mins)
- Allow for opportunities for students to re-read text to gain knowledge
- Self-regulation component consists of goal setting prior to reading, attribution statements, and a self-monitoring checklist to support use of attribution statements during reading

Figure 1. An example of the self-regulation materials.

I am going to do my BEST!!!	BEST	
Goals:		
Use _____ new words. Use _____ old words.		
	I Can!	I Did!
Believe	Yes/ No	Yes/ No
Execute	Yes/ No	Yes/ No
Stay with it	Yes/ No	Yes/ No
Think: What can get in the way	Yes/ No	Yes/ No
Did I achieve my goal: Yes/ No		
I will use _____ new words and _____ old words tomorrow!		

Language Experience Method

- Builds on student's knowledge and language base
 - Links different forms of language- listening, speaking, reading, and writing
 - Uses student's own experiences and language as raw material
 - Students start by dictating stories to the teacher, or writing them themselves
 - The stories are then the basis of the reading instruction
- The vocabulary, syntax and content are not predetermined or controlled
 - Allows students to conceptualize the following about written material
 - What they can think about, they can talk about
 - What they say, they can write (or have written)
 - What they can write, they can read
 - They can read what others write for them to read

Comprehension

- **Intervention Background Info**
- 10 minutes in length
- Guided by research that students with RD benefit when difficulty of comprehension task is controlled, and direct instruction provided
- 1 comprehension strategy taught at least 3 weeks
- Unit topics:
 - Activating background knowledge and asking personal connections with text
 - Direct recall of text information and literal comprehension
 - Recognition of narrative text elements and story retelling
 - Question generation
 - Making inferences
 - Identifying the topic and main idea of a text segment

Structure of Intervention

Tier 1 Instruction

- Anchor lesson with teacher provided explicit instruction in new strategy with modeled application using “think-aloud”
- Students receive guided practice in application
- Read-aloud lesson follows with problem or guiding question connected to the comprehension theme or element
- Teacher stops at predetermined points to guide students toward guiding question
- Students engage in text-based discussion related to the guiding question

Tier 2 Instruction

- Students engage in activities targeting same objectives as Tier 1 lessons
- Designed to provide extended practice with increased opportunities for teacher feedback
- Frequent use of manipulatives and strategies to promote active student involvement

References

Algozzine, B., Marr, M. B., Kavel, R. L., & Dugan, K. K. (2009). Using Peer Coaches to Build Oral Reading Fluency. *Journal of Education for Students Placed at Risk (JESPAR)*, 14(3), 256–270. <https://doi.org/10.1080/10824660903375735>

[Intervention 1](#)

Lerner, J. W., & Johns, B. H. (2015). *Learning disabilities and related disabilities: strategies for success*. Cengage Learning.

[Intervention 1](#)

[Intervention 2](#)

McMaster, K. L., Jung, P.-G., Brandes, D., Pinto, V., Fuchs, D., Kearns, D., Lemons, C., Sáenz, L., & Yen, L. (2014). Customizing a Research-Based Reading Practice. *The Reading Teacher*, 68(3), 173–183. <https://doi.org/10.1002/trtr.1301>

[Intervention 1](#)

Solari, E. J., Denton, C. A., Petscher, Y., & Haring, C. (2017). Examining the Effects and Feasibility of a Teacher-Implemented Tier 1 and Tier 2 Intervention in Word Reading, Fluency, and Comprehension. *Journal of Research on Educational Effectiveness*, 11(2), 163–191. <https://doi.org/10.1080/19345747.2017.1375582>

[Intervention 1](#)

[Intervention 2](#)

[Intervention 3](#)

References

Solís, M., Scammacca, N., Barth, A. E., & Roberts, G. J. (2017). Text-based Vocabulary Intervention Training Study: Supporting Fourth Graders with Low Reading Comprehension and Learning Disabilities. *Learning Disabilities: A Contemporary Journal*, 15(1), 103–115.

[Intervention 1](#)

Steady, L. M., Fuchs, D., Gilbert, J. K., Kearns, D. M., Elleman, A. M., & Edwards, A. A. (2020). Sight word acquisition in first grade students at risk for reading disabilities: an item-level exploration of the number of exposures required for mastery. *Annals of Dyslexia*, 70(2), 259–274. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11881-020-00198-7>

[Intervention 1](#)

Toste, J. R., Capin, P., Williams, K. J., Cho, E., & Vaughn, S. (2018). Replication of an Experimental Study Investigating the Efficacy of a Multisyllabic Word Reading Intervention With and Without Motivational Beliefs Training for Struggling Readers. *Journal of Learning Disabilities*, 52(1), 45–58. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0022219418775114>

[Intervention 1](#)