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## What is the $\mathrm{P}-\mathrm{O}-\mathrm{S}-\mathrm{E}_{\circ}$

The P-O-S-E@: Phonological / Orthographic Substitution Evaluation is a criterion-referenced assessment instrument, designed to probe for substitution errors in a child's phonological (spoken) and orthographic (written, scored as equivalent phonology) representations of target short vowels presented in monosyllabic non-word and real word spelling and reading tasks; i.e. an incorrect phoneme is substituted for the target phoneme.
> Silent /e/ rule test items are incorporated as a crosscheck and validation of the depth of short vowel proficiency. Outcomes provide prescriptive interventional direction when indicated.

## What does the $\mathrm{P}-\mathrm{O}-\mathrm{S}-\mathrm{E}$ © measure ?

> A criterion-referenced screening test, the Phonological Orthographic Substitution Evaluation ( $\mathrm{P}-\mathrm{O}-\mathrm{S}-\mathrm{E}$ ) is designed to extract underlying phonological codes operating in the student's reading and spelling processes.
> The $\mathrm{P}-\mathrm{O}-\mathrm{S}-$ Ee elicits the sound/symbol system utilized by students in the automaticity of spelling \& reading.
> $\mathrm{P}-\mathrm{O}-\mathrm{S}-\mathrm{E}$ © focuses on short vowel proficiency using monosyllabic non-words and low frequency of occurrence real words.
> $\mathrm{P}-\mathrm{O}-\mathrm{S}-\mathrm{E} \odot$ target level is Grade 3 with option to survey Grade 2.

## How were $\mathrm{P}-\mathrm{O}-\mathrm{S}-\mathrm{E}_{\odot}$ test items selected?

> A short vowel assessment instrument was constructed using monosyllabic real and non-words in CVC (short vowel) and CCVCC (short vowel and silent /e/) formats, balancing target vowel occurrences, consonants and blends while avoiding homonyms.
> Given the inverse relationship between word-frequency and time required for perception (Hall, 1953), thirty low probability monosyllabic words were selected from catalogued vocabularies. (Thorndike, 1968; British National Corpus, via Webster's Online Dictionary, Rosetta Edition). Monophonic and biphonic phonotactic probabilities (Vitevitch, 2004) did not differ for real and non-word items ( $\mathrm{P}>.10$ ).
$>$ Subsequent validation of real word frequency counts ( $=4.4 / 10 \wedge 6 ; \mathrm{SE}=0.8$ ) was obtained using the Corpus of Contemporary English (Davies, 2008)

## P-O-S-E® Low-Frequency-of-Occurrence Real Words



## P-O-S-E® Non-Word and Real Word Phoneme/Biphone Phonotactic Probabilities

|  | P.O.S.E Pseudo-word $\mathrm{sV}+/ \mathrm{E} /$ test items "Klattese" | Phoneme probabilities Pseudo-words | $\begin{gathered} \text { P-O-S-E } \\ \text { pseudo-word } \\ \text { SV }+/ \mathrm{E} / \text { test items } \end{gathered}$ | P.O-S-E real word SV $+/$ /E/ test items "Klattese" | Phoneme probabilities Real words | $\begin{gathered} \text { P-O-S-E } \\ \text { Pseudo-word } \\ \text { SV }+/ E / \text { test items } \\ \text { "Klattese" } \end{gathered}$ | Biphone probabilities Pseudo-words pseudo-words | $\begin{gathered} \text { P-O.S-E } \\ \text { real word } \\ \text { SV }+/ \mathrm{E} / \text { test items } \end{gathered}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 | vip | 0.1558 | vip | t@b | 0.1499 | vip | 0.0088 | tab |
| 2 | rEt | 0.1890 | ret | nlp | 0.1572 | rEt | 0.0133 | nip |
| 3 | $\mathrm{s}^{\wedge} \mathrm{g}$ | 0.1595 | sug | $\mathrm{P}^{\wedge} \mathrm{n}$ | 0.1353 | $\mathrm{s}^{\wedge} \mathrm{g}$ | 0.0073 | pun |
| 4 | tab | 0.1310 | tab | wEd | 0.1311 | tab | 0.0041 | wed |
| 5 | p@g | 0.1817 | pag | kag | 0.1711 | p@g | 0.0115 | cog |
| 6 | zlb | 0.1248 | zib | s@p | 0.2189 | zlb | 0.0028 | sap |
| 7 | fEm | 0.1689 | fem | blb | 0.1734 | fEm | 0.0075 | bib |
| 8 | $\mathrm{d}^{\wedge} \mathrm{t}$ | 0.1570 | dut | $\mathrm{r}^{\wedge} \mathrm{t}$ | 0.1553 | $\mathrm{d}^{\wedge} \mathrm{t}$ | 0.0048 | rut |
| 9 | lad | 0.1326 | lod | dEn | 0.2208 | lad | 0.0043 | den |
| 10 | w@p | 0.1368 | wap | kap | 0.1903 | w@p | 0.0055 | cop |
| 11 | $\mathrm{S}^{\wedge} \mathrm{g}$ | 0.0668 | sug | h@k | 0.1723 | $\mathrm{S}^{\wedge} \mathrm{g}$ | 0.0019 | hack |
| 12 | grab | 0.1556 | grob | drip | 0.2144 | grab | 0.0161 | drip |
| 13 | gIES | 0.1053 | glesh | st^b | 0.1592 | gIES | 0.0080 | stub |
| 14 | bllk | 0.1732 | blick | klat | 0.2471 | bllk | 0.0129 | clot |
| 15 | pl@S | 0.1664 | plash | pEst | 0.3255 | pl@S | 0.0138 | pest |
| 16 | tr^b | 0.1652 | trub | r@S | 0.1373 | tr^b | 0.0167 | rash |
| 17 | Cag | 0.0874 | chog | bllp | 0.1671 | Cag | 0.0016 | blip |
| 18 | bEmp | 0.2097 | bemp | flap | 0.1478 | bEmp | 0.0171 | flop |
| 19 | sllnd | 0.2618 | slind | mEnd | 0.2664 | sllnd | 0.0176 | mend |
| 20 | gr@t | 0.2349 | grat | $\mathrm{C}^{\wedge} \mathrm{m}$ | 0.0976 | gr@t | 0.0205 | chum |
| 21 | nYd | 0.0961 | nide | dYm | 0.1355 | nYd | 0.0040 | dime |
| 22 | gyut / gut | 0.1261 | gute | myut / mut | 0.1573 | gyut / gut | 0.0053 | mute |
| 23 | moz | 0.1266 | moze | hoz | 0.1088 | moz | 0.0055 | hose |
| 24 | fek | 0.1292 | hake | fek | 0.1292 | fek | 0.0039 | fake |
| 25 | von | 0.1678 | vone | kon | 0.2381 | von | 0.0032 | cone |
| 26 | sYm | 0.1861 | sime | VYn | 0.1528 | sYm | 0.0044 | vine |
| 27 | fjut / fut | 0.1427 | fute | fjum / fum | 0.1045 | fjut / fut | 0.0025 | fume |
| 28 | bYp | 0.1226 | bipe | kYt | 0.1929 | bYp | 0.0037 | kite |
| 29 | bev | 0.1040 | bave | Jed | 0.0809 | bev | 0.0032 | jade |
| 30 | wod | 0.1075 | wode | tot | 0.1598 | wod | 0.0031 | tote |

## P-O-S-E® Non-Word and Real Word Phoneme/Biphone Phonotactic Probabilities

| इ Phoneme probabilities <br> SV $+/$ /E/ Pseudo-words |  |
| :--- | ---: |
| Mean | 0.149 |
| Standard Error | 0.008 |
| Median | 0.149 |
| Mode | \#N/A |
| Standard Deviatior | 0.043 |
| Sample Variance | 0.002 |
| Kurtosis | 0.758 |
| Skewness | 0.582 |
| Range | 0.195 |
| Minimum | 0.067 |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  | 0.262 |
| Maximum | 4.472 |
| Sum | 30.000 |


| $\sum$ Phoneme probabilities <br> SV $+/$ /E/ Real words |  |
| :--- | ---: |
| Mean | 0.170 |
| Standard Error | 0.010 |
| Median | 0.158 |
| Mode | \#N/A |
| Standard Deviation | 0.053 |
| Sample Variance | 0.003 |
| Kurtosis | 1.348 |
| Skewness | 0.969 |
| Range | 0.245 |
| Minimum | 0.081 |
|  |  |
|  | 0.326 |
| Maximum | 5.098 |
| Sum | 30.000 |


| $\sum$ Biphone probabilities |  |
| :--- | ---: |
| SV +/E/P Pseudo-words |  |
| Mean | 0.008 |
| Standard Error | 0.001 |
| Median | 0.005 |
| Mode | 0.006 |
| Standard Deviat | 0.006 |
| Sample Varianc | 0.000 |
| Kurtosis | -0.555 |
| Skewness | 0.888 |
| Range | 0.019 |
| Minimum | 0.002 |
|  |  |
|  |  |
| Maximum | 0.021 |
| Sum | 0.235 |
| Count | 30.000 |


| $\Sigma$ Biphone probabilities <br> SV +/E/ Real words |  |
| :--- | ---: |
| Mean | 0.011 |
| Standard Error | 0.002 |
| Median | 0.007 |
| Mode | 0.006 |
| Standard Deviatic | 0.008 |
| Sample Variance | 0.000 |
| Kurtosis | 2.402 |
| Skewness | 1.685 |
| Range | 0.032 |
| Minimum | 0.002 |
|  |  |
|  |  |
| Maximum | 0.035 |
| Sum | 0.319 |
| Count | 30.000 |


| t-Test: Two-Sample Assuming Equal Variances |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | इPhoneme probabilities $S V+/ E /$ Pseudo- words | $\Sigma$ Phoneme probabilities SV + /E/ Real words |
| Mean | 0.1491 | 0.1699 |
| Variance | 0.0018 | 0.0028 |
| Observations | 30.0000 | 30.0000 |
| Pooled Variance | 0.0023 |  |
| Hypothesized Mean | 0.0000 |  |
| df | 58.0000 |  |
| t Stat | -1.6787 |  |
| $\mathrm{P}(\mathrm{T}<=\mathrm{t})$ one-tail | 0.0493 |  |
| t Critical one-tail | 1.6716 |  |
| $\mathrm{P}(\mathrm{T}<=\mathrm{t})$ two-tail | 0.0986 |  |
| t Critical two-tail | 2.0017 |  |
| Mean Difference | 0.0209 |  |


| t-Test: Two-Sample Assuming Equal Variances |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | E Biphone probabilities $S V+/ E /$ Pseudo- words | ¿Biphone probabilities $S V+/ E / R e a l$ words |
| Mean | 0.0078 | 0.0106 |
| Variance | 0.0000 | 0.0001 |
| Observations | 30.0000 | 30.0000 |
| Pooled Variance | 0.0001 |  |
| Hypothesized Mear | 0.0000 |  |
| df | 58.0000 |  |
| t Stat | -1.5093 |  |
| $\mathrm{P}(\mathrm{T}<=\mathrm{t})$ one-tail | 0.0683 |  |
| t Critical one-tail | 1.6716 |  |
| $\mathrm{P}(\mathrm{T}<=\mathrm{t})$ two-tail | 0.1367 |  |
| t Critical two-tail | 2.0017 |  |
| Mean Difference | 0.0028 |  |

## How reliable is the $\mathrm{P}-\mathrm{O}-\mathrm{S}-\mathrm{E}$ ?

The P-O-S-E॰ 2006-7 Grade 3 validation study ( $n=275$ ) demonstrated the following internal correlations:
>Cronbach alpha 120 test items: 0.96
>Cronbach alpha 60 spelling test items: 0.93
> Cronbach alpha 60 reading test items: 0.92
$>$ Correlation spelling half with reading half :
> $\mathrm{r}=.77 \mathrm{P}<.0001$.

## How does the $\mathrm{P}-\mathrm{O}-\mathrm{S}-\mathrm{E}$ c correlate with other measures of literacy?

The 2006-7 P-O-S-E@ Grade 3 (Plainview, NY) validation study ( $\mathrm{n}=275$ ) demonstrated the following correlations:
> Contemporary (2006-7) NYS ELA: $\mathrm{r}=.41$; $\mathrm{P}=.0001$.
> Forward ELA scores +1 year $r=.39$; +2 years $r=.19$; +3 years $r=.28 ;+4$ years $r=.26$.
>Fountas and Pinnell Benchmark (* $\mathrm{N}=78$ ): $\mathrm{r}=.60$, $\mathrm{P}<.0001$
(Otis IQ: $\mathrm{r}=.29 ; \mathrm{P}<.0001$ )

## How does the $\mathrm{P}-\mathrm{O}-\mathrm{S}-\mathrm{E}_{\odot}$ correlate with other measures of literacy?

In the Mineola, NY 2012-13 study of Grade 3 students ( $n=191$ ), the following correlations were obtained:

| Mineola U.F.S.D. Grade 3 ( $\mathrm{N}=191$ ) 2012-2013 <br> Multiple Correlations Among Baseline and RTI P-O-S-E® Error Scores and Accepted Measures of Literacy. |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Parameter ( $\mathrm{N}=191$ ) | POSE Base | POSE RTI | Ben Base | Ben RTI | NWEA F12 | NWEA SP13 | ELA |
| POSE Base | 1.00 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| POSE RTI | 0.78 | 1.00 |  |  |  |  |  |
| Benchmark Base | -0.69 | -0.64 | 1.00 |  |  |  |  |
| Benchmark RTI | -0.64 | -0.61 | 0.91 | 1.00 |  |  |  |
| NWEA/MAP Base | -0.56 | -0.47 | 0.69 | 0.64 | 1.00 |  |  |
| NWEA/MAP RTI | -0.47 | -0.46 | 0.64 | 0.63 | 0.80 | 1.00 |  |
| ELA 2013 | -0.57 | -0.54 | 0.69 | 0.66 | 0.72 | 0.69 | 1.00 |

## What are $\mathrm{P}-\mathrm{O}-\mathrm{S}-\mathrm{E}_{8}$ short vowel substitution error patterns? I

> Phonological / Orthographic Substitution errors occur when a child's phonologic (read/spoken) or orthographic (spelled/written - scored as equivalent phonology) representations deviate within morphological context from the target vowels.
$>$ When reported as a point at the intersection of Cartesian coordinates (F1 / F2) on the vowel quadrangle, substitution errors can be described in terms of deviations in direction and distance relative to the target vowel.
> The area immediately surrounding the target vowel is known as the phonological neighborhood. The most frequent category of errors is substitutions found in the phonological neighborhood.
> With ESL students, primary language phonotactic probabilities prevail. I.e. Spanish/Hispanic students will consistently substitute (ē) for (ī) when reading the letter I and reverse the pattern when hearing the phoneme (I).
> The second most frequent category of errors involves the substitution of long vowel cognates for short vowels and vice versa; I.e a silent /e/ rule infraction.

## What are $\mathrm{P}-\mathrm{O}-\mathrm{S}-\mathrm{E}_{\odot}$ short vowel substitution error patterns? II

> The ubiquity of short vowel substitution error patterns suggests the presence of erroneous phonological/orthographic rules operating within the student's cognitive linguistic processing.

- Error patterns can also be characterized concurrently by the degree of symmetry between spelling and reading short vowel substitutions.
$>\mathrm{P}-\mathrm{O}-\mathrm{S}-\mathrm{E} \odot$ substitution errors can range from adjacent to remote.
> Adjacent implies that the expressed short vowel is minimally displaced from the target vowel within the phonological neighborhood. Remote means that the expressed short vowel is widely removed from the target location on the vowel quadrangle i.e. Significantly removed from the phonological neighborhood.
$>$ P-O-S-E® substitution errors can be mirrored or disjunctive.
> Mirrored means that the same short vowel displacement locus is reflected in both the phonologic and orthographic expressions of the target. Disjunctive means that the short vowel displacement locus differs between phonologic and orthographic expressions of the target.


## What are $\mathrm{P}-\mathrm{O}-\mathrm{S}-\mathrm{E}_{\odot}$ short vowel substitution error patterns? III

$\Rightarrow \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{O}-\mathrm{S}-\mathrm{E} \odot$ substitution errors can be systematic or random.
> Systematic connotes that there is a consistency in locus of the expressed short vowel displacement on similar vowel test items. Random indicates a nonspecific dispersion of errors within the vowel space. The latter condition (choatic) suggests the absence of rules.
$>\mathrm{P}-\mathrm{O}-\mathrm{S}-\mathrm{E} \odot$ substitution errors may appear obsessive.
> The persistent substitution of a single vowel or vowel cluster across target vowels Implies a rule to the effect of : "If you don't know the answer, substitute $\qquad$ ."
$>$ P-O-S-E® substitution errors can present as long vowel substitutions for short vowel items and short vowel substitutions for long vowel (silent/e/) items.
> $\mathrm{P}-\mathrm{O}-\mathrm{S}-\mathrm{E} \odot$ item omissions of target vowels or entire test items are also reported as (null) substitution errors.
> Interpretation of the short vowel substitution error patterns provides interventional guidance. For example, a review of an ESL student's first language phonology and phonotactic probabilities may reveal phonemic variations in vowels which appear allophonic in English.

## What are common P-O-S-E® vowel substitution errors? I

The table of short and long vowel substitution errors shown below is based on an analysis of 33,000 3rd grade $\mathrm{P}-\mathrm{O}-\mathrm{S}-\mathrm{E} \odot$ test item responses from 275 students in three schools of the Plainview-Old Bethpage School District in 2006-07. District Demographics: 80\% White; 15\% Asian 4\% Spanish/Hispanic; 0\% Black.

|  | s items | TOTA | RROR |  | 275 |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| İ | è | ă | ŏ | ǔ |  | Sum |
|  |  |  |  |  |  | 11 errors |
| 303 | 506 | 237 | 688 | 595 |  | 2329 |
| 13.0\% | 21.7\% | 10.2\% | 29.5\% | 25.5\% |  | 100.0\% |
|  |  |  |  |  | avge | 10.6\% |
| i |  | ā | ¢ | ōō/y |  | Sum |
| $\begin{gathered} 503 \\ 29.0 \% \end{gathered}$ |  | 303$17.5 \%$ | 535 | 394 |  | all errors |
|  |  | 1735 |  |  |
|  |  | 30.8\% | 22.7\% | avge | $\begin{gathered} 100.0 \% \\ 15.8 \% \end{gathered}$ |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |

## What are common P-O-S-E® vowel substitution errors? II



## What are common P-O-S-E® vowel substitution errors? III



## What are common P-O-S-E® vowel substitution errors? IV


www.P-O-S-E.net
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## Common Core State Standards

Criterion referenced testing of monosyllabic short vowels and the silent /e/ rule, in closed syllables, measures a body of knowledge determined by the State Common Core Standards to be mastered by the end of $2^{\text {nd }}$ grade.

## Why short vowels?

> Common Core State Standards target $2^{\text {nd }}$ grade for instruction of short vowels in monosyllabic words and the silent /e/ rule
> "In the English language, the vowel forms the nucleus of every syllable" (S. Nolan, 2007)
> Failure to acquire accurate short vowel knowledge inhibits future acquisition of long vowels.

## Learning to Read vs. Reading to Learn

>Students from K through $3^{\text {rd }}$ grade are developing the skills for proficient reading
-Students from $4^{\text {th }}$ grade and higher are using reading to learn.

## How is the $\mathrm{P}-\mathrm{O}-\mathrm{S}-\mathrm{E}_{\odot}$ Administered?

Spelling test
>Group or individual administration
>Time: 30 minutes
> Two sections (30 items each)
>Non-words -"vip"
>Low-frequency-of occurrence real words- "mute"

Reading test
> Individual administration
> Time: 5 minutes per student

- Two sections (30 items each)
> Words are identical to spelling test

P-O-S-E © ARCHITECTURE MODULAR PERMUTATIONS

Spellimg
STIMULUS 1


RESPONSE 1


## Process



Phonological-Orthographic Substitution Evaluation Reading STIMULUS 2


RESPONSE 2

$\square$

## Evaluate




Phonological-Orthographic Substitution Evaluation
Reading





## P-O-S-E

## Phonological-Orthographic Substitution Evaluation



To view videos demonstrating $\mathrm{P}-\mathrm{O}-\mathrm{S}$ - ${ }^{\circ}$ test procedures, visit: www.P-O-S-E.NET Select the A-V tutorials tab

SPELLING, INDIVIDUAL SPELLING, SINGLE CLASS


SPELLING, MULTI-CLASS


## READING INDIVIDUAL



## P-O-S-E®RTI Spelling Test Results for Grade 3 ESL Student in Her Own Handwriting



Phonological-Orthographic Substitution Evaluation ${ }^{6}$

## Spelling Non-Words

Falana
Directions: Listen and spell the words you hear.
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## P-O-S-E® Baseline Spelling Test Errors Transcribed in AHD* Notation by SLP



## P-O-S-E® Baseline Reading Test Errors Transcribed in AHD* Notation by SLP



## Data Analysis of P-O-S-E® responses

## Individual Student SCORING

> Individual student responses are entered into the included Excel-based computer application that analyzes the results.
> An individual report is produced that identifies error patterns in short vowels and the silent /e/ rule.
> The analyzed data becomes a prescriptive template for targeted intervention by classroom teachers, speech-language pathologists, reading teachers and ESL teachers.

## Student Baseline P-O-S-E® Test Results Analyzed Using Included Excelo-Based Scoring Application: Table Format



## Student Baseline P-O-S-E® Test Results Analyzed Using Included Excelo-Based Scoring Application: Chart Format



| Student \% P-O-S-E Total Vowel Errors |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\begin{gathered} \text { P-O-S-E SP } \\ \text { Date } \end{gathered}$ | Total Error \% | Silent/e/ <br> \% | ü \% | ŏ \% | i \% | è \% | ă \% |
| 9/13/2012 | 54\% | 50\% | 63\% | 25\% | 88\% | 44\% | 63\% |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| INTERVENTION PRIORITY LEVEL: |  |  | HIGH | MID- | <> | LOW | N/A |

## Student Baseline P-O-S-Ee Test Transcript Using School District Forms-with-Processing (Option)



## Student Baseline P-O-S-E® Test Outcome Using Individual Vowel Quadrangle Display (Option)

SHORT (i) SPELLING AND READING


SHORT (ŭ) SPELLING AND READING


## Data Analysis of $\mathrm{P}-\mathrm{O}-\mathrm{S}-\mathrm{E}_{\ominus}$ Responses

## Class and Grade Level Scoring I

> Where full class or grade level P-O-S-E® testing is proposed, it is essential that school districts avail themselves of the $\mathrm{P}-\mathrm{O}-\mathrm{S}-\mathrm{E} \odot$ Forms-With-Processing (FWP) service.
> Considerable staff time is saved. Spelling results are scored directly from the handwritten response sheets and coordinated with Reading results entered in the data processing program from the examiner's transcription of errors.
> Because a comprehensive table of vowel errors and exceptions is incorporated into the computerized processing service, scoring is internally consistent and not subject to variability of interpretation among examiner/scorers.
> The FWP service produces, for each student on a single colorcoded table, a series of enhanced individual reports including a transcript of vowel errors as well as pre-vowel and postvowel consonant errors.

## Data Analysis of $\mathrm{P}-\mathrm{O}-\mathrm{S}-\mathrm{E}_{\ominus}$ Responses

## Class and Grade Level Scoring II

- A full class Baseline performance report is compiled for each class that identifies error patterns in short vowels and the silent /e/ rule long vowels for every student
> The baseline FWP analysis sets intervention priority levels becoming a prescriptive template for targeted intervention by classroom teachers, speech-language pathologists, reading teachers and ESL teachers.
> For year-end $\mathrm{P}-\mathrm{O}-\mathrm{S}-\mathrm{E} \odot$ RTI testing, a detailed FWP report compares Baseline and RTI findings for each class member and for the class as a whole including tables of RTI gains in performance.
> Sample reports can be view on the www.P-O-S-E.net website.


## P-O-S-E® Forms-With-Processing Baseline Class Summary Report



[^0]
## P-O-S-E® INTERVENTIONAL VOWEL TRAINING

INDIVIDUAL


GROUP


## Integrating $\mathrm{P}-\mathrm{O}-\mathrm{S}-\mathrm{E}_{\odot}$ Findings with the Intervention Program

> Data on errors provide prescriptive information for targeted intervention in classroom, SLP, reading and special education instructional contexts.
> Students with high levels of errors receive targeted intervention by the speech-language pathologist, in areas of phonological knowledge to develop competencies foundational to the core curriculum.

## P-O-S-E@ Outcome Effectiveness

## P-O-S-E® Baseline and RTI Reports

$>$ All teachers receive a copy of the summary class results
$>$ Teachers have a copy of the classroom summary and bar graph indicating students short vowel performance arrayed from the highest number of errors to the least number
$>$ In-service training meetings are set up using the $\mathrm{P}-\mathrm{O}-\mathrm{S}-\mathrm{E} \odot$ data for their students as a basis for planning targeted intervention
$>$ Remediation manuals are distributed with referenced books including word lists to be used for targeted intervention
$>$ A P-O-S-E® intervention team is established incorporating ESL, Reading, SLP, Special Education and Classroom teachers for students with mid- and high intervention priority levels of vowel errors.

## Factors Contributing to Mid and High Intervention Priority Levels for P-O-S-Eo Vowel Error Patterns

> ESL students
>Spanish/Hispanic languages have five basic vowels.

| Spanish/English Short Vowel Conflict |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| U.S. English Vowel Phonemes AHD | U.S. English word | Common <br> Alphabet | Reading Spanish Pronunciation (expected) | Spelling <br> Spanish (examples) | Spanish Vowel Phonemes AHD |
| ă* | pad (ă) | A | pod (ŏ) | pade | ŏ |
| è* | pet (ě) | E | payt (ā) | pate | ā\|** |
| İ* | pip (i) | I | peep (ē) | pep | $\overline{\text { e }}$ |
| ŏ | top (ŏ) | 0 | toap (ō) | tap | ō |
| ǔ | cut | U | coot (u) | cort | ōō |
| wĭ | quit (wi) |  | kweet (wē) | quet (?) | wē |
| *vowel not common in Spanish |  |  |  |  | short duration) |

## Factors Contributing to Mid and High Intervention Priority Levels for $\mathrm{P}-\mathrm{O}-\mathrm{S}-\mathrm{E}$ © Vowel Error Patterns

> Learning Disabilities
> Speech and Language Disorders
> Hearing Loss
> Developmental issues requiring protracted teaching of basic phonics
> Teaching methodology

## P-O-S-Eo RTI Spelling Test Results for Grade 3 ESL Student in Her Own Handwriting



## Student RTI P-O-S-E© Test Results Analyzed Using Included Excel®-Based Scoring Application: Table Format

シ\%\% Phonological-Orthographic Substitution Evaluation *


| $\begin{aligned} & \text { Short Vowel } \\ & \text { Error Count } \end{aligned}$$\mathrm{CVC}+\mathrm{CCVCC}$ |  |  | $\underset{\text { extas }}{\substack{\text { en }}}$ | , misa | $\stackrel{\circ}{\text { n }}$ | $\underset{n=0,4}{\substack{\text { und }}}$ |  | Short Vowel Errors |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\begin{gathered} \text { sum } \\ \substack{\text { spelling } \\ \text { Erross }} \end{gathered}$ | 1 monwerd $(50)$ | 0 | 0 | 2 | - | 0 | \% | 2720 |
|  | $2 \mathrm{radmad}(5)$ | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | cs | 0170 |
|  | Sub-Total N/a | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | is | $2 \quad 140$ |
| Enter SubstitutionPhonemes(max=3) |  |  |  | Epet |  |  |  | + |
| $\begin{array}{\|c\|c\|c\|c\|c\|c\|} \hline \text { Seading } \\ \text { Efrors } \end{array}$ | 2. nommed (Ma) | 1 | 4 | 0 | 1 | 0 | \% | 6120 |
|  | 4 4.rat wors (in) | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | is | 1720 |
|  | Sub-Totals Na | 1 | 5 | 0 | 1 | 0 | " | $7 \quad 140$ |
| Enter SubstitutionPhonemes(max=3) |  |  | Tpit |  | 0 00/yoo |  |  | $=$ |
| Short Vowel Errors w/16 Spelling + Reading |  |  | $\begin{aligned} & 5 \\ & 0^{5} \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $2$ | $\begin{array}{\|c\|} \hline 1 \\ \hline \end{array}$ | $0^{0}$ | U |  |



## Student RTI P-O-S-E® Test Results Analyzed Using Included Excelo-Based Scoring Application: Chart Format



## Student RTI P-O-S-E® Test Transcript Using School District Forms-with-Processing Option




## P-O-S-E® Forms-with-Processing RTI Class Summary Report: Table Format



## P-O-S-EO, Inc

www.P-O-S-E.net
Carol A. Sullivan, CCC-SLP
Roy F. Sullivan, PhD, CCC-A

## P-O-S-E® Forms-with-Processing RTI Class Summary Report: Chart Statistics



## P-O-S-E@ Forms-with-Processing RTI Class Summary Report: Chart Statistics



## P-O-S-E® Forms-with-Processing RTI Class Summary Report: Table Format



## Working Model for Integration of the P-O-S-E® Program into School Curriculum



## The $\mathrm{P}-\mathrm{O}-\mathrm{S}-\mathrm{E}$ © and Your School District: I

> Review the $\mathrm{P}-\mathrm{O}-\mathrm{S}-\mathrm{E}$ © school district operational flow chart.
$>$ Designate a member of the school district staff to serve as $\mathrm{P}-\mathrm{O}-\mathrm{S}-\mathrm{E}$ coordinator.
> Experience has demonstrated that a credential in Speech-Language Pathology is to be valued in the role of $\mathrm{P}-\mathrm{O}-\mathrm{S}$-Eo coordinator, given the foundational nature of short and long vowel phonology in literacy.
> Secure a $\mathrm{P}-\mathrm{O}-\mathrm{S}$-E® test kit with license for the school district.

## The $\mathrm{P}-\mathrm{O}-\mathrm{S}-\mathrm{E} \odot$ and Your School District: II

$>$ Contract with $\mathrm{P}-\mathrm{O}-\mathrm{S}-\mathrm{E} \odot$, Inc. for in-district service training of key personnel assigned to the $\mathrm{P}-\mathrm{O}-\mathrm{S}-\mathrm{E} \odot$ project

## or

> Enroll key personnel in a two-segment offsite $\mathrm{P}-\mathrm{O}-\mathrm{S}-\mathrm{E} \odot$ tutorial course offered on demand in the Summer interval.
$>$ Part I: Administering scoring the $\mathrm{P}-\mathrm{O}-\mathrm{S}-\mathrm{E} \odot ;$ Interpreting the findings; evidence-based structure of modular $\mathrm{P}-\mathrm{O}-\mathrm{S}-\mathrm{E} \odot$ vowel intervention.
> PART II: Organization and management of a comprehensive Grade 3 P-O-S-E® assessment and intervention program.

## The P-O-S-Eo and Your School District: III

- Administer $\mathrm{P}-\mathrm{O}-\mathrm{S}$-Eœ baseline tests to a select sample of Grade 3 students.
> Use the $\mathrm{P}-\mathrm{O}-\mathrm{S}-\mathrm{E} \odot$ computer scoring application to score and process in-district the individual student results.
> Make a data-based determination to proceed with a curriculum-integrated application of the $\mathrm{P}-\mathrm{O}-\mathrm{S}-\mathrm{E} \odot$ program across the entire Grade 3 level.


## The P-O-S-Eo and Your School District: IV

> The nature and range of individual Grade 3 student error scores will provide evidence for the projected extent of school district commitment to incorporating the $\mathrm{P}-\mathrm{O}-\mathrm{S}-\mathrm{E}_{\odot}$ into its literacy armamentarium.
$>$ Options for district use of the $\mathrm{P}-\mathrm{O}-\mathrm{S}-\mathrm{E}$ © include:
$>$ A. Continue with use as a diagnostic test, selectively applied to preselected students or
$>$ B. Commit to programmatic $\mathrm{P}-\mathrm{O}-\mathrm{S}-\mathrm{E} \odot$ testing and intervention with the entire Grade 3 population for both Baseline (Fall) and RTI (Spring).

## The P-O-S-Eo and Your School District: V

> The comprehensive $\mathrm{P}-\mathrm{O}-\mathrm{S}$-Eo program requires the forms-with-testing (Title I-eligible) option which includes full scoring of handwritten $\mathrm{P}-\mathrm{O}-\mathrm{S}-\mathrm{E}$ © Spelling responses and transcribed $\mathrm{P}-\mathrm{O}-\mathrm{S}-\mathrm{E} \odot$ Reading responses.
$>$ Individual student reports of $\mathrm{P}-\mathrm{O}-\mathrm{S}$-Eo performance are provided as well as class summaries that facilitate modular intervention strategies.
> At year end, a $\mathrm{P}-\mathrm{O}-\mathrm{S}-\mathrm{E} \odot \mathrm{RTI}$ report is provided for individual students as well as for each Grade 3 class.

## P-O-S-E $e_{\odot}$ Data-Based Website

For additional information including validation studies, sample reports, online-instructional videos demonstrating group and individual $\mathrm{P}-\mathrm{O}-\mathrm{S}-\mathrm{E} \odot$ testing procedures and intervention, visit:


WWW.P-O-S-E.net
E-mail: c@p-o-s-e.net
Phone: 516-248-POSE (7673)



[^0]:    P-O-S-EO, Inc
    www.P-O-S-E.net
    Carol A. Sullivan, CCC-SLP
    Roy F. Sullivan, PhD, CCC-A

