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What matters for therapy quality: Collaboration and Job Satisfaction

1. ASHA Guidelines: Critical and Direct Role
   a. Role of the SLP
   b. Service Delivery Options

2. Therapy Quality (Biancone, Farquharson, Justice, Schmitt, Logan, 2014)
   a. Classroom Assessment Scoring System (Pianta, LaParo, & Hamre, 2008)
      i. Instructional Support
      ii. Emotional Support
      iii. Classroom Management

3. Job Satisfaction (Biancone, Farquharson, Justice, Schmitt, Logan, 2014)
   b. Caseload size
   c. Years of experience
   d. Lack of preparation time
   e. Similar reports from classroom teachers

a. How does job satisfaction affect therapy quality?

5. Collaboration
   a. Importance for professionals (Ehren & Ehren, 2001; Snow, Burns, & Griffin, 1998; Yeager Pelatti, 2012)
   b. Importance for children (Justice & Ezell, 200)
   c. Obstacles?
      i. Audience examples
   d. SLP and Teacher Collaboration Survey (Kollia & Mulrine, 2014)
      i. 80% of SLPs report collaborating with the general education teacher
      ii. 62.9% of teachers report minimal or no knowledge of what an SLP does

6. SLPs in Literacy

7. Crucial Conversations (Patterson, Grenny, McMillan, & Switzler, 2012)
   i. Opinions vary, emotions run strong, stakes are high
   ii. Collaboration Scenarios
   iii. Why are crucial conversations difficult?
   iv. Dynamics of team based work
   v. How to have a crucial conversation
   vi. STATE:
      1. Share your facts
      2. Tell your story
      3. Ask for others’ paths
      4. Talk tentatively
      5. Encourage testing

8. Question and Answer
How and Why to write quality IEP goals for Language and Literacy

1. Do SLPs Matter? [The WHY]
   
   a. Implementation Science: How what works
   
   b. Grammar
      
      i. Common marker for SLI
      
      ii. Grammar interventions = mixed results
   
   c. Vocabulary
      
      i. Vocabulary is malleable (Vasilyeva et al., 2006)
      
      ii. Children with LI do not acquire vocabulary through their environment like typically development children (Nash & Donaldson, 2005; Rice, Buhr, & Nemeth, 1990; Steele & Mills, 2011)
      
   
   d. Decoding
      
      i. Children with LI struggle with word decoding (Catts, Fey, Tomblin, & Zhang, 2002; Scarborough, Neuman, & Dickinson, 2009)
      
      ii. Phonological awareness and letter sound correspondence have yielded positive results in reading ability (Blachman, Tangel, Ball, Black, & McGraw, 1999; Gillon, 2000; Schuele & Boudreau, 2008)
      
      iii. Many SLPs do not feel prepared to work with literacy and/ or do not feel that literacy should be within our scope of practice (Blood, Mamett, Gordon, & Blood, 2010; Katz et al., 2010)
   
   e. How much variance in children’s gains in language and literacy are attributable to their particular SLP?
      
      i. Grammar = 11%; Vocabulary = 8%; Decoding = 12%
   
   f. SLPs’ work with school-age children is effective for advancing children’s language and literacy skills
i. Despite a dearth of well-designed empirical studies to rely upon (Cirran & Gillam, 2008)

g. The effectiveness of language intervention involves recognizing that both parties – the service provider and the recipient – are potentially variable factors that may impact children’s outcomes

h. Results highlighting that individual SLPs are differentially contributing to children’s outcomes suggests that there are specific SLP-level factors that make a difference in gains.

i. Child factors: Grade and fall language ability

j. SLP factors: None

2. Stability of Language Impairment profiles over time [The WHY]

a. Subgroups of language impairment

b. Including literacy

c. Stability of profiles

i. How do children with LI change over time?

ii. Are there factors that contribute to how and why certain children change in certain ways?

iii. Profile instability = GOOD

d. Latent Profile Analysis – person centered

e. Profile 1: Low Language

f. Profile 2: Average Language/ Low PA

g. Profile 3: Average Language/ High PA

h. Profile 4: High Language

i. 134 children stayed in the same profile; 111 children shifted into a higher profile from fall to spring; 13 children shifted into a lower profile

j. Child-level factors: SES contributed to children who moved into a higher profile. Children from lower SES backgrounds had a more stable profile

k. Therapy-level factors: **Children who received more classroom-based sessions moved into a higher profile.** Children who received therapy in a different setting did not move into a higher profile.
3. IEP goal writing [The HOW]
   a. Revised Goals and Objectives Rating Instrument (R-GORI; Notari, 1988)
   b. Farquharson, Tambyraja, Justice, & Redle (2014)
   c. Audience examples of IEP goals
   d. IEP goal writing practice

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicator</th>
<th>Question/ definition</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Observability</td>
<td>Does the target behavior have a beginning and an end and can be seen and/ or heard?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Measurability</td>
<td>Can the child’s performance be measured over time either qualitatively or quantitatively (i.e., determine mastery level)?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Functionality</td>
<td>Does the child need the target behavior to participate in all/ most daily activities?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Generalizability</td>
<td>Can the target behavior be generalized across a variety of settings, materials, and/ or people?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Daily Tasks</td>
<td>Can the target behavior be taught across daily activities?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Clarity of goals  | Can the target behavior be taught/ addressed by various team members (e.g., teachers, therapist, caregivers)?