Resource List

Specific Learning Disabilities and Responsiveness to Intervention

Winter 2007

Authors

Barbara E. Starrett
NRCLD

Sonja R. de Boer
NRCLD

Julie M. Tollefson
NRCLD

In this document

Specific Learning Disabilities (SLD)

The Individuals with Disabilities Education Act of 1997 (IDEA 1997) and Individuals with Disabilities Education Improvement Act of 2004 (IDEA 2004) define specific learning disabilities in a similar manner. "The term *specific learning disability* means a disorder in one or more of the basic psychological processes involved in understanding or in using language, spoken or written, which disorder may manifest itself in [the] imperfect ability to listen, think, speak, read, write, spell, or do mathematical calculations. Such term includes such conditions as perceptual disabilities, brain injury, minimal brain dysfunction, dyslexia, and developmental aphasia. Such term does not include a learning problem that is primarily the result of visual, hearing, or motor disabilities, or mental retardation, or emotional disturbance, or of environmental, cultural, or economic disadvantage" (IDEA 1997, IDEA 2004).

Scientific-Based Research (SBR)

The No Child Left Behind Act of 2001 (NCLB 2001) defines *scientific-based research* as "research that involves the application of rigorous, systematic, and objective procedures to obtain reliable and valid knowledge relevant to education activities and programs." Numerous sources (Coalition for Evidence-Based Policy, 2002; Comprehensive School Reform Program Office, 2002; National Research Council, 2002; NCLB, 2001) agree that scientifically based research's defining characteristics include "persuasive research that empirically examines important questions using appropriate methods that ensure reproducible and applicable findings" (Beghetto, 2003).

Literature Resources

The following bibliography is not intended to be exhaustive; rather, the references are a starting point for individuals interested in searching for additional information about learning disabilities (LD), specific learning disabilities (SLD), and responsiveness to intervention (RTI).

Comprehensive Resources

❍ Bradley, R., Danielson, L., & Hallahan, D.P. (Eds.) (2002). *Identification of learning disabilities: Research to practice.* Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

❍ Lyon, G.R. (Ed.) (1994). *Frames of reference for the assessment of learning disabilities: New views on measurement issues.* Baltimore, MD: Brookes Publishing Co.

❍ Swanson, H.L., Harris, K.R., & Graham, S.G. (Eds.) (2003). *Handbook of learning disabilities.* New York, NY: Guilford.

Adolescents-High Schools

❍ Deshler, D.D. (2005). Adolescents with learning disabilities: Unique challenges and reasons for hope. *Learning Disability Quarterly, 28*(2), 122-124.

Research shows that adolescents with learning disabilities can be taught how to learn and that their ability to successfully respond to secondary-level school curriculum demands can be significantly improved. For such students to make substantial gains across multiple core curriculum classes and receive standard high school diplomas, a future research and development agenda must address the challenges of maintaining teacher roles and teaching validated interventions with intensity and fidelity.

❍ Edgar, E. (2005). Bending back on high school programs for youth with learning disabilities. *Learning Disability Quarterly, 28*(2), 171-173.

The writer contends that schools should be viewed as moral places where youth are prepared to take on the role of advancing democratic ideals. He also states that the notion that top-down management solves problems should be abandoned, that work should be done to repeal ineffective laws, and that schooling should be refocused on deeper and more moral premises than consumerism and the free-market economy.

Assessment-Identification

❍ Berninger, V., & Abbott, R. (1994). Redefining learning disabilities: Moving beyond aptitude-achievement discrepancies to failure to respond to validated treatment protocols. In *Frames of reference for the assessment of learning disabilities: New views on measurement issues,* G. Reid Lyon (Ed.). Baltimore, MD: Paul H. Brookes Publishing.

❍ Bocian, K.M., Beebe, M.E., MacMillan, D.L., & Gresham, F.M. (1999). Competing paradigms in learning disabilities classification by schools and the variations in the meaning of discrepant achievement. *Learning Disabilities Research & Practice, 14*(1), 1-14.

❍ Bradley, R., & Danielson, L. (2004). The Office of Special Education Program's LD Initiative: A context for inquiry and consensus. *Learning Disability Quarterly, 27*(4), 186-188.

The U.S. Office of Special Education Programs launched the LD (learning disability) Initiative in 2000 in response to a call from the National Joint Committee on Learning Disabilities for it to focus on the identification of learning disabilities. A multiyear process involving numerous activities and stakeholders, this initiative aimed to examine, document, and discuss the identification and classification of children with learning disabilities. Further information on the LD Initiative and the subsequent creation of a National Research Center on LD is provided.

❍ Fletcher, J.M., Coulter, W.A., Reschly, D.J., & Vaughn, S. (2004). Alternative approaches to the definition and identification of learning disabilities: Some questions and answers, *Annals of Dyslexia, 54*(2), 304-331.

❍ Francis, D.J., Shaywitz, S.E., Stuebing, K.K., Shaywitz, B.A., & Fletcher, J.M. (1996). Developmental lag versus deficit models of reading disability: A longitudinal, individual growth curves analysis. *Journal of Educational Psychology, 88*(1), 3-17.

Individual growth curves were used to test whether the development of children with reading disabilities is best characterized by models of developmental lag or developmental deficit. Developmental changes in reading ability were modeled by using nine yearly longitudinal assessments of a sample of 403 children classified into three groups representing (a) deficient reading achievement relative to IQ expectations (RD-D), (b) deficient reading achievement consistent with IQ expectations (LA), and (c) no reading deficiency (NRI). Using a model of quadratic growth to a plateau, the age and level at which reading scores plateaued were estimated for each child. Reading-disabled children differed on average from nondisabled children in the level but not in the age at which reading skills plateaued. The RD-D and LA groups did not differ in reading plateau or age at plateau. The subgroup of RD-D children scoring below the 25th percentile in reading differed from LA children only in reading plateau. Results suggest that the developmental course of reading skills in children with reading disability is best characterized by deficit as opposed to lag models. In addition, no support for the validity of classifications of reading disability based on IQ discrepancies was apparent.

❍ Gresham, F.M., MacMillan, D.L., Beebe-Frankenberger, M.E., & Bocian, K.M. (2000). Treatment integrity in learning disabilities intervention research: Do we really know how treatments are implemented? *Learning Disabilities Research & Practice, 15,* 198-205.

❍ Hale, J.B., & Fiorello, C. (2002). Beyond the academic rhetoric of g: Intelligence testing guidelines for practitioners, part i. *NASP Communique, 31*(2).

❍ Horvath, M., Kass, C., & Ferrell, W. (1980). An example of the use of fuzzy set concepts in modeling learning disability. *American Educational Research Journal, 17*(3), 309-324.

The way a particular clinician judges, from data, the degree to which a child is in the category "learning disabled" was modeled on the basis of the clinician's statement of the traits that comprise the handicap. The model illustrates the use of fuzzy set theory to make a formal model from a vague and imprecise verbal model. The method can facilitate research in areas where understanding of phenomena is not yet well developed.

❍ Kavale, K.A., & Forness, S.R. (2000). What definitions of learning disability say and don't say: A critical analysis. *Journal of Learning Disabilities, 33*(3), 239-56.

❍ Leighton, J., Gierl, M., & Hunka, S. (2004). The attribute hierarchy method for cognitive assessment: A variation on Tatsuoka's rule-space approach. *Journal of Educational Measurement, 41*(3), 205-237.

A cognitive item response theory model called the attribute hierarchy method (AHM) is introduced and illustrated. This method represents a variation of Tatsuoka's rule-space approach. The AHM is designed explicitly to link cognitive theory and psychometric practice to facilitate the development and analyses of educational and psychological tests. The following are described: cognitive properties of the

AHM; psychometric properties of the AHM, as well as a demonstration of how the AHM differs from Tatsuoka's rule-space approach; and application of the AHM to the domain of syllogistic reasoning to illustrate how this approach can be used to evaluate the cognitive competencies required in a higher-level thinking task. Future directions for research are also outlined.

❍ Lennon, J.E., & Slesinski, C. (2002). Comprehensive test of phonological processing (CTOPP): Cognitive-linguistic assessment of severe reading problems. *NASP Communique, 29*(6).

School psychologists search for sources of severe reading problems in various ways. Typically, the search involves identifying students who have significant aptitude-achievement discrepancies as learning disabled. Numerous authors have raised concerns about the validity and reliability of this practice. These studies, in part, question the relevance of administering global measures of intelligence, which do not tap reading-related cognitive abilities, to students suspected of having learning disabilities. Converging research evidence strongly suggests that the most common forms of severe reading problems are caused by deficits in one or more aspects of phonological coding, a cognitive linguistic ability. Deficits in phonological coding distinguish between average and deficient beginning readers and predict which deficient readers will demonstrate a limited response to instruction.

❍ MacMillan, D.L., Gresham, F.M., & Bocian, K.M. (1998). Discrepancy between definitions of learning disabilities and school practices: An empirical investigation. *Journal of Learning Disabilities, 31*(4), 314-326.

Students referred by general education teachers to study teams (SSTs) were evaluated for learning disabilities (LD) eligibility. The authors classified children as having an LD on the basis of a WISC-III Full Scale IQ of 82 or higher and a 22-point discrepancy between IQ and any WRAT-R achievement score. Research decisions were then contrasted with actual school-based decisions regarding the child. More than half of the students referred to SSTs were certified by the schools as having an LD, yet less than half of these school-certified students with LD evidenced the aptitude-achievement discrepancy required by the state. Examination of the cases called LD by the schools revealed that children were classified as LD on the basis of low absolute achievement, regardless of whether or not a discrepancy existed. Moreover, in cases where a discrepancy was found but the school did not classify the child as LD, that child evidenced significantly higher achievement, despite exhibiting the requisite 22-point discrepancy. The school-identified students with LD constituted an extremely heterogeneous group, including students with mental retardation along with a substantial number who failed to qualify for any special education services. Findings are discussed in terms of the discrepancy between criteria specified in state regulations and what the committee members at the school site seemed to use in classifying children with LD.

❍ Mellard, D.F., Deshler, D.D., & Barth, A. (2004). LD identification: It's not simply a matter of building a better mousetrap. *Learning Disability Quarterly, 27*(4), 229-242.

Historically, researchers, policy makers, and practitioners have sought improved solutions to the issues associated with LD identification decisions. Since the passage of P.L. 94-142, numerous identification methods have been proposed, implemented, and studied. Although each new method has been successful, at least partially, in addressing some of the limitations of earlier methods, each new identification model is saddled with its own set of shortcomings. This article argues that factors beyond specific LD identification technology significantly influence the decision-making process and ultimately decisions about who is and who is not LD. Results from focus group discussions with six stakeholder groups (LD parents, LD teachers, general education teachers, directors of special education, school principals, and school psychologists/diagnosticians) are reported, indicating that a broad array of factors beyond a student's performance on formal and informal assessments influence ultimate decisions made about a student's eligibility for learning disability services. Thus, the search for new identification technologies also should include efforts to better understand the values and biases of critical stakeholders and how to include these factors in the overall decision-making process.

❍ National Association of School Psychologists, (2002). The demise of IQ testing for children with learning disabilities: Distinguished lecture by Robert Pasternack. *NASP Communique, 30*(7).

❍ Nelson, N.W., & Meter., A.M.V. (2002). Assessing curriculum-based reading and writing samples. *Topics in Language Disorders, 22*(2), 35-59.

Curriculum-based language assessment requires tools that differ from those used for traditional assessment. Analysis of reading and written language samples can provide information about curriculum-based language strengths and needs that can be used recursively to establish goals and benchmarks, provide intervention, evaluate change, and begin the next round of planning—all aimed at influencing students' progress in the general education curriculum. This article presents methods and tools for conducting these analyses and a case example to illustrate their use.

❍ Peterson, K.M.H., & Shinn, M.R. (2002). Severe discrepancy models: Which best explains school identification practices for learning disabilities. *School Psychology Review, 31*(4), 459.

❍ Scruggs, T.E., & Mastropieri, M.A. (2002). On babies and bathwater: Addressing the problems of identification of learning disabilities. *Learning Disability Quarterly, 25*(3), 155-168.

In this article, the authors review problems in identification of learning disabilities and consider proposed alternatives to present procedures. They argue that no proposed alternative meets all the necessary criteria for identification of learning disabilities and that radically altering or eliminating current conceptualizations of learning disabilities may amount to "throwing the baby out with the bathwater." They conclude that the major problems of identification of learning disabilities—including over-identification, variability, and specificity—can be eliminated by increasing specificity and consistency of state criteria and strict adherence to identification criteria on the local implementation level. Finally, they argue that scarce special education funds should not be employed to address the problems of general education.

❍ Stanovich, K.E. (2005). The future of a mistake: Will discrepancy measurement continue to make the learning disabilities field a pseudoscience? *Learning Disability Quarterly, 28*(2), 103-106.

The writer contends that the learning disabilities field suffers from persistently linking the definition of learning disability to the concept of aptitude-achievement discrepancy and identifying aptitude with performance on intelligence tests. He proceeds to highlight the lack of evidence for treating the concept of aptitude-achievement discrepancy as foundational and discusses the implications of failure to consider alternative theories for the future of the learning disabilities field.

❍ Swanson, H.L. (1994). The role of working memory and dynamic assessment in the classification of children with learning disabilities. *Learning Disabilities Research and Practice, 9*(4), 190-202.

This article investigates (a) the degree to which working memory differences among children with learning disabilities (LD) reflect specific or generalized working-memory processes, and (b) whether "testing-the-limits" of working memory by systematic cuing (referred to as dynamic assessment) yields similar diagnostic classifications of children with LD as initial testing conditions. To this end, performance of reading-disabled, math-disabled, slow-learning, under-achieving, and normal-achieving children was compared on verbal and visual-spatial working-memory measures under initial, gain, and maintenance testing conditions. The results were (a) learning disability subtypes are comparable in performance during initial testing conditions, but children with math disabilities improve on verbal working-memory tasks when compared to children with reading disabilities during dynamic testing conditions; (b) learning disability subtypes are inferior to average-achieving children but superior to slow learners across working-memory processing conditions; and (c) ability group classifications change under dynamic testing conditions when compared to initial testing conditions, suggesting that ability estimates were modified. The study demonstrates the applicability of dynamic assessment to the measurement of learning potential of children with LD.

❍ Swanson, H.L. (1999). Instructional components that predict treatment outcomes for students with learning disabilities: Support for a combined strategy and direct instruction model. *Learning Disabilities Research & Practice, 14*(3), 129-140.

❍ Swanson, H.L., & Howard, C.B. (2005, Winter). Children with reading disabilities: Does dynamic assessment help in the classification? *Learning Disability Quarterly, 28,* 17-34.

This study was conducted to determine whether the cognitive performance of reading disabled and poor readers can be separated under dynamic assessment procedures and whether measures related to dynamic assessment add unique variance, beyond IQ, in predicting reading achievement scores. The sample consisted of 70 children (39 females and 31 males). Within this sample, four groups of children were compared: children with reading disabilities (*n*=12), children with math/reading disabilities (*n*=19), poor readers (*n*=14), and skilled readers (*n*=25). Intelligence, reading and math tests, and verbal working memory (WM) measures were administered (presented under static and dynamic testing conditions). Two important findings emerged: (a) hierarchical regression analyses found that a dynamic assessment measure factor score contributed unique variance to predicting reading and mathematics, beyond what is attributed to verbal IQ and initial scores related to WM and (b) poor readers and skilled readers were more likely to change and maintain their WM score gained under the dynamic testing conditions than children with reading disabilities or children with a combination of math/reading disabilities. Implications for a valid classification of reading disabilities are discussed.

Curriculum-Based Measurement (CBM)

❍ Brown-Chidsey, R., Davis, L., & Maya, C. (2003). Sources of variance in curriculum-based measures of silent reading. *Psychology in the Schools, 40*(4), 363-377.

❍ Deno, S.L. (1985). Curriculum-based measurement: The emerging alternative. *Exceptional Children, 52*(3), 219-232.

Despite general agreement that we should routinely assess the student performance outcomes of instruction, general agreement regarding how this should be done does not exist. Commercially distributed achievement tests are not always congruent with curriculum objectives and teachers tend not to value the information obtained from them. Informal observation of performance is the approach used and preferred by teachers. Unfortunately, the reliability and validity of teachers' informal observation of student academic performance is unknown. An emerging alternative to commercial standardized tests and to informal observations is curriculum-based measurement (CBM) that combines the advantages of both. Through standardizing observation of performance in the curriculum, CBM generates reliable data that are valid with respect to widely used indicators of achievement, such as achievement test scores, age, program placement, and teachers' judgments of competence. These data are now being used to make screening, referral, IEP planning, pupil progress, and program outcome decisions. This article provides background on and illustrations of the use of CBM in special education.

❍ Fuchs, L.S., & Fuchs, D. (1992). Identifying a measure for monitoring student reading progress. *School Psychology Review, 21*(1), 45-58.

Based on a decade of research, oral reading fluency has been identified as the standard task for monitoring reading progress within Curriculum-Based Measurement (CBM). Although a technically sound and useful measure for monitoring growth, collecting reading fluency on a routine basis can be time-consuming for teachers. Moreover, its acceptability as an index of comprehension has been questioned. The authors conducted a research program investigating alternative reading monitoring measures. The measures share two features: they are suitable for automatic data collection and scoring using two computers, and they appear acceptable as measures of reading comprehension. In this research program, the criterion validity of four reading measures was assessed. Based on results, a subset of measures was identified and their usefulness and technical features were studied as ongoing measures of reading progress over a series of years. This article summarizes

this research program and offers recommendations for alternative CBM reading monitoring systems and future investigation.

❍ Fuchs, L.S., Fuchs, D., & Compton, D.L. (2004). Monitoring early reading development in first grade: Word identification fluency versus nonsense word fluency. *Exceptional Children, 71*(1), 7-21.

This study contrasts the validity of two early reading curriculum-based measurement (CBM) measures: word identification fluency and nonsense word fluency. At-risk children (n = 151) were assessed (a) on criterion reading measures in the fall and spring of first grade and (b) on the two CBM measures each week for seven weeks and twice weekly for an additional 13 weeks. Concurrent and predictive validity for CBM performance level and predictive validity for CBM slopes demonstrated the superiority of word identification fluency over nonsense word fluency. Findings are discussed in terms of the measures' utility for identifying children in need of intensive instruction and for monitoring children's progress through first grade.

❍ Malecki, C.K., & Jewell, J. (2003). Developmental, gender, and practical considerations in scoring curriculum-based measurement writing probes. *Psychology in the Schools, 40*(4), 379-390.

The present study focused on CBM written language procedures by conducting an investigation of the developmental, gender, and practical considerations surrounding three categories of CBM written language scoring indices: production-dependent, production-independent, and accurate-production. Students in first- through eighth-grade generated a three-minute writing sample in the fall and spring of the school year using standard CBM procedures. The writing samples were scored using all three types of scoring indices to assess the trends in scoring indices for students of varying ages and gender and of the time required to score writing samples using various scoring indices. With only one exception, older students outperformed younger students on all of the scoring indices. Although at the middle school level, students' levels of writing fluency and writing accuracy were not closely associated, at the younger grade levels, the CBM indices were significantly related. With regard to gender differences, girls outperformed boys on measures of writing fluency at all grade levels. The average scoring time per writing sample ranged from 1-1/2 to 2-1/2 minutes (depending on grade level).

❍ Marston, D. (1989). *A curriculum-based measurement approach to assessing academic performance: What it is and why do it.* New York: Guilford Press.

❍ Shinn, M. (1989). *Identifying and defining academic problems: CBM screening and eligibility procedures.* New York: Guilford Press.

Higher Education

❍ Williams, J.P. (2005). Teachers college: An early focus on instruction. *Learning Disability Quarterly, 28*(2), 129-131.

The writer reflects on learning disabilities research at Teachers College, Columbia University, from 1971 to the present day.

History-Future of LD

❍ Scanlon, E. (Ed.). (2005). The future of LD. *Learning Disability Quarterly*. 28(2).

This issue of *LDQ*, highlighting where the LD field has been and where it is going, contains 24 short articles discussing learning disabilities at its current crossroads. The issue includes the individual articles listed below.

❍ Bateman, B. (2005). The play's the thing. *Learning Disability Quarterly, 28*(2), 93-95.

The writer reviews how awareness of and concern for children with learning disabilities (LD) has grown since the 1920s. She expresses the hope that the No Child Left Behind Act and the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act will lead to schools adopting proven, available teaching methods and materials for children with LD.

❍ Danielson, L., Doolittle, J., & Bradley, R. (2005). Past accomplishments and future challenges. *Learning Disability Quarterly, 28*(2), 137-139.

The writers provide hypotheses regarding the near-term future of the identification of learning disabilities.

❍ Healey, W.C. (2005). The learning disability phenomenon in pursuit of axioms. *Learning Disability Quarterly, 28*(2), 115-118.

The writer considers how Samuel Kirk's use of the term learning disabilities in 1963 has, despite containing axioms of undeniable truths, resulted in uncertainties and 42 years of unresolved issues in standardizing identification of learning disabilities. He discusses the expansion of the federal role in educating children with disabilities since Kirk's historic speech, eventful shifts in national priorities, insensitive paradigm shifts, and possible, probable, and preferred futures for the learning disabilities field.

❍ Lipsky, D.K. (2005). Are we there yet? *Learning Disability Quarterly, 28*(2), 156-158.

The writer examines the current status of the education of students with disabilities. She focuses on the areas of access to free appropriate public education; the achievement of quality academic, behavioral, and social outcomes; and the establishment of a unitary inclusive education system to prepare all students for a full and productive adult life.

❍ Lloyd, J.W., & Hallahan, D.P. (2005). Going forward: How the field of learning disabilities has and will contribute to education. *Learning Disability Quarterly, 28*(2), 133-136.

The writers discuss the various controversies to have afflicted the learning disabilities field in the past and its resilience in the face of skepticism and criticism. They maintain that despite an array of controversies since its inception, the learning disabilities field has been one of the main sources of empirically founded practices that have proven valuable to a wide spectrum of students, not just those with learning disabilities.

❍ Poplin, M., & Rogers, S.M. (2005). Recollections, apologies, and possibilities. *Learning Disability Quarterly, 28*(2), 159-162.

The writers reflect on the last few years of research, theory, and practice in learning disabilities and suggest new possibilities for the future.

❍ Rueda, R. (2005). Searching for the grand unifying theory: Reflections on the field of LD. *Learning Disability Quarterly, 28*(2), 168-170.

The writer outlines his own views on the future of the field of learning disabilities, which are informed and colored by his own research focus on social and cultural aspects of learning and motivation for individuals with disabilities and students in at-risk circumstances.

❍ Skrtic, T.M. (2005). A political economy of learning disabilities. *Learning Disability Quarterly, 28*(2), 149-155.

The writer reviews his earlier contributions to learning disabilities research, reflects on trends since then, and offers suggestions or predictions for the future of the field.

Neurology

❍ Galaburda, A.M. (2005). Neurology of learning disabilities: What will the future bring? The answer comes from the successes of the recent past. *Learning Disability Quarterly, 28*(2), 107-109.

The writer considers the past two decades of research into the neurology of dyslexia and suggests that dyslexia may represent the first example of a learning disability in which a possible pathway may link the observed behavior to an underlying neurological substrate that has a neuro-developmental history beginning with an abnormal gene. He notes that similar efforts are being made to link other cognitive disorders of development to a molecular pathway involved in brain development and offers recommendations for future research into the neurology of learning disabilities.

❍ Lee, C.M. (2005). Evolution. *Learning Disability Quarterly, 28*(2), 182-184.

The writer, who has learning disabilities, reflects on his childhood and his current focus on brain research.

❍ Rourke, B.P. (2005). Neuropsychology of learning disabilities: Past and future. *Learning Disability Quarterly, 28*(2), 111-114.

A review of research into the neuropsychology of learning disabilities is provided. This review covers general and subtypal definitions of learning disabilities, learning disabilities and brain dysfunction, psychosocial aspects of learning disabilities, and interventions for learning disabilities.

Policy

❍ 2004 Learning Disabilities Roundtable: Comments and recommendations on regulatory issues under the individuals with disabilities education improvement act of 2004 (2005).

❍ Division of Research to Practice (2002). *Specific learning disabilities: Finding common ground.* Washington, D.C.: U.S. Department of Education, Office of Special Education Programs.

❍ Individuals with Disabilities Education Improvement Act of 2004 (P.L. 108-446).

❍ Kavale, K.A., Fuchs D., & Scruggs, T.E. (1994). Setting the record straight on learning disability and low achievement: Implications for policy making. *Learning Disability Research and Practice, 9,* 70-77.

❍ Keogh, B.K. (2005). Revisiting classification and identification. *Learning Disability Quarterly, 28*(2), 100-102.

Despite years of effort and an extraordinary rise in the number of individuals diagnosed with learning disabilities (LD), there are still vagaries and inconsistencies with regard to classification, definition, and identification in the field of LD. These problems are, in part, related to a lack of clear boundaries between LD and other conditions and to definitions that serve political, legislative, advocacy, or intervention needs as well as research or "scientific" purposes. Limited and often inadequate or inappropriate operational methods of identification further compound classification problems. Issues surrounding the development of a classification system and the specification of identification procedures are discussed.

❍ Lichtenstein, R., Klotz, M.B., & Canter, A. (2002). NASP recommends changes in IDEA for learning disabilities. *NASP Communique, 30*(6)

❍ Martin, R. (2005). The future of learning disabilities as federal laws change again. *Learning Disability Quarterly, 28*(2), 144-146.

The writer discusses federal special education laws and their effect on parents, students, teachers, evaluators, school administrators, and the courts.

❍ National Association of School Psychologists, (2002). Learning disabilities criteria: Recommendations for change in IDEA reauthorization. *NASP Communique, 30*(6).

In preparation for the reauthorization of the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA),

the National Association of School Psychologists and partner organizations comprising the National Joint Committee on Learning Disabilities (NJCLD) were invited to provide recommendations for revision of current regulations. Specifically, NASP was asked to address the identification process and eligibility criteria. The following summary statements on Identification Process and Eligibility Criteria were synthesized from the input provided by NASP members and leaders and submitted to the NJCLD roundtable workgroup. These summaries are intended not only to approximate consensus but also to maximize consistency with NASP position statements and with rigorous research in the field of learning disabilities.

❍ National Center for Learning Disabilities. (2002, May). Maintaining rights – achieving better outcomes: Identifying and serving students with learning disabilities (Concept paper). New York: Author.

❍ Reschly, D.J., & Hosp, J.L. (2004). State SLD identification policies and practices. *Learning Disability Quarterly, 27*(4), 197-213.

Specific learning disabilities (SLD) conceptual definitions and classification criteria were examined through a survey of state education agency (SEA) SLD contact persons in an effort to update information last published in 1996. Most prior trends continued over the last decade. Results showed that SEA SLD classification criteria continue to be dominated by three features: severe discrepancy between intellectual ability and achievement, specific achievement areas, and exclusion factors. Significant variability between states also continues to exist in SLD prevalence, conceptual definitions, and classification criteria. SLD diagnostic decisions depend heavily on SEA classification criteria, producing potential changes in the eligibility of children for special education depending on their state of residence. Dissatisfaction with current SLD criteria is discussed along with likely future trends.

❍ Weintraub, F. (2005). The evolution of LD policy and future challenges. *Learning Disability Quarterly, 28*(2), 97-99.

The writer reviews the status of education for students with learning disabilities (LD), 42 years after Sam Kirk proposed the use of the term. Adopting a policy perspective within the context of historical antecedents, the writer examines whether students with LD receive their entitlement to a free appropriate public education, whether there are too many students classified as having LD, and whether such students receive an appropriate education.

Problem-Solving Model

❍ Marston, D., Muyskens, P., Lau, M., & Canter, A. (2003). Problem-solving model for decision making with high-incidence disabilities: The Minneapolis experience. *Learning Disabilities Research and Practice, 18*(3), 187-200.

The problem-solving model (PSM) is used in the Minneapolis Public Schools to guide decisions regarding (1) interventions in general education, (2) referral to special education, and (3) evaluation for special education eligibility for high-incidence disability areas. District implementation was driven by four themes: the appropriateness of intelligence tests and the IQ-achievement discrepancy for determination of eligibility, bias in assessment, allocation of school psychologist time, and linking assessment to instruction through curriculum-based measurement. This article describes how the PSM was designed as a three-stage process to measure response to intervention and used in the special education eligibility process. Program evaluation data collected since initial implementation in 1994 is reported in the areas of child count, achievement, referral, eligibility, and disproportion. The authors discuss the limitations of conducting PSM research in school settings and barriers to implementation of PSM and make suggestions for enhancing treatment integrity.

Responsiveness to Intervention (RTI)

❍ Bradley, R. & Danielson, L. (Eds.) (2004). The Office of Special Education Program's LD Initiative: A context for inquiry and consensus. [Special issue]. *Learning Disability Quarterly, 27*(4).

This issue of *LDQ*, highlighting the Office of Special Education Program's LD Initiative, contains eight articles addressing learning disabilities determination and responsiveness to intervention issues.

❍ Hughes, C. (Ed.) (2003). Research and Practice [Special Series]. *Learning Disabilities Research and Practice, 18*(3).

This issue of *LDR&P* contains six articles addressing responsiveness within learning disabilities identification.

❍ Fletcher, J.M., Coulter, W.A., & Reschly, D.J. (2004). Alternative approaches to the definition and identification of learning disabilities: Some questions and answers. *Annals of Dyslexia, 54*(2), 304-331.

Recent consensus reports concur in suggesting major changes in the federal regulatory approach to the identification of learning disabilities (LD). These reports recommend abandoning the IQ-achievement discrepancy model and the use of IQ tests for identification and also recommend incorporation of response to instruction (RTI) as one of the identification criteria. These changes also are recommended to states in the current reauthorization of the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA). Although the changes are not mandatory, states that follow these recommendations will experience major changes in identification and treatment of students served under the LD category. This paper reviews the basis for these recommendations, summarizing four recent consensus group reports on special education that concur in suggesting these changes. Seventeen commonly asked questions about these changes are presented, with responses. To ensure adequate instruction for students with LD, it is essential that identification practices focus on assessments that are directly related to instruction, that any services for students who are struggling prioritize intervention over eligibility, and that special education be permitted to focus more on results and outcomes and less on eligibility and process. Identification models that incorporate RTI represent a shift in special education toward the goals of better achievement and behavioral outcomes for students identified with LD, as well as those students at risk for LD.

❍ Fuchs, D., Deshler, D.D., & Reschly, D.J. (2004). National research center on learning disabilities: Multimethod studies of identification and classification issues. *Learning Disability Quarterly, 27*(4), 189-195.

Four lines of programmatic activity being pursued by staff at the National Research Center on Learning Disabilities are described. They involve providing technical assistance and dissemination to a wide range of end users nationwide, conducting a national search for exemplary responsiveness-to-intervention methods of identifying students with learning disabilities, randomized field trials to examine the relative use of specific identification methods in reading and mathematics, and surveys and focus groups to describe and comprehend state- and local-level identification practices.

❍ Fuchs, D., Fuchs, L.S., & Compton, D.L. (2004). Identifying reading disabilities by responsiveness-to-instruction: Specifying measures and criteria. *Learning Disability Quarterly, 27*(4), 216-227.

First, the authors describe two types of assessment (problem solving and standard treatment protocol) within a "responsiveness-to-instruction" framework to identify learning disabilities. They then specify two necessary components (measures and classification criteria) to assess responsiveness-to-instruction and present pertinent findings from two related studies. These studies involve databases at grades one and two, which were analyzed to compare the soundness of alternative methods of assessing instructional responsiveness to identify reading disabilities. Finally, conclusions are drawn and future research is outlined to prospectively and longitudinally explore classification issues that emerged from our analyses.

❍ Fuchs, D., Mock, D., Morgan, P.L., & Young, C.L. (2003). Responsiveness-to-intervention: Definitions, evidence, and implications for the learning disabilities construct. *Learning Disabilities Research and Practice, 18*(3), 157-171.

Longstanding concern about how learning disabilities (LD) are defined and identified, coupled with recent efforts in Washington, D.C., to eliminate IQ-achievement discrepancy as an LD marker, have led to serious public discussion about alternative identification methods. The most popular of the alternatives is responsiveness-to-intervention (RTI), of which there are two basic versions: the "problem-solving" model and the "standard-protocol" approach. The authors describe both types, review empirical evidence bearing on their effectiveness and feasibility, and conclude that more needs to be understood before RTI may be viewed as a valid means of identifying students with LD.

❍ Fuchs, L.S. (2003). Assessing intervention responsiveness: Conceptual and technical issues. *Learning Disabilities Research and Practice, 18*(3), 172-186.

Implementing an intervention responsiveness approach to the identification of learning disabilities (LD) requires specification of procedures for the assessment process. In this article, the author uses examples in the literature to explore conceptual and technical issues associated with options for specifying three assessment components: the timing of the measurement of student response to intervention; the criterion for demarcating learning as inadequate (below which students are identified as LD); and the nature of the intervention. Then, the author summarizes research contrasting alternative assessment methods within an intervention responsiveness approach to LD identification. Conclusions are drawn, and future related work is described.

❍ Gresham, F. (2002). Responsiveness to intervention: An alternative approach to the identification of learning disabilities. In R. Bradley, L. Danielson, & D.P. Hallahan (Eds.), *Identification of learning disabilities: Research to practice.* Mahwah, NJ.: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

The learning disabilities (LD) category now accounts for 52 percent of all students with disabilities served in special education under the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA). However, the process by which public schools identify students as learning disabled (LD) often appears confusing, unfair, and logically inconsistent. G. Reid Lyon of the National Institute of Child Health and Human Development suggests that "learning disabilities have become a sociological sponge to wipe up the spills of general education." Findings over the past 15 years have pointed out the lack of consistent definition in policy or practice in the identification of students with LD, a circumstance that has been a major stumbling block to effective research and practice. Research findings indicate that substantial proportions of school-identified students with LD—from 52 to 70 percent—fail to meet state or federal eligibility criteria. Further, between 1976–77 and 1996–97, the number of students served as LD increased 283 percent. During this same period, according to the U.S. Department of Education, the number of students served as mentally retarded (MR) decreased 60 percent.

❍ Hickman P., Linan-Thompson S., & Vaughn S. (2003). Response to instruction as a means of identifying students with reading/learning disabilities. *Exceptional Children, 69,* 391-410.

❍ Mellard, D.F., Byrd, S.E., & Johnson, E. (2004). Foundations and research on identifying model responsiveness-to-intervention sites. *Learning Disability Quarterly, 27*(4), 243-256.

As regulations are rewritten regarding school-based learning disabilities identification practices, the components of those practices are likely to change. For example, cognitive assessment and aptitude-achievement discrepancy might be less important. A student's responsiveness-to-intervention (RTI) is emerging as an important construct for assessing underachievement. This article provides a framework for understanding how RTI fits as one LD determination component, describes research on RTI, and outlines the NRCLD's research efforts to examine current RTI implementation in schools and model site selection.

❍ Speece, D.L., Case, L.P., & Molloy, D.E. (2003). Responsiveness to general education instruction as the first gate to learning disabilities identification. *Learning Disabilities Research and Practice, 18*(3), 147-156.

Most definitions of learning disabilities (LD) include a qualification that adequate general education instruction was received and the child with LD did not benefit. Rarely is this tenet assessed in either practice or research before a diagnosis is made. The authors review three studies that investigated children's responsiveness to general education reading instruction as an indicator of need for more intensive interventions. Adequacy of instruction was quantified by children's level and rate of progress, compared to classmates, as measured by curriculum-based measures of oral reading fluency. They found that the response-to-instruction model tested was valid in that (1) children who differ from their peers on level and slope of performance (dual discrepancy) have more severe academic and behavioral problems than children who have IQ-achievement discrepancies or low achievement; (2) children who demonstrate persistent limited responsiveness over three years differ from other at-risk children on reading, reading-related, and behavioral measures; and (3) at-risk children who participated in specially designed general education interventions had better outcomes than at-risk children who did not participate. The authors conducted additional analyses to assess low achievement definitional variations and found that they lack sensitivity and coverage compared to a dual discrepancy definition.

❍ Vaughn, S.A., & Fuchs, L.S. (2003). Redefining learning disabilities as inadequate response to instruction: The promise and potential problems. *Learning Disabilities Research and Practice, 18*(3), 137-146.

In this introduction to the special issue, a response-to-instruction approach to learning disabilities (LD) identification is discussed. Then, an overview of the promise and the potential pitfalls of such an approach is provided. The potential benefits include identification of students based on risk rather than deficit, early identification and instruction, reduction of identification bias, and linkage of identification assessment with instructional planning. Questions concern the integrity of the LD concept, the need for validated interventions and assessment methods, the adequacy of response to instruction as the endpoint in identification, the appropriate instruction intensity, the need for adequately trained personnel, and due process. Finally, an overview of the articles constituting the special issue is provided.

❍ Ysseldyke, J. (2005). Assessment and decision making for students with learning disabilities: What if this is as good as it gets? *Learning Disability Quarterly, 28*(2), 125-128.

The writer discusses the future of the learning disabilities field. He contends that despite calls for identification practices to change, the LD field still engages in many of the same old practices. He outlines potential future problems with response-to-intervention approaches.

Scientific-Based Research

❍ Denton, C.A., Vaughn, S., & Fletcher, J.M. (2003). Bringing research-based practice in reading intervention to scale. *Learning Disabilities Research and Practice, 18*(3), 201-211.

Multiple consensus reports have provided converging evidence regarding effective instruction for students who have difficulty learning to read. Evidence-based instruction in general education classrooms must be in place to implement response-to-intervention models. Despite the well-developed knowledge base supporting the value of interventions that have been demonstrated to have positive outcomes, these interventions are not widely employed in typical classroom instruction, and models of service delivery for students with reading and learning disabilities implemented in schools are often ineffective. Recent research has demonstrated that this need not be the case, but there are many obstacles to change. Large-scale implementation of effective educational practices for struggling readers depends on a research agenda that directly addresses questions related to scaling and sustaining educational innovations. The authors suggest that reform depends on collaboration among researchers, educational practitioners, teacher educators, and policymakers, with the common goal of improving outcomes for students who might otherwise experience reading failure.

❍ Fletcher, J.M., Lyon, R., Barnes, M., Stuebing, K., Francis, D.J., Olson, R., et al. Classification of learning disabilities: An evidence-based evaluation. In R. Bradley, L. Danielson, & D.P. Hallahan (Eds.), *Identification of learning disabilities: Research to practice.* Mahwah, NJ.: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

The purpose of this paper is to review research on the classification of learning disabilities (LD). The authors begin by briefly reviewing the nature of classification research. Then they discuss the evolution of definitions of LD, making explicit the classification hypotheses will be provided for the three components of classification implicit in the federal definition of LD: discrepancy, heterogeneity, and exclusion. The authors contend that classification hypotheses involving discrepancy and exclusion as embedded in federal (and state) policy have at best weak validity, often representing inaccurate and outdated assumptions about LD. There is evidence for heterogeneity of LD, but some reorganization of the types of LD identified in the federal definition may be necessary. Throughout the paper, they identify alternative approaches to classification and identification, including weaknesses in any psychometric approach to the identification of LD. They suggest that classifications are based on inclusionary definitions that specify attributes of different forms of LD are more desirable than current exclusionary definitions. Inclusionary definitions permit a focus on identification procedures that are intervention oriented as well as a focus on prevention, both of which are desirable and could contribute to improved results in remediating LD.

❍ Lyon, G.R. (2005). Why scientific research must guide educational policy and instructional practices in learning disabilities. *Learning Disability Quarterly, 28*(2), 140-143.

The writer highlights the need to sustain and build on scientific research investments to ensure that the educational and social needs of children and adults with learning disabilities are addressed in an optimal manner.

Second Language Learners

❍ Figueroa, R.A. (2005). Dificultades o desabilidades de aprendizaje? *Learning Disability Quarterly, 28*(2), 163-167.

The writer argues that the field of learning disabilities (LD) knows very little about Latino students in the U.S. and claims that the future of LD could mimic the field of mental retardation if it does not counter the potential problems of social construction in diagnosis and irreparable educational harm in pedagogy for Latino students.

Social Skills Domain

❍ Bryan, T. (2005). Science-based advances in the social domain of learning disabilities. *Learning Disability Quarterly, 28*(2), 119-121.

Drawing on research conducted at the Chicago Institute for Learning Disabilities, the writer discusses science-based advances in the social domain of learning disabilities. After reviewing how students with learning disabilities are at risk for problems in various aspects of the social domain, she discusses studies of effective interventions, particularly as they relate to positive affect induction and attribution retraining. The writer concludes by briefly considering the future of social skills research.

❍ Cartledge, G. (2005). Learning disabilities and social skills: Reflections. *Learning Disability Quarterly, 28*(2), 179-181.

The writer discusses how, despite the challenges, those in the field of learning disabilities must increase, not relax, their commitment to effective social skill interventions.

Technology

❍ Blackhurst, A.E. (2005). Perspectives on applications of technology in the field of learning disabilities. *Learning Disability Quarterly, 28*(2), 175-178.

The writer describes how concepts related to the use of technology in education have evolved, focusing on their implications for people with learning disabilities.

Validity

❍ Fuchs, L.S., Fuchs, D., & Speece, D.L. (2002). Treatment validity as a unifying construct for identifying learning disabilities. *Learning Disability Quarterly, 25*(1), 33-45.

The purpose of this article is to revisit the issue of treatment validity as a framework for identifying learning disabilities. In 1995, an eligibility assessment process, rooted within a treatment validity model, was proposed that (a) examines the level of a student's performance as well as his or her responsiveness to instruction, (b) reserves judgment about the need for special education until the effects of individual student adaptations in the regular classroom have been explored, and (c) prior to placement, verifies that a special education program enhances learning. The authors review the components of this model and reconsider the advantages and disadvantages of verifying a special education program's effectiveness prior to placement.

Internet Resources

The following provide Internet links to information specific to the topic heading. NRCLD does not necessarily endorse these links; rather, they are intended to provide additional background information and perspectives about the topic.

Responsiveness to Intervention

❍ National Research Center on Learning Disabilities (NRCLD) web site: http://www.nrcld.org

❍ NRCLD Responsiveness-To-Intervention Symposium materials, December 4-5, 2003, contains papers, video and Microsoft® PowerPoint slides from presentations made during a two-day conference focused entirely on aspects of responsiveness to intervention.
http://www.nrcld.org/symposium2003

❍ Core concepts of Responsiveness to Intervention (NRCLD web site).
http://www.nrcld.org/research/rti/concepts.shtml

❍ Mellard, D. (2003). *Understanding Responsiveness to Intervention in Learning Disabilities Determination,* NRCLD paper available at http://www.nrcld.org/publications/papers/mellard.shtml

❍ Learning Disabilities Summit: Building a Foundation for the Future. (2001, August).
http://www.air.org/ldsummit/

❍ What is Responsiveness-to-Intervention?
(American Speech-Language-Hearing Association web site).
http://www.asha.org/about/publications/leader-online/archives/2005/050322/050322b2.htm

Progress Monitoring

❍ The National Center on Student Progress Monitoring. http://www.studentprogress.org

Special Education Technical Assistance and Dissemination Network Resources

The U.S. Department of Education, Office of Special Education and Rehabilitative Services supports numerous centers and organizations that have topical interest and expertise as part of its Special Education Technical Assistance and Dissemination Network Centers. The following list provides contact information for those centers.

Dissemination

❍ **National Dissemination Center for Children with Disabilities (NICHCY)**
Academy for Educational Development
P.O. Box 1492
Washington, DC 20013-1492
phone: 800.695.0285; 202.884.8200
fax: 202.884.8441
TTY: 800.695.0285; 202.884.8200
e-mail: nichcy@aed.org
http://www.nichcy.org

❍ **Reading Rockets**
WETA
2775 S. Quincy Street
Arlington, VA 22206
phone: 703.998.2001 | fax: 703.998.2060
e-mail: info@readingrockets.org
http://readingrockets.org

Early Childhood

❍ **National Early Childhood Technical Assistance Center (NECTAC)**
Campus Box 8040, UNC-CH
Chapel Hill, NC 27599-8040
phone: 919.962.2001 | fax: 919.966.7463
TTY: 919.843.3269
e-mail: nectac@unc.edu
http://www.nectac.org

Learning Disabilities Initiative

❍ **National Research Center on Learning Disabilities (NRCLD)**
Vanderbilt University
Peabody College, Box 328
Nashville, TN 37203-5701
phone: 615.322.8150
fax: 615.343.1570
e-mail: nrcld@ku.edu
http://nrcld.org

University of Kansas
Center for Research on Learning
1122 West Campus Road
Joseph R. Pearson Hall, Rm 517
Lawrence, KS 66045-3101
phone: 785.864.7072
fax: 785.864.5728
e-mail: nrcld@ku.edu
http://nrcld.org

Minorities

❍ **Linking Academic Scholars to Educational Resources (Project LASER)**
University of South Florida
Department of Special Education
4202 East Fowler Avenue, EDU 162
Tampa, FL 33620
phone: 813.974.1384 | fax: 813.974.5542
e-mail: laser@tempest.coedu.usf.edu
http://www.coedu.usf.edu/laser

❍ **National Center for Culturally Responsive Educational Systems (NCCRESt)**
University of Colorado at Denver
1380 Lawrence Street, Suite 625
Denver, CO 80204
phone: 303.556.3990 | fax: 303.556.6141
e-mail: elizabeth.kozleski@cudenver.edu
e-mail: shelley.zion@cudenver.edu
http://www.nccrest.org

❍ **National Center for Personnel Preparation in Special Education at Minority Institutions of Higher Education (Monarch Center)**
University of Illinois at Chicago
1640 West Roosevelt Road
(M/C947), Room 651
Chicago, IL 60608
phone: 866.323.7648 | fax: 312.996.1427
e-mail: monarch@uic.edu
http://www.monarchcenter.org

Outcomes

❍ **The Early Childhood Outcomes Center: Demonstrating Results for Infants, Toddlers, and Preschoolers with Disabilities and Their Families**
SRI International
333 Ravenswood Avenue
Menlo Park, CA 94025-3493
phone: 530.758.7483 | fax: 530.753.0832
e-mail: kathleen.hebbeler@sri.com
http://www.the-eco-center.org

❍ **National Center on Educational Outcomes (NCEO)**
University of Minnesota
350 Elliott Hall
75 East River Road
Minneapolis, MN 55455
phone: 612.626.1530 | fax: 612.624.0879
e-mail: scott027@umn.edu
http://www.nceo.info

Parents

❍ **Technical Assistance ALLIANCE for Parent Centers**
National Technical Assistance Center
PACER Center
8161 Normandale Blvd
Minneapolis, MN 55437-1044
phone: 888.248.0822; 952.838.9000
fax: 952.838.0199
TTY: 952.838.0190
e-mail: alliance@taalliance.org
http://www.taalliance.org

Region 1 ALLIANCE for Parent Centers
❍ **Technical Assistance Center**
Statewide Parent Advocacy Network (SPAN)
35 Halsey Street, 4th Floor
Newark, NJ 07102
phone: 973.642.8100 | fax: 973.642.8080
e-mail: diana.autin@spannj.org
e-mail: debra.jennings@spannj.org
http://www.spannj.org

Region 2 ALLIANCE for Parent Centers
❍ **Technical Assistance Center**
Exceptional Children's Assistance Center (ECAC)
907 Barra Row, Suite 102/103
Davidson, NC 28036
phone: 704.892.1321 | fax: 704.892.5028
e-mail: ecacta@ecacmail.org
http://www.ecac-parentcenter.org

Region 3 ALLIANCE for Parent Centers
❍ **Technical Assistance Center**
Family Network on Disabilities of Florida
2735 Whitney Road
Clearwater, FL 33760-1610
phone: 727.523.1130 | fax: 727.523.8687
e-mail: fnd@fndfl.org
http://www.fndfl.org

Region 4 ALLIANCE for Parent Centers
❍ **Technical Assistance Center**
Ohio Coalition for the Education of Children with Disabilities (OCECD)
165 West Center Street, Suite 302
Marion, OH 43302-3741
phone: 740.382.5452 | fax: 740.383.6421
e-mail: ocecd@gte.net
http://www.ocecd.org

Region 5 ALLIANCE for Parent Centers
❍ **Technical Assistance Center**
PEAK Parent Center
611 North Weber, Suite 200
Colorado Springs, CO 80903
phone: 719.531.9400 | fax: 719.531.9452
e-mail: info@peakparent.org
http://www.peakparent.org

Region 6 ALLIANCE for Parent Centers
❍ **Technical Assistance Center**
Matrix Parent Network and Resource Center
94 Galli Drive, Suite C
Novato, CA 94949
phone: 415.884.3535 | fax: 415.884.3555
e-mail: region6@matrixparents.org
http://www.matrixparents.org

Postsecondary

❍ **Midwest Center for Postsecondary Outreach (MCPO)**
Saint Paul College - A Community & Technical College
235 Marshall Avenue
St. Paul, MN 55102
phone: 651.846.1337 | fax: 651.221.1339
TTY: 651.846.1337
e-mail: dave@mcpo.org
http://www.mcpo.org
http://www.pepnet.org

❍ **National Post-School Outcomes Center**
1268 University of Oregon
Eugene, OR 97403-1268
phone: 541.346.5641 | fax: 541.346.0322
e-mail: jafalls@uoregon.edu
http://psocenter.org

❍ **The National Clearinghouse on Postsecondary Education for Individuals with Disabilities, HEATH Resource Center**
The George Washington University
2121 K Street, NW, Suite 220
Washington, DC 20037
phone: 202.973.0904; 800.544.3284 fax: 202.973.0908
e-mail: askheath@gwu.edu
http://www.heath.gwu.edu

Technology

❍ **Center for Implementing Technology in Education (CITEd)**
American Institutes for Research
1000 Thomas Jefferson Street, NW
Washington, DC 20007-3835
phone: 202.403.5000 | fax: 202.403.5001
e-mail: citeducation@air.org
http://www.cited.org

❍ **NIMAS Development and Technical Assistance Center**
CAST
40 Harvard Mills Square, Suite 3
Wakefield, MA 01880
phone: 781.245.2212 | fax: 781.245.5212
TTY: 781.245.9320
e-mail: chitchcock@cast.org
e-mail: sstahl@cast.org
http://nimas.cast.org

Transition

❍ **National Center on Secondary Education and Transition (NCSET)**
University of Minnesota
6 Pattee Hall
150 Pillsbury Drive SE
Minneapolis, MN 55455
phone: 612.624.2097 | fax: 612.624.9344
e-mail: ncset@umn.edu
http://www.ncset.org

Other Projects

❍ **The Access Center: Improving Outcomes for All Students K-8**
American Institutes for Research
1000 Thomas Jefferson Street, NW
Washington, DC 20007-3835
phone: 202.403.5300 | fax: 202.403.5454
TTY: 877.334.3499
e-mail: accesscenter@air.org
http://www.k8accesscenter.org

❍ **Center for Improving Teacher Quality**
Council for Chief State School Officers
One Massachusetts Avenue, NW, Suite 700
Washington, DC 20001-1431
phone: 202.336.7001 | fax: 202.371.1766
http://www.ccsso.org/intasc

❍ **Center on Positive Behavioral Interventions and Supports (PBIS)**
1235 University of Oregon
1761 Alder Street
Eugene, OR 97403
phone: 541.346.2505 | fax: 541.346.5517
e-mail: pbis@uoregon.edu
http://www.pbis.org

❍ **Consortium for Appropriate Dispute Resolution in Special Education (CADRE)**
Direction Service, Inc.
P.O. Box 51360
Eugene, OR 97405-0906
phone: 541.686.5060 | fax: 541.686.5063
V/TTY: 800.695.0285 (NICHCY)
e-mail: cadre@directionservice.org
http://www.directionservice.org/cadre

❍ **IDEA Partnership**
National Association of State Directors of Special Education (NASDSE)
1800 Diagonal Road, Suite 320
Alexandria, VA 22314-2840
phone: 877-IDEA-INFO; 703.519.3800 fax: 703.519.3808
e-mail: partnership@nasdse.org
http://www.ideainfo.org

❍ **IRIS Center for Faculty Enhancement (IRIS)**
Vanderbilt University
101 Hill Student Center
Peabody College
Nashville, TN 37203
phone: 866.626.4747 | fax: 615.343.5611
e-mail: iris@vanderbilt.edu
http://iris.peabody.vanderbilt.edu

❍ **National Center for Special Education Accountability Monitoring (NCSEAM)**
Human Development Center
Louisiana State University
Health Sciences Center
1100 Florida Avenue, Building 138
New Orleans, LA 70119
phone: 504.942.8212 | fax: 504.942.8305
TTY: 504.942.5900
e-mail: acoulter@lsuhsc.edu
http://www.monitoringcenter.lsuhsc.edu

❍ **The National Center for Special Education Personnel and Related Service Providers**
(Personnel Center)
National Association of State Directors of Special Education (NASDSE)
1800 Diagonal Road Suite 320
Alexandria, VA 22314
phone: 866.BECOME1 | fax 703.519.3808
e-mail: info@personnelcenter.org
http://www.personnelcenter.org

❍ **National Center on Education, Disability, and Juvenile Justice (EDJJ)**
Department of Special Education
University of Maryland
College Park, MD 20742
phone: 301.405.6462 | fax: 301.314.5757
e-mail: edjj@umail.umd.edu
http://www.edjj.org

❍ **National Center on Student Progress Monitoring (NCSPM)**
American Institutes for Research
1000 Thomas Jefferson Street, NW
Washington, DC 20007
phone: 202.403.5300 | fax: 202.403.5454
TTY: 877.334.3499
e-mail: studentprogress@air.org
http://www.studentprogress.org

❍ **National Dropout Prevention Center for Students with Disabilities**
Clemson University
209 Martin Street
Clemson, SC 29631-1555
phone: 864.656.2599 | fax: 864.656.0136
e-mail: sjay@clemson.edu
e-mail: lbost@clemson.edu
http://www.dropoutprevention.org

❍ **National Institute for Urban School Improvement**
University of Colorado at Denver
1380 Lawrence Street, Suite 625
Denver, CO 80204
phone: 303.556.3990 | fax: 303.556.6141
e-mail: elizabeth.kozleski@cudenver.edu
e-mail: shelley.zion@cudenver.edu
http://www.inclusiveschools.org

❍ **Project FORUM**
National Association of State Directors of Special Education (NASDSE)
1800 Diagonal Road, Suite 320
Alexandria, VA 22314-2840
phone: 703.519.3800 | fax: 703.519.3808
TTY: 703.519.7008
e-mail: forum@nasdse.org
http://www.nasdse.org

Regional Resource and Federal Centers

OSEP has funded six regional resource centers (RRCs) to assist state education agencies with implementing IDEA. These resource centers are working with the National Research Center on Learning Disabilities in identifying and evaluating schools using responsiveness to intervention in preventing reading problems and LD determination. RRC staffs participate in dissemination and technical assistance activities.

❍ **The Federal Resource Center for Special Education (FRC)**
Academy for Educational Development (AED)
1825 Connecticut Avenue NW
Washington, DC 20009
phone: 202.884.8215 • fax: 202.884.8443
TTY: 202.884.8200
e-mail: frc@aed.org
http://www.rrfcnetwork.org

Region 1 RRC
❍ **Northeast Regional Resource Center (NERRC)**
Learning Innovations at WestEd
20 Winter Sport Lane
Williston, VT 05495
phone: 802/951-8213 * fax: 802/951-8222
TTY: 802/951-8213
e-mail: nerrc@wested.org
http://www.rrfcnetwork.org/nerrc//

Region 2 RRC
❍ **The Alliance for Systems Change, Mid-South Regional Resource Center (MSRRC)**
Interdisciplinary Human Development Institute/UK
1 Quality Street, Suite 722
Lexington, KY 40507
phone: 859/257-4921 • fax: 859/257-4353
TTY: 859/257-2903
e-mail: tblythe@uky.edu
http://www.rrfcnetwork.org/msrrc

Region 3 RRC
❍ **Southeast Regional Resource Center (SERRC)**
School of Education
Auburn University Montgomery
PO Box 244023
Montgomery, LS 36124-4023
phone: 334/244-3100 • fax: 334/244-3101
e-mail: ebeale@mail.aum.edu
http://www.rrfcnetwork.org/serrc

Region 4 RRC
❍ **North Central Regional Resource Center (NCRRC)**
Institute on Community Integration
University of Minnesota
150 Pillsbury Drive, SE
5 Pattee hall
Minneapolis, MN 55455
phone: 612/624-9722 • fax: 612/624-9344
TTY: 800/627-3529
e-mail: contactus@northcentral-rrc.org
http://www.rrfcnetwork.org/ncrrc

Region 5 RRC
❍ **Mountain Plains Regional Resource Center (MPRRC)**
Utah State University
1780 North Research Pkwy, Suite 112
Logan, UT 84341
phone: 435/752-0238• fax: 435/753-9750
TTY: 435/753-9750
e-mail: cope@ cc.usu.edu
http://www.rrfcnetwork.org/mprrc

Region 6 RRC
❍ **Western Regional Resource Center (WRRC)**
1268 University of Oregon
Eugene, OR 97403-1268
phone: 541/346-5641 • fax: 541/346-0322
TTY: 541/346-0367
e-mail: wrrc@uoregon.edu
http://www.rrfcnetwork.org/wrrc

Resources for Further Information

The National Research Center on Learning Disabilities (NRCLD), funded by the U.S. Office of Special Education Programs (OSEP), is a joint project of researchers at Vanderbilt University and the University of Kansas. NRCLD has been charged with spearheading continuing work on scientific, research-based interventions as a promising component of identification procedures for SLD while educators seek improved practices beyond achievement testing, history, and child observation. NRCLD's primary mission is to research the critical issues surrounding SLD identification, explore alternative processes for accurate and efficient identification of children with SLD, track state- and local-level SLD identification practices, and provide technical assistance and dissemination of research results and best practices to states. In this Resource List, NRCLD has provided literature, Internet, and OSEP technical assistance center resource information. Additional information can be obtained from the U.S. Department of Education's Office of Special Education Programs' web site: www.ed.gov/osers/osep.

IDEAs that Work
U.S. Office of Special Education Programs

NRCLD is a joint project of researchers at Vanderbilt University and the University of Kansas. This document was produced under U.S. Department of Education Grant No. H324U010004. Renee Bradley served as the project officer. The views expressed herein do not necessarily represent the positions or policies of the Department of Education. No official endorsement by the U.S. Department of Education of any product, commodity, service or enterprise mentioned in this publication is intended or should be inferred.

Starrett, B.E., de Boer, S.R., & Tollefson, J.M. (2007). Resource list: Specific learning disabilities and responsiveness to intervention [Brochure]. Lawrence, KS: National Research Center on Learning Disabilities.