SPED 6313 Seminar in Language and Learning Disabilities
Spring Semester 2018

SPED 6313 is a required course for Sped Master Degree, Dyslexia, and Diagnostician Certification.

College of Education, Department of Language, Literacy and Special Populations

Instructor: Name: Dr. Nancy Stockall
Professor
Sam Houston State University
Language, Literacy and Special Populations
Teacher Education Center Rm 127
Box 2119
Huntsville, TX 77341-2119
936-294-3983
nxs016@shsu.edu

Office hours: Tuesday 11:00-3:00 or by appointment

Day and time the class meets: Online

Location of class: Online

Course Description: This course is a graduate level course that introduces the theories of reading disabilities and suggested research based intervention strategies.

IDEA Objectives:

Essential: Learning fundamental principles, generalizations, or theories

Important: Learning to apply course material (to improve thinking, problem solving, and decisions).

Gaining factual knowledge (terminology, classifications, methods, trends).

Learning how to find and use resources for answering questions or solving problems

Textbooks: Required: Kamhi, A. G. & Catts, H. W. (2012). *Language and Reading Disabilities*. Boston: Pearson.

Course Format: Online

Course Content: This course examines a wide range of theories by comparing and contrasting spoken and written language. The text is broad based and covers identification, assessment, and treatment of reading and writing disorders. Additionally, students will increase comprehension skills through the use of structured research based comprehension strategies and apply these to the content of the textbook and readings.

Course Requirements:

Assignment Deadlines: No late assignments will be accepted. All assignments must be submitted through Blackboard. If sent through any other means (including email), they will not be graded.

Time Requirement: For each hour of course credit, you will be expected to commit at least three hours of study per week (**9 hours**). It is expected that if you enroll in this course, you can meet the time requirements.

Professionalism: Professional online and in person behavior and demeanor are part of a candidate's future as a professional. The college of Education's conceptual Framework states that candidates will have, as part of their Knowledge Base, the "dispositions that enable them to be understanding, respectful, and inclusive in their creation of nurturing environments for diverse learners…" Let me be clear; **ALL** communication shall be respectful, appropriate for learning, and accepting of diverse perspectives.

Assignments:

Type of Assignment: Summary of Chapter and Implications

- **Summary of Chapter and Implications.** In this assignment, you will summarize the big ideas of the chapter from your textbook and then explain how these big ideas might impact teachers' instruction in the classroom. To summarize the chapter follow these four rules:
    - Identify the main ideas
    - Delete trivial information
    - Delete redundant information
    - Relate the main idea(s) and supporting information
- **How to put the paper together.** Each section of the chapter should be summarized as a rough draft. Then compile and organize the summaries into an essay with transitions that flow logically from one idea to the next. You should have an introduction, a main body of the summaries, and a conclusion (i.e. implications for instruction).
- **Implication Section.** In the conclusion of your essay, you will write about how these big ideas impact teachers' instruction. Please be specific and give examples such as-
    - *Teachers who view reading from a broad perspective may inadvertently believe that simple exposure to story reading aloud will lead to children's ability to read unfamiliar texts. This is because a broad perspective focuses on higher level thinking processes rather than specific skill sets. The teacher may not realize that she/he must help children learn the connections between sounds & letters patterns in order to decode words.*
    - Given the amount of material in this chapter you should certainly be able to come up with more than one example.
- **Length**. The paper should **not be more than 5 pages long** so make sure that you summarize by BIG IDEAS. **Please use Times New Roman 12 pt. font, double spaced.** (Approximately 700 words)

Type of Assignment: Questions Generation and Response.

For this assignment, you will generate three open ended ***essential questions*** along with their answers from the information you read in your textbook. An essential question has these characteristics

- Is open-ended; that is, it typically will not have a single, final, and correct answer.
- Is thought-provoking and intellectually engaging, often sparking discussion and debate.
- Calls for higher-order thinking, such as analysis, inference, evaluation, prediction. It cannot be effectively answered by recall alone.
- Points toward important, transferable ideas within (and sometimes across) disciplines (like technology, humanities, biology etc) .
- Raises additional questions and sparks further inquiry.
- Requires support and justification, not just an answer.
- Recurs over time; that is, the question can and should be revisited again and again. (McTighe and Wiggens, 2014).
    - To read more about the definition and find examples of "***topical essential questions"*** go to
    - http://www.ascd.org/publications/books/109004/chapters/What-Makes-a-Question-Essential%A2.aspx
    - Also watch the video "How to Create Essential Questions" in the unit with this assignment.
    - Create five essential questions from the chapter, then write a thorough answer to each question.
    - Submit your five questions and answers through Blackboard.
        - The assignment will be graded according to (a) the quality of your topical essential questions as defined by McTighe & Wiggens (2014) and (b) the quality of your answers to the questions you wrote. See the rubric below

General Conceptual Understanding Rubric

Score %	
92-100	**High**: A high score in conceptual understanding means that the student shows an accurate and extensive understanding of the topic. This can be shown in many ways including: Correct and precise use of terminology, Precise selection of the pieces of information required to make a point (no more, no less), correct and appropriate use of examples and counterexamples, key concepts identified and addressed, a relevant focus and uses concise explanations that are to the point.
	The questions meet the definition of "topical essential question" according to McTighe & Wiggins (2014).
84-91	**Medium:** A medium score in conceptual understanding means that the student presents some important information, but there is a sense that the student is only about halfway home in terms of understanding. Performance is indicated by: Reasonable clear ideas, but the reader needs to make some guesses as to what the student meant, even though a general point is made, the student hasn't fine-tuned the answer, sometimes the student seems to know which concepts and points are most important and telling; other times not.
	The questions meet some of the characteristics of a "topical essential question"
75-83	**Low:** A low score in conceptual understanding indicates that the student is still

	searching for the connections that will make the content meaningful. Weak performance is indicated by such things as: ideas are extremely limited or hard to understand even when the reader tries to draw inferences based on what is there. The text may be repetitious or read like a collection of random thoughts or information is inaccurate or terminology is used incorrectly and/or there is little sense of which information is most important.
	The questions generated are more factual in nature (hook, lead, or guide) or they are more like "hunt and find" questions
Below 75	**"We have a problem"** Ideas are extremely limited or hard to understand even when the reader tries to draw inferences based on what is there. The text is repetitious. Folk wisdom is used rather than research based information and/or the student wants to share what he/or she does know, but it doesn't relate to the question. Text may be copied straight from the book rather than put in one's own words.
	Closed question and does not lead to higher level processes

Type of Assignment. **PowerPoint Presentation with Voice Overlay**.

For this type of assignment you will create a ***PowerPoint presentation with a voice overlay and visuals*** that pertain to key ideas and details of the chapter. The visuals may include graphs, tables, pictures, charts or links that provide additional information to the viewer. You are designing this as though you are working in a school district and must conduct an in-service presentation to faculty or staff working in public schools. It should be designed to show your expertise of the content and your ability to hold the audience's attention and interest.

Do and Don'ts.

- **Do create an interesting narrative to go along with the slides**
- **Do use visuals that add to the content of the text**
- **Do use a clear and well-articulated voice in telling the narrative**
- **Do design the PowerPoint to capture and hold the audience's attention**
- **Do not copy long sentences from the book and put in your PowerPoint**
- **Do not put in visuals for decoration!**
- **Do not read the text from the slides!**
- **Do not mumble or use Uh's and Ummms**

Type of Assignment. Graphic organizer.

For this assignment you will take the content of the chapter and use it to design a concept map also known as a **graphic organizer**. The graphic organizer must be computer generated and designed by you. The organizer should include the main ideas and details of the chapter. Again, your audience would be teachers or parents and the text should be easy to read and well organized. For examples please see Graphic Organizers under the **COURSE CONTENT**.

Type of Assignment: **Simulation of a Dialogue with a parent**.

In this assignment, you will prepare a written dialogue with a parent in which you explain that his/her child will be placed on Tier II of the Response to Intervention (RTI) program at your school. You are to explain in detail what this will mean for the student, describing the interventions discussed in your text. Make sure that you clearly explain what "direct instruction" is-what does it look like? What does the teacher say and what does the child do when using direct instruction? Also explain "intensity of instruction" and "level of support." For more information

on “direct instruction” go to

http://www.cde.state.co.us/coloradoliteracy/clf/eightelements_04-purposefulinstruction

Your “script” of the simulation should look like this:

“Your name”: “Hello Ms. Jones, I’m pleased that you could come to the conference today. There are several things I’d like to discuss, but first can you tell me what you are most concerned about with Daniel’s school progress?

Ms. Jones: “Well I’m most worried about his reading. He doesn’t seem to be reading as well as his sister did when she was in first grade. And he really doesn’t like to read. He’d rather watch TV or play on the computer.

“Your name”: “I’m glad that you brought that up. I’ve been concerned about Daniel’s reading too. He listens in class, and follows directions well but seems to struggle with decoding.”

Ms. Jones: “What do you mean, decoding?”

Continue the dialogue between the participants. Make sure that you address all the concepts below. Ms. Jones will want to know exactly what the terms mean, such as

- *Direct instruction*
- *RTI*
- *Tiers I, II, and III and how they differ*
- *What happens in each tier (what the teacher does, what the student does)*
- *What program is being used*
- *Describe in detail the program if it is a commercial program (you will have to do some research on your own to find out what the content looks like; how many books, what kind of practice exercises are presented etc.)*
- *Explicit reading instruction*
- *Progress monitoring (what it is, it’s purpose, what it looks like-examples of assessment items)*
- *Phonological Awareness and how it is different from phonics*

End the dialogue with suggestions that Ms. Jones might be able to do for Daniel that will fit into their daily routine and improve his reading. DO NOT SUGGEST WORKSHEETS AS HOMEWORK ASSIGNMENTS.

Type of Assignment: Prezi Presentation with Voice Overlay.

Like PowerPoint, a Prezi presentation is designed with an audience in mind and organizes big ideas and details from the chapter. It is to be a professionally designed presentation. Designing a Prezi may be new to you but that is the purpose of the assignment-***to learn how to design and organize information into a professional presentation for in-service teachers or parents AND to summarize in your own words the important ideas and concepts from the reading***. Follow the directions on how to copy and submit your Prezi to the discussion board. Your classmates will be able to view and listen to your Prezi adding to their own knowledge and understandings. Go to **Prezi.com** to create your Prezi and submit to Blackboard. In addition please see the document **Creating Prezi**.pdf. on Blackboard Assignments.

Expectations

Assignments

(1) Essay Question
(2) Question Generation and Response
(1) PowerPoint Presentation with Voice Overlay
(2) Graphic Organizers
(1) Simulation of a dialogue with a parent
(2) Prezi Presentations with Voice Overlays
(3) Tests

Grading Scale

92-100%	**A**
84-91%	**B**
75-83%	**C**
67-74%	**D**

All assignments when submitted to Blackboard are expected to be final documents and not drafts! If you want someone to review your work before submitting for a grade, call the Writing Center on campus. They can help you. If you have difficulty uploading an assignment please contact SHSU Online Support- 936-294-HELP. Please do not email me for technology support.

No late assignments will be accepted. Do not even ask!

A grade of "A" in this class means that you exceeded the expectations for a Master Level graduate course (moving toward doctoral level).
A grade of "B" in this class means that you met expectations for a Master Level graduate course.
A grade of "C" or below in this class means that you did not meet expectations for a Master Level graduate course and the work is at an undergraduate performance level.

Student Syllabus Guidelines

- SHSU Academic Policy Manual -- Students
  - Procedures in Cases of Academic Dishonesty #810213
  - http://www.shsu.edu/dept/academic-affairs/documents/aps/students/811006.pdf
  - Student Absences on Religious Holy Days #861001
  - Academic Grievance Procedures for Students # 900823
- SHSU Academic Policy Manual – Curriculum and Instruction
  - Use of Telephones and Text Messaging in Academic Classrooms and Facilities #100728
- (Not applicable to this class).Visitors in the classroom - Only registered students may attend class. Exceptions can be made on a case-by-case basis by the professor. In all cases, visitors must not present a disruption to the class by their attendance.

NCATE Accreditation

The Sam Houston State University, College of Education has the distinction of NCATE accreditation since 1954. As an NCATE accredited program, the College of Education ensures that the best-prepared teachers will be in classrooms teaching the next generation of leaders how to solve problems, communicate effectively, and work collaboratively.

In November 2010, NCATE merged with the Teacher Education Accreditation Council (TEAC) to become the Council for the Accreditation of Educator Preparation (CAEP), combining the two premiere accrediting organizations as a single accrediting agency for reform, innovation, and research in educator preparation. SHSU will continue to be NCATE accredited through its next review scheduled for November 2015.

NCATE Standards

CAEP Standards

The Conceptual Framework and Model

The COE Conceptual Framework establishes the shared vision of the college in preparing educators to work with P-12 students through programs dedicated to collaboration in instruction, field experience, and research, the candidates in Sam Houston State University's Educator Preparation Programs acquire the knowledge, dispositions, and skills necessary to create a positive learning environment preparing educators to work with P-12 students. Employing a variety of technologies, candidates learn to plan, implement, assess, and modify instruction to meet the needs of diverse learners. The Conceptual Framework (CF) incorporates five (5) indicators throughout the framework that serve to identify areas tied to course work where there is evidence of Conceptual Framework and goals assessment. The five indicators are: Knowledge Base (CF1), Technological Learning Environment (CF2), Communication (CF3), Assessment (CF4), and Effective Field Experience with Diverse Learners (CF5)

Continued on next page……

SHSU Dispositions and Diversity Proficiency (DDP) Standards

CF: Conceptual Framework

	DDP	CF	CAEP	NCATE
1.	Demonstrates an attitude of reflection and thoughtfulness about professional growth and instruction.	2	1.1 (InTASC #10) & 3.3	1. c., 1.g., & 4. c
2.	Demonstrates a commitment to using technology to create an authentic learning environment that promotes problem-solving and decision making for diverse learners.	2	1.5 & 3.4	1.b, 4.a., & 6.d.
3.	Practices ethical behavior and intellectual honesty.	3	1.1(InTASC #9) , 3.3, & 3.6	1.g. & 4.a.
4.	Demonstrates thoughtfulness in communication and an awareness and appreciation of varying voices.	3	3.1, 3.3	4.a.
5.	Demonstrates knowledge of second language acquisition and a commitment to adapting instruction or programs to meet the needs of culturally and linguistically diverse learners.	3 & 5	1.1 (InTASC #2)	4.a.& 4.d.
6.	Demonstrates ability to be understanding, respectful and inclusive of diverse populations.	3 & 5	3.1	4.a. & 4.d.
7.	Uses assessment as a tool to evaluate learning and improve instruction for all learners	4	1.1 (InTASC #6)	1.d. & 4.a.
8.	Demonstrates a commitment to literacy, inquiry, and reflection.	1 & 4	1.1 (InTASC #9) & 3.3	1. d, 1. g., & 4.a.
9.	Leads diverse learners to higher level thinking in cognitive, affective, and/or psychomotor domains.	5	1.1 (InTASC, & #2)	4.a.
10.	Demonstrates a commitment to adapting instruction or programs to meet the needs of diverse learners.	5	1.1 (InTASC #2 and #9), & 1.4, 2.3	1.c., 3.c., 4.a., & 4.d.

CAEP: Council for the Accreditation of Educator Preparation (see page 20-21 of CAEP Standards for cross-cutting themes and diversity characteristics)

NCATE: National Council for the Accreditation of Teacher Education

The Dispositions and Diversity Proficiency (DDP) Standards are administered and evaluated in prescribed courses to all educator preparation student in initial and advanced programs. Your communication and products in this online course will be evaluated using these DDPs.

College of Education Information:

Please be advised that the College of Education conducts ongoing research regarding the effectiveness of the programs. You will receive one survey in the final semester prior to graduation regarding the operations of the unit during your time here. A second survey will occur within one year following graduation from or completion of a program, and will be sent to you and to your employer. This survey will focus on the preparation received at SHSU. Please remember that your response to these surveys is critical to SHSU program excellence.

Matrix

Topic(s)/Objective(s)	Activities/Assignments (including field based activities)	Measurement (including performance based	Standards Alignment **S**—SPA Standard Alignment **TS**—Texas Educator Standards/Competencies **DDP**—Diversity and Disposition Proficiencies **CF**—Conceptual Framework Indicator **N/C**—NCATE/CAEP Standard 1 (if there is no SPA) **NETS*S** – ISTE NETS Technology Standards for Students
Essential Questions	**Research and read Essential Questioning Strategies. Research and read summarizing techniques for reading comprehension. Generating and answering essential topic questions**	**Assignment: Summary of Chapter and Implications**	**CEC**: Standard 2: Curricular & Content Standards **DDP**: #8 **CF:** Knowledge Base **NETS*S Standard #: 3 Research and information fluency**
Summarizing Techniques	**Research and read summarizing techniques for reading. Summarize and provide implications that connect text content to practice.**	**Summarize and provide implications that connect text content to practice**	**CEC**: Standard 2: Curricular & Content Standards **DDP**: #8 **CF:** Knowledge Base **NETS*S Standard #: 3 Research and information fluency item b.**
Graphic Organizers	**Research and read summarizing techniques for creating graphic organizers for comprehension. Design graphic organizer of chapter content**	**Design graphic organizer of chapter content**	**CEC**: Standard 2: Curricular & Content Standards **DDP**: #8 **CF:** Knowledge Base **NETS*S Standard #: 3 Research and information fluency item b & c**
Technology Presentation Formats	**Design in-service presentations using various presentation models**	**Prezi Presentation PowerPoint Presentation**	**CEC: ACSI3 K4; SEDS4 K1; ACSI4 S3** **DDP: #2** **CF2: subtopic b**
Response to Intervention RTI	**Research and identify interventions at Tier 1, II, and II. Design, and describe Tier II**	**Simulation of Educator/Parent conference regarding RTI model.**	**CEC**: Standard 2: Curricular & Content Standards **DDP: #4**

	interventions for children with reading disabilities		**CF4: Critical thinking, problem solving, and decision making subtopic d.**
Language and Reading	**Reading and summarizing content information**	**Summarize and provide implications that connect text content to practice**	**CEC**: Standard 2: Curricular & Content Standards **DDP**: #8 **CF:** Knowledge Base **NETS*S Standard #: 3 Research and information fluency item b.**
Reading Development	**Read and identify big ideas and details of concepts**	**Design graphic organizer of chapter content**	**CEC**: Standard 2: Curricular & Content Standards; ACSI1 S3; SEDS3 K2; ACSI4 S3 **DDP**: #8 **CF:** Knowledge Base **NETS*S Standard #: 3 Research and information fluency item b & c**
Defining and Classifying Reading Disabilities	**Read and identify big ideas and details of concepts**	**Prezi Presentation PowerPoint Presentation**	**CEC: ACSI1 K1; ACSI1 K2; SEDS3 K2; SEDS3 K4** **DDP: #2** **CF2: subtopic b**
Causes of Reading disabilities	**Read and identify big ideas and details of concepts**	**Question Generation and Responses Assignment**	Standard 2: Curricular & Content Standards; DDP: #3 CF1: Knowledge Base
Assessment and Instruction for Phonemic Awareness and Word Recognition Skills	**Read and identify big ideas and details of concepts**	**Simulation of Educator/Parent conference regarding RTI model**	**CEC**: Standard 2: Curricular & Content Standards **DDP: #4** **CF4: Critical thinking, problem solving, and decision making subtopic d.**
Perspectives on Assessing and improving reading comprehension	**Read and identify big ideas and details of concepts**	**Design graphic organizer of chapter content**	**CEC: ACSI3 K4; SEDS3 K1; SEDS3 K4; DDP #5;** **CF1: Knowledge Base;** **CF4: Assessment**
Assessing and Remediating Text Comprehension problems	**Read and identify big ideas and details of concepts**	**Question Generation and Responses Assignment**	**CEC: ACSI3 K4; SEDS3 K1; SEDS3 K4; DDP #5;** **CF1: Knowledge Base;** **CF4: Assessment**
Spelling Assessment and Intervention	**Read and identify big ideas and details of concepts**	**Design graphic organizer of chapter content**	**CEC: SEDS3 K2; SEDS3 K1; ACSI3 K6; ACSI3 K2** **DDP# 5**

			CF1: Knowledge Base **CF4: Assessment**
Learning to Write	**Read and identify big ideas and details of concepts. Listen and reflect on video content**	**Prezi Presentation**	**CEC: Standard 2: Curricular and Content Standards; ACSI3 K4; ACSI3 K6; SEDS3 K4;** **DDP: #2** **CF2: subtopic b**
Developing Knowledge and Skills for Writing	**Read and identify big ideas and details of concepts. Listen and reflect on video content**	**Prezi Presentation**	**CEC: Standard 2: Curricular and Content Standards; ACSI3 K4; ACSI3 K6; SEDS3 K4;** **DDP: #2** **CF2: subtopic b**
Math Disabilities	**Read and identify big ideas and details of concepts**	**Test**	**CEC: Standard 2: Curricular and Content Standards; ACSI3 K4; ACSI3 K6; SEDS3 K4;** **DDP: #2** **CF2: subtopic b**
Theories of Cognitive Development	**Read and identify big ideas and details of concepts. Listen and reflect on video content**	**Test**	**CEC: Standard 2: Curricular Content Knowledge; ACSI3 K1; SEDS4 S1;** **DDP: #6** **CF1 Knowledge Base**
Methods of Identification of Children with Learning Disabilities	**Read and identify big ideas and details of concepts. Listen and reflect on video content**	**Test**	**CEC**: ACSI1 K1; ACSI1 K2; ACSI1 K3; ACSI1 K4; SEDS1 ; SEDS1 K2 **DDP** #6; 7,3 **CF1: Knowledge Base** **CF4: Assessment**

For information on CEC standards (CEC codes) go to the following website listed below.

Council for Exceptional Children standards:

http://www.cec.sped.org/Standards/Special-Educator-Professional-Preparation/CEC-Initial-and-Advanced-Specialty-Sets

Texas State Standards: http://www.tea.state.tx.us/index2.aspx?id=5938

Bibliography

Barnes, M. A., Fuchs, L. S., & Ewing-Cobbs, L. (2010). Math disabilities. *Pediatric neuropsychology: Research, theory, and practice*, 375-407.

Branum-Martin, L., Fletcher, J. M., & Stuebing, K. K. (2013). Classification and Identification of Reading and Math Disabilities The Special Case of Comorbidity. *Journal of learning disabilities*, *46*(6), 490-499.

Bridges, M. S., & Catts, H. W. (2011). The use of a dynamic screening of phonological awareness to predict risk for reading disabilities in kindergarten children. *Journal of learning disabilities*, 0022219411407863.

Cutting, L. E., Clements-Stephens, A., Pugh, K. R., Burns, S., Cao, A., Pekar, J. J., ... & Rimrodt, S. L. (2013). Not all reading disabilities are dyslexia: distinct neurobiology of specific comprehension deficits. *Brain connectivity*, *3*(2), 199-211.

Davidson, K. (2014). Teachers' Reported Utilization of Reading Disabilities Research. *Alberta Journal of Educational Research*, *59*(3), 487-502.

De Weerdt, F., Desoete, A., & Roeyers, H. (2013). Working memory in children with reading disabilities and/or mathematical disabilities. *Journal of learning disabilities*, *46*(5), 461-472.

Denton, C. A., & Al Otaiba, S. (2011). Teaching word identification to students with reading difficulties and disabilities. *Focus on Exceptional Children*, *43*(7), 1-16.

Doabler, C. T., Strand Cary, M., Jungjohann, K., Clarke, B., Fien, H., Baker, S., ... & Chard, D. (2012). Enhancing core mathematics instruction for students at risk for mathematics disabilities. *Teaching Exceptional Children*, *44*(4), 48-57.

Fletcher, J. M., & Morris, R. D. (2014). Reading, Laterality, and the Brain: Early Contributions on Reading Disabilities by Sara S. Sparrow. *Journal of autism and developmental disorders*, *44*(2), 250-255.

Frijters, J. C., Lovett, M. W., Steinbach, K. A., Wolf, M., Sevcik, R. A., & Morris, R. D. (2011). Neurocognitive predictors of reading outcomes for children with reading disabilities. *Journal of Learning Disabilities*, *44*(2), 150-166.

Geary, D. C. (2011). Consequences, characteristics, and causes of mathematical learning disabilities and persistent low achievement in mathematics. *Journal of developmental and behavioral pediatrics: JDBP*, *32*(3), 250.

Gustafson, S., Fälth, L., Svensson, I., Tjus, T., & Heimann, M. (2011). Effects of three interventions on the reading skills of children with reading disabilities in grade 2. *Journal of learning disabilities*, *44*(2), 123-135.

Kamhi, A. G., & Catts, H. W. (2012). *Language and reading disabilities*. Pearson. (3rd edition)

Koepke, K. M., & Miller, B. (2013). At the Intersection of Math and Reading Disabilities Introduction to the Special Issue. *Journal of learning disabilities*, *46*(6), 483-489.

Kroesbergen, E. H., Van Luit, J. E., & Aunio, P. (2012). Mathematical and cognitive predictors of the development of mathematics. *British Journal of Educational Psychology*, *82*(1), 24-27.

Machek, G. R., & Nelson, J. M. (2010). School psychologists' perceptions regarding the practice of identifying reading disabilities: Cognitive assessment and response to intervention considerations. *Psychology in the Schools*, *47*(3), 230-245.

Mazzocco, M. M., & Grimm, K. J. (2013). Growth in rapid automatized naming from Grades K to 8 in children with math or reading disabilities. *Journal of learning disabilities*, 0022219413477475.

McNamara, J. K., Scissons, M., & Gutknecth, N. (2011). A longitudinal study of kindergarten children at risk for reading disabilities: The poor really are getting poorer. *Journal of learning disabilities*, 0022219411410040.

Meisinger, E. B., Bloom, J. S., & Hynd, G. W. (2010). Reading fluency: Implications for the assessment of children with reading disabilities. *Annals of Dyslexia*, *60*(1), 1-17.

Melby-Lervåg, M., Lyster, S. A. H., & Hulme, C. (2012). Phonological skills and their role in learning to read: a meta-analytic review. *Psychological bulletin*, *138*(2), 322.

Morris, R. D., Lovett, M. W., Wolf, M., Sevcik, R. A., Steinbach, K. A., Frijters, J. C., & Shapiro, M. B. (2010). Multiple-component remediation for developmental reading disabilities: IQ, socioeconomic status, and race as factors in remedial outcome. *Journal of Learning Disabilities*.

Norton, E. S., & Wolf, M. (2012). Rapid automatized naming (RAN) and reading fluency: Implications for understanding and treatment of reading disabilities. *Annual review of psychology*, *63*, 427-452.

Ritchey, K. D. (2011). The first "R": Evidence-based reading instruction for students with learning disabilities. *Theory Into Practice*, *50*(1), 28-34.

Soriano, M., Miranda, A., Soriano, E., Nievas, F., & Felix, V. (2011). Examining the efficacy of an intervention to improve fluency and reading comprehension in spanish children with reading disabilities. *International Journal of Disability, Development and Education*, *58*(1), 47-59.

Swanson, H. L. (2011). Dynamic testing, working memory, and reading comprehension growth in children with reading disabilities. *Journal of learning disabilities*, *44*(4), 358-371.

Swanson, H. L. (2011). The influence of working memory growth on reading and math performance in children with math and/or reading disabilities. *Cognitive development and working memory: A dialogue between neo-Piagetian theories and cognitive approaches*, 203-231.

Swanson, H. L. (2012). Cognitive profile of adolescents with math disabilities: Are the profiles different from those with reading disabilities?. *Child Neuropsychology*, *18*(2), 125-143.

Swanson, H. L., Harris, K. R., & Graham, S. (Eds.). (2013). *Handbook of learning disabilities*. Guilford Press.

Swanson, H. L., Lussier, C., & Orosco, M. (2011). Effects of Cognitive Strategy Interventions on Word Problem Solving and Working Memory in Children with Math Disabilities. *Society for Research on Educational Effectiveness*.

Toll, S. W., Van der Ven, S. H., Kroesbergen, E. H., & Van Luit, J. E. (2011). Executive functions as predictors of math learning disabilities. *Journal of Learning Disabilities*, *44*(6), 521-532.

Tran, L., Sanchez, T., Arellano, B., & Swanson, H. L. (2011). A meta-analysis of the RTI literature for children at risk for reading disabilities. *Journal of Learning Disabilities*, *44*(3), 283-295.

Vaughn, S., & Wanzek, J. (2014). Intensive Interventions in Reading for Students with Reading Disabilities: Meaningful Impacts. *Learning Disabilities Research & Practice*, *29*(2), 46-53.

Vaughn, S., Wexler, J., Roberts, G., Barth, A. A., Cirino, P. T., Romain, M. A., ... & Denton, C. A. (2011). Effects of individualized and standardized interventions on middle school students with reading disabilities. *Exceptional children*, *77*(4), 391-407.

Wei, X., Lenz, K. B., & Blackorby, J. (2012). Math growth trajectories of students with disabilities: Disability category, gender, racial, and socioeconomic status differences from ages 7 to 17. *Remedial and Special Education*, 0741932512448253.

Wong, B. (Ed.). (2011). *Learning about learning disabilities*. Academic Press.

Zheng, X., Flynn, L. J., & Swanson, H. L. (2013). Experimental Intervention Studies on Word Problem Solving and Math Disabilities A Selective Analysis of the Literature. *Learning Disability Quarterly*, *36*(2), 97-111.