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Center on Literacy and Deafness: Study 1

• Describe the development of language and literacy skills of a diverse sample of DHH K-2nd grade
• Identify what instructional strategies work for which children
  • Expect child x instruction interactions
Center on Literacy and Deafness: Study 1

- Total sample = 354 students
  - Videorecorded language arts instruction in about 100 classrooms (fall, winter, spring) in nine states and British Columbia.
  - Assessed target students in areas of language, reading, theory of mind, vocabulary, English syntax in fall and spring.
  - Classroom instruction was coded on two levels
    - ISI Classroom Observation System (Connor et al., 2009): Codes across three dimensions of classroom instruction; content, context, and management.
What is the Learning Environment?

- Organization
  - Physical characteristics of classroom
  - Teacher techniques
- Management
  - Warmth and responsiveness
  - Classroom control and discipline techniques (proactive and reactive)
- Instruction
  - Purposeful communication of academic information
  - Individualization of instruction
High-Quality Classrooms

High-quality classrooms are learning environments that include “purposeful and teacher-implemented systems of organization, instruction, and management meant to aid in successful student learning” (McLean, Sparapani, Toste, & Connor, 2016, p. 46).
Why study the learning environment?

• Higher classroom quality related to performance in reading comprehension and expressive vocabulary (McLean et al., 2016)
• Classroom environment influences student development of behavior regulation and literacy (Day, Connor, & McClelland, 2015)
• Classroom organization predicts word reading skills (Cameron, Connor, Morrison, & Jewkes, 2008)
• Warmth and responsiveness and time spent in academic activities related to stronger vocabulary and decoding skills (Connor, Son, Hindman, & Morrison, 2005)
QLE-DHH: What is it?

- Rating scale
- Captures quality of classroom instruction
  - Six categories rated on a 6-point rating scale using multiple behavior indicators
  - For each category, we developed the rating scale with very specific behavioral indicators.
QLE-DHH Categories

- Instructional Clarity
- Instructional Delivery
- Classroom Organization
- Behavior Management
- Teacher Warmth and Responsiveness
Development of the QLE-DHH

• Based on the work of Connor et al. (2010) “Quality of the Classroom Learning Environment”
# CLAD Quality of the Learning Environment (QLE) - Deaf/Hard of Hearing

## Rating Scale Descriptors and Indicators

### Category: Instructional Delivery (ID)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rating</th>
<th>&lt;10%</th>
<th>11-25%</th>
<th>26-49%</th>
<th>50-75%</th>
<th>76-89%</th>
<th>90-100%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Descriptor</td>
<td>Instructional delivery is almost never purposeful and focused on student outcomes.</td>
<td>Instructional delivery is rarely purposeful and focused on student outcomes.</td>
<td>Instructional delivery is purposeful and focused on student outcomes less than half of the time.</td>
<td>Exemplary instructional delivery is purposeful and focused on student outcomes more than half of the time.</td>
<td>Instructional delivery is often purposeful and focused on student outcomes.</td>
<td>Instructional delivery is exemplary of being purposeful and focused on student outcomes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indicators</td>
<td>ID 1. According to the Classroom Observation Coding Scheme, &lt;10% of class time is spent in instruction, rather than non-instruction.</td>
<td>ID 1. According to the Classroom Observation Coding Scheme, 11-25% of class time is spent in instruction, rather than non-instruction.</td>
<td>ID 1. According to the Classroom Observation Coding Scheme, 26-49% of class time is spent in instruction, rather than non-instruction.</td>
<td>ID 1. According to the Classroom Observation Coding Scheme, 50-75% of class time is spent in instruction, rather than non-instruction.</td>
<td>ID 1. According to the Classroom Observation Coding Scheme, 76-89% of class time is spent in instruction, rather than non-instruction.</td>
<td>ID 1. According to the Classroom Observation Coding Scheme, 90-100% of class time is spent in instruction, rather than non-instruction.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ID 2. Teacher almost never checks for student understanding. Teacher may ask questions, but questions are unrelated to the objective.</td>
<td>ID 2. Teacher rarely checks for student understanding.</td>
<td>ID 2. Teacher checks for student understanding less than half the time but checks may be too general or use only one strategy.</td>
<td>ID 2. Teacher checks for student understanding more than half the time but checks may be too general or use only one strategy.</td>
<td>ID 2. Teacher checks for student understanding using a variety of strategies.</td>
<td>ID 2. Teacher consistently and routinely checks with students to determine their understanding of lesson objectives using a variety of strategies (e.g., think-pair-share, thumbs up/thumbs down, example/non-example, direct questioning, asking students to support their answers, etc.).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
1. Instructional Delivery

- Time in instruction (Connor….)
- Teacher use of differentiated instruction (Brophy, 1988)
- Systematic delivery of instruction (Rupley, Blair, & Nichols, 2009)
- Systematic/structured instruction (Brophy, 1988; Lang, McKee, & Conner, 1993)
**Instructional Delivery**

**Category: Instructional Delivery (ID)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rating 1</th>
<th>Rating 2</th>
<th>Rating 3</th>
<th>Rating 4</th>
<th>Rating 5</th>
<th>Rating 6</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ID 3. Checks for understanding are not used to inform instruction.</td>
<td>ID 3. Checks for understanding are rarely used to inform instruction.</td>
<td>ID 3. Checks for understanding are seldom used to inform instruction.</td>
<td>ID 3. More than half the time checks for understanding are used to inform instruction for students.</td>
<td>ID 3. Checks for understanding are often used to inform instruction for students.</td>
<td>ID 3. Checks for understanding are consistently and routinely used to inform instruction for students (e.g. teacher asks follow-up questions, Remediates incorrect responses, reinforces correct responses, explains further, reteaches)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
2. Instructional Clarity

- Objectives explicitly stated (Rupley, Blair, & Nichols, 2009)
- Explanation of instructional content (Brophy, 1988; Civikly, 1992)
- Teacher responses to students maximize learning (Brophy, 1988)
- Students have visual and auditory access to instruction and materials (Ramsey & Padden, 1998)
Instructional Clarity

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rating 1</th>
<th>Rating 2</th>
<th>Rating 3</th>
<th>Rating 4</th>
<th>Rating 5</th>
<th>Rating 6</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>IC 3. Teacher almost never responds to students in ways that maximize learning.</td>
<td>IC 3. Teacher rarely responds to students in ways that maximize learning.</td>
<td>IC 3. Teacher responds to students in ways that maximize learning less than half the time.</td>
<td>IC 3. Teacher responds to students in ways that maximize learning more than half the time.</td>
<td>IC 3. Teacher often responds to students in ways that maximize learning.</td>
<td>IC 3. Teacher consistently and routinely responds to students in ways that maximize learning (e.g., extends students' responses, requires students to support responses, remediates responses, provides feedback that supports student learning and higher order thinking).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
3. Classroom orientation, organization and planning

- Efficient working system for student organization (Cameron, Connor, Morrison, & Jewkes, 2008)
- Few disruptions (Knoors & Hermans, 2010)
- Materials are organized and available (Cameron, Connor, Morrison, & Jewkes, 2008)
- Transitions are managed smoothly (Day, Connor, & McClelland, 2015)
## Classroom Orientation, Organization, and Planning

**Category: Classroom Orientation, Organization and Planning (COOP)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rating 1</th>
<th>Rating 2</th>
<th>Rating 3</th>
<th>Rating 4</th>
<th>Rating 5</th>
<th>Rating 6</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>COOP 4.</strong> Teacher almost never communicates expectations for transitions. Transitions are almost never effective for students and are unnecessarily long.</td>
<td><strong>COOP 4.</strong> Teacher rarely communicates expectations for transitions. Transitions are rarely effective for students and are unnecessarily long.</td>
<td><strong>COOP 4.</strong> Less than half of the time teacher communicates expectations for transitions. However, transitions may be effective for students whether or not they move from their seats, but tend to be too long.</td>
<td><strong>COOP 4.</strong> More than half of the time teacher communicates expectations for transitions clearly and precisely. Transitions are quick and effective for students whether or not they move from their seats more than half of the time.</td>
<td><strong>COOP 4.</strong> Teacher consistently and routinely communicates expectations for transitions clearly and precisely. Transitions are quick and effective for students whether or not they move from their seats. (e.g., students do not have to wait for instruction to start, students know where to go and what materials they need).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
4. Behavior Management and Control/Discipline

- Teacher in charge (Wong & Wong, 2009)
- Effective management system in place and used (Day, Connor, & McClelland, 2015)
- Discipline is proactive and positive (Brophy, 1988)
## Behavior Management and Control/Discipline

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category: Behavior Management and Control/Discipline (BMCD)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Rating 1</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BMCD 4. Non-student interruptions are almost never handled effectively (e.g., visitor to the room, fire drill, issues with technology, announcements, adult conversation). When disruptions occur, students become chaotic.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
5. Warmth and Responsiveness

- Teacher models supportive and respective attitudes (Knoors & Hermans, 2010)
- Teacher affect is positive (Brophy, 1988)
- Teacher encourages respect among students
# Warmth and Responsiveness

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rating 1</th>
<th>Rating 2</th>
<th>Rating 3</th>
<th>Rating 4</th>
<th>Rating 5</th>
<th>Rating 6</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>WR 1.</strong> During instructional and non-instructional situations, teacher talk is never encouraging and respectful. Teacher talk is sarcastic and/or angry.</td>
<td><strong>WR 1.</strong> During instructional and non-instructional situations, teacher talk is rarely encouraging and respectful. Teacher talk is often negative.</td>
<td><strong>WR 1.</strong> During instructional and non-instructional situations, teacher talk is encouraging and respectful less than half the time.</td>
<td><strong>WR 1.</strong> During instructional and non-instructional situations, teacher talk is encouraging and respectful more than half the time.</td>
<td><strong>WR 1.</strong> During instructional and non-instructional situations, teacher talk is often encouraging and respectful.</td>
<td><strong>WR 1.</strong> During instructional and non-instructional situations, teacher models an encouraging, positive, supportive, and respectful attitude toward others.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Student participation and active engagement

Students attend and participate in instructional activities (Knoors & Hermans, 2010)

Students participate readily in discussions (Knoors & Hermans, 2010)
Data Set

- Observed Time 1 (fall) and Time 3 (spring) videos
- 90 teachers, 180 instructional sessions
- Language arts instruction
- Primary teacher only
- Reliability
  - One primary and one secondary observer
  - 20% of videos
  - 78-100%
How did we rate?

- Notes
- Rated according to notes
- Student Participation and Engagement
Using the QLE in Teacher Preparation

- Practicum and internship experiences
- Coaching and evaluation tool
- Target area(s) for refinement
### Instructional Delivery

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time in instruction</th>
<th>Checks for understanding</th>
<th>Checks for instruction</th>
<th>Individualized instruction</th>
<th>Systematic delivery</th>
<th>Pacing</th>
<th>Questioning</th>
<th>Wait time</th>
<th>Opportunities to participate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Instructional Clarity

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Objectives Shared</th>
<th>Intentional delivery</th>
<th>Maximizes learning</th>
<th>Visual and auditory access</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Classroom Orientation, Organization, and Planning

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Organizational system</th>
<th>In-Class interruptions</th>
<th>Materials</th>
<th>Communicates expectations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Behavior Management and Control/Discipline

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Teacher in charge</th>
<th>Management system in place</th>
<th>Proactive vs. reactive</th>
<th>Outside disruptions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Warmth and Responsiveness

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Teacher talk</th>
<th>Teacher affect</th>
<th>Student respect</th>
<th>Positive attention</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Instructional Delivery

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time in instruction</th>
<th>Checks for understanding</th>
<th>Checks inform instruction</th>
<th>Individualized instruction</th>
<th>Systematic delivery</th>
<th>Pacing</th>
<th>Questioning</th>
<th>Wait time</th>
<th>Opportunities to participate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Instructional Clarity

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Objectives Shared</th>
<th>Intentional delivery</th>
<th>Maximizes learning</th>
<th>Visual and auditory access</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Classroom Orientation, Organization, and Planning

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Organizational system</th>
<th>In-Class interruptions</th>
<th>Materials</th>
<th>Communicates expectations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Behavior Management and Control/Discipline

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Teacher in charge</th>
<th>Management system in place</th>
<th>Proactive vs. reactive</th>
<th>Outside disruptions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Warmth and Responsiveness

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Teacher talk</th>
<th>Teacher affect</th>
<th>Student respect</th>
<th>Positive attention</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Questions?
References


Connor et al. 2010???


