Here we go...

2 years of intervention work
across 5 grades
by 100+ people
described in 15 minutes!
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LARRC Intervention Aim Years 1-3

- Define and develop...
  - 2 distinct instantiations
  - language-based comprehension intervention
  - grades PreK to Grade 3 & ELL PreK
  - systematic and iterative developmental process
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Iterative Intervention Design...& Beyond

**UNIFYING PRINCIPLES**
- Language-based
- Text-based
- Concept-based
- Adaptable
- Motivating
- Systematically organized

Year 1: Prototype Development and Teaching Trials
- Year 1: Feasibility and Pilot Studies
- Years 4 & 5 Randomized Controlled Trial

---

**UNIFYING PRINCIPLES**

**Year 1: Advisory Panel Conclusions**
- Include both informational and narrative texts
- Texts should be the backbone of intervention
- Strategic selection of words
- Vocabulary tied to texts
- Align with Common Core and State Standards

---

**Year 1: Advisory Panel Conclusions**
- Lesson format
- Supplement to existing language arts curricula
- Include a range of lesson types
- Scripted lessons with examples
- 30 minutes maximum
- Content-based, language-based intervention innovative compared to current curricula

---

**Year 1: Winter Teaching Trial**
- 16 teachers distributed across sites completed one unit
  - Six, 25-30 minute lessons
  - PreK and K unit “Animals and Their Needs”
  - Grades 1 and 2 unit “Are Spiders Insects?”
- Lessons were observed by LARRC staff
- Teachers completed online evaluation after each lesson
  - Planning and effort
  - Student engagement
  - Success meeting teaching objectives
  - Evaluation of texts and other teaching materials

---

**Year 1: Changes for Next Trial**
- Clarified key objectives for each lesson
- Ensured that all activities supported objectives
- Wrote lessons that could be implemented in 30 mins
- Provided scripts for modeling vocabulary words and expanding on responses
Year 2: Fall Teaching Trial

- Tested a six-week “Earth Materials” Unit
  - Eight classrooms
    - Two classrooms each in PreK, PreK ELL, K, Gr 2 across sites

Spiral Content Across Grades and Across Areas of Text Structure

Changes for Spring Feasibility Study

- 4, 7-week units
  - Two Informational Text Units, Two Narrative Units
  - Two instantiations of each unit
  - Four, 30 min lessons per week
  - Week 6 CBMs

  - Expanded CBMs to more closely match intervention
    - Added CBM preview in week 2 of the unit

2 Instantiations: Let’s Know

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Instantiation 1</th>
<th>Instantiation 2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Hook</td>
<td>Hook</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Read to Me</td>
<td>Read to Me</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Integration</td>
<td>Integration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Read to Know</td>
<td>Read to Know</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Words to Know</td>
<td>Words to Know</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Text Mapping</td>
<td>Text Mapping</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stretch and Review</td>
<td>Stretch and Review</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Close</td>
<td>Close</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Show Me What You Know Lite</td>
<td>Show Me What You Know Lite</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Show Me What You Know</td>
<td>Show Me What You Know</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Year 2: Spring 2012 Feasibility Study

- Goal: To determine...
  - revised prototypes
    - 2 instantiations
      - could be delivered in different classrooms
        - acceptable levels of consistency, usability, and fidelity
  - Tested 2 instantiations of 7-week “Fiction” Unit
    - 54 classrooms
      - 5 classroom per instantiation pre grade PreK – Grade 3
      - 4 PreK ELL classrooms

Feasibility Study Results & Changes

- No major differences between 2 instantiations
  - Fidelity was medium-high
    - 68-94% of components implemented
  - Teacher satisfaction was high
    - 72-90% of lessons rated ‘satisfied’ or ‘very satisfied’
    - CBM data similar
      - Mean grade-level scores of 11-21 out of 26 points
  - Numerous minor changes were integrated into next iteration of lessons and professional development
Goal: To test...
- sequence of lessons and professional development implemented at each grade (3 units; 2 instantiations)
- acceptable fidelity?
- positive impacts on the quality and quantity of language instruction within classrooms?
- 72 classrooms
  - 12 classrooms per grade, PK ELL, PK-Grade 3
  - Two each: instantiation 1, instantiation 2, BAU
  - 5 children per classroom (360 total)

Refining:
- Lessons
- Professional Development
- General and lesson-specific fidelity checklists
- Measures of child and teacher classroom language
- CBMs and progress monitoring tools

Selecting and Refining:
- Pre- and post-test measures

Year 1
Prototype Development and Teaching Trials

Years 2 & 3
Feasibility and Pilot Studies

Years 4 & 5
Randomized Controlled Trial

On the Horizon...Years 4 & 5
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