Reframing out Thinking as SLPs: The Language-Literacy-Dyslexia Connection

CSHA Convergence Pasadena
March 25, 2022

Robert A. Pieretti, Ph.D., CCC-SLP, CSHA Fellow
Interim Associate Dean, College of Health and Human Services
Professor, Department of Communication Sciences and Disorders
California State University, Sacramento

Jeannene M. Ward-Lonergan, Ph.D., CCC-SLP, BCS-CL
Associate Dean of Academic Affairs, School of Health Sciences
Professor, Department of Speech Pathology and Audiology
University of the Pacific

Workshop Description

The Common Core Standards emphasize the relationship between language development and the successful acquisition of reading and writing. There has also been renewed emphasis in several states on recognizing the impact of language-based reading disabilities, including dyslexia, on students' ability to succeed in school. This session will review these language-based learning disabilities and provide SLPs with practical, collaborative strategies for participating in transdisciplinary language-literacy assessment in school-based settings and review appropriate language intervention goals, transdisciplinary service delivery, and evidence-based treatment methodology.

Workshop Objectives

As a result of this workshop, learners will be able to:

Learner Outcome 1: Identify areas of language SLPs may address to support literacy development in students with language disorders and language-learning disabilities including dyslexia.

Learner Outcome 2: Discuss the SLP's role in literacy assessment in the public schools and how to link the assessment results of transdisciplinary team members in the assessment process.

Learner Outcome 3: Describe transdisciplinary treatment techniques, strategies, and approaches that may be used to support this population of students

COMPARING READING PROBLEMS BY TYPE

	Dyslexia (Profile A)	Specific Comprehension Deficit (Profile B)	Mixed Decoding/Comprehension Deficit (Profile B)	Examples of Key Measures
Listening Comprehension	Average to above average	Below average	Below average	Language Testing; WJ/IV Oral Comprehension; WIAT-III Listening Comprehension; Other measures, both formal and informal
Reading Comprehension	Below average	Below average	Below average	WJ/IV Passage Comprehension; WIAT-III Reading Comprehension; Other achievement measures, both formal and informal
Oral Language Skills		Below average in one or more sub-components of language	Below average in one or more sub-components of language	Formal and informal language testing
Decoding/Spelling	Below average	Average or above average	Below average	WJ/IV Letter-Word ID and Spelling; WIAT-III Word Reading and Spelling; or other achievement measures, both formal and informal, including classroom reading fluency and writing samples
Reading nonsense words	Below average	Average or above average	Below average	WJ/IV Word Attack; WIAT-III Pseudoword Decoding; Other achievement measures, both formal and informal
Phonological Processing	Below average	Average or above average	Below average	CTOPP-2 or other measures of phonological processing that include phonological awareness and rapid automatic naming
Cognitive Ability	Average to above average	Average to below average	Average to below average	Psychologist testing

Pieretti, R. & Ward-Lonergan, J.M, 2016; CSHA Position Paper and Resource Guide, 2016

THE SIMPLE VIEW OF READING

Catts, H. & Kamhi, A. (2005); Hoover, W.A. & Gough, P.B. (1990), Kamhi, A.G. & Catts, H.W. (2012)
California Speech-Language-Hearing Association (2016): *Roles and Responsibilities of SLPs with Respect to Literacy in Children and Adolescents in California*
Retrieved April 21, 2017 from: http://www.csha.org/Member-Center/Position-Papers

LLD Areas	Dyslexia (Profile A)	Mixed Decoding/ Comprehension Deficit (Profile B)	Specific Comprehension Deficit (Profile B)	Typical Reading
Language Comprehension	Good	Poor	Poor	Good
Word Recognition	Poor	Poor	Good	Good

Case #1 "Franco"

Test Administered   *Clinical Evaluation of Language Fundamentals (CELF-5)* (Wiig, Semel, & Secord, 2013).

The *CELF-5* "is an individually administered clinical tool for the identification, diagnosis, and follow-up evaluation of language and communication disorders in students aged 5-21 years."

Core Language Score and Indexes

	Standard Score	Percentile	Score Description
Core Language Score	123	94	"Above Average Range of Language Functioning"
Receptive Language Index	141	99.7	"Above Average Range of Language Functioning"
Expressive Language Index	124	95	"Above Average Range of Language Functioning"
Language Content Index	135	99	"Above Average Range of Language Functioning"
Language Structure Index	123	94	"Above Average Range of Language Functioning"

<u>Interpretation:</u> These composite scores have a mean of 100 and a standard deviation of 15. A score of 100 on this scale represents the performance of the typical student of a given age. Scores within one standard deviation of the mean (between 86 and 114) are considered "average." All of Franco's scores were above this range.

Test Administered   *Comprehensive Test of Phonological Processing-2 (CTOPP2)* [Wagner, Torgesen, Rashotte, & Pearson. (2013). Austin: Pro-Ed.]

Composite Scores

Composites			Standard Score	Percentile	Score Description
Phonological Awareness			67	1	Very Poor
Phonological Memory			88	21	Below Average
Rapid Symbolic Naming			100	50	Average
Alternate Phonological Awareness			67	1	Very Poor

<u>Interpretation:</u> These composite scores are based on a distribution with a mean of 100 and a standard deviation of 15. Franco's score on the Rapid Symbolic Naming composite was within the average range. His score on the Phonological Memory composite was within 1 standard deviation below the mean. His Phonological Awareness and Alternate Phonological Awareness composite scores were greater than 2 standard deviations below the mean.

<u>**Observation of Reading and Language Abilities:**</u>
When Franco spoke, he used complex grammar and vocabulary. When he read, however, he appeared to struggle. For example, when he read a story to the clinician from his school textbook, his reading was observed to be labored. When he was asked to read silently, he was observed to mouth each word separately. When presented with four comprehension questions based on the passage he read, his response latency averaged approximately 30 seconds or greater, and he only answered one question correctly.

Case #2 "Julie"

Test Administered: *Clinical Evaluation of Language Fundamentals (CELF-5)* (Wiig, Semel, & Secord, 2013).

Core Language Score and Indexes

	Standard Score	Percentile	Score Description
Core Language Score	71	3	"Low/Moderate Range of Language Functioning"
Receptive Language Index	72	3	"Low/Moderate Range of Language Functioning"
Expressive Language Index	72	3	"Low/Moderate Range of Language Functioning"
Language Content Index	72	3	"Low/Moderate Range of Language Functioning"
Language Structure Index	71	3	"Low/Moderate Range of Language Functioning"

Interpretation: These composite scores have a mean of 100 and a standard deviation of 15. A score of 100 on this scale represents the performance of the typical student of a given age. Scores within one standard deviation of the mean (between 86 and 114) are considered "average." All of Julie's composite scores were >1.5 standard deviations below the mean.

Test Administered: *Comprehensive Test of Phonological Processing-2 (CTOPP2)* [Wagner, Torgesen, Rashotte, & Pearson. (2013). Austin: Pro-Ed.]

Composite Scores

Composites			Standard Score	Percentile	Score Description
Phonological Awareness			67	1	Very Poor
Phonological Memory			88	21	Below Average
Rapid Symbolic Naming			88	21	Below Average
Alternate Phonological Awareness			88	21	Below Average

Interpretation: These composite scores are based on a distribution with a mean of 100 and a standard deviation of 15. Julie's scores were within 1 standard deviation below the mean, with the exception of the Phonological Awareness composite score, which was greater than 2 standard deviations below the mean.

Observation of Reading and Language Abilities:

When Julie spoke, she used simple grammar and vocabulary. When she read, she appeared to struggle. For example, when she read a story to the clinician from her school textbook, her reading was observed to be labored. When she was asked to read silently, she was observed to mouth each word separately. When presented with four comprehension questions based on the passage she read, her response latency averaged approximately 30 seconds or greater, and she only answered one question correctly.

Case #3 "Jonelle"

<u>Test Administered</u> *Clinical Evaluation of Language Fundamentals (CELF-5)* (Wiig, Semel, & Secord, 2013).

Core Language Score and Indexes

	Standard Score	Percentile	Score Description
Core Language Score	72	3	"Low/Moderate Range of Language Functioning"
Receptive Language Index	72	3	"Low/Moderate Range of Language Functioning"
Expressive Language Index	72	3	"Low/Moderate Range of Language Functioning"
Language Content Index	72	3	"Low/Moderate Range of Language Functioning"
Language Structure Index	71	3	"Low/Moderate Range of Language Functioning"

<u>Interpretation:</u> These composite scores have a mean of 100 and a standard deviation of 15. A score of 100 on this scale represents the performance of the typical student of a given age. Scores within one standard deviation of the mean (between 86 and 114) are considered "average." All of Jonelle's composite scores were >1.5 standard deviations below the mean.

<u>Test Administered.</u> *Comprehensive Test of Phonological Processing-2 (CTOPP2)* [Wagner, Torgesen, Rashotte, & Pearson. (2013). Austin: Pro-Ed.]

Composite Scores

Composites			Standard Score	Percentile	Score Description
Phonological Awareness			100	50	Average
Phonological Memory			101	53	Average
Rapid Symbolic Naming			101	53	Average
Alternate Phonological Awareness			101	53	Average

<u>Interpretation:</u> These composite scores are based on a distribution with a mean of 100 and a standard deviation of 15. Jonelle's scores were all within the average range.

<u>Observation of Reading and Language Abilities:</u>

When Jonelle spoke, she used simple grammar and vocabulary. When she read, she did not appear to struggle. For example, when she read a story to the clinician from her school textbook, her reading was observed to be fluent. When she was asked to read silently, she did so. When presented with four comprehension questions based on the passage she read, her response latency averaged approximately 30 seconds or greater, and she only answered one question correctly.

MOCK IEP TEAM ACTIVITY

Your group will be provided with three sets of abbreviated assessment results. You will break into your groups and work together to figure out what type of language - based reading disability each student exhibits using the given questions below. When we report out, your group should be prepared to present your client and the test results that support your diagnosis and give recommendations for therapy by the SLP and other team members.

READ THE REPORT AND ANSWER THE FOLLOWING:

1. What type of reading problem is indicated—Profile A or Profile B? If A, is it single or double deficit?

2. Where does it fit on the Simple View of Reading Table?

3. List specific evidence from the SLP testing to support your decision— cover both CELF-5 Results and CTOPP-2 Testing Results:

4. What might the Psychologist's ability scores look like?

5. What do you predict the Educational Specialist will find on the following subtests of the WJIV?

Subtest	Score (Average, Above Average, Below Average, etc.)
Letter-Word ID	
Word Attack	
Passage Comprehension	
Oral Comprehension	

6. What type of goals may be indicated? Why? Who will be responsible for those goals?

7. What is the SLP's role?

LET'S START IMPLEMENTING THESE TECHNIQUES!

- Think of either an individual student, a pair of students, or a small group of students on your caseload who would likely benefit from some written language intervention.

- Briefly jot down some of the difficulties that you have noticed with respect to his/her literacy skills.

- List up to 3 treatment goals that you believe would be the most critical for this/these student(s) this year.

- List at least one treatment activity/technique that you could use to address each of these goals.

Jeannene Ward-Lonergan