

**ED PS 6842-001, 015 (3 credits)
Reading Interventionist Seminar
Spring, 2018**

Tuesday, 4:30 – 7:00 pm @ SAEC 2155

Instructor: S. Claire Son, Ph.D.
Office: Department of Educational Psychology, SAEC 3249
Email: s.claire.son@utah.edu
Office hours: by appointment

READING INTERVENTIONIST SEMINAR/INTERNSHIP DESCRIPTION

A prerequisite: the completion of the Tier II and III practicum for the Reading Interventionist Endorsement

The purpose of this graduate-level semester course is to provide educators with opportunities to integrate the knowledge and skills learned in preceding Tier II and Tier III Clinical Practica.

The course has two primary objectives:

1. To develop a deep understanding of current theory and research related to reading difficulties and effective intervention; and
2. To extent and solidify learning about reading difficulties and effective intervention.

The course differs the courses you took in the Reading Endorsement Level I in a few important ways. In those courses, theoretical, research and practical readings revolved around normally progressing readers, with minimal emphasis on students who have difficulties in learning to read and comprehend. In this class, you will read primarily theoretical and research articles and chapters about students who have difficulties learning to read and comprehend. So, many of the readings in this class will be taken from special education sources that focus specifically on students with difficulties.

In addition, the focus of the readings and this class will not be on practice, as you have experienced how to work with these students in the Tier III and Tier II practica. Instead, the focus will be on your developing a deep understanding of the research behind what works and why specific strategies and instructional activities work for these students. As well, readings will focus on effective intervention for struggling readers.

REQUIRED READING

Theory and Scientific Research Standards and Findings for Reading Instructional and Intervention

Rayner, K., Foorman, B.F., Perfetti, C.A., Pesetsky, D., & Seidenberg, M.S. (2002). How psychological science informs the teaching of reading. *Psychological Science in the Public Interest*, 2(2), 31-74.

Shanahan, T. (2002). What reading research says: The promises and limitations of applying research to reading education. In A. E. Farstrup (Ed.), *What research has to say about reading instruction* (pp. 8-24).

Reading Primary Studies and Meta-Analyses

Bus, A. G., van IJzendoorn, M. H., & Mol, S. E. (2011). Meta-Analysis. In N. K. Duke & M. H. Mallette (Eds.), *Literacy Research Methodologies* (2nd Ed.). (pp. 270-300). New York: Guilford.

Slavin, R. E. (2002). Evidence-based education policies: Transforming educational practice and research. *Educational Researcher*, 31(7), 15-21.

Early Literacy Development and Intervention

Whitehurst, G. J., & Lonigan, C. J. (1998). Child development and emergent literacy. *Child Development*, 69(3), 848-872.

Vasilyeva, M., & Waterfall, H. (2011). Variability in language development: Relation to socioeconomic status and environmental input. In S. B. Neuman & D. K. Dickinson (Eds.), *Handbook of Early Literacy Research: Vol 3*. (pp. 36-48). New York: Guilford.

Diamond, K. E., & Powell, D. R. (2016). Developing literacy and language competence: Preschool children who are at risk or have disabilities. In B. Reichow, B. Boyd, E. Barton, & S. Odom (Eds.), *Handbook of Early Childhood Special Education* (pp. 125-141). New York: Springer.

Beginning Reading Skills

Ehri, L. C. & Roberts, T. (2006). The roots of learning to read and write: Acquisition of letters and phonemic awareness. In D. K. Dickinson & S. B. Neuman (Eds.), *Handbook of Early Literacy Research: Vol 2*. (pp. 113-131). New York: Guilford.

Torgeson, J.K., Wagner, R.K. & Rashotte, C.A. (1997). Approaches to the prevention and remediation of phonologically based reading disabilities. In B. Blachman (Ed.), *Foundations of Reading Acquisition and Dyslexia* (pp. 287-304). Mahwah, NJ: Erlbaum

Goodwin, A. P., & Ahn, S. (2010). A meta-analysis of morphological interventions: Effects on literacy achievement of children with literacy difficulties. *Annals of Dyslexia*, 60(2), 183-208.

Cunningham, A. E., Nathan, R. G., Schmidt Raheer, K. S. (2011). Orthographic processing in models of word recognition. In M. Kamil, P. D. Pearson, E. Moje & P. Afflerbach (Eds.), *Handbook of Reading Research: Vol. 4*. (pp. 259-285). New York: Routledge.

Verhoeven, L. (2011). Second language reading acquisition. In M. Kamil, P.D. Pearson, E. Moje & P. Afflerbach (Eds.), *Handbook of Reading Research: Vol. 4*. (pp. 661-683). New York: Routledge.

Fluency

Morgan, P. L. and Sideridis, G. D. (2006). Contrasting the effectiveness of fluency interventions for students with or at risk for learning disabilities: A multilevel random coefficient modeling meta-analysis. *Learning Disabilities Research & Practice*, 21, 191–210.

Chard, D. J., Vaughn, S., & Tyler, B. J. (2002). A synthesis of research on effective interventions for building reading fluency with elementary students with learning disabilities. *Journal of learning disabilities*, 35(5), 386-406.

Therrien, W. J. (2004). Fluency and comprehension gains as a result of repeated reading: A meta-analysis. *Remedial and special education*, 25(4), 252-261.

Vocabulary

- Marulis, L. M. & Neuman, S. B. (2010). The effects of vocabulary intervention on young children's word learning. *Review of Educational Research, 80*(3), 300-335.
- Elleman, A. M., Lindo, E. J., Morphy, P., & Compton, D. L. (2009). The impact of vocabulary instruction on passage-level comprehension of school-age children: A meta-analysis. *Journal of Research on Educational Effectiveness, 2*(1), 1-44.
- Bryant, D. P., Goodwin, M., Bryant, B. R., & Higgins, K. (2003). Vocabulary instruction for students with learning disabilities: A review of the research. *Learning Disability Quarterly, 26*(2), 117-128.

Comprehension

- Shankweiler, D., Lundquist, E., Katz, L., Stuebing, K. K., Fletcher, J. M., Brady, S., Fowler, A., Dreyer, L. G., Marchione, K. E., Shaywitz, S. E., & Shaywitz, B. A. (1999). Comprehension and decoding: Patterns of association in children with reading difficulties. *Scientific Studies of Reading, 3*, 69-94.
- Perfetti, C, Marron, M. A. & Foltz, P. W. (1996). Sources of comprehension failure: Theoretical perspectives and case studies. In C. Cornoldi & J. Oakhill (Eds.), *Reading Comprehension Difficulties: Processes and Intervention* (pp. 137-165). Mahwah, NJ: Erlbaum.
- Berkeley, S., Scruggs, T. E., & Mastropieri, M. A. (2010). Reading comprehension instruction for students with learning disabilities, 1995–2006: A meta-analysis. *Remedial and Special Education, 31*(6), 423-436.
- Gersten, R., Fuchs, L. S., Williams, J. P., & Baker, S. (2001). Teaching reading comprehension strategies to students with learning disabilities: A review of research. *Review of Educational Research, 71*(2), 279-320.
- Faggella-Luby, M. N., & Deshler, D. D. (2008). Reading comprehension in adolescents with LD: What we know; what we need to learn. *Learning Disabilities Research & Practice 23*(2), 70-78.

Interventions for Older Struggling Readers

- Slavin, R. E., Lake, C., Davis, S., & Madden, N. A. (2011). Effective programs for struggling readers: A best-evidence synthesis. *Educational Research Review, 6*(1), 1-26.
- Wanzek, J., Wexler, J., Vaughn, S., & Ciullo, S. (2010). Reading interventions for struggling readers in the upper elementary grades: A synthesis of 20 years of research. *Reading and writing, 23*(8), 889-912.
- Fisher, D., & Ivey, G. (2006). Evaluating the interventions for struggling adolescent readers. *Journal of Adolescent & Adult Literacy, 50*(3), 180-189.

Assessment of Reading Difficulties

- Fuchs, D., Fuchs, L.S., McMaster, K.N., & Al Otaiba, S. (2003). Identifying children at risk for reading failure: Curriculum-based measurement and the dual-discrepancy approach. In H.L. Swanson,

K.R. Harris, & S. Graham (Eds.), *Handbook of Learning Disabilities* (pp. 431-449). New York: Guilford.

Kilpatrick, D. A. (2015). Reading difficulties and Learning Disability Identification. *Essentials of Assessing, Preventing, and Overcoming Reading Difficulties* (pp. 344-356). Hoboken, NJ: Wiley.

Salinger, T. (2006). Policy decisions in early literacy assessment. In D.K. Dickinson & S.B. Neuman (Eds.), *Handbook of Early Literacy Research: Vol 2.* (pp. 427-444). New York: Guilford.

Writing

Graham, S., & Hebert, M. (2011). Writing to read: A meta-analysis of the impact of writing and writing instruction on reading. *Harvard Educational Review, 81*(4), 710-744.

Graham, S., McKeown, D., Kiuahara, S., & Harris, K. R. (2012). A meta-analysis of writing instruction for students in the elementary grades. *Journal of Educational Psychology, 104*(4), 879-896.

Gersten, R., & Baker, S. (2001). Teaching expressive writing to students with learning disabilities: A meta-analysis. *The Elementary School Journal, 101*(3), 251-272.

Additional Resources for Instructional Decision-Making

What Works Clearinghouse

http://ies.ed.gov/ncee/wwc/publications_reviews.aspx

Birsh, J.R. (2005). *Multisensory Teaching of Basic Language Skills*. Baltimore, MD: Brookes.

CORE: Teaching Reading

<https://www.corelearn.com/sb2resources-html/>

CORE: Assessing Reading

<https://www.corelearn.com/assessing-reading-multiple-measures-2nd-edition/>

LETRS (Language for Teachers of Reading and Spelling) Modules: Print & E-Books

<http://www.voyagersopris.com/services/professional-resources/professional-books/letrs-second-edition/training-support#Print>

***NOTE ON THE READINGS:** We cannot have a successful class and/or discussion without everyone having read the articles for the week. Therefore, it is imperative that you come to class each week already having read and written about the readings.

COURSE ASSIGNMENTS

1. *Leading Seminars:* To accomplish the first objective, you will take turns leading seminars each week. To lead a seminar, you will come prepared with pertinent questions about the set of readings you are required to read for the week. You will receive 10 points for effective leading of the seminar.
2. *Reading Questions:* For readings of each week, you will come up with three discussion questions to use during the seminar. Questions need to be typed and printed out. You will receive 10 points for reading questions.

3. *Quizzes*: You will have quizzes on weekly readings. The quizzes are to ask your broad understanding of the readings, including concepts, theories, findings, and implications. You will receive 30 points for quizzes.
4. *Capstone Paper*: You will write a capstone paper planning and justifying five reading intervention activities, each targeting one of the following areas: phonological/phonemic awareness, orthographical/morphological processing, fluency, vocabulary, and comprehension. The gist of the paper is justifying your specific activities by reviewing related theories and research studies. You will submit a progress report (10 points) and a final report (40 points). Before you submit the final capstone paper, you will have a chance to peer-edit the paper. Detailed descriptions and a grading rubric of the capstone paper is attached at the end of the syllabus.

GRADING:

Assignments and Grading	
1. Reading Questions	10
2. Quizzes	30
3. Leading Seminars	10
4. Capstone paper	50
Progress report	(10)
Final paper	(40)

TOTAL:	100

General Criteria for Grading Assignments

Please note that all assignments must be turned in to Canvas on time (Monday 11:59 pm). If there is a particular hardship, let me know in advance. Papers that are one week late are reduced by a total grade. e.g. if a paper is an A paper and submitted one week late, it becomes a B, a B paper submitted one week late becomes a C. Two weeks late, two grades are taken off the resulting grade, etc.

Appropriateness

Does my work meet all criteria given on the syllabus, the rubric and in class?

Evidence of Knowledge

Is it clear from my work that I know and understand the relevant material?

Completeness

Have I included all relevant information and ideas?

Clarity

Is my paper organized so that the ideas and information are clear?

Do the wording and phrasing of my sentences match the thoughts I am trying to convey?

Professional Presentation

Is my paper typed and free of errors in grammar, punctuation, and spelling? (Please proofread carefully. If you hand in a paper that is not in good form, you will lose points.)

Grades are earned, and will be given at the conclusion of the course, based on the following university guidelines. Please refer to the U of U Student Handbook for students' professional and academic responsibilities.

A= Superior performance, excellent achievement

B= Good performance, substantial achievement

C= Standard performance and achievement

A = 93-100%

A- = 90-92%

B+ = 87-89%

B = 83-86%

B- = 80-82%

C+ = 77-79%

C = 73-76%

C- = 70-72%

D+ = 67-69%

D = 63-66%

D- = 60-62%

F = 59% and below

General Criteria for Grading Assignments

Please note that all assignments must be turned in on time. If there is a particular hardship, let me know in advance. Papers that are one week late are reduced by a total grade. E.g. if a paper is an A paper and submitted one week late, it becomes a B, a B paper submitted one week late becomes a C. Two weeks late, two grades are taken off the resulting grade. Etc.

Other Course Requirements

It is expected that students will maintain a respectful and civil atmosphere during class meetings. Thus, expectations are that students:

- Arrive to class on time, and on a regular basis. It is important for your own learning and for the good of the class that you are in class every session, on time, and ready to go with all readings, all text reflections, and any other assignments completed. Regular class participation is very important to this class since much of the course content will come from the interactive class sessions, lectures, and group discussions. Again, please be prepared to be an active voice in class! At my discretion, you may lose points for consistent nonparticipation in class activities and discussions.
- Complete--on time--the required assignments.
- Show courtesy and respect to fellow students during all classroom activities. Please remember that everyone in the class has good ideas and that each individual's response to the readings helps to enrich the group's understanding and discussions.
- Prevent disruptions by turning off and refraining from use of cell phones and beepers, and by putting away extraneous reading materials. Use of laptop computers in class is not allowed without instructor's permission.
- Adhere to the University of Utah code for student conduct (see below).

Students' Rights and Responsibilities

In order to maintain a positive, civil environment for learning I expect that all students will strive to meet the goals described in the University of Utah's Student Code, which states *"the mission of the University of Utah is to educate the individual and to discover, refine and disseminate knowledge. The University supports the intellectual, personal, social and ethical development of members of the University*

Following the Student Code, I adopt a zero-tolerance policy for academic misconduct in this course. "Academic misconduct," according to the University of Utah Student Code, *"includes, but is not limited to, cheating, misrepresenting one's work, inappropriately collaborating, plagiarism, and fabrication or falsification of information...It also includes facilitating academic misconduct by intentionally helping or attempting to help another to commit an act of academic misconduct."* Again, utilizing the ideas, expressions, or words of others without citing the source constitutes plagiarism.

Therefore, you must cite sources in ALL your work. Please also note that you may not submit an assignment for this class that has been previously submitted for another course.

You will be held accountable to high standards for academic integrity and should read and understand the policy on academic integrity as printed in the University of Utah's Student Handbook. Please read the Student Code of Academic Conduct available at:
<http://www.admin.utah.edu/ppmanual/8/8-10.html>.

Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA)

The University of Utah seeks to provide equal access to its programs, services and activities for people with disabilities. If you will need accommodations in the class, reasonable prior notice needs to be given to the Center for Disability Services, 162 Olpin Union Building, 581-5020 (V/TDD). CDS will work with you and the instructor to make arrangements for accommodations. All written information in this course can be made available in alternative format with prior notification to the Center for Disability Services.

This syllabus is meant to serve as an outline and guide for the course. Please note that it may be modified by the instructor at any time so long as reasonable notice is provided to students of the modification. The general course outline as well as reading assignments may be modified by the instructor at any time to accommodate the needs of a particular class. Should you have any questions or concerns about the syllabus, it is your responsibility to contact the instructor for clarification.

COURSE TOPICS, READINGS, AND SCHEDULE

<i>Date</i>	<i>Lecture Topics</i>	<i>Readings and Assignments (Canvas)</i>
Week 1 1/9	Introduction Frameworks for Understanding Reading	Discussion of leading seminars
Week 2 1/16	Theory and Scientific Research Standards and Findings for Reading Instructional and Intervention	Rayner, Foorman, Perfetti, Pesetsky, & Seidenberg, 2002. Shanahan, 2002
Week 3 1/23	Reading Primary Studies and Meta-Analyses Online Literature Search	Bus, van IJzendoorn, & Mol, 2011 Slavin, 2002 Bring your laptop to class
Week 4 1/30	Early Literacy Development and Intervention	Whitehurst & Lonigan, 1998 Vasilyeva & Waterfall, 2011 Diamond & Powell, 2016
Week 5 2/6	Beginning Reading Skills	Ehri & Roberts, 2006 Torgeson, Wagner, & Rashotte, 1997 Goodwin & Ahn, 2010
Week 6 2/13	Beginning Reading Skills (cont.)	Cunningham, Nathan, Schmidt Raher, 2006 Verhoeven, 2011
Week 7 2/20	Fluency	Morgan & Sideridis, 2006 Chard, Vaughn, & Tyler, 2006 Therrien, 2004
Week 8 2/27	Vocabulary	Marulis, & Neuman, 2010 Elleman, Lindo, Morphy, & Compton, 2009 Bryant, Goodwin, Bryant, & Higgins, 2003

Week 9 3/6	Comprehension	Shankweiler, Lundquist, Katz, Fletcher, et al. 1999 Perfetti, Marron, & Foltz, 1996
Week 10 3/13	Comprehension (cont.)	Berkeley, Scruggs, & Mastropieri, 2010 Gersten, Fuchs, Williams, & Baker, 2001 Faggella-Luby, & Deshler, 2008 *Capstone project progress report (Due on Canvas 3/19): Include a summary of activities and a list of supporting theories and research studies for each activity
Spring Break, No Class (3/20)		
Week 11 3/27	Work on Your Capstone Paper	*Capstone draft to peer (Due to your peer on 4/9)
Week 12 4/3	Interventions for Older Struggling Readers	Wanzek, Wexler, Vaughn, & Ciullo, 2010 Slavin, Lake, Davis, & Madden, 2011 Fisher & Ivey, 2006
Week 13 4/10	Assessment of Reading Difficulties	Fuchs, Fuchs, McMaster, & Al Otaiba, 2003 Kilpatrick, 2015 Salinger, 2006 *Peer feedback of capstone project draft (Due to your peer on 4/16)
Week 14 4/17	Writing	Graham & Herbert, 2011 Graham, McKeown, Kuyhara, & Harris, 2012 Gersten & Baker, 2001
Week 15 4/24	Wrap Up	* Capstone project (Due on Canvas 4/23)

Capstone Paper Components

You will write a capstone paper planning and justifying five reading intervention activities on phonological/phonemic awareness, orthographical/morphological processing, fluency, vocabulary, and comprehension. You will write five main sections, each describing Early Steps/Next Steps activities targeting each of the above reading skills and justifying the activities with relevant theories and research studies. The final paper is expected to include following components and 15-25 pages long. In-text citations and references should follow APA style (refer to the APA manual or the Purdue online APA style guide, <https://owl.english.purdue.edu/owl/resource/560/01/>).

Title

Introduction

- Introducing the capstone paper
- General topic of reading difficulties, children who need support, and their characteristics
- Overall intervention goals and settings

Phonological/phonemic awareness intervention

- Intervention activity
- Arguments of the activity justification by reviewing theories and research studies

Orthographic processing intervention

- Intervention activity
- Arguments of the activity justification by reviewing theories and research studies

Fluency intervention

- Intervention activity
- Arguments of the activity justification by reviewing theories and research studies

Vocabulary intervention

- Intervention activity
- Arguments of the activity justification by reviewing theories and research studies

Comprehension intervention

- Intervention activity
- Arguments of the activity justification by reviewing theories and research studies

Conclusion

- Brief summary of the overall planning of activities
- Potential difficulties
- Expected outcomes from intervention and possible next steps

References

Capstone Progress Report

You need to submit a capstone progress report. As part of the progress report, you need to select five intervention activities from Early Steps/Next Steps. Activity justification parts need to include brief ideas of which theories and research studies you will use for your arguments.

Capstone Final Report Grading Rubric

Criteria	PASS	FAIL
Introduction (5 possible points)	The writer introduces the general topic of reading difficulties, target children, goals, and settings in the beginning of the whole paper. The writer outlines in narrative form the organization of the essay.	The writer does not introduce the general topic of reading difficulties, target children, goals, and settings and/or does not outline in narrative form the organization of the essay.
Intervention Activity Content (5 possible points)	All intervention activities included are relevant to address specific reading skills with detailed descriptions. Activities include a literacy focus in depth and explicitly.	Intervention activities lack depth and explicit descriptions, irrelevant or missing content.
Relevant Research and Theories (15 possible points)	Ideas are fully supported with appropriate evidence and examples from research studies. Relevant and rigorous (peer-reviewed and empirical) research is included, cited research comes from multiple sources, clear examples to clarify points made in the paper.	Lack of support and examples. Relevant research is not used, or all cited research comes from just a few sources, or too few examples to clarify points made in the paper.
Citations/References (5 possible points)	All major ideas in the text are supported by citations from research. References at the end of the paper are referenced appropriately, accurately and completely. APA style is used consistently for citations and references.	APA citations are not followed and/or essential information is missing
Conclusion (5 possible points)	The writer concludes the paper by summarizing the overall activity planning to improve target children’s reading difficulties and expected outcomes. The writer mentions potential difficulties with the planned activities and possible next steps.	The writer does not conclude the paper by summarizing the overall activity planning and/or potential difficulties and possible next steps.
Clarity of Writing (5 possible points)	Writing is clear and succinct and free from mechanical errors, spelling, punctuation, grammar, etc. Paragraphs are well organized with headings and subheading as well as clear topic sentences.	Writing is generally unclear and/or not succinct and/or may be rambling and/or meaning is hidden and/or paragraphs poorly structured and/or mechanical errors can be found. Paragraphs are not organized with headings and subheading; no topic sentences.