WESTERN UNIVERSITY
School of Communication Sciences and Disorders

CSD 9638 – Developmental Language Disorders 2

1. COURSE AND INSTRUCTOR INFORMATION

Instructor:	Dr. Lisa Archibald
	Rm 2597, Elborn College
	Ext. 82753
	larchiba@uwo.ca
Office Hours:	often Wednesdays 11:00-12:00, *or by appointment*
Class times:	Tuesday, 12:30-2:00; Thursday, 10:00-11:30

2. TEXTBOOK AND COURSE MATERIALS

Readings are listed in the course schedule, and are made available on OWL whenever possible.

The required textbook for DLD1 will be a useful reference for this course as well:
Pauls, R. & Norbury, C.F. (2012). *Language disorders from infancy through adolescence: Listening, speaking, reading, writing, and communicating, 4th ed*. Elsevier: St. Louis, USA.

Here are some other texts you might consider purchasing (in alphabetical order):
Beck, I.L., McKeown, M.G., & Kucan, L. (2013). *Bringing words to life: Robust vocabulary instruction, 2nd ed.* New York, NY: Guildford Press.
Nelson, N.W., Bahr, C.M., & Van Meter, A.M. (2004). *The writing lab approach to language instruction and intervention*. Baltimore, MLD: Paul H. Brookes Publishing Co.
Stone, C.A., Silliman, E.R., Ehren, B.J., & Wallach, G.P. (2013). *Handbook of language and literacy: Development & disorders, 2nd ed*. New York, NY: The Guilford Press.
Ukrainetz, T.A. (2007). *Contextualized language intervention*. Austin, TX: Pro-ed Inc.

Note: The Beck et al. & Stone et al. texts are available to browse through the Western Library, and I have the other 2 and will happily let you browse them.

3. COURSE OBJECTIVES

Goals of the Course: (1) To provide sufficient knowledge and basic clinical skills to begin practice in the area of language and related disorders affecting school age children, and (2) to develop clinical reasoning skills necessary to address the ambiguity characteristic of professional practice in this area.

Objectives
1. To review relevant education policies, initiatives, and curriculum especially with regards to special education

2. To explore the range of services provided by speech language pathologists to school age children with language and language-related disorders, and the service delivery models supporting these services
3. To develop a conceptual understanding of the multiple factors affecting language competence and performance including cognitive, affective, and environmental influences
4. To understand the links between language and learning as applied to literacy and other academic domains
5. To provide basic knowledge of age and context appropriate assessment procedures for language and related disorders affecting school age children
6. To provide basic knowledge of age and context appropriate intervention options for language and related disorders affecting school age children
7. To promote flexible, problem-solving in order to apply knowledge in various and novel situations as may be necessary in practice

4. POLICIES

Participation / Attendance
Attendance and participation in all aspects of the course are expectations of the course. Students wishing to document a medical reason for missing classes, assignments, or exams should present such documentation to the Office of the Dean / Counseling office.

Statement of Academic Offences
Scholastic offences are taken seriously. Students are responsible for understanding the nature of, and avoiding the occurrence of, plagiarism and other academic offenses, and are directed to read the appropriate policy, specifically, the definition of what constitutes a Scholastic Offence, at the following Web site:
http://www.uwo.ca/univsec/pdf/academic_policies/appeals/scholastic_discipline_grad.pdf
Students must write their essays and assignments in their own words. Whenever students take an idea or a passage from another author, they must acknowledge their debt both by using quotation marks where appropriate, and by proper referencing such as footnotes or citations. All required papers may be subject to submission for textual similarity review to the commercial plagiarism-detection software under license to the University for the detection of plagiarism. All papers submitted for such checking will be included as source documents in the reference database for the purpose of detecting plagiarism of papers subsequently submitted to the system. Use of the service is subject to the licensing agreement, currently between The University of Western Ontario and Turnitin.com (http://www.turnitin.com)
The penalties for a student guilty of a scholastic offense include refusal of a passing grade in the assignment, refusal of a passing grade in the course, suspension from the University, and expulsion from the University.

Appealing academic evaluations
Students are referred to the CSD student handbook for policies regarding appeals.

Rules of Conduct in the Classroom

Students are expected to maintain the same high standards of conduct and moral judgment in the classroom as will be expected when they become Speech-Language Pathologists/Audiologists. Therefore, they are asked to comply with the following reasonable expectations for classroom conduct:

1. Students and the instructor will behave in a manner that is welcoming, supportive, and respectful of cultural and individual differences at all times.
2. Students are expected to participate in the course by asking questions and contributing comments during lectures.
3. *Conduct that could distract fellow students or the instructor during a lecture must be avoided.* This includes but is not limited to talking when others are speaking, passing notes, sleeping, and overt inattention.
4. Please arrive on time for class. If you are unavoidably late, please enter quietly and take the nearest seat.
5. Cell phones, MP3 players, and PDAs are to be turned off during class. Receiving and sending text messages should not be undertaken during the lecture.
6. Computers may be used solely for course purposes, e.g., taking notes. Students must not browse the web, use email or engage in instant messaging during class.

Support Services – Health and Wellness

As part of a successful graduate student experience at Western, we encourage students to make their health and wellness a priority. Western provides several on campus health-related services to help you achieve optimum health and engage in healthy living while pursuing your graduate degree. For example, to support physical activity, all students, as part of their registration, receive membership in Western's Campus Recreation Centre. Numerous cultural events are offered throughout the year. Please check out the Faculty of Music web page http://www.music.uwo.ca/, and our own McIntosh Gallery http://www.mcintoshgallery.ca/. Information regarding health- and wellness-related services available to students may be found at http://www.health.uwo.ca/

Students seeking help regarding mental health concerns are advised to speak to someone they feel comfortable confiding in, such as their faculty supervisor, their program director (graduate chair), or other relevant administrators in their unit. Campus mental health resources may be found at http://www.health.uwo.ca/mental_health/resources.html

To help you learn more about mental health, Western has developed an interactive mental health learning module, found here: http://www.health.uwo.ca/mental_health/module.html. This module is 30 minutes in length and provides participants with a basic understanding of mental health issues and of available campus and community resources. Topics include stress, anxiety, depression, suicide and eating disorders. After successful completion of the module, participants receive a certificate confirming their participation.

5. EVALUATION

Method of Instruction
This course is designed to provide an authentic graduate experience by providing you with the opportunity to take an active role in directing your own learning. The course employs a 'flipped classroom' format in which you build your background knowledge and skills using resources outside of class time then you come to class to clarify information, and to discuss the application of what you have learned. The role of the instructor is one of 'guide on the side' rather than the more traditional 'sage on the stage'. This approach was adopted to facilitate intentional learning as defined by Katz and Dack (2013): *True learning* occurs when the learner is an active participant in constructing knowledge and is constantly thinking about how new information confirms or challenges previously existing beliefs and ideas.

Grading Plan

Formative Assessment

Assessment for/of Learning quizzes	**no grade**	*available 48 hrs in advance of each session*

Summative Assessment

Participation, reflective evaluation, and social media opportunities	**30%**	*completed in class, or within 24 hrs of class, or at times designated for social media events*
Case responses	**30%**	*completed in class (Oct. 8, 17, 29, Nov. 5, 14, 26)*
SLP partner conversation and reports	**15%**	
Final project		
Application	**5%**	*by Dec. 2*
Final project	**20%**	*by end of term (Dec. 22)*

Formative Assessment
Formative assessment refers to a wide variety of methods used to conduct in-process evaluations of comprehension, learning needs, and academic progress. The information provides feedback that can be used by instructors to modify learning activities and by students to improve their learning. In this course, formative assessment in the form of a '**reading quiz**' will be used to provide you with an *assessment for learning*, and an *assessment of learning*.

- Assessment for Learning is the process of seeking & interpreting evidence regarding where students are in their learning, and where they need to go. By reviewing the 'reading quiz' prior to completing course readings, you will assess your current knowledge regarding forthcoming concepts. The critical reasoning questions will also serve to guide to your reading. Reading quizzes will be available on the OWL site 48 hrs prior to each class.
- Assessment of Learning is the process of evaluating how well students have learned. By completing 'reading quiz' after reading, you will assess your growth in knowledge and

reasoning with regards to the relevant concepts. You are encouraged to use this information & the question feedback to identify learning gaps you may still need to address & review in the readings.

Summative Assessment

Summative assessment typically refers to assessments aimed at evaluating learning outcomes of a program of study. Summative assessment also refers to the graded components of the course.

Participation, reflective evaluation, and social media opportunities

Consistent with the flipped classroom / intentional learning approach to this course, engagement with course content through participation in open class discussions or written reflection regarding the facts, ideas, problems, hypotheses, and potential actions for issues or cases under consideration is of paramount importance. Sharing differing views and opinions in an open, 'error-friendly' manner is particularly valued.

Class discussions will be based on the readings and questions or cases posed by the instructor, or questions raised by you. During the course of the discussion, the instructor may make 'cold calls' to students for contributions and/or reflections. Students will have the option to contribute to real-time discussion in writing by use a backchannel to post written participation comments and questions during class. Students will be introduced to the backchannel application during the first class. Students also have the option of contributing a written response to the Written Participation Forum on the OWL course site as a way of participating in the class. Only written participation comments posted within 24 hrs of a relevant class will be considered as participation for that class.

Participation grading has three components:
1. Peer & Instructor evaluation: At each class session, 2-4 students will be assigned the role of peer evaluator such that all students assume this role at least twice. Each peer evaluator will complete the class participation tool, as will the Instructor at the end of the session. Peer evaluators are responsible for representing the variability in individual participation performance across students in their ratings. Should a peer evaluator return a form with uniform scoring (e.g., all students are given a +2 rating), the peer evaluator's scores for that session will be ignored and that peer evaluator will receive a rating of -2 for the session. Peer evaluations will be kept confidential, although those completing evaluations at any one session may discuss rating patterns generally to promote consensus and consistency. Students who are absent from class on the day they are assigned to evaluate participation will not be penalized on the first occurrence only (i.e., no rating will be assigned). After one missed classed, absent students will be assigned a rating of -2. Postings to the Written Participation Forum will be rated by the Instructor only.

   Session ratings will be used to determine a rating for each student for that session, which will then be used to calculate an overall average rating for the course. Ratings will be rank ordered and grades assigned accordingly.

The rating scale for the classroom participation tools is as follows:

-1 or lower — student displays disinterest, is engaged in off-task behaviours such as browsing the internet or checking a mobile device, or shows no evidence of preparation / review of assigned materials

0 — student follows discussion and/or displays signs of interest in discussion

+1 — student makes an effective oral or written contribution

higher than +1 — student makes a particularly meaningful contribution overall

Average rankings and corresponding participation grades are as follows:

Below 0	- not higher than 60%
0	- 70%
Greater than 0, but less than 1	- 72-82%
1	- 85%
Greater than 1, but less than 2	- 87-92%
2 or greater	- higher than 92%

2. Reflective evaluation: At each class session (starting after Unit 1), 2-4 students will be assigned the task of completing the reflective evaluation tool. One component of the tool encourages self-evaluation through reflection-in-action (during the discussion) and reflection-on-action (after the discussion). Here, students will evaluate their own participation in the group discussion. The second component of the tool elicits reflective evaluation of the learning process and tools employed during the session using the same rubric as that developed for the final project. Students who are absent from class when assigned this role will not be penalized <u>on the first occurrence only</u>. After the first missed reflective evaluation, the student will be assigned a participation rating of -2 for that session.

3. Social media opportunities

   a. Twitter chat: On Tuesday, October 15th (time to be determined), we will engage in a twitter chat with the hashtag #WesternDLD2. The topic of the twitter chat will be 'Parent Engagement'. Four chat questions will be posted prior to the chat. Students who contribute 1 tweet for each question during the chat will receive a participation score of +1 for the session. Higher levels of participation will result in ratings of +2 or +3.

   You will need to <u>sign up for a free twitter account</u> at twitter.com (if you don't already have one) in order to participate in the twitter chat. If you would like to learn about twitter chats, you can view transcripts of previous #WesternDLD2 chats at <u>https://www.uwo.ca/fhs/lwm/teaching/dld2.html</u>.

   b. Online Review: We will be reviewing resources from several online reading programs. The online tool will be reviewed in class. You have the option of participating in class, or completing the activities as part of a self-study option. Those

who contribute 6 posts and provide 3 comments in response to student colleague posts will receive a participation mark of +1. Higher levels of participation will result in higher ratings. Only posts completed by Wednesday, November 14th at midnight will be included in the participation score.

Case responses

On 6 occasions, you will have the opportunity to respond to a case or problem posed incorporating concepts from the course. Case responses will be completed in the last 30 minutes of respective classes either by writing a paper/pen answer or typing an answer online via the OWL course website. You may be asked to describe the problem posed by the case, to provide a hypothesis regarding the nature of the case, to indicate your next actions, to give your reflections on the case, or to describe how you could confirm or disprove your hypothesis. On each occasion, the instructor will mark 75% of student responses chosen at random (from a list of all students enrolled in the class) and provide online feedback. Each question will be marked on a 5-point scale (5 – excellent; 3 – good; 1 – poorly reasoned), and the overall total will be converted to a percentage at the end of term. **Case responses must be completed during class time and in class.** If no response has been provided by you for a question for which you are selected to be marked, you will not be penalized <u>on the first occurrence only</u>. After that, you will receive 0/5 without adjustment.

SLP partner conversations and reports

A group of SLPs working with school age children with language and language-related disorders have graciously volunteered to act as partners in this course. You will be assigned one (or possibly 2) partner(s). You will have at least three conversations with this SLP corresponding to 3 of the 5 units of the course. You are responsible for making an initial contact with your partner SLP by email and scheduling each of your conversations at your mutual convenience. Although a spoken conversation (via phone or skype, for example) is preferred, any format (including email) is acceptable. Should your SLP partner be unavailable for any conversation, let the instructor know as soon as possible so other arrangements can be made. Please be aware of the privilege it is to receive a gift of time from your SLP partner and do everything possible to contact your SLP partner at each meeting time you set. Should you miss the meeting for some reason, please contact *both* the instructor and your SLP partner and provide your reasons in a professional manner.

For each conversation, you are responsible for choosing the main questions / issues for discussion. Importantly, conversations should be limited to 30 minutes. Please be sure to stop the conversation after 30 minutes and acknowledge that time is up. After each conversation, post a brief comment in the OWL forum corresponding to the relevant unit in the course. When posting, please avoid identifying information (e.g., name of the employer or SLP). If you wish to include some identifying information (e.g., the name of an intervention program developed at a particular board), please check with your SLP partner before posting. **Please be aware that course partners have access to all course materials including the OWL forum.** Each conversation/posting is worth 5 points using an all-or-none scoring of 5 points for an informative comment, and 0 points for no comment or an uninformative comment.

Final project
The final project may take any format. It should reflect some meaningful interaction with, and synthesis of, the course materials, as well as the ability to work with knowledge relevant to the area of school age child language and language-related disorders. Projects that score well will provide a useful reference or tool for your use in clinical practice for this population, or will represent your considered and planned approach to your clinical practice with this population.

There are 2 steps to the final project:

> Step 1 – Application for final project
> In your application for your final project, you will describe the focus of your project and why, what your project will entail, and how your project will contribute to your own clinical understanding or practice. The Instructor may provide feedback regarding your application and require a revision(s). Completion of the application is worth 5 points using an all-or-none scoring regardless of whether or not you are asked to revise your application.
> Step 2 – Final project
> See the description above as well as the list of potential examples below.

Here are some possible examples:
-a term paper on a topic of your choice
-a mind map organizing your thoughts, approach, and materials
-a video demonstrating a tool or providing important information for any relevant target audience
-a portfolio of materials gathered and integrated across the course
-a web-based organizer for online resources and/or apps
-an inservice for educators on a topic of your choice
-something with a focus on advocacy

You can view examples of past project on the instructor's lab website:
http://www.uwo.ca/fhs/lwm/teaching/dld2.html
You may give your permission for the instructor to post your project on this website when your project is complete and has been reviewed by the instructor.

5. EVALUATION

Method of Instruction

This course is designed to provide an authentic graduate experience by providing you with the opportunity to take an active role in directing your own learning. The course employs a 'flipped classroom' format in which you build your background knowledge and skills using resources outside of class time then you come to class to clarify information, and to discuss the application of what you have learned. The role of the instructor is one of 'guide on the side' rather than the more traditional 'sage on the stage'. This approach was adopted to facilitate intentional learning as defined by Katz and Dack (2013): *True learning* occurs when the learner is an active participant in constructing knowledge and is constantly thinking about how new information confirms or challenges previously existing beliefs and ideas.

Grading Plan

Formative Assessment

Assessment for/of Learning quizzes	**no grade**	*completed in class*

Summative Assessment

Participation, reflective evaluation, and twitter chat	**30%**	*completed in class*
Case responses	**30%**	*completed in class (Sept. 26, Oct. 19, 26, Nov. 7, 16, 23)*
SLP partner conversation and reports	**15%**	*by end of term (Dec. 22)*
Final project		
Application	**5%**	*by Dec. 1*
Final project	**20%**	*by end of term (Dec. 22)*

Formative Assessment

Formative assessment refers to a wide variety of methods used to conduct in-process evaluations of comprehension, learning needs, and academic progress. The information provides feedback that can be used by instructors to modify learning activities and by students to improve their learning. In this course, formative assessment in the form of a '**reading quiz**' will be used to provide you with an *assessment for learning*, and an *assessment of learning*.

- Assessment for Learning is the process of seeking & interpreting evidence regarding where students are in their learning, and where they need to go. By completing the 'reading quiz' prior to completing course readings, you will assess your current knowledge and reasoning regarding forthcoming concepts. You are encouraged to use this information to help guide your future learning.
- Assessment of Learning is the process of evaluating how well students have learned. By reviewing the answers to each 'reading quiz' after learning, you will assess your growth in knowledge and reasoning with regards to the relevant concepts. You are encouraged to use this information to identify learning gaps you may still need to address.

Summative Assessment

Summative assessment typically refers to assessments aimed at evaluating learning outcomes of a program of study. Summative assessment also refers to the graded components of the course.

Participation, reflective evaluation, and twitter chat
? http://www.equitymaps.com/
Consistent with the flipped classroom / intentional learning approach to this course, participation in open class discussions of the facts, ideas, problems, hypotheses, and potential actions of issues or cases under consideration is of paramount importance. Sharing differing views and opinions in an open, 'error-friendly' manner is particularly valued.

Class discussions will be based on questions or cases posed by the instructor, or questions raised by you. During the course of the discussion, the instructor may make 'cold calls' to students for contributions and/or reflections.

Class participation grading has three components:

4. Peer & Instructor evaluation: At each class session, 2-4 students will be assigned the role of peer evaluator such that all students assume this role at least twice. Each peer evaluator will complete the class participation tool, as will the Instructor at the end of the session. Peer evaluators are responsible for representing the variability in individual participation performance across students in their ratings. Should a peer evaluator return a form with uniform scoring (e.g., all students are given a +2 rating), the peer evaluator's scores for that session will be ignored and that peer evaluator will receive a rating of -2 for the session. Peer evaluations will be kept confidential, although those completing evaluations at any one session may discuss rating patterns generally to promote consensus and consistency. Students who are absent from class will not be penalized <u>on the first occurrence only</u> (i.e., no rating will be assigned). After one missed classed, absent students will be assigned a rating of -2. Session ratings will be used to determine a rating for each student for that session, which will then be used to calculate an overall average rating for the course. Ratings will be rank ordered and grades assigned accordingly.

   The rating scale for the classroom participation tools is as follows:

-1 or lower	– student displays disinterest, is engaged in off-task behaviours such as browsing the internet or checking a mobile device, or shows no evidence of preparation / review of assigned materials
0	– student follows discussion and/or displays signs of interest in discussion
+1	– student contributes to discussion effectively
higher than +1	– student makes a particularly meaningful contribution to the discussion overall

   Average rankings and corresponding participation grades are as follows:

Below 0	- not higher than 60%
1	- 70%
Greater than 0, but less than 1	- 72-82%
1	- 85%

              Greater than 1, but less than 2   - 87-92%
              2 or greater   - higher than 92%

5. Reflective evaluation: At each class session (starting after Unit 1), 2 students will be assigned the task of completing the reflective evaluation tool. One component of the tool encourages self-evaluation through reflection-in-action (during the discussion) and reflection-on-action (after the discussion). Here, students will evaluate their own participation in the group discussion. The second component of the tool elicits reflective evaluation of the learning process and tools employed during the session using the same rubric as that developed for the final project. Students who are absent from class when assigned this role will not be penalized <u>on the first occurrence only</u>. After the first missed reflective evaluation, the student will be assigned a participation rating of -2 for that session.

6. Twitter chat: On Thursday, October 12th from 1:30 – 2:30pm, we will engage in a twitter chat with the hashtag #WesternDLD2. The topic of the twitter chat will be 'Advocating for children with language impairments'. Four chat questions will be posted prior to the chat. Students who contribute 1 tweet for each question during the chat will receive a participation score of +1 for the session. Higher levels of participation will result in ratings of +2 or +3.

   a. You will need to <u>sign up for a free twitter account</u> at twitter.com (if you don't already have one) in order to participate in the twitter chat. If you would like to learn about twitter chats or observe SLP chats, follow the @WeSpeechies handle (also see, http://speech-language-therapy.com/index.php?option=com_content&view=article&id=147). You can also view my week as the rotating @WeSpeechies curator at https://storify.com/larchiba6/my-week-wespeechies and the previous #WesternDLD2 chat at https://storify.com/larchiba6/westerndld2

Case responses
On 6 occasions, you will have the opportunity to respond to a case or problem posed incorporating concepts from the course. Case responses will be completed in the last 30 minutes of respective classes either by writing a paper/pen answer or typing an answer online via the OWL course website. You may be asked to describe the problem posed by the case, to provide a hypothesis regarding the nature of the case, to indicate your next actions, to give your reflections on the case, or to describe how you could confirm or disprove your hypothesis. On each occasion, the instructor will mark 75% of student responses chosen at random (from a list of all students enrolled in the class) and provide online feedback. Each question will be marked on a 5-point scale (5 – excellent; 3 – good; 1 – poorly reasoned), and the overall total will be converted to a percentage at the end of term. Case responses must be completed during class time and in class. If no response has been provided by you for a question for which you are selected to be marked, you will not be penalized <u>on the first occurrence only</u>. After that, you will receive 0/5 without adjustment.

SLP partner conversations and reports
A group of SLPs working with school age children with language and language-related disorders have graciously volunteered to act as partners in this course. You will be assigned one (or possibly 2) partner(s). You will have at least three conversations with this SLP corresponding to 3 of the 5 units of the course. You are responsible for making an initial contact with your partner SLP by email and scheduling each of your conversations at your mutual convenience. Although a spoken conversation (via phone or skype, for example) is preferred, any format (including email) is acceptable. Should your SLP partner be unavailable for any conversation, let the instructor know as soon as possible so other arrangements can be made. Please be aware of the privilege it is to receive a gift of time from your SLP partner and do everything possible to contact your SLP partner at each meeting time you set. Should you miss the meeting for some reason, please contact *both* the instructor and your SLP partner and provide your reasons in a professional manner.

For each conversation, you are responsible for choosing the main questions / issues for discussion. Importantly, conversations should be limited to 30 minutes. Please be sure to stop the conversation after 30 minutes and acknowledge that time is up. After each conversation, post a brief comment in the OWL forum corresponding to the relevant unit in the course. When posting, please avoid identifying information (e.g., name of the employer or SLP). If you wish to include some identifying information (e.g., the name of an intervention program developed at a particular board), please check with your SLP partner before posting. Each conversation/posting is worth 5 points using an all-or-none scoring of 5 points for an informative comment, and 0 points for no comment or an uninformative comment.

Final project
The final project may take any format. It should reflect some meaningful interaction with, and synthesis of, the course materials, as well as the ability to work with knowledge relevant to the area of school age child language and language-related disorders. Projects that score well will provide a useful reference or tool for your use in clinical practice for this population, or will represent your considered and planned approach to your clinical practice with this population.

There are 2 steps to the final project:
>Step 1 – Application for final project
>In your application for your final project, you will describe the focus of your project and why, what your project will entail, and how your project will contribute to your own clinical understanding or practice. The Instructor may provide feedback regarding your application and require a revision(s). Completion of the application is worth 5 points using an all-or-none scoring regardless of whether or not you are asked to revise your application.
>Step 2 – Final project
>See the description above as well as the list of potential examples below.

Here are some possible examples:
-a term paper on a topic of your choice
-a mind map organizing your thoughts, approach, and materials
-a video demonstrating a tool or providing important information for any relevant target audience
-a portfolio of materials gathered and integrated across the course
-a web-based organizer for online resources and/or apps

-an inservice for educators on a topic of your choice
-something with a focus on advocacy

You can view examples of past project on the instructor's lab website:
http://www.uwo.ca/fhs/lwm/teaching/dld2.html
You may give your permission for the instructor to post your project on this website when your project
is complete and has been reviewed by the instructor.

TENTATIVE SCHEDULE

Students are encouraged to refer to the course materials on the OWL course for the most up-to-date information on course readings and additional resources for your reference.

- Asterisks (*) mark documents for which a familiarity is required but detailed knowledge is not expected
- In addition to the required readings listed here, many references will be listed on the OWL site for your reference. These are updated as new resources are found, and are not included here.

UNIT 1: ISSUES IN EDUCATIONAL SPEECH LANGUAGE PATHOLOGY		
Date	Topics/Questions	Resources to Review
Thurs. Sept. 5 (1.1)	Course introduction	(In class) VIDEO on 'Thinking Routines' (scroll to 2nd video on site)(4:36): http://ww2.kqed.org/mindshift/2016/03/31/when-kids-have-structure-for-thinking-better-learning-emerges/
	Curriculum	2016 The Kindergarten Program (Ontario) (331 pages*) 2006 Language, Grades 1-8 (155 pages*)
	Special education services & exceptionalities; introduction to IEPs	2017 Special education in Ontario (246 pages*). DSM-5 Chart of changes & ASHA comments (7 pages) Browse sample IEPs: http://www.edugains.ca/newsite/SpecialEducation/transitions.html
Tues. Sept. 10 (1.2)	Education policy – universal design of learning; differentiated instruction; inquiry based learning; inclusive education	2013 Learning for all (74 pages*) 2010 Growing success (Learning skills & work habits, p. 10-14) 2013 Capacity building series. Inquiry-based learning (8 pages) Rix (2009) Educating a syndrome?: Seeking a balance between identifying a learning profile & delivering inclusive education. ASHA Perspectives (7 pages) (In class) VIDEOs: While watching these videos, refer to this handout summarizing UDL guidelines: http://udlguidelines.cast.org/ VIDEO on Universal Design for Learning (4:36): https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=bDvKnY0g6e4 VIDEO on Differentiation in Teaching & Learning (9:53): https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=UkIQ6KiyA5U

Thurs. Sept. 12 (1.3)	Roles & responsibilities	[2014 CASLPO Reference guide for SLPS employed in school board setting](#) (18 pages*) [2014 CASLPO Practice stds & guidelines for Ax of children by SLPs](#) (29 pages*)
	Collaborators (educators; professional services; supportive personnel)	The Department of Education (Newfoundland & Labrador) provides a comprehensive website concerning support services for Education and Early Childhood Development: https://www.gov.nl.ca/eecd/k12/studentsupportservices/ Browse these 2 resources, in particular: - The 2000 Communication Disorders Handbook (125 pages*), which can only be accessed via this link: https://www.gov.nl.ca/eecd/files/k12_studentsupportservices_publications_communicationdisordershandbook.pdf - The description of their comprehensive assessment (21 pages*) http://www.ed.gov.nl.ca/edu/k12/studentsupportservices/Comprehensive.html Read through the roles of members of the Professional Support Services at TDSB: http://www.tdsb.on.ca/AboutUs/ProfessionalSupportServices.aspx
	Education funding	There will be a short presentation on education funding in Ontario (if you're interested in reading more, you can refer to A23-A25 in the [2017 Special Education Guide](#)) & the Ontario Special Needs Strategy ([http://www.children.gov.on.ca/htdocs/English/professionals/specialneeds/strategy.aspx)](#)
Tues. Sept. 17 (1.4)	Service delivery models	Suleman et al. (2013). Collaboration: More than "Working Together"…. CJSLPA, 37, 298-307 (read p. 299-301, 3 pages) Swenson & Williams (2015) How to collaborate: Five steps for success. Perspectives on School-Based Issues, 16, 122-130 (read Table 2, p. 125-6; 2 pages) Archibald (2017). SLP-educator classroom collaboration. ADLI, 2, 1-17 (17 pages)
	Response to Intervention	Troia (2005) Responsiveness to intervention: Roles for speech-language pathologists in the preventions and identification of learning disabilities. TLD, 25, 106-119 (14 pages)
	Effective Professional Development	Study summary provided for the following study (the study is not a required reading): Neuman & Wright (2010) Promoting language & literacy development for early childhood educators. The Elementary School Journal, 111, 63-86.
UNIT 2: NEUROCOGNITIVE MODEL OF LANGUAGE AND EXECUTIVE FUNCTIONS		
Date	Topics/Questions	Resources to Review

Thurs. Sept. 19 (2.1)	Oral language	(In class) VIDEO: The neurocognitive model (Part 1) on OWL (25:26) Bishop (2006) What causes SLI in children? Current Directions in Psychological Science, 15, 217-221 (5 pages) Krishnan et al. (2014) Neurobiological basis of language learning disabilities. Trends in Cognitive Sciences, 20, 701-714 (14 pages) Study summaries provided for the following studies (the studies are not required reading): Plante et al. (2015) Variability in the language input to children enhances learning in a treatment context. AJSLP, 23, 530-45 (16 pages) Wagovich et al. (2015) Semantic-syntactic partial word knowledge growth through reading. AJCLP, 24, 60-71 (12 pages)
Tues. Sept. 24 (2.2)	Written language	(In class) VIDEO: The neurocognitive model (Part 2) on OWL (15:47) Ehri (2014) Orthographic mapping in the acquisition of sight word reading, spelling, memory, and vocabulary learning. Scientific Studies of Reading, 18, 5-21 (17 pages) Cain et al (2004) Children's reading comprehension ability: Concurrent prediction by working memory, verbal ability, and component skills. J. Educ. Psych., 96, 31-42 (read p. 31-34, 4 pages) Naming Speed Deficit Frequently Asked Questions, Center for Reading & Language Research, Tufts University https://ase.tufts.edu/crlr/documents/FAQNamingSpeedDeficit.pdf (2 pages) Wolter et al. (2009) The influence of morphological awareness on the literacy development of first-grade children. LSHSS, 40, 286-298 (14 pages)
Thurs. Sept. 26 (2.3)	Executive functions	(In class) VIDEO: The neurocognitive model (Part 3) on OWL (18:21) Diamond (2013) Executive functions. Annu. Rev. Psychol, 64, 135-68 (34 pages) An interesting blogpost on development & early educational goals: https://theconversation.com/too-much-too-soon-what-should-we-be-teaching-four-year-olds-43210 Blogpost on what we need to teach kids in school: http://www.upworthy.com/researchers-studied-kindergarteners-behavior-and-followed-up-19-years-later-here-are-the-findings?g=2 Blogpost on behaviour as a form of communication:

		http://pamelasnow.blogspot.com/2018/06/behaviour-as-form-of-communication.html
Tues. Oct. 1 (2.4)	Environmental influences; risk & protective factors	Harrison & McLeod (2010) Risk & protective factors associated with speech and language impairment in a nationally representative sample of 4- to 5-year-old children. JSLHR, 53, 508-529 (p. 523-526, 4 pages) Hart & Risley (2003) The early catastrophe. American Educator, 27, 4-9 (6 pages) Article in the Star on the word gap: http://www.thestar.com/yourtoronto/education/2015/02/04/how-closing-the-word-gap-could-give-poorer-kids-an-equal-chance-at-success.html?fb_ref=Default The 2000 words to grow campaign: http://www.2000wordstogrow.ca/
	Labels	Catts et al. (2006) Language deficits in poor comprehenders: A case for the simple view of reading, JSLHR, 49, 278-293 (16 pages) Ebbels (2017) Summary: CATALISE: a multinational & multidisciplinary Delphi consensus study of problems with language development. Phase 2. https://www.rcslt.org/clinical_resources/docs/revised_catalise2017 (4 pages, point form) There will be a short presentation on the new consensus label, Developmental Language Disorder (#devlangdis)
	Application Considerations	Review the Universal Design for Learning guidelines: http://www.udlcenter.org/sites/udlcenter.org/files/updateguidelines2_0.pdf
UNIT 3: ASSESSMENT CONSIDERATIONS		
Date	Topics/Questions	Resources to Review
Thurs. Oct. 3 (3.1)	The Assessment Tool	This session will merge with CSD9648 9-10am, and cover: DLD2 Assessment Tools Spreadsheet Review of the TILLS (FYR) The Test of Early Grammatical Impairment is available here: https://cldp.ku.edu/rice-wexler-tegi
Tues. Oct. 8 (3.2)	Oral language – phonology, morphosyntax, semantics	DLD2 Quick Reference for Assessment DLD2 Assessment Tools Spreadsheet Relevant sample report: FullAx_Gr.3_GG (see OWL site)

		Peterson et al. (2008) Emerging procedures in narrative assessment: The index of narrative complexity TLD, 38, 115-130 (16 pages) Scott & Balthazar (2013) The role of complex sentence knowledge in children with reading & writing difficulties. Perspectives on Language & Literacy (Summer 2013), 18-26. (9 pages) Study summary provided for the following study (not required reading): Hayward et al. (2007) Retelling a script-based story: Do children with and without language impairments focus on script and story elements? AJSLP, 16, 235-45 (12 pages)
	Classroom assessment tools	Browse these resources: CELF-5 Observation Rating Scale - There is a brief description here: http://www.pearsonassess.ca/content/dam/ani/clinicalassessments/ca/programs/pdfs/CELF-5-objectives-descriptions_cdn_lr.pdf Classroom Performance Checklist (this is an earlier version of the observation rating scale) CASL subtest descriptions Universal language rubric: https://s3.amazonaws.com/toolkit-rubrics/universal+language+rubric+-+revised+12-23-15.pdf Authentic assessment: http://jfmueller.faculty.noctrl.edu/toolbox/whatisit.htm
Thurs. Oct. 10 (3.3)	Social communication	In class: VIDEO on self-regulation (10:15): https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=wJRtbcChy0Y In class (if time allows): VIDEO on Appreciative Inquiry (3:45): https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=QzW22wwh1J4 DLD2 Quick Reference for Assessment DLD2 Assessment Tools Spreadsheet Relevant sample report: FullAx_Gr1LangBeh_KK (see OWL site) Dodd (2010) Thinking outside the assessment box: Assessing social communicative functioning in students with ASD. Perspectives on School-based Issues, 11, 88-98 (11 pages) Winner & Crooke (2009) Assessing the Social Mind in Action: The importance of informal dynamic assessments. Autism News, 5(2), 12-16 (4 pages) Winner (n.d.) Assessment of social cognition and related skills. https://www.socialthinking.com/Articles?name=assessment-social-cognition-related-skills

		Ward & Jacobsen (2014) Executive function situational awareness observation tool. ASHA Perspectives SIG 16 (10 pages) Shanker (n.d.) Calm, alert and happy available at https://www.edu.gov.on.ca/childcare/Shanker.pdf (6 pages) Social competence in kindergarten: http://blogs.edweek.org/edweek/early_years/2015/07/social_competence_in_kindergartners_linked_to_adult_success.html?cmp=SOC-EDIT-FB (with links to the main study and executive summary)
Tues. Oct. 15	**TWITTER CHAT**	See syllabus item and OWL site for resources, questions, and logistics Topic: Parent engagement
Thurs. Oct. 17	Reading; writing; spelling	DLD2 Quick Reference for Assessment DLD2 Assessment Tools Spreadsheet Relevant sample report: FullAx_WrittLang_Gr5WW (see OWL site) Putting reading first, 3rd ed. National Institute for Literacy: The Partnership for Reading (60 pages*) Sturm et al. (2012) The developmental writing scale, TLD, 32, 297-318 (22 pages) Apel & Masterson (2001) Theory-guided spelling assessment and intervention: A case study. LSHSS, 32, 182-95 (14 pages) Blogpost on the 'Words their way' program (Bear et al., 2008-15; Pearson Ed. Inc.) with link to a description of the assessment tool: http://www.elltoolbox.com/words-their-way.html#.Vdi-QSxViko Writing curriculum-based measurement (6 pages, point form): https://my.vanderbilt.edu/specialeducationinduction/files/2013/07/IA.Writing-CBM.pdf
Tues. Oct. 22	Cognition, academic achievement, & the psychoed assessment	In class presentation on WM & language assessment DLD2 Quick Reference for Assessment DLD2 Assessment Tools Spreadsheet Classroom Observation Guide for Executive Functions Relevant sample report: FullAx_AudMem_7yXX (see OWL site)

		Boudreau & Costanza-Smith (2011) Assessment & treatment of working memory deficits in school-age children: The role of the speech-language pathologist. LSHSS, 42, 152-166 (15 pages) Bell (2002) The assessment process/Psychoeducational assessment (13 pages) Sample psychoeducational report (9 pages): https://www.yumpu.com/en/document/view/36866481/sample-of-adolescent-adhd-evaluation-meet-the-faculty (FYR) Childhood Executive Function Inventory (with items marked for the 2 factors established by their research (working memory; inhibition): www.chexi.se (FYR) Section 3 of Keys to Effective LD Teaching Practice: http://www.cls.utk.edu/keys_to_ld.html (FYR) VIDEO: An introduction to the psychoeducational assessment (17:16) http://ldatschool.ca/accommodations/an-introduction-to-the-psychoeducational-assessment/
Thurs. Oct. 24	Culturally & linguistically fair assessment	Relevant sample report: Consultation_ELL_AA7-5 (see OWL site) Hoff & Core (2015) What clinicians need to know about bilingual development. Seminars in Speech & Language, 36, 89-99 (11 pages) De Lamo White & Jin (2014) Evaluation of speech & language assessment approaches with bilingual children, IJLCD, 46, 613-27 (p. 613-620, 8 pages) Browse resources at the Child English as a Second Language Resource Centre: https://www.ualberta.ca/linguistics/cheslcentre 4 typical language errors in ELL: http://blog.asha.org/2016/04/12/4-quick-ways-to-identify-typical-language-patterns-of-bilingual-children/ Study summaries provided for the following studies (the studies are not required reading): Eriks-Brophy (2014) Assessing the language of aboriginal Canadian children: Towards a more culturally valid approach. CJSLPA, 38, 152-173 (21 pages) Gross et al. (2014) Conceptual scoring of receptive & expressive vocabulary measures in simultaneous & sequential bilingual children. AJSLP, 23, 574-586 de Villiers & Burns (ASHA, 2003) Assessing narrative skills in children. https://www.umass.edu/aae/NarrativeASHA2003.ppt

Tues. Oct. 29	Dynamic assessment	In class: VIDEO on dynamic assessment (2:36): https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=YKHQTrd-5FE&feature=youtu.be referencing this assessment tool: http://bilinguistics.com/wp-content/uploads/2013/09/Dynamic-Assessment-Protocol.pdf De Lamo White & Jin (2011) Evaluation of speech & language assessment approaches with bilingual children, IJLCD, 46, 613-27 (p. 620-627, 8 pages) Gutierrez-Clellen & Pena (2001) Dynamic assessment of diverse children: A tutorial, LSHSS, 32, 212-24 (13 pages) Petersen et al (2016) Dynamic assessment of narratives: efficient, accurate identification of language impairment in bilingual students. JSLHR, 60, 983-998 (Appendix B, 1 page) Study summaries provided for the following studies (the studies are not required reading): Spencer, T.D., Petersen, D.B., & Adams, J.L. (2015). Tier 2 language intervention for diverse preschoolers: An early-stage randomized control group study following an analysis of response to intervention. AJSLP, 24, 619-636 Kramer et al. (2009) Dynamic assessment of narratives with grade 3 children in a First Nations community. CJSLPA, 33, 119-128 Camilleri & Botting (2013) Beyond static assessment of children's receptive vocabulary: the dynamic assessment of word learning (DAWL). IJLCD, 48, 565-581.
UNIT 4: INTERVENING EFFECTIVELY		
Date	Topics/Questions	Resources to Review
Thurs. Oct. 31 (4.1)	Oral language intervention overview	DLD2 Quick Reference for Intervention Archibald (2015) Theory motivated therapy studies of SLI. In Stavrakaki (ed) Specific language impairment. Current trends in research. John Benjamins Publishing Company (32 pages) Larson & McKinley (2007) Skills to Teach in Intervention (Table 12.1). In Communication solutions for older students: Assessment & intervention strategies. Greenville, SC: Thinking Publications. Swenson & Williams (2015) How to collaborate: Five steps for success. Perspectives on School-Based Issues, 16, 122-120 (9 page) (read Table 2, 1 page)
	Adjusting cognitive demands to support learning	There will be a brief presentation on the EF Smart classroom Cognitive strategy instruction: http://s3.amazonaws.com/cmi-teaching-ld/alerts/21/uploaded_files/original_Alert19.pdf?1331403099 (4 pages)

		Do pictures really help learning: https://www.tes.com/news/do-pictures-really-help-learning
Tue. Nov. 5 (4.2)	Promoting social competence	In class: VIDEO – Cookie Monster on self-regulation (3:10): https://youtu.be/9PnbKL3wuH4 DLD2 Quick Reference for Intervention Brinton & Fujiki (2019) Facilitating social communication in children with DLD: A bibliotherapeutic approach. Perspectives of the ASHA Special Interest Groups, 4, 532-7 (6 pages) Timler et al. (2007) Strategies for promoting generalization of social communication skills in preschoolers and school-aged children. TLD, 27, 167-181 (15 pages) Winner & Crooke (2009) Social Thinking®: A developmental treatment approach for students with social learning/social pragmatic challenges. Perspectives on Language Learning & Educ., 16, 62-69 (8 pages). https://www.socialthinking.com/Articles?name=developmental-treatment-approach-students-learning-issues Read about these programs: Lego therapy - http://www.harlowstar.co.uk/School-aims-build-social-skills-Lego/story-26761230-detail/story.html School wide social competence - http://www.pbis.org/school
Thurs. Nov. 7 (4.3)	Early years: Classroom based oral language	DLD2 Quick Reference for Intervention Gillam et al. (2014) Classroom-based narrative and vocabulary instruction: Results of an early-stage, nonrandomized comparison study. LSHSS, 45, 204-19 (16 pages) Smith-Lock et al. (2013) Effective intervention for expressive grammar in children with specific language impairment. IJLCD, 48, 265-82 (18 pages) Orient yourself to the Preschool Core Knowledge Language Arts curriculum, and spend some time looking at the language facilitation section (p. 37-41, 5 pages): http://www.coreknowledge.org/mimik/mimik_uploads/documents/868/CKLA_PK_GenOver_Engage.pdf
	Early years: emergent literacy	Read about the 'Read It Again-PreK!' program https://earlychildhood.ehe.osu.edu/files/2016/05/Curriculum-Supplement.pdf (18 pages*)

		-You can download all of the Read It Again program materials here: https://earlychildhood.ehe.osu.edu/ See infographics from Amanda Van Horne's 2018 facebook discussion: https://sites.udel.edu/chs-tell/about/recent-talks-and-papers/ (FYR) Phonological awareness resources http://www.education.canterbury.ac.nz/people/gillon/resources.shtml (FYR) Targeting advanced phonemic awareness: https://homeschoolingwithdyslexia.com/advanced-phonemic-awareness-reading-fluency/ (FYR) Phonological vs. phonemic awareness: http://www.readingrockets.org/helping/target/phonologicalphonemic
	Beyond early years: Classroom based oral language activities	In class: VIDEO (2:25): Talking moves (love the 'I agree with you' hand signal!) https://www.teachingchannel.org/videos/student-participation-strategy VIDEO (3:22): Great teachers (love the visual comprehension checks!) https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=7bIQ4-3XSxU VIDEO (6:11): Academic conversations with ELLs (love the explicit focus on discourse) https://www.teachingchannel.org/videos/improve-conversation-skills-ells-ousd VIDEO (3:24): I do, We do, You do https://www.teachingchannel.org/videos/modeling-strategy-getty VIDEO (1:41) Vocabulary Paint Chips https://www.teachingchannel.org/video/build-student-vocabulary
Tues. Nov. 12	Review of Reading programs	This session will have an online & self-study option. See OWL for details. National Reading Panel: Teaching children to read (2000; 449 pages*) Browse the sites of these reading programs: A phonics program: www.progressivephonics.com A program aimed at phonological awareness, phonics, and strategies: Empower: https://www.sickkids.ca/LDRP/Empower-Reading/Program-description/index.html Read about the Empower reading strategies: https://www.sickkids.ca/LDRP/Empower-Reading/Program-description/Empower-Reading-Strategies/index.html

<table>
<tr><td colspan="2"></td><td>

A program aimed at reading fluency and vocabulary:
http://www.voyagersopris.com/curriculum/subject/literacy/rave-o/overview
A program integrating science concepts & reading:
http://cori.umd.edu/
A balanced approach:
http://www.oise.utoronto.ca/balancedliteracydiet/Home/
Florida Centre for Reading Research:
http://www.fcrr.org/curriculum/SCAindex.shtm
Promoting Adolescents' Comprehension of Text:
http://www.meadowscenter.org/projects/detail/promoting-adolescents-comprehension-of-text-pact

(FYR) Current research on reading comprehension instruction:
http://www2.ed.gov/programs/readingfirst/support/compfinal.pdf (32 pages*)
(FYR) Earle & Sayeski (2017) Systematic instruction in phoneme-grapheme correspondence for students with reading disabilities. Intervention in School & Clinic, 52, 262-269 (8 pages)
(FYR) Erickson (2017) Comprehensive literacy instruction, interprofessional collaborative practice, & students with severe disabilities. AJSLP, 26, 193-205 (13 pages)
(FYR) What is a decodable book? https://www.spelfabet.com.au/2018/05/what-is-a-decodable-book/

</td></tr>
<tr><td>

Thurs.
Nov.
14

</td><td>

(Cont'd) Beyond early years:
Classroom based oral language activities

</td><td>

 DLD2 Quick Reference for Intervention

Spread your reading out across these 4 papers so you're familiar with their methods & general findings:
Gill et al. (2003) Following directions: Rehearsal and visualization on strategies for children with specific language impairment. CLTT, 19, 85-103 (19 pages*)
Méndez et al. (2015) A culturally and linguistically responsive vocabulary approach for young latino dual language learning. JSLHR, 58, 93-106 (14 pages*)
Starling et al. (2012) Training secondary school teachers in instructional language modification techniques to support adolescents with language impairment: A randomized controlled trial LSHSS, 43, 474-495 (22 pages*)
Steele & Mills (2011) Vocabulary intervention for school-age children with language impairment: A

</td></tr>
</table>

		review of evidence & good practice. CLTT, 27, 354-370 (17 pages*)
Tues. Nov. 19	Supporting reading development: Word recognition	DLD2 Quick Reference for Intervention Snowling & Hulme (2011) Evidence-based interventions for reading and language difficulties: Creating a virtuous circle. British J. of Educ. Psychol., 81, 1-23 (p. 1-10, 10 pages) Wolter & Green (2013) Morphological awareness intervention in school-age children with language and literacy deficits: A case study. TLD, 33, 27-41 (p. 27-33, 7 pages) Study summaries provided for the following studies (the studies are not required reading): McArthur et al. (2015) Sight word and phonics training in children with dyslexia. JLD, 48, 391-407 Lovett et al. (2000) Components of effective remediation for developmental reading disabilities: Combining phonological and strategy-based instruction to improve outcomes. J. of Educ. Psychol., 92, 263-283
Thurs. Nov. 21	Supporting reading development: morphological awareness	DLD2 Quick Reference for Intervention In class presentation on morphological awareness & intervention Wolter & Green (2013) Morphological awareness intervention in school-age children with language and literacy deficits: A case study. TLD, 33, 27-41 (p. 33-41, 8 pages)
	Reading motivation	Online article on motivation: http://www.readingrockets.org/article/teacher-practices-impact-reading-motivation Review the CORI assessment tools here: http://cori.umd.edu/measures/
	Math	Alt et al. (2014) The relationship between mathematics and language: Academic implications for children with specific language impairment and English language learners. LSHSS, 45, 220-233 (14 pages) Why words matter in math (blog) https://blog.bedrocklearning.org/blog/maths-academic-vocabulary
Tues. Nov. 26	Supporting reading development: text comprehension	DLD2 Quick Reference for Intervention Snowling & Hulme (2011) Evidence-based interventions for reading and language difficulties: Creating a virtuous circle. British J. of Educ. Psychol., 81, 1-23 (p. 10-23, 13 pages) Neuffeld (2005) Comprehension instruction in content area classes. The Reading Teacher, 59, 303-

		312 (11 pages) Hall (2016) Inference instruction for struggling readers: A synthesis of intervention research. *Educational Psychological Review*, 28, 1-22 (p. 12-14 & 19, 4 pages) Browse the strategies on the Reading Rockets website (many with videos): http://www.readingrockets.org/strategies
Thurs. Nov. 28	Supporting writing development	DLD2 Quick Reference for Intervention Al Otaiba et al (2018) Elementary grade intervention approaches to treat specific learning disabilities including dyslexia. LSHSS, 49, 829-842 (14 pages) Ukrainetz (2019) Sketch & speak: An expository intervention using note-taking & oral practice for children with language-related learning disabilities. LSHSS, 50, 53-70 (18 pages) Study summaries provided for the following studies (the studies are not required reading): Berninger et el. (2008) Tier 3 specialized writing instruction for students with dyslexia. Reading & Writing, 21, 95-129 Perry (2017) A mixed methods study of expository paragraph writing in English-proficient, Hispanic, middle school students with writing weaknesses. SIG 1, 2 (Part 3), 151-167.
UNIT 5: SPECIAL POPULATIONS		
Date	Topics/Questions	Resources to Review
Tues. Dec. 3	ADD; APD; Autism/Social Pragmatic Communication Disorder	DLD2 Quick Reference for Special Populations Recall this reading from DLD1: Pauls & Norbury (2012) ch. 4 Redmond (2016) Markers, models, and measurement error: Exploring the links between attention deficits and language impairments. JSLHR, 59, 62-71 (10 pages) Kamhi (2011) What SLPs need to know about auditory processing disorder. LSHSS, 42, 265-272 (8 pages) Ferguson et al. (2011) Communication, listening, cognitive and speech perception skills in children with auditory processing disorder (APD) or specific language impairment (SLI). JSLHR, 54, 222-225 (4 pages) Swineford et al. (2014) Social (pragmatic) communication disorder: A research review of this new

		DSM-5 diagnostic category. J. Neurodev. Dis., 6, 41 (8 pages)
Thurs. Dec. 5	NVLD; Selective Mutism	DLD2 Quick Reference for Special Populations Volden (2004) Nonverbal learning disability: A tutorial for speech-language pathologists. AJSLP, 13, 128-141 (14 pages) Hungerford et al. (2011) A socio-communication intervention model for selective mutism. ASHA Convention, Chicago (5 pages) Johnson & Wintgens (2005) Selective mutism: Planning & managing intervention with small-step programmes (9 pages)