The Science of Dyslexia and Implications for Teacher Education Presentation to the Connecticut Dyslexia Task Force

Devin Kearns, Ph.D. & Fumiko Hoeft, M.D. Ph.D. University of Connecticut

Overview

- Background about us
- Understanding reading comprehension
- Understanding word recognition

Background about us

Why you would possibly want to hear us talk about dyslexia

Cabrie's older brother





Mr. Kearns

teacher, literacy coach, and reading remediation specialist



Lourdes, Sergio, Rosa, Francisco

Adolfo, Jaime, Maggie, Blake

Dr. Kearns

reading researcher, intervention designer, teacher educator



Fumiko Hoeft, M.D., Ph.D.

Professor @ UConn Psychological Sciences | Psychiatry | Neuroscience | IBACS
 Member of Board of Directors & Co-Chair of Scientific Advisory Board @ IDA

 Member of Professional Advisory Board @ NCLD
 Director @ UConn Brain Imaging Research Center (BIRC)
 Professor @ UCSF Psychiatry | Weill Inst. for Neurosci. | Dyslexia Cntr.
 Exec. Director @ Univ CA-Stanford Precision Learning Center (PrecL)
 Co-Director @ Haskins Global L² Innovation Hub

ONN Contractions of the second se

board member, advisor





professor & director



Understanding Reading Comprehension

Fitting dyslexia into the big picture

The Tale of Peter Rabbit by Beatrix Potter

Once upon a time there were four little Rabbits, and their names were Flopsy, Mopsy, Cotton-tail, and Peter. They lived with their Mother in a sandbank, underneath the root of a very big fir-tree.

"Now my dears," said old Mrs. Rabbit one morning, "you may go into the fields or down the lane, but don't go into Mr. McGregor's garden: your Father had an accident there; he was put in a pie by Mrs. McGregor."



Reading Comprehension

• Constructing a situation model from the textbase



Situation model





This is a fairy tale about four bunnies

Tools to construct the situation model: The simple view of reading







Devin Kearns (devin.kearns@gmail.com)







Key Idea

Concept

Instructional Implication

- Dyslexia prevents the reader from constructing the situation model because they cannot access the print
- Students with dyslexia require instruction that focuses on helping them access print

Individual Differences in Word Recognition Development

Value of differing degrees of emphasis

Connectionist framework for word recognition



Seidenberg & McClelland (1989)

Word recognition in the brain



Implications of connectionist framework

- Saying the word correctly depends on
 - Early in reading acquisition: Phonological awareness and decoding letters to sounds
 - Later: Sight recognition
 - letters to meaning
- Strong vocabulary knowledge supports word recognition
 - This knowledge is especially useful once readers have established decoding skills
 - This can provide some support for students with reading difficulty

Individual differences in word recognition

In a connectionist framework

- The value of different ways of learning depends on the learner
- This raises the questions:
 - Should we include meaning instruction in phonics instruction?
 - Should we teach students less about phonics?

Some students will learn to read without extensive phonics instruction

- Foorman et al. (1998) found that in first-grade classrooms
- with explicit phonics instruction, 84% of students made reading progress
- without explicit phonics instruction, 56% of students made reading progress

Processing in dyslexia



Underactivation in the temporo-parietal region

а



Successful adult readers

Kindergarteners at-risk for dyslexia

Adapted from presentations by Trynia Kaufman & Joanna Christodoulou

Yamada et al. (2011)

Not all learners with reading difficulty need the same kinds of intervention



Not all readers need the same kind of tasks

Group 1

Grade Equivalent: 0.94	TEACHER MANAGED		CHILD MANAGED		GROUP		
	Meaning-focused	Code-focused	Meaning-focused	Code-focused	Recommended	Actions	
Connor, Carol	11	15	37	23	Group 1 A	Student Actions	\$
Farris, Anna	12	17	36	23	Group 1 A	Student Actions	\$
GaGa, Lady	13	17	35	22	Group 1 A	Student Actions	\$
Imahara, Grant	12	18	36	24	Group 1 A	Student Actions	\$
Pitt, Brad	13	21	36	27	Group 1 A	Student Actions	\$
Group Minutes	12	18	36	24			

Group 2

Grade Equivalent: 1.38	TEACHER MANAGED		CHILD MANAGED		GROUP		
	Meaning-focused	Code-focused	Meaning-focused	Code-focused	Recommended	Actions	
Fey, Tina	10	10	38	14	Group 2 A	Student Actions	\$
Kidman, Nicole	13	16	35	22	Group 2 A	Student Actions	\$
Pratt, Chris	11	12	37	16	Group 2 A	Student Actions	\$
Smith, Will	13	14	35	16	Group 2 A	Student Actions	\$
Travolta, John	11	11	37	14	Group 2 A	Student Actions	\$
Group Minutes	12	13	36	16			

Matching instruction and student is important

- National RTI Evaluation did not show success
 - Students at the 40th percentile were given additional phonics instruction
 - This may have been less effective for them
- Leveled Literacy Intervention is a good example
 - It is controversial when considered for teaching students with dyslexia because it has less focus on explicit systematic phonics
 - It has some evidence of success in randomized controlled trials
 - The effects appear to be best for students with less difficulty

Students with dyslexia need intensive phonics

- Examination of long-term effects of phonics (Suggate, 2015) showed the greatest long-term benefits for students with the most serious reading difficulty
- Value of phonics for students with serious reading difficulty has been shown repeatedly (e.g., Wanzek, 2013)

Neural effects of phonological intervention in children with dyslexia

 Pre-Intervention
 Post-Intervention

 Image: Constraint of the second sec

After intervention, metabolic brain activity of children with dyslexia more closely resembles that of typical readers.

What are intervention programs?

- Standardized, research-based interventions designed for students who do not meet grade-level expectations
- Programs referred to as
 - Strategic interventions
 - Word reading interventions
 - Basic-skills program
 - Foundational skills programs
- "Examples"
 - Let's Learn to Read: Beginning Reading Support Program
 - Words Everywhere: Literacy Fundamentals
- The key is for programs to meet the criteria



Characteristics of a standardized program

• Research-based:

- Has been studied using rigorous methods
- Has been shown to be effective in those studies
- Explicit:
 - provides instructions for the teacher (maybe scripted)
 - uses a model and practice instructional approach
- Systematic:
 - reflects the entire continuum of target skills
 - has enough lessons to be valuable
- Focused on foundational skills:
 - addresses standards or skills underpinning standards
 - supports (but is likely not the same as) grade-level standards

Research-based: Has good evidence of good effects

- If a program is really research-based
 - It has evidence of working
 - There are programs that have been research-based
 - The Institute for Education Sciences Practice Guide provides guidance
- But maintain healthy skepticism
 - These days, every program has a tab on their website that says "research" or "evidence"
 - An evidence review saying this type of instruction works
 - Testimonials from educators or families
 - Unpublished internal studies
 - Poorly designed studies presented somewhere (not found in a journal)



Explicit

Clear Objective

- Important focus
- Specific learning outcome

l Do

Modeling	Practice	
Clear Explanation	Guided Practice	We Do
Planned Examples	Independent Practice	You Do

Supporting Practices

- Using effective methods to elicit frequent responses
- Providing immediate specific feedback
- Maintaining a brisk pace

Explicit

A Tapping and Sounding Out

Direct the student to the Decodable Words section of the lesson page. We're going to tap and sound out words together. We'll tap once for each dot. Me first. Give this instruction only for the first word. <u>Mat</u> is used in this example; substitute with the different words given for each lesson.

I'll tap the sounds in this word (point to mat). Tap one finger under the first dot. /m/Tap under the next dot with the same finger. /a/Tap under the last dot. /t/

I'll sound it out. Slide your finger slowly under the word in an arc. /maaaat/

I'll say it fast. Slide your finger quickly under the word in a straight line. <u>mat</u>
Systematic

Graphemes and Corresponding Phonemes Based on Devin's Program and Words in the EWFG for Grades 1-5

a	ch	f	1	ou	th
-/ 21	/ch/ 376	/f/ 1395	/-/ 35	/ow/ 245	/th*/ 123
/aw/ 116	/k/ 97		/1/ 4326	/ŭ/ 43	/th/ 351
ā/ 661		g	/əl/ 52	/ə/ 72	
ă/ 2114	ck	/g/ 987			u
ĕ/ 50	/k/ 344	/j/ 423	le	our	1-1 56
ŏ/ 136			/əl/ 365	/er/ 37	/00/ 200
/ə/ 1631	d	h		/or/ 33	/yoo/ 105
	/d/ 3532	/-/ 56	m		/yə/ 70
а-е	/t/ 54	/h/ 730	/m/ 2576	ow	/ū/ 1210
ā/ 408				/ow/ 137	/ʊ/ 62
1/ 33	e	i	n	/ō/ 178	
ə/ 74	/-/ 508	/-/ 450	/n/ 5435		u-e
	/ē/ 312	/y/ 74	/ng/ 233	oy	/00/70
i	/ē/ 1933	/ē/ 312		/oy/ 57	/yoo/ 42
ā/ 256	/1/ 333	/ī/ 484	ng		2011
	/ə/ 2281	/1/ 3762	/ng/ 1293	р	ue
air		/ə/ 592	1740	/p/ 2673	/00/ 30
ēr/ 51	e-e		0	00.*00#00#00#00#0	
	/ē/ 36	i-e	/aw/ 127	ph	ur
ar		/ē/ 31	/00/ 41	/f/ 126	/er/ 244
er/ 185	ea	/1/ 385	/ō/ 634		
or/ 50	/ē/ 380	/1/ 100	/õ/ 955	qu	ure
ĕr/ 44	/ē/ 125	/ə/ 37	/ŭ/ 143	/kw/ 134	/er/ 88
ŏr/ 460			/ə/ 1246		
	ear	ie		r	v
are	/er/ 35	/ē/ 263	o-e	/r/ 3206	/v/ 1051
ěr/ 68	/ïər/ 77	/1/ 57	/ō/ 185		
			/ŭ/ 36	s	w
au	ed	igh		/s/ 4612	/w/ 699
aw/ 83	/d/ 527	/1/ 110	oa	/sh/ 63	
	/t/ 312		/õ/ 113	/z/ 2861	wh
w		ir		/zh/ 58	/w/ 88
aw/ 79	ee	/er/ 107	oi		
	/ē/ 315		/oy/ 87	sh	wr
ay		ire		/sh/ 472	/r/ 44
ā/ 162	eer	/ier/ 56	00	1010 -112	
	/íer/ 33		/00/ 196	t	x
0		j	/3/ 104	1-1 44	/gz/ 33
-/ 35	er	/j/ 250		/ch/ 97	/ks/ 202
b/ 1743	/er/ 1637	11 200	or	/d/ 1104	1837 202
0/ 1/45	/īər/ 35	k	/er/ 324	/sh/ 333	v
	/101/ 33	k /k/ 757	/or/ 411	/t/ 4198	y /y/ 89
k/ 2230	ew	110 151	/01/ 411	10 4150	/ē/ 1122
k/ 2230 s/ 694	/oo/ 73	kn	ore	tch	/i/ 101
s/ 694 sh/ 57	100/75	/n/ 35	ore /or/ 59	/ch/ 92	/1/ 101
511/ 5/		/11/ 35	/01/ 59	7017 92	11/ 83
	ey				
	/ē/ 67				Z
					/z/ 185

oy /oy/ 57	u-e /oo/ 70 /yoo/ 42
p	ue
/p/ 2673	/oo/ 30
ph	ur
/f/ 126	/er/ 244

Focused on foundational skills

- Phonics skills underlie all other English Language Arts standards in the Common Core State Standards
- For students with dyslexia, the critical foundation is phonics

An example: The Nashville Early Reading Project

Designed by Fuchs, Kearns et al. (2012) for first graders

Tested in a large-scale randomized control trial Had positive effects on word reading and comprehension



Tested with students needing intensive intervention one-to-one





Checklist: The Nashville Early Reading Program

- Research-based
- Explicit
- □ Systematic
- Focused on foundational skills

- We did the research and it worked
- We used very structured lessons
- We created a clear sequence \checkmark
- It focuses on foundational skills

Students with dyslexia—but perhaps not always others—need intensive phonics instruction

- Students with less severe reading difficulty benefit from less intensive interventions focused somewhat less on phonics
- Students with dyslexia benefit from more intensive interventions focused specifically on word recognition skills

Key Idea

Concepts

Instructional Implication

- Word recognition skills develop as a result of letter, sound, and meaning knowledge
- The need for word recognition instruction varies by degree of difficulty

• Students with dyslexia should receive highly explicit systematic phonics instruction

Thank you

Dyslexia is not a visual processing problem

	Hebrew speakers	Non-Hebrew speakers		
	good	poor	good	
	readers	readers	readers	_
	Hebrew words Then, children dr			
Wron	9 best memory	worst memory	good memory	visual prediction
	best memory	same memory		actual data

Dyslexia is *not* a visual processing problem

Good readers	reversals	Poor readers
few	bdpqg	many
errors	b u p y y	errors

Fischer, Liberman, & Shankweiler (1978)



But...it's a similar percentage of errors

Errors Made

