

Welcome everyone. I'm Noura Shahabi.

I'm the founder of EBLI, Evidence-Based Literacy Instruction, which is a system of effective, efficient, research-aligned teacher training and student instruction in reading, writing, and spelling.

So that's what we normally do. I cannot wait to get going with this webinar to talk to you and share with you about speech to print versus print to speech.

And there's a lot of questions from everybody about this, and including a lot of questions even that I have had. As I've been researching this, it's just been like, oh my gosh, there's so much confusion with the terms, with what's going on. So I'm going to talk to you guys tonight about that, obviously, and share some really explicit examples and stuff about the differences in what I mean, because it really is a whole bunch of confusion.

And how I came to do this was probably about two months ago, I started having a whole lot of conversations about the difference of not just what is speech to print and print to speech, but what is the delivery of it? How does that differ?

And it really started at Plain Talk in

New Orleans at that conference and talking to Brett Tingley, who she's the president of Our Dyslexic Children.

And then I had kind of an accidental surprise party happening where I got Donna, who started the Science of Reading Facebook page, and I got to room together in Chicago for some filming for "The Truth About Reading" documentary when she was there because there was a snowstorm. She had to stay overnight, so we did a ton of talking, and a ton of talking about this, and then it started popping up all over Facebook and people were saying, "You should do a webinar. You guys should do something." So I had lots of discussions with Marnie Ginsberg, with a bunch of people about this, and I thought, "I'll just go ahead and do this." Didn't quite know what I was getting myself into, until I started digging in. Because I was going from what I had learned really 25 years ago when I was learning all the time and the terms and what I knew about them and all that type of thing. And a lot of things have changed as I started to dig in. So I'm really, really happy to share with you what I have learned. I want you to know that even though it's tremendously muddy, the whole, all of it really, I'm going to provide a lot of clarity, though it's not going to be like this crystal clear, beautiful water. More like kind of a pond, I think. But you'll be able to understand a lot more about what really do all these things mean, especially when it comes to

actually application with teaching it to kids in a classroom or to your kids if you're tutoring or whatever. So teaching it to those kids, what are these differences about and what do they look like there?

Okay, kind of the evolution. So that's what we're going to be doing, and that's what we're going to be talking about.

So I'm going to share my screen and we'll get going.

And if you're just coming in, please put your name and where you're from in the chat and feel free to ask questions, interact with each other, all of that.

Or don't ask questions in the chat. Sorry. Wrong, because I'll talk about that too.

But you can interact with each other and all there in the chat, and

let me know where you're from so I can have my little geography entertainment and

joy of thinking about all of you from all of your places all over the world, which is very cool.

All right, so the name of this tonight, our webinar tonight, is Speech to Print versus Print to Speech, and what this means and why it's important.

And there's a lot of misconceptions about it, so really my goal is to help clear that up as much as possible. Okay?

So I talked about the chat, your name, and where you're from, and all that good stuff. If you're in the States, include your state, your country if you're

not in the States. I appreciate that.

So we are tonight on a new Zoom format because we had to

increase our Zoom thing to accommodate

more people because we have 2,700 people who have registered for

this webinar. So

it's a little bit different if you've been with us on webinars before.

It's a different setup. It's the webinar.

You can't have the other kind of setup at this number, so it's the webinar

format. So instead of asking your questions in the chat,

if you'll see at the bottom on the bar on your computer, and sometimes it might be

at the top on your phone, it says Q&A.

And so what you want to do if you have a question is to click on that Q&A.

We will gather all those questions, and

Hannah will be feeding them to me at the end.

So click on the Q&A, type in your question, and we will get it, and we will get to

that at the end. To share where you're from, to share

insights or--

Not questions. No questions there.

To share insights and interact with other people and share that kind of stuff,

use the chat for that. Okay? So the chat for interacting, the Q&A

button for questions and answers.

And that's different than

what we've done before. So if you forget and you put a question in the chat, one of

our EBLI team will remind you, "Hey, could you put that in the chat?"

All right? Our whole EBLI team is excited to learn here too, because

I have been deep, deep, deep for two weeks, it's really kind of

consumed me researching this because I've gone down all these rabbit

holes and realized like, oh my gosh, these rabbit holes are much deeper than

I even realized. I wasn't sure exactly what I was getting myself into.

So I'm going to be sharing all that I've learned and all that I've known before,

again, to help provide some clarity.

All right, so what we're going to do tonight is talk about linguistic phonics and

structured literacy, and I'm going to go more into depth into those terms and why I

chose those terms. But there's a lot on

... phonics all over the place, and a lot of it is kind of mushy and like this is a

little bit of this and a little bit of that.

So Orton-Gillingham programs were the most

consistent to actually look at as a whole, which is why

I chose to do them, and linguistic phonics,

based on Diane McGuinness' prototype, which is

Phono-Graphics and Ebly and Reading Simplified, those kinds of

programs. And Orton-Gillingham, their system has programs like Barton and

Wilson, and All About Reading Inspire.

So there's overlap, some,

especially in those things that are in the middle that are a little more ambiguous,

really. But really, I'm going to talk about the actual

delivery of instruction,

and the differences of print to speech and speech to print, and I promise I'll tell

you more about that. Okay? I also did a blog on this topic, and there's some

other links and stuff. Alyssa will stick the blog link, if you haven't

read it yet, in the chat, and you'll also get that tomorrow with the recording.

We'll include all the links. This one has quite a lot of links, and I could've done

three times as much links, but didn't want to really overwhelm you.

So you can check out the blog, too. More links there.

So this topic seems to have a lot of emotion around

it. And so I just want to kind of

point out that all of us are starting from different places, and we're

at different spots, and we're doing different things.

We're all doing the best that we can, and we're all curious.

That's why we're here, to learn. So I just want to say when you're feeling

charged or you're just like, "Oh, that's really annoying me that she's saying

this," or, "I think that," or whatever it may be, take a deep breath and

know that we're all here together to work toward that common goal

of 95 to 100% of our kids becoming highly literate,

and that new information can sometimes be hard.

But please be respectful to each other, to me, I will be,

of course, to you, and know that sometimes we get

triggered about stuff and we want to lash out,

which is very normal for all of us humans.

But again, take that big, deep breath, just be kind,

think it through,

wait a little bit before you comment or whatever.

So try to

just come from that place of curiosity and

learning, which is what we're going to be doing tonight.

So this slide

is a lot of shades of gray. A lot of us, as

humans, we like to put things into neat categories, right?

We would like it to be either black, or we'd like it to be white, or we'd like it

to always be like this. And neither reading

instruction or humans

are really black or white. There's a whole lot of gray area.

So there's a lot of things that are not like, "It's this way," or, "It's this way."

There's a lot of, what do I want to say? Da, da, da, da.

Variety with that. So English is a very complex code.

We're not teaching something like Spanish, which is a more simple,

transparent code. English is a complex code

that we need to, oopsie, be able to decipher to be able to apply it to

read and write in our language. It's English, which we're teaching. Okay?

So there's a lot of gray area. So I want to just point that

out, which we all know, but we still, as humans, like to try to push stuff into,

"It's this way," or, "It's that way."

Which a lot of times it can be just not that clear.

It's that one. So all explicit, systematic

phonics instruction includes speech to print and print to speech.

Print to speech is basically reading, we are looking at the letters, and we're

reading them off the page. We're all doing print to speech when we're reading.

And when I look at this slide, you are when you look at this slide.

And speech to print is what we do when we're spelling, right?

We take our speech and put it down on paper.

So any systematic explicit phonics instruction, and

the research, and I'm going to talk a little bit more about this, but

it's typically never settled completely, right?

There's always more that we can learn.

However, there's some research that's so solid we can say, "You know what?

We know for sure." For example, smoking cigarettes.

We know for sure that that can very typically cause

lung damage, right? That's pretty solid.

You could do more research on it, but definitely that's a solid thing.

The same thing with explicit phonics instruction to decode our

words so that we can actually read them accurately, and to read and spell

them accurately, to write. The research and the brain imaging and all of that is

very, very solid. Okay? So what this webinar is

about is just talking about the phonics part of the five essential

components of reading, and also writing, spelling, and handwriting, which we teach

in Ebly, and many

literacy programs teach also. But this webinar is just talking

about phonics, and pretty much anyone who teaches reading would

agree that phonics is important. The degree of phonics and all of that may be

debatable, but everybody agrees that, yes, being

able to read the words accurately on the page and knowing how this code

works is very, very important. However, there's a lot of confusion,

and I had a lot more confusion about the terms as I

started digging into this than I did before, even.

And again, and more clarity now, but terms that were used in the

National Reading Panel, which is like, "This is what this said, and it said that,"

those terms now when I googled, I could find

the same exact term, let's say synthetic phonics,

and it had a whole bunch of different definitions that were completely different

than each other.

Analytic phonics, different definitions.

So I was thinking traditional phonics, but then there was just so

much of a mix-up and not clarity with that, really.

But traditional phonics is the phonics most of us are familiar with,

the letters to the sounds and what a lot of us learned, regardless of

our age, if we were taught any phonics.

So I decided to, as I kept going down all these rabbit

holes and more and more, then somebody said, "Well, in the UK, we're doing this

structured literacy, and that means print to speech," but Diane McGuinness said, "Structured literacy," or not structured, "synthetic phonics.

In England, we're doing synthetic phonics, and that means print to speech."

Whereas Diane McGuinness used to talk about it as speech to print.

And really, it's kind of the traits of what it is and

how you deliver it, whether it's print to speech or speech to print, is the

difference. So that's a whole lot of not total clarity, I understand.

So what I chose was structured literacy and linguistic phonics.

Now, there's even more kind of drill-down confusion in here

because structured literacy, I'm going to share with you the

definition of it, and structured literacy, the definition is exactly what I talk

about of what EBLI is. But I didn't put structured literacy

or EBLI in the structured literacy column because, as I was

digging in and finding new information, I found that the

International Dyslexia Association had trademarked the

terms structured literacy, and just learned a few days ago they just trademarked

the symbol for it, not the whole term, to ensure that it was

explicit, systematic phonics. But they said it was an umbrella term for

Orton-Gillingham programs, which EBLI is not one of.

So I'm like, wait a minute, does that mean then we're not structured literacy?

So the structured literacy and how it is put

out there is supposed to mean an Orton-Gillingham program.

Okay? So that's why I separated into those because the--

and we've got some links that we'll share about that talks about the structured literacy and is really very clear about that term, about them using it. Not to mean that we can't use it, I've learned just in literally the past few days, which I didn't, I'm like, "Well, I can't change this now," but so we can use that because how we teach is structured literacy, and you'll see that with the definition. Linguistic phonics is pretty solid as far as it's from the speech, the presentation of your instruction goes from speech first, then print.

So linguistic talking phonics. Are any of these terms perfect?

Absolutely zero, no. They're not.

None of them are going to be, again, that gray area, there's a lot of gray, and it seems like the gray has gotten grayer over the years because I haven't really thought that I needed to pay attention to that from what I had learned previously. But things-- this whole, I loved this picture because it's like this is kind of where it's at. There's a lot of confusion.

So structured literacy, here's the definition.

It's characterized by the provision of systematic explicit instruction that integrates listening, speaking, reading, and writing.

Okay?

That is systematic explicit instruction, like with EBLI, but presented it differently. And that's what this whole webinar is about.

I'm going to go through this comparison of these things and how it's presented

differently in instruction. So that's what this talks about, all that that

I just explained to you. Linguistic phonics, an approach to teaching reading and spelling that builds on speech, starting from what we say, what we already know, how to talk, and then moving from there.

This is a wonderful quote from Louisa Moats, who is very well known in instruction on phonics and decoding and all of that. So one of, and this is so brilliant, one of the fundamental flaws of all phonics programs, so this is our traditional phonics programs that's taught almost everywhere of some degree, even though they're called different things and they're delivered in different ways, but almost always, they teach the code backwards. They go from the letter and then the sound, as opposed to the sound and then the letter.

And that's what we're going to really dig deep into tonight.

I'm also going to tell you that typically our webinars are supposed to be an hour. I usually go an hour and 15.

I know that this one is going to be longer because I gained so much more information, and I have a lot more to deliver, and I want to leave time for question and answers at the end. So if you can only stay an hour, that's cool.

We will give you the recording tomorrow, but I will stay for as long as two hours in answering questions because I know that there'll be a bunch.

So hopefully you guys are asking them in the Q&A, and also still sharing in the chat, especially if you're just coming on and where

you're from and all.

So Alyssa is going to share a couple of links that

really help to kind of clarify that--

Actually, it's speech to print. I have this backwards up here.

Speech to print approaches, resources. Okay? So this is backwards, so ignore that.

I'll change it before we send it to you tomorrow.

So Who Moved My Socks is this really lovely, very--

and I forget, I wanted to say who shared it with me, and now I'm forgetting who

shared it with me. Somebody emailed it to me and said--

Gosh, I wish I could-- Oh, it might've been

Jen. Jen, if that was you, thank you. This is by Dr.

Jen Wasowicz, sorry, I probably messed up her name there, from Spell

Links. But it really explains the difference of going from print to speech

as-- or speech to print as opposed to print to speech.

That's all confusing, isn't it? Using all the same words.

And then this is a total delight that I stumbled upon that

has just been created, and it's called the Speech to Print Exploration

Facebook page. I highly recommend all of you do not pass go, go

directly to this page and join.

Nikki Pratte is a mom of a dyslexic child who has gone through

Orton-Gillingham stuff. She continues to explore to try to help her daughter.

She's been looking into speech to print, and the resources on there,

I'm like, I don't know how old it is, maybe two weeks old, but I was just like, "Oh

my gosh." She has searched the world over to

really work and exploring and

sharing tons of resources. It's exceptional.

So good job, Nikki, and thank you very much.

And like I said, I didn't know her until about the last less

than a week, and now I feel like I've kind of known her forever.

She has been so gracious and generous in

helping to educate me from a dyslexic parent

in her

long journey and how that's gone. So I really,

really appreciate her in that. So check out that page.

It's very much worth your while

All right. So I do want to talk also, one other thing about research.

So I used to be a nurse, know all about the whole-- I was neonatal ICU.

We were in a big research hospital, actually.

So research is kind of a big deal to me, but research is

constantly evolving. It's not settled, per se.

And a lot of times, I think those of us in the literacy space like to say,

"There's research on this, it's good.

There's not research on that, it must be bad." So we don't want to say that

there's not research on that, it must be bad.

Like, "Wow, there's promising information about that.

Maybe we should research it." I think that we should be looking a little bit

more along those lines. And I want to share a story, and I love because Steve Dykstra, a couple times I've heard him talk about Ignaz Semmelweis. And when I was in, literally my first day of nursing school back in 1979, I know that I'm very old, that I was handed this book called "Childbed Fever," and all of us were in nursing school handed that book. And it was about this doctor from Vienna, Austria. He oversaw a bunch of interns who worked in autopsy and delivering babies. And in the maternity ward, they found that every month, up to even more than 30% of the mothers would die of what was infection, but they didn't know that back then. And one day, one of the interns died. He cut his finger during an autopsy, and he died of the same symptoms that the women were dying of. So Ignaz Semmelweis was trying to figure out, is it the airflow? There's all these theories that he was trying to wonder if this is what was causing it. But he realized that it was going with all these germs and putting them into these mothers, basically from these doctors that had been doing autopsies. So he decided to have himself and his doctors wash their hand in this bleach solution. And when they started doing that, immediately, they went down to anywhere from 0% of the women dying to 5%, and it was over two years that they had this. Interestingly, he never actually published any research, and there's theories about that, but we don't know. So anyway, he was washing their hands.

They knew these women weren't dying, and he was telling all the other doctor friends, and they were infuriated. They were like: "You are full of baloney.

The women are weak.

This is not our fault. This is not the thing." So he

wouldn't be quiet about it. He kept pushing, and so they fired him.

And then he kept writing letters and pushing, and they got him excommunicated from the country. And he continued to push writing to doctors around the world like,

"Could you please just wash your hands? Just try it.

What have you got to lose?" And I always wondered, like, did those doctors wash their hands when their wives were having a baby? I kind of wonder that.

But anyway, they were so infuriated with him, and he was getting so agitated about it that they wouldn't listen.

They got his wife to have him committed to an insane asylum.

And not long, I think just a few weeks after he

was there, he was beaten, and he got an infection in his hand and back.

So he was buried in kind of like this indigent

cemetery, and he was very much like, ugh, horrible

guy. And it was 50 years. If you're a mother that's ever

had a baby, you would be like, "Ooh." But it was 50 years before they started washing hands.

This was in the 1940s when he realized this, before they started washing their hands with delivering babies.

So there wasn't any research on it, but he had very strong

data showing, here it is, all the numbers up here, now they are way down here.

So we want to be careful to not say,

"This isn't possible because you don't have your double-blind studies on it," or

"This is possible because there is a double-blind study even though it's not so grand." Or are we comparing things?

There's so much, I don't know why there's not more data on how we actually teach

the methodology of teaching kids to read, but hopefully that is coming.

But anyway, I always keep in mind Ignaz Semmelweis, and I have talked to curriculum directors and principals and superintendents when

I work in schools and train their teachers about ones who are like, "Eh, maybe we shouldn't do it, maybe we should, maybe these ones who want to, they can and they can't." So I tell the Ignaz story, and I'm like, "Are you going to wash your hands or are we not?" We have the obligation when we're working with other humans, of course, whether delivering their babies or teaching them to read, to continue to evolve and learn more based on what's out there.

So he is always on my shoulder,

and I love that he's coming up. I think Margaret Goldberg has talked about him before, too. So I love that his story is coming up in literacy because there's a lot of parallels with that.

So

this is just a picture of the evolution of explicit, systematic phonics instruction. Okay? Everything that we do in life, and

especially when it involves humans, evolves, right?

So we have the original Blue Back Speller from the 1700s into the early 1900s. I know that they talk about it in "Little House on the Prairie." Laura Ingalls Wilder was taught with the Blue Back Speller.

So people, that was the way that they were taught to read.

And then in the 1930s, we had Samuel Orton and Anna Gillingham, who had this revolutionary idea like, well, it was this theory that these kids who were very bright and were not learning to read, there was something going on there. So they created the Orton-Gillingham methodology of teaching reading.

So were ahead of their time, very phenomenal. And then in the 1960s, '70s, '80s, there was a lot of research.

Pat Lindamood was one of the people with that, with the phonemic awareness and the sound-based focus.

There's a whole lot of research that had been done on that.

And then in the '80s and '90s, Diane McGuinness, who's the author of "Why Our Children Can't Read," she and her son and daughter-in-law and another student of hers, she was a psychology professor. But they did research and created this program, Phonographics, where it was speech to print, and a lot of the stuff that I'm going to be talking about that is even that further evolution. So if you look at this umbrella that's going over all three

of these things, okay, the end result is to get kids reading.

Okay? But the evolution is in how we deliver the

instruction the same or differently, or how we

evolve it. So thinking about

if you had appendicitis back in the 1700s, you'd probably

die. Your appendix bursts, you're back. Okay?

If you're in the 1900s, now that we've got surgery and anesthetic and all that type

of stuff, your appendix

is inflamed, you have appendicitis, we do surgery,

cut you open, get the

appendix out, sew you up, and then you're in the hospital for a few days and

recover. And then that's evolved to laser surgery, where you can

have this non-invasive surgery. It's

the same day kind of thing, a lot different recovery time.

All kinds of stuff with that. So a lot less traumatic to your

body. So that evolution. So we want to look at that same

evolution, like in here, with reading, and that's what I'm going to be talking

mostly about. Okay. So I want to talk before

the next slide, I swear it's going to be-- well, there's one before that, but it's

going into our comparison. So first about my journey, because it really

is important to this conversation.

I have three daughters, and the first one was taught a

traditional phonics program called Abeka when we lived overseas in Guam, in

an unaccredited school that was probably the best education my kids got, to be honest. And she learned to read in first grade beautifully. I got her the "Little House on the Prairie" reading series. She read the entire thing in six weeks, and I'm like: "Look at my great reader kid." Okay? And it's actually Hannah, who's going to be asking the questions now, "Does this work with me?" Then Colleen was in the same school, kindergarten. She's learning the Abeka, doing fine with the one-letter spellings. Then they moved to the two, three, and four-letter stuff, and the more complex. And she was a good memorizer. Then we moved back to the States, and she was in a, back then in the '90s, whole language stuff where she could memorize. She was a great memorizer. She had many of the classic dyslexia symptoms, and if I would have had her somewhere where they diagnosed dyslexia, she totally would have been diagnosed as dyslexia. Her articulation stuff, her processing, her sequencing, b, d reversals. She was good at math, she was very creative, just a lot of the high pain tol-- a lot of the characteristics of dyslexia. So she looked to be a great reader because she was a great memorizer, actually, and did well on a spelling test, but couldn't spell in her writing. So she was why I started researching how to teach reading, because I'm like, well, she's been taught

traditional phonics, and she's been taught

whole language, and neither of these things are working.

So everything I read for about six months was about one of those two things.

And then I called a former professor from Michigan State, Annette

Weinschenk is her name, and she had been teaching for decades in the College of Ed

at Michigan State and started, it's called the Reading Clinic in East Lansing,

Michigan. And my mom had called me one day and said, "My 12-year-old

neighbor twins just went to this place in East Lansing for 12 hours,

and they no longer require special ed." And I'm like, "What?"

Okay. So I called and I talked to her, and she told me about "Why Our Children

Can't Read and What We Can Do About It" by Diane McGuinness.

So this was really what started my journey into

this literacy stuff. So Diane created this prototype for teaching

the alphabetic code, which is what I'm calling linguistic phonics.

And again,

Marnie had just told me, I think today, "Well, linguistic phonics, there's

one definition that says it's onset rhyme, too, which we don't teach." And I'm

like, "You know what? There is no purity in this whole thing." But linguistic

phonics, if you Google it and you look at the different definitions, it is the

closest to Diane's prototype. I suppose I could call it Diane's prototype, maybe.

Then after I taught my daughter, I taught other people, friends.

I talked to them, and their kids struggled, and I taught their kids.

And then my then husband wanted to open a wellness

center. I

was teaching all these kids at my house, and he said, "Why don't you use a room in here?" And his wellness center fell through, and I had a whole reading center.

So that was interesting. And then I got trained in

1999 in phonographics. I was a phonographics trainer for four years,

also teaching phonographics at a reading center, but mostly teaching teachers.

And I did that until 2003. So that's

my journey from going through all of these

processes. All right. Last thing is a quote that I love from Steve

Dykstra, and it's so true for all of us that are human because we're

human. "The tendency, and we're all guilty of it to some degree, is to hold

the things we like to a lower standard of proof than the

things we reject." So whether we are looking at speech-to-print or

print to speech, which we're going to be talking about, or we're looking at

balanced literacy and

phonics instruction, science of reading stuff, are we using

the same bar to measure both? Are we looking at theirs, whoever

the they are, whether it's me or whoever, are we looking at ours

with the same critical eye we're looking at

theirs? If we're going to ask the question

of this, we should ask that question of ours, too.

It would behoove us and definitely our children and our teachers and our parents,

of course, to be critical consumers. All right?

And it's a lot of work, and there's a lot of noise out there.

I'm almost thankful that I had my journey 25

years ago of learning into the science of reading, because now it's

so saturated with so much stuff, and there's a lot of confusion

around it. Okay? So there we go. Here is my list.

It's really small, which is good because I've kind of changed the order of stuff,

but these are the things I'm going to look at from print to speech and speech to

print. So now we're going to get into the stuff that you're really wondering about.

So structured literacy, which we're looking at, is the OG programs,

are mostly print to speech. Now, again, all programs are speech to print

and print to speech, and when I say mostly, the instruction

methodology goes from print first.

So it starts with the letter and then goes to the sound. Okay?

So it's letter-based decoding. Actually, Marnie just shared with me sound-based

decoding, and I like that.

So letter-based decoding starts with the letter Moves to the sound.

Maybe that should be our term. I don't know. This is the start of a conversation.

So that is really, really critical to the difference

between speech to print or sound-based decoding.

Because what speech to print does is when children come to kindergarten,

almost all of them are talking, right?

So they're halfway to that reading piece, because what reading

is, is matching the sounds in all the words that we say,

because all of our words are made up of sounds, and if we can segment, we can capture each of the sounds. So we're matching these sounds to the print on the page. So we're going from what we're saying first, then to the letters, because that's natural, okay?

Letters are man-made.

Samuel Johnson, way back when, and then Noah Webster kind of did it, a little refining for the United States, but they were the ones that created what our code was going to be, what letters were going to go with what sounds, and then they mucked it up by borrowing from all these different countries and different-- So we have a whole lot of different spellings for the same sound.

But what is consistent and what do we all have? The speech.

So when you go from the speech first, and then you add the spelling or the letters, you can accelerate instruction tremendously. And truly tremendously increase the effectiveness of it, which is so exciting.

This is what Pat Lindamood figured out back in the '60s and the '70s when she was doing all of her work with speech and teaching kids and with teaching reading.

So we're going to go with what we already have.

So these little kids come into kindergarten, they can talk.

We're going to match the sounds that are coming out of their mouth.

We're going to teach them how to segment, match those sounds to the letter in

there. That is what speech to print instruction is.

So it allows us to

simplify and accelerate instruction tremendously

by starting from that speech piece.

And I'm not going to go into depth, of course, because we don't have time, but that

is the basic gist of it and a huge difference in when

I say print to speech as far as speech to print, how are we delivering that

instruction? So instead of A, apple, a, this little guy over here is

actually my nephew, who's now a teenager, but he is a preschooler, and

he did the word, I don't know what word we did, cat maybe, and now he's doing the

word fast. So he did sound lines. What are the sounds in fast?

And he's looking at my fingers and telling me the sounds.

Then he writes the sound lines without-- and then we show the letters, and he

builds the word. So he's learning f, a, s, and t,

as in the context of a word, which makes it meaningful and relevant, starting with

what he already has, which is speech, and going from the natural

way, okay, that we already do, instead of the man-made piece.

So it's a smoother path and a faster path because

it's going from what we already have.

We have to teach them the segmenting piece, obviously, and then when reading, the

blending piece, but we teach them so much of it

interchangeably, which is really, really, really exciting.

Now, most of the speech to print, which is why I kind of had to look,

especially when we get to the amount of time and stuff, at intervention.

Ideally, in my opinion, this instruction needs to be whole class, which is one of the reasons why I left Phonographics to create EBLI.

So that we can get this to teachers so that they can teach it.

And that's what I've spent most of my life is creating the system that will make it easy for teachers to do this and do it with a whole class, whether they're teaching

10 kids or 40. So that they can do that explicit, systematic instruction from that speech to print,

and move their kids really, really quickly.

So that is the main difference, okay?

So it's about the delivery of instruction and the methodology, going from speech first here with the linguistic phonics.

Print to speech starts A, apple, a.

So we're going from that artificial man-made letter and then putting it to the sound. So they're doing a whole different system.

I hope that makes sense. Please ask questions if you have them.

I look forward to answering them.

The other thing with print to speech typically is reading and spelling are taught, they may be taught together, but they're taught with different processes.

So, for example, I was looking at the Orton-Gillingham manual, like

for stop, they're going to teach stop when you read to do it as st,
o, p. Okay, so you're going to put the blends together, that kind of thing.
But when you spell, you're going to separate all the sounds.
So when we do speech to print or linguistic phonics, we're going to
go just from separating to the smallest unit of sound with almost
every single thing. There's very few exceptions to that because we put the kids
on a horse, and it's the same horse, no matter.
It's the same horse for every single word.
This is actually a kindergarten classroom spelling the word caterpillar.
We're going to teach spelling and reading in the same activity.
It's not like it's going to be in this lesson, but it's going to be further along,
and we're going to use a different process.
We're using the same process with that evolution
to accelerate what we're doing, which is thrilling.
Isn't that thrilling? Well, look at these kindergartners spelling a fourth-grade
word. And then we have other things that we do where we
do so much instruction right in the context of a word because it's
meaningful, it's relevant. You can teach morphology, you can talk about prefixes
and suffixes and root words and everything under the sun, so we can really
skyrocket our kids using what the science of reading tells us
as far as these are the components that need to be taught.
But the beef of it is a lot of times with a lot of educators, and
when there's arguments about it, it's like, this takes way too long.

But if we can speed it up, imagine we can get them quicker to be reading automatically, reading accurate, everybody, all of them, from our highest readers to our lowest readers. But getting those lowest readers up so that they become a highest reader, too, okay?

So teaching those things simultaneously so the kids have no doubt that reading-- oftentimes in classrooms, reading spelling is one subject, and spelling is taught as another. When you teach it together, again, another way to accelerate, but also it makes sense to the kids, like, "Oh, this is a code, and I can either decipher it or decode it or encode it, and I use the same process going both ways.

One of them, I'm picking the sounds up off the page.

The other one is I'm putting the spellings down on the page." Cool.

All right. Hopefully, that makes sense.

This is another difference, is in our print to speech typical structured literacy is we have a 90% mastery of information before you move on.

So whether it's short I, and we do a lot, there's a lot of instruction that's happening on that until you get it mastered, then you can move on to, I don't know, short U,

I guess, or something. So whatever else you're going to come to next, I don't know really the sequence of how that works. So it's that mastery.

With the linguistic phonics and speech to print, it's interleaved, meaning that you're teaching several things at a time.

So you're doing explicit instruction as an introduction, and you're still doing

explicit instruction, but we may do, let's say, once we get to the point where we're going to sort different ways to spell the sound C, and we do that sort and then the next thing we're going to do is we may read it in a story, write it in a sentence, do a vocabulary graphic organizer with a word that has the sound C, where we expand upon it, and we keep applying it, and we never ditch it, because if we've learned short I, we're still going to use it even when we sort words that have the sound S, because you have words like "miss," and so you're going to continue to apply it, so you have that interleaving.

And cognitive psychology research shows very strongly the power of that interleaving, and how it can move our kids further faster. Okay? So that is another difference that I like this colorful thing over here because it really shows the difference. Go with all these, then with all these, or mix them together, and especially our kids who are nine years old and younger, and they're very literal, right?

They can understand the application and why they're doing what they're doing, which is really lovely.

Okay. So again, ask your questions if you have them.

Over here on our print to speech side, one spelling of each sound is taught. So let's say we're teaching the sound O.

They would teach O-A as part of their thing, and then they've got

all, because there's all kinds of activity.

When I Googled this, I could have found thousands of things to show about O-A. But they do that to mastery, but they don't want to mix up with, because we're going from the print part.

But when you teach it from speech to print in that delivery system, this is a kindergarten sort that we were doing.

So they've got this, four different ways to spell O.

They see it, they discover the spelling, guided, always guided with the explicit instruction, and then they sort different words, and they put them in columns. Then, because they have this here, they can do all of that because now you can see these patterns or tendencies, which I'm going to talk about more in a minute.

So this O spelling is typically in the middle of the word.

Once in a while at the beginning. Again, very gray. Nothing in English is always.

This one is more commonly at the end. So you're looking at patterns.

Human beings from the time they're newborns pick up patterns.

My little granddaughter, who's six months old, when she was born, my grandsons, they know, and my kids, all of our kids, they know the pattern of their mom's face.

My one-year-old grandsons, they know that one of them has this little tiny dog that's a greyhound, and one has a big, what's she called, a labradoodle. All right?

They look very different from each other.

But both of those boys know dog, dog, because our brain

is keyed into patterns, which are natural, and

so we want to really capitalize on that pattern idea.

So that's what this does. We teach this explicitly.

We reinforce it with different activities.

This is one we call Listen, Tell, Say, and Write.

Elkonin boxes, a lot of people do things that are like this.

But what we don't go here yet and have them do

any independence until we've given them the guided instruction, but

they can very easily, even in preschool, weirdly enough,

manage this whole thing that I'm looking at

these different letters, and they're the same sound.

Just like I'm looking at these different dogs, and they're all dogs. Okay?

That's another exciting piece of that.

Another one is that in, over here, this is a structured literacy and

Orton-Gillingham thing, like this child is going through, and she's saying K, C, J,

J, all those letters. So we teach the letter names and the sounds together

in structured literacy print to speech. That's how those are taught.

In speech to print, the sounds are taught first

away from, especially with our little kids.

Are they going to know the letter names? Of course.

The letter names are like their middle names. We're not saying get rid of them.

However, they're not what we need to use to apply to read.

The sounds are what we need. So when we get kids, when they come into preschool

or kindergarten, and we're teaching them how to read, we start with what they need to use, which is what they already have, the sounds.

So if they're saying, "This is fun." "Oh, what are those sounds?" F, U, N.

So we keep them in the context of a word.

So this little kindergarten girl is doing the word, I think it is snap, that that word is. We put down lines for the sounds in snap.

She could

segment that. She doesn't have the word there yet.

The word isn't there until after the lines are down.

Now she doesn't have that visual interference or the letter name interference from looking, what's the first sound in snap?

If that word's there, most likely she's going to say S.

And we have to tell them, "Well, the word wouldn't be S-nap.

That would be S-nap." That's the letter name.

What we need to read and spell is the sound.

So we get them firm in the sound, and we teach the letter names aside from the sound, okay? Because the sound is what we need to access.

Now, over in England, in UK, I spoke to a superintendent once who was from Scotland, and he said, "I came here when I was seven, and I was the best reader in the class, and I was put in the lowest group because I didn't know my letter names." He said, "We don't start with letter." They start, I guess, over there with sounds, and he said, "I could read, and I knew the sounds, but I needed to know those letter names." So there, in every

single consonant letter name-- now, sometimes obviously the letter name is the same as the sound for the vowels, because O can be O like in go, but never is a consonant letter name the same as the sound.

Now, like for B, B-E, the first sound is that B, right?

But it's still two sounds. So B is not,

it's a two-sound thing, but you have some of those letters that kids get real mixed up with, like for Y they say W, because the first sound in W-I is W.

So we don't--

and this is

Typically, for the kids who read well or are going to read well, it's a non-issue. It's for those kids, whatever percentage you want to say they may be, that are struggling or confused by it, they're more confused.

And the older they get, the more they get--

Everybody at my reading center who couldn't read at all, everybody, they're older than second grade, when they can't read at all, coming to us, they all know their letter names. All of them, they know their letter names.

They have no idea that it's sounds.

Especially adults are like, "What are you talking about here?" So we want to give them what they need to do the job that they've got to get done.

So that's why we go from speech first, sound first, letter name

later. And when you need a spelling bee, you've got the letter names.

It's not like we're saying, "Go and have those letter names, or you can't ever have

them."

And I looked at a lot of research on that, actually, looked for and looked at, and there's a mix. There's one where they looked at England and the United States, and the kids in England spelled better because they went sounds first.

But mostly, the research goes with letter name and sound together.

Again, the research isn't settled there.

But we find decreasing the confusion.

We want to decrease the cognitive load, we want to decrease the confusion of kids who are struggling, whether it's a cognitive thing, whether they have

dyslexia, and the

organization of how things are going and like, "Wait a minute, this is not making sense to me," or, "This is confusing me," like with my daughter.

We want to keep it as streamlined and as simple as possible so that they can move far and fast.

All right. And this seems like a little deal, and it is a little deal for some of our kids that really don't have any struggles with reading, but for kids who, and especially little kids, too, that are real literal, this

is what can be a big issue. So what does this letter say or

B says "buh"? This is almost universal, and all of the teachers that

I've trained and the thousands or tens of thousands of classrooms I coached in,

it's very much for us to automatically, "What does that letter say?

What is that?" Okay? So when we're going from speech to print,

we flip that on its head because we're talking about what do we say, because--

And I'll say to kids, I'll pick up something, got a bill here, and I'll say, "Oh,

what do you hear? Listen to this print or this text." And they're like,

"I don't hear anything," because the letters aren't talking, right?

The letters aren't talking. We're doing the talking, and these are symbols that

represent the sounds that we're saying, okay?

So we got to go for what sound do

you say here? And that shift can be

really important to a lot of kids, okay, because it's the difference, or say "buh"

here or whatever. So,

seems like a little thing that can make a big difference.

Some words are memorized in almost all phonics programs.

This is starting to change, especially in the last couple of years, I

see, which is exciting.

So what this little girl is, she's tapping her arm for say, the word is the,

T-H-E, and then she says, "The," because she's taught

to memorize words that have irregular spellings as a whole. Okay?

So again, more of a memory load,

and it takes more time. This child over here, these little kindergarten guys,

they're being taught "the" by sound. So what are the sounds in "the"?

Th, uh. So they do sound lines. I show them "the," let's match the

spellings, we're good to go, okay?

So that way, we put them on the same horse, and every

single word, if we speak a word out of our mouth,

you can match the spellings to it. You may not like the spellings, like in the word

colonel, or there's a few really weird words.

Hors d'oeuvre, really weird, some spellings, but it will

work. You match all the letters in the word, match to the sounds that we say.

Okay? So they write this, th, uh.

We point out, "Oh, this is the spelling for 'uh' in this word," because they might

want to write a U. We've all seen that.

And then it only takes a few repetitions.

So if we can accelerate our instruction, we're way far ahead to

move our kids to where we want to be, which is reading in text, reading in

authentic text, and comprehending and understanding and higher-level thinking

and all of the goodness of reading.

Okay.

Most traditional phonics, structured literacy, print to speech, teach onset or

the blends at the beginning and the rhyme at the end. Okay?

So the blends are

two consonants together, like the st or the pl or

those kind of things, okay? Those, or at the end, like the

at family or the whatever, the couple sounds.

So they'll do chunks of sounds together.

Where with speech to print, we stay on the same horse, and we segment those

sounds down to the smallest unit. So you can see over here we've got this fr

together. But fr, if we taught our kids f, r, and this is the spelling for f and this is r, and then we teach them fr as a blend together, if we teach all the blends and word families, we give them 1,500 extra pieces of unnecessary information that can be a cognitive overload, okay? So with linguistic phonics, which Evelyn is, staying on that same thing. What are the sounds in friend? F, r, e, n, d. Now match your spellings. F, r, e-- Cool. So if you've taught f and r, you don't need to teach that extra step, okay? Because they already know that, and if they can blend, of course, and segment. So that is another difference that increases efficiency really significantly. And this one is rules, exceptions. There's a lot of questions I've gotten on this one as we were talking about this webinar coming up. Rules, exception to rules, and syllable types, there's a lot of them. And this is because when we go from the man-made piece of letters and try to squeeze it into our speech sounds, and this more arbitrary, it gets messy. It's really messy, actually, because we have to have rules, and then we have to

have exceptions to rules, and there's sometimes more exceptions to the rules than follow the rule. And if we give our kids a lot of practice on words that follow the rule, and then they're out and trying to transfer this to real-life reading or whatever, they're like, "Wait a minute." Like my daughter.

I was in my daughter's classroom

when her teacher, they were going to read "The Dream Team," it was from their Basal series. And she wrote E-A. I was with my youngest daughter, and we were volunteering in there in the back.

And she wrote E-A on the front board, and she said, "When two vowels are together, two vowels are walking.

And the first one does the talking, so you say the first letter, so E.

So E-A is E." Now, my daughter, who has a

vault of a brain, she's like super glue, got it in there. She learns really well.

She's like, "Cool." So she'd read the word great as greet, the word dad

as D. She spelled the word we, W-E-A.

Every word she had started having E-A in it because she's like, "Okay, I got that." So we only gave them part of the information, and we

didn't tell them about the rest of the story, like Paul Harvey and the rest of the story. So when we are doing speech to print,

we are again looking at those patterns, which is how our

brain learns most naturally. Okay, so a

pattern is different in that the pattern of weather in Michigan is

that it's usually in the 50s and 60s

in April. Okay. However, we just had a snowstorm the other day.

So it's not a rule. Our kids, when we tell them a rule, "Here's a rule. You don't run in the halls." Or they're man-made things.

A rule is, not for our kids, but for me,

75 miles an hour is the speed limit.

I'm like, "Oh, I have a hard time keeping within that." Sometimes we break the rules or whatever, but so you have these rules that are man-made things, and the kids are like, "A rule means I don't run in the hallway anytime.

If I'm not supposed to hit the kid next to me, this is a rule, I don't do it at all." Okay? Not, you don't hit the kid next to you except

for on Tuesdays and Thursdays between 1:00 and 3:00 or whatever.

We don't have a rule and exceptions to rules in our kids' brains for them to really follow. So patterns, and so if you look at

here, what this kindergartner's doing is sorting different ways to spell the sound /s/. So they're looking at the different words, they're discovering the spellings, and then we're going to sort different words under.

Then we're going to talk about the patterns in application and in comparison. Beautiful thing. So you look at that /s/.

When you

hear /s/ at the end of a word after a vowel with a short vowel sound

or the most common sound, this is usually your spelling, and we look at that double spelling for /s/. When you hear /s/, okay, or you see it in your

writing, and it's followed by E-I and Y, this is the way you normally spell

/s/. When you have /s/ this one like in sit or best,
it's going to be at the beginning of the word or the middle.

When it's at the end, more times it's going to be /z/ like is,
as, was, and his, right? It can be /s/ like in bus.

So we're telling them that it's a pattern.

We're showing them what the pattern is, and we let them know very much
so it's not all the time. Because, again, nothing in English is all the time.

So it's going along with how their brain naturally is
dealing with language already, which is brilliant.

The McGinnis' were brilliant. And I have read, I think

Diane McGinnis has it in her book, too, and Nikki had some stuff on,

I think, the Speech to Print page, about this woman named Nellie
Dale.

Back in 1902, she was a teacher, and she created what really was a

total linguistic phonics system, and it

was highly successful, but then whole language and whole word stuff kind of came in
and it became a dinosaur and got

pushed into the oblivion. But so it's not like this is new

stuff, but this is how we created the English alphabetic system, by matching the
sounds that we say to the letters in print. That's how it was actually created.

And then staying in decodables, a lot of times with our phonics
programs, we stay in decodables for quite a long time.

And with Speech to Print, because we're teaching them, it's not

about the information that we're teaching them, it's about the process that we're teaching them. We want you to get good at the process.

We don't have to even teach you all the information because once you understand the concepts and the skills and all of that, you can apply it to all the rest of the code, and we're utilizing it and applying it into real text and print. With our little kids, of course, we do decodable readers. We love the Phonic Books decodable readers.

They work really well with the linguistic phonics approach, very much so. The

people who created those, they were also trained in phonographics, so they're familiar with that. But we want to get our kids into trade books, real books, things they want to read, right?

So we want to do that as quickly as-- Some of our kindergartners are into things like Frog and Toad, okay? Sometimes it's not until first grade.

We give them that decodable support and transition them over to real books because that's our whole point of what we're wanting to do.

And the quicker we can do that, the faster we can move our kids to what they need to do, which is read, write, and spell.

Okay, now this one. Take a deep breath.

This one, I'm like, "Oh my gosh, I can't take this off now," but I have gotten so much feedback of angst from this next slide. So I want you to just

know where we're coming from here, not for the point of

going to angst, but when we get much more efficient in how we're delivering the exact same information that we all have under the same umbrella when we're doing systematic, explicit, and phonics instruction.

When we deliver it in a way that's so much more efficient, the progress is a whole lot faster, okay?

So,

having said that, in our print to speech structured literacy, this was hard to find. Mostly I found it, and I'm talking about intervention on these two slides, okay? Intervention, it's really hard to-- I

couldn't really find in the research, and I actually asked sweet Nate Joseph, who's done this meta-analysis stuff, brilliant stuff.

I asked him, "How much time

And he could tell me months or years of how much time as far as with a structured literacy Orton-Gillingham program, but he could not tell me as far as how many hours. All right? So that was not really very easy

to get to. But from kids who have had that instruction that

have come to our center, parents, I've talked to at least probably close to a dozen parents in the last month or so, who have talked about their kids and

their instruction with Orton Gillingham programs, following the Orton-Gillingham system.

And so this one is actually from the Barton system, and it talks about two to four times a week.

So twice a week, two to three times a year.

Might need four to five times a year or three to four times a week.

So most of everybody who I've talked to said

two to four times a week, and it can be 10 years. It can be seven years.

Actually, four, three for sure. Some are obviously going to be less because

everybody's different. But the people who I have talked to

or who bring their kids to our reading center or the adults that come to our

reading center, typically it has been many, many years.

But most of the things I found probably four, and the average was

two to four times a week for two to four years.

And a lot of that is that memorization to mastery,

and going from what is man-made, which is letters

as far as the code, and takes a lot more time and energy.

Now, this one also got me in a lot of trouble, this 12 hours.

Now, when my mom told me that that professor from Michigan State

at her center was getting kids in 12 hours out of special ed and reading,

and I called her and I'm like, "Uh." I was like, "Right,

okay." I was very skeptical. However, I wanted to teach my kid to read.

So I called her and I said, "Now, come on. What are you doing?

Are you doing phonics? Are you doing whole language?

What are you doing here?" And she said, "No and no.

There are good things in both of those.

However, the research has shown for quite a few years," and this was in 1997, "for

quite a few years what we need to do to teach somebody quickly

to read to their highest potential, but it's not getting to teachers in colleges."

Now, in most of us, it's pretty common knowledge now that most teachers are not taught how to teach reading in college. Right?

So there's a lot about that, and that's starting to shift, which is very exciting.

So I asked her what it was. She told me about Diane McGuinness's book.

I read the book. I read "Reading Reflex." I taught my daughter, and

now this is another thing that people say to me, "That's not true.

You couldn't have done that." I taught her in three hours.

And I've started to kind of quit saying that because people really, you know,

"Ah, that's not true. You're a liar." It's kind of like,

I understand that that seems crazy, but we replicate that in our reading

center. Teachers that we train, they replicate that in their classrooms, in their special ed.

12 hours is the average. This was published in

the "Orton Annals of Dyslexia" in 1996, and

in "Phonographics," 12 hours or less. All right?

And these are all struggling readers.

They have some data, too, and Alyssa will share a link with you on

that, about some studies that have done just dyslexic kids.

But as far as whatever

literacy lack child that they have taught or adult,

an average of 12 hours. To me, this didn't seem too crazy because

in that Weinshank, same thing, average of 12 hours.

And Diane McGuinness says, really, if you're doing the most efficient possible way of instruction, it shouldn't take more than 60 hours of instruction. Now, again, we have had two clients here over 100 hours because of cognitive issues and different things that required them to need more instruction.

But very rarely do we go over 24 hours of instruction. So really the average is 12, sometimes it's two, sometimes it's 24. Humans, there's a range, but with this efficiency and teaching the kids, utilizing and capitalizing on what they're already bringing to you, which is the ability to speak, a lot of our time and energy is undoing the stuff that happens a lot of times in the classroom, which is guessing and those types of things, but also rules and exceptions. I just taught this wonderful adult.

She memorized herself to teach herself to read, then she was taught Orton Gillingham approach program for a year and a half, and then she was taught Ebley. And she had this great analogy.

She said, "Learning the Orton Gillingham..." But for the first couple hours, every time I'd show her something, she's like, "Wait a minute." And she'd want to tell me the rule, and she'd want to give me this whole dissertation, and I'd be like,

"Let's take that and set it aside and just do what I ask." She's like, "I spent a lot of time and energy.

I spent all this homework memorizing all these things, and I know this stuff." I'm like, "Well, she wanted to increase her reading speed, and all of her, of course, are reading." So I said, "Let's set it aside and then just go from this." And she said, "When I did that, doing my Orton Gillingham, which definitely helped me, I made very good gains.

It took a lot of time and a lot of effort, but it was like driving a stick shift. It's like you got to be cognizant all the time. It's not natural.

It took a long time to get to, to get even automatic.

Whereas when I did Ebley, it was more like driving an automatic car. Like you get in and the car does all that stuff.

You don't have to err and grind the gears and do all this and all the things with your feet. It's just a lot more smooth and,

I don't know, efficient, really." So this is that evolution that we go through with everything in life. And so moving to this to get this to be more, not just, yes, we all teach speech

to print and print to speech, but our delivery of our instruction, how can we streamline it? How can we simplify it?

How can we make it so these kids who are like, "I need some logic here because I'm overwhelmed with all of this cognitive overload in my brain, especially with the rules and keeping track of these rules, and what's that syllable type, and how do I do this, and what's this process?"

I have to stop and do this," and that's going to slow down their ability to become automatic and comprehend.

So all of these things are efficiency

improvers. That's what they are. And they work brilliantly

as we do them, but

change is hard. And we know, just like with kids, getting them to quit

guessing or saying the letter name or doing those types of things when we're

teaching them, adults are learners too.

So adults and teachers and parents who are teaching their kids, it is

challenging to shift

what has become a habit and what we normally do.

However, it's an evolution, just like everything.

And all of us,

we're all dedicated, motivated people that are focused on literacy,

so we can do anything, which is cool.

So, if you want to learn more, we've given you a lot of links, I know, but these

are three things. If you're very new to like, "What is this phonics in general?"

Like, "She's talking all these phonics terms," and I'm like, "Ah, what's phonics,

period?"

"At a Loss for Words," a radio documentary by Emily Hanford,

is spectacular. We'll share that link.

If you're just like, "I'm kind of at the beginning of my learning here," that's a

great place for you. "Speech to Print Exploration," if you just want to be like, "I

want to dabble in this and kind of see what's going on," thank you, Nikki.

Go here. She has so many resources.

And in two weeks, I don't think she's done anything else in the last two weeks besides find these things, and she's a brilliant finder.

And then, "Why Our Children Can't Read." I highly recommend this book.

I'm going to tell you, have a glass of wine when you read it, because I just reread it. I hadn't read the whole thing again since 1997, and I just read it two weeks ago on a plane ride. And I was in a very different place,

1997, because I had tried these things with my child.

I was looking to help her. I was like, "Hallelujah!" Still my favorite book I'm reading, quite frankly. And I've read hundreds of them, but still my favorite.

And it was like, "This is phenomenal.

Oh my gosh." When I read it two weeks ago, it was cool because a lot of the people in it that she talks about, and the researchers, I'm like, "I'm familiar with them." Like Benita Blackman, which Maria Murray absolutely loves, and she was her professor, and she did research with her. She talks about her.

You will note she has 15 pages of references in here.

But, and here's the but,

and we have all got to kind of get past this when you read her book.

She is,

you could call her a lot of different things, but pretty abrasive. Okay?

She's blunt, and she's just like, "Boom, this is it." And

so she may be triggering to pretty much everybody, quite frankly.

If you teach balanced literacy, she can trigger you.

If you teach print to speech, she can probably trigger you.

If you're a dyslexia advocate, she's going to trigger you.

Pretty much everybody, she's going to say something like, "Listen, lady."

I actually tried to reach out to her recently because we talked back in the day

quite a bit, but I heard she was in failing health, and I wasn't able to

connect with her because I had some questions for her. But brilliant.

It's a brilliant book. I highly recommend it. Get that wine, read the book.

You will be happy that you did, I think. I hope.

Okay, our next webinar is May 19th at 7:00.

It's going to be much mellower, but really pretty much as important.

Handwriting Tips to Increase and Improve Literacy Skills.

We're pretty obsessed with handwriting here at EBLI, and we are constantly learning

more about that too, and that's a whole another wonderful thing to learn about.

So now, we are going to-- That wasn't too bad,

really,

that I went over. I'm going to bring Hannah on here, and she is

going to be my question deliverer, so I can answer some

questions. Hopefully you've got some questions, Hannah.

Oh, we've got questions. Really, really good questions, too.

Awesome.

And the first thing, though, this isn't a question, but I just feel like this is a

good kind of kickoff to the discussion part, is something that Leslie said, that if people didn't see it in the chat, I just want to bring everyone's attention. So she said, Leslie Loud, "The phonics versus whole language debate has consumed us. We just want to see phonics.

What Nora seems to be saying is that within phonics, there may be dramatically better ways to teach. We need to, one, everyone to understand we need phonics." That's a good start.

Yeah.

"Two, learn the best ways to then do phonics." And she said, "Mind-blowing."

And that is such a true-- I just thought that was a really powerful insight.

Thank you, Leslie. Another new friend of mine. Leslie Loud, is that what you said?

Yeah.

Yeah. Another new friend of mine. I'm happy you're on here, Leslie.

I've made a lot of new friends this week and last week. All right.

Yes. Lots of stuff stirred up. But,

there's kind of two camps of questions, Nora, so that you've got kind of the general questions, and then you've got some real in the weeds EBLI specific ones.

So I'm going to save the in the weeds EBLI specific ones for last, if you have time and want to answer those.

Okay.

This word, or how do you sort this and that and the other thing.

Okay.

Just so everyone's aware. I'm going to kick it off with Yolanda's question, which you'll appreciate.

"What's going on with our teacher educational programs that we are not taught any of this?"

Oh, wow. Hmm.

Isn't that the \$50 million question?

Hmm. Well,

huh.

I don't know. Okay, let me tell you a story,

and maybe this will lead to it, because I don't really know the total answer.

My pat thing that I say

about teacher education and a lot of other things, why it's not been happening in

schools, is that most of the

time,

our literacy instruction stuff that comes down from

wherever it may come down from, from publishing companies, from legislative, from

wherever, ends up being about power and politics and ego

and money. And it doesn't end up being about children, and

that's unfortunate. Now, I've met with, and we've worked with, and we've actually

been in it, Americo, before they closed down, colleges.

I had a professor who wanted to try to get this into colleges.

She said it's a three-year process.

Anette Weinshink, basically she said, "I got blackballed out of my

college, and people who had been my friends for 30 years, for me talking about this,

would no longer speak to me." So there's a huge charge on this, a charge on not teaching-- Typically, a lot of colleges even can't mention phonics at all.

In

It's like some power struggle that's about the adults, unfortunately.

I know one day, Amanda Price, she was a state representative who wrote the K3 literacy bill in Michigan.

Her people called me one day and said, "Will you meet with her?

Because we're having these subcommittee hearings, and people say, 'They should do Ebly, they should do Ebly.' We're like, 'What's Ebly?'" The Department of Ed didn't

know. It's because us linguistic phonics people, we usually

like to hide in a cave, and if you want us, you come ahead and get us, but we don't want to get out there and get shot at, right?

Because there's a lot of shooting happening.

So I told her, "Okay, I'll have coffee with you." And she said,

"What do you do?" I said, "Here's the deal. This is what I want to ask of you.

Teachers aren't taught how to teach reading in college." And she said, "That's not true." And I said, "I know." I didn't think it was either.

Annette Wynesheank told me that way back when, and I thought she was crazy on that, too. I said, "I understand that you don't think that that's true, because it seems

crazy. However, will you go back to your subcommittee thing and get Michigan and Michigan State, Grand Valley, all those colleges, and bring in their Department of Ed person and ask them about literacy instruction?" So, I don't know, maybe three weeks later, we meet again, and she's like, "Nora, they only teach two credits out of 30 that are reading, and they don't even have to be about how to teach reading." And I'm like, "I know." So I know that that's the case, and I know that there's a lot of politics around it.

Why is it?

I don't know the answer to that, but it's a really good question, and it's starting to shift. It's starting to shift. I know Virginia--

Why am I blanking on my-- Oh my gosh, and I just read an email from her today.

Nelson?

No. Oh, well. Anyway, she's helped with a bill in

Virginia that's reading for everybody.

Why don't we have reading bills that's like, "Let's improve and put the reading instruction that works for everybody, and let's make sure that it starts at the College of Education, so that our teachers who are paying money and not being taught what they need to be taught..." Bless your hearts.

God, my heart goes out to you guys, teachers.

Why aren't you getting what you're getting? I wish I knew.

I have a lot of assumptions.

Other people probably know better than I do, but we need to change.

I was going to say a lot going on in the chat, too, with really good

insights there. And-

Yeah, if you guys have insights, please share, because I don't-- I'm a nurse.

I was a nurse. I didn't come up through the education system, which I'm at a huge disadvantage and a huge advantage because of that.

So I wasn't indoctrinated into that, but also, there's a lot of things like I don't get how this goes, or the thinking.

Okay, so I guess I don't know. There's that, Yolanda.

Sorry about that, but those are some of my thoughts. All right, what else, Hannah?

It's a nice start that there's so many here who understand the need for change and see that as well, which is pretty fun.

Okay, so the next question I have for you is,

let me see.

Why the switch from phonographics?

I know that you touched on that a bit in the webinar.

Yeah.

I was teaching phonographics. I also had a reading center, which was like our learning lab, and I was really obsessive.

Hannah was just a young child then, but

one time she hijacked somebody at a

neighborhood bonfire, a mom, she was 12 years old, and told her all about--

She was like, "No wonder she's here and my right-hand woman," because she knew because this was just my world of everything. I was obsessive about it.

So

I continued to learn. I continued to refine my practice.

I continued to add to it,

where I wasn't really doing phonographics anymore, to be perfectly honest, in my contract.

There were some things in phonographics that were not-- Like they teach special endings or different things that are like, why don't we stay on the same horse and do this? And Carmen, I had conversations with her, but it was a program where Eby is a system, so a program's pretty static.

So that was one thing. The other thing was, is phonographics was very, and Carmen and Jeff really wanted it this way, that it was one-on-one remediation. And I still, I'd like to get rid of my reading center,

because this needs to be taught in a classroom, K3.

So I wanted to

have it be easy for teachers in a classroom to get trained and to easily teach it. So that is where I've been really for the last 20 years almost, putting almost all of my energy into getting this so that the classroom teachers can apply it, so we can have that fence at the top of the cliff instead of the ambulance at the bottom picking up Humpty Dumpty.

So that was another reason. There are a few others, but those are the main ones.

I always will be thankful, always will be thankful to Diane McGinnis, to Carmen and Jeff for creating phonographics for what I learned from them.

It is the foundation of what I do, but also, I wanted to expand and include handwriting and writing and vocabulary and more, so it's comprehensive.

That was another thing, too.

Yep, and I just want to say one thing before I give you the next one, is that for the people asking about the recording, for the resources, all the links that were added, the slides, and then all the questions that have been asked, all of that is coming to you tomorrow in an email. So everything that we've talked about, included all of that's coming. And for those of you who have hands raised, if you want to go ahead and put your question in the Q&A, that would be great, too, so that we can collect all of them. Nora's going to answer questions till 9:00.

Anything that she doesn't answer by then, we will have her answer in a typed answer in the email. So the next question is around--

There's kind of two similar ones. So first of all, are you aware of a speech-to-print program or educational program that leads to a certification through CERI or IDA, particular with a practicum? Good question.

Yeah, that's a good question.

Years ago, I was told that

Ebly could not be

an approved IDA program because it had

to be an Orton-Gillingham program.

More recently, and I haven't checked into it, quite frankly, because I've had a lot

of moving parts in the last year here,

I was told that they're starting to look at

non-Orton-Gillingham programs. I haven't followed up on that.

For \$2,000 a year, it can be in there.

So That is something-- we have

moved all of our instruction online over the last five years,

and totally refined, and we did a pilot, and we've been doing all of our

revisions all with it. So that is

finishing up, and we're switching over to that starting literally now,

this summer in our next trainings.

So that has consumed us with everything.

That's just been all-hands-on-deck kind of thing.

So, I haven't, it's more a thing of time.

And quite honestly, ignorance on my part as far as not really knowing

how to go about doing a lot of these things that are these things.

It's opened up a lot because people are talking to me.

I didn't used to get anybody who would talk to me about this before,

and recently, and I say just even in the last few months, that has really

changed, which I find is really exciting.

So, I will put that on my long laundry list of things to do

and would love to-- We have a certification that's just ours type of deal.

And we're on the list, like the State of Michigan approved program.

And when people ask us to apply for those lists or to be put on those,

in certain states, we'll do that. But

it's a process and we're constantly learning.

Nora and I have a list that's called "For Another Day."

Yeah. And I have a list of, I really would like these things researched.

So if there's any researchers out there looking for a good idea, and some stuff,

and really-

Lots of them

... many of them are fairly easy to research.

So-

Yeah

... get ahold of me.

Another great question, kind of along that lines: "Is there a way to adapt a

science of reading or OG to be speech to print rather than scrapping all

of our new learning?" And I love just the mindset there.

Yeah. I feel like a lot of things that I looked

at,

people are trying to do that. But what they're doing is they're trying to do

both, and then there's this confusion, and I'm looking like, "What? Wait a minute.

Oh, this looks like speech to print." Like, no, here's all these rules, or here's

all this, so there's a whole big mixing up of.

I really feel that there can be, and I know anything's possible, for

sure. But it's a huge paradigm shift.

It's a huge paradigm shift. I think like the heart words thing, which

is our traditional--

We don't talk about these are weird or irregular, you can't read these until we've taught them. Yet we teach our kids, if we haven't taught you that this is /ă/ like in "said," and the word's coming up, guess what?

We're going to do sound lines and teach the word "said," and then we're going to have it in our reading. So you can have that because of the process of it. And you can make it so much more simplified even.

Like even the heart words thing. The way that we teach those words, they're along the same lines, but probably three times faster.

Because if you can save a second or two, I'm going there.

We're going to change how we're delivering our stuff so that we're going for the more and more efficient. And it's constantly evolving because I'm always learning more. So

I don't know because I sat in Orton Gillingham trainings,

I've watched Reading Recovery. I'm not saying that that's Orton

Gillingham. No, that's not at all. That's the whole more whole language stuff.

But a whole bunch of things, I'm like, "What's this?"

Okay, let me learn more about it." You're like, "Hmm." I don't know.

But I look at all of those things and I wonder,

how we look at balanced literacy and say, "Well, you can do a phonics patch." Well, this is good that you're teaching some phonics, but when you're teaching those

other skills that then

counteract what you've just taught here, it's kind of like the cow

gives you a good pail of milk, and then kicks it over.

And then we've got to fill up the milk again and kick it over.

So there's things that are going to have to go,

like in balanced literacy, guessing, looking at the picture, those things, context

clues to our through cueing. That really needs to go.

That's not doing us any justice really. Unless you're a good reader.

So once you're a good reader, we all do that stuff.

But when we're teaching somebody to read, they're not a good reader.

So it's the same thing with our Orton Gillingham approach stuff. Mm.

The syllable types, I don't even know the syllable types.

I've had many

people who have come here that want to tell me about the syllable types

and show me, and when I'm trying to teach them, like, "No, let's just put that

aside so that we can just be straightforward about from what you're saying, and

let's just go with that." Because it's more natural.

So I know that there is, but I think that it's a pretty

significant thing, but people are trying to do that.

It's just like with the speech to print and print to speech, and we're kind of

doing a combo, and it muddies the waters for kids, and it also, poor

teachers. Man, I

think, wow, the science of reading and the science of reading page and all this

information, I think, wow, aren't I glad that I don't have that

deluge to try to sift through and figure out who is what and

what is good and what is not. So it's not

an easy answer of any of it,

but it's a process to, where can we go from here?

We're talking about it. That's a huge first step.

Okay, now how do we evolve even further, and what can

change, and how can we work together? This is about our kids, you guys.

This is about our kids. That's what all of us want.

So let's work together. People have said to me, "Why would you talk about

this? We're on this side of the fight or this." Why do we have to fight?

Can't we all work together? Because everybody, nobody I know wants to

get up in the morning and harm children. Nobody.

And if we could use our collective things and be

open to

knowing that we have room to evolve, I think that would be good.

So I'd be open to talking about how that could be.

But it is a big paradigm shift.

Right.

This is another one. If you'll speak to the

assessments. So somebody was saying, the letter names are assessed, or

is it important that my student needs to know all of these Dolch words on this

Dolch word list, or to be able to say them all by sight, a certain number of words.

So can you speak to that a little bit, the assessment piece, and how that makes it a little tricky?

Yeah. I did have one school that took the letter names off of their assessment, which was cool. But it's fine if you assess a letter's name. There's lots of correlational research between letter, name, and sound. Usually, it's the kids that are good at reading, actually, they know the letter names, and they know their sounds. So we don't know.

That's inconclusive research, really, as far as there needs to be more of that.

So

how important is it for us to know if when the kids don't know their letter names, we're like, "Woohoo!" Ooh, they don't know their letter names, when they come to us at our center anyway, because, especially with that letter name interference stuff, almost everybody second grade and above knows their letter names. So it's not like we're saying, "Keep the letter names hidden in a box and don't ever show them." But you can learn them just like the middle name.

We don't want you to get rid of your middle name, but it's not really what we access and utilize much. So as far as assessment, do I care? I suppose the kids are going to know the letter name.

I don't mind if they don't know it at the beginning of kindergarten, even the middle. They'll know it by the end.

We have a process that we do with handwriting to teach the letter names, but it's aside from reading. So, depending on what you teach, but what I don't like is let's drill these letter

names, let's do it in isolation, let's do these things that put this cognitive load on the kid,

and they're like, "Wait, is that O this, or is that a that?"

And what's the letter name, and do I want the sound?" Especially when we're doing more sound stuff. We're overloading our children, and for what reasoning?

What was the second part of that question, Hannah?

There was also knowing a certain amount of words by sight.

Oh, yeah. I

like an assessment, like a word idea assessment,

because it's a good correlation, really, with comprehension, too, like a list of words, real words. I also like nonsense words second grade and older.

We do nonsense words for little kids, which is interesting.

But, I like second grade and older because you can memorize a list of real words, but

nonsense words, you'd have to really be able to decode them.

But as far as Dolch sight words things,

no. I do not agree with lists of words in

isolation or on a little flippy card thing that we all memorize

by the whole word, which is what those are, and it doesn't work well.

My kid could memorize every one of them. She couldn't apply them in reading.

She certainly couldn't spell them.

So we're using a lot of time and energy

on memorizing those whole shapes.

So we're kind of going back to the dark ages where they used to write pictures on the walls and look at that whole picture.

So we're like, "Look at this whole picture of this word and memorize it.

So look at this word that's of. Now here's of, and here's for, and here's-- they all look so much alike." And so you're like, "Oh my God, my brain can't decide what's what." So they're using all their brain power to do that, and they can't possibly become automatic or accurate to comprehend.

So I would not do that personally.

Well, Nora, I might not have clearly gotten the questions across.

The question is more like as a teacher or a parent when we don't have a choice, right? Like we have to give this test.

Oh, okay. Got it.

I have to have my kid take this test.

Yeah. Not as flashcards then. Okay, so I'm still going to go on the same tack.

Do not teach those words as flash cards. If you go by, "Okay, of. O-V.

Here's the word of. Now say it as you write it. O-V. Wow, look at this one.

I don't know any other word in English where that's the spelling of O-V. Who cares?

Cool." So then they spell it. It takes so much less

time for that to be orthographically mapped,

cemented in their brain to become automatic when you do it that way.

So when you have to have those things on the ring or whatever, those words, and

they have to have those, teach them by sound.

Do not teach them to memorize the whole word by the look of it or by the letter names, O-F, of. That's kind of

confusing. We don't want to do that either. So yes, go by sound.

And Emma very generously said that she has the whole Fry, Dolch, et cetera, word lists all code mapped out, so she's going to send that to you.

Is that my Australian Emma?

I think SSP, yeah.

Hi, Emma.

Thank you, Emma.

Yay, thank you. Yeah, she's got all kinds.

I've been learning from her this last few weeks, too, so thank you.

Yeah, no, go by sound. That's what your kids have. They've got the sound.

They've already got half of it there.

And then segment, use your fingers to segment instead of looking at the letters so that they don't say the letter names.

We've got a lot of things that we can do to really make this much more efficient and faster.

Chris, another great question. "What tips do you have for changing school culture around literacy instruction? My school is balanced literacy disguised as science of reading, but I want to see a complete overhaul, at least for K2."

Grace,

I would say. You have to understand that people are where they're at,

and I wasn't like this 25 years ago, for sure.

I've worked with enough teachers and enough parents and enough kids and enough

school systems to understand that everybody

is where they are. And I could tell you what's going to make them not at all

interested in changing, and that is

not grace. Okay? If we're degrading, if we're fighting, if we're telling you

everything you're doing wrong. So sometimes you have to do small steps.

For me, what I tell our schools when they come when they have that situation,

please don't train all your staff. Please don't do that.

You shouldn't do that in anything. You shouldn't do that in anything.

You should do a pilot, have a few teachers be trained, have them

try this, and then what happens with that list, then they all come out because

they're like, "What are you doing?" Especially if they're remediation teachers, and

they go back into the classroom. But even the classroom teachers, because then

they're going to talk. And who do they trust? Each other.

So create a culture of collaboration

instead of a culture of blame and shame and

that type of thing. To me, and educate them gently.

I think that Emily Hanford's "At a Loss for Words," and I know this, many, many,

many, many teachers have started to shift their thinking

thanks to that, and then they want to learn more.

So when they want to learn more,

it's so confusing. Sometimes when I go on even the

science reading page, Donna has done such an amazing job, and there's great stuff,
but it's like, blah. So I just don't even
look at it. I'm looking there out of curiosity just to kind of see what's there,
but it's like sensory overload and 25
different thing answers. Even if you look in the comments to the answer stuff, it's
like this is interesting. We've got 10 different things that people are saying.
Who am I believing? Jane or Julie or Tim or--
Which one knows really what's what?
So we need to collaborate together, we need to explore together, and we
need to have a lot more compassion
and willingness to be curious and to help each other
So I think that, and I don't think that unless people are
ready or if you have a real strong leader,
it takes some time to change the culture and to educate
people and to ask them, "Hey, I read this and I'm curious what you think
about it. Will you read it and we could talk about it on Thursday?" Or, "I listened
to this. Will you check this out?" Or, "Let's listen to this at a staff meeting.
Can we do that?" Try not to be subversive, I think.
I think being really open and curious and learning,
you catch a lot more flies with honey, my mom always used to say.
So that would be my advice for that. It's frustrating.
As a mom whose kid was a
victim of this,

I wasn't feeling nearly as grace-filled

25 years ago, for sure. I was feeling fury.

But we

have to understand that we're feeling that, and that's our thing, but

what can we do that's going to affect change?

And it's not this beating heads against the wall or against

each other,

in my opinion, anyway. So, yeah.

Yeah. And sweet Donna said, she said, "OG..." Let me see if I

can find her comment.

"OG is all we had, but again, we learn as we go.

That's what important thing-"

Well, it is this evolution.

"Important to keep evolving." To keep evolving. Yeah.

Yeah. I like to use this evolution thing.

When I was 16, I got glasses when I was 16.

I didn't even know that there was delineation of leaves on a tree.

It was like the world opened up. And then when I was in my 20s, I got

contacts. I'm like, "This is cool.

I'm not losing my glasses." And then I got

LASIK surgery in my 30s, and I'm like, "Wow." So it's this evolution.

I didn't say, "Those darn glasses.

Those were horrible," or, "Those stupid contacts." No, it's this evolution,

and when we know better, we do better.

A lot of things are easier in theory than in practice, but we have to really practice that.

Understand that everybody's at different places, and they all want to do better, but when you're attacking and you're feeling attacked, you don't feel like being open and curious. So I think the non-attacking is really important.

And Chris, who asked that question, said, "Thank you for answering my question in such a thoughtful way."

Aw.

And Dave said, "I love how you're always questioning things, have not been tainted by teacher training and PD. I appreciate you so much." That's so kind, you guys.

Thank you.

And then just a little bit of clarity around, I think you said something at the beginning about how your preference is to have Able or speech to print in classrooms. But some people are saying, "Why don't you want it in small group or intervention?"

Oh.

So can you speak to that a little bit?

Oh, it's not that I don't want it there.

It's really funny because for years and years and years, everybody thought Able was only for intervention, and it's phenomenal for intervention.

But the name of my reading center is Ounce

of Prevention Reading Center, and so an ounce of prevention is worth a pound of cure. So why I want it in classrooms is because

then we can prevent

so many. Now, some kids are going to need more repetition.

Okay, that's what tier two and tier three are for, but we don't need 20% of them or half of the class or half the school going into intervention, right?

If we teach it well and right out of the gate, we don't

have any... No, I would love for everybody to have the instruction.

I'm a sucker for all of this, and when somebody is suffering and they come for-- We have a waiting list that's like, poor cricket, I don't know. Are we at 60 people?

And we go through it really fast. We're getting people off all the time because we only see them for once a week for typically 12 weeks, sometimes six weeks, sometimes 24, 18, whatever. But it

takes months to get up on that wait, and it keeps filling up and filling up and filling up. And I don't think that it's okay for kids

to have to come here, a lot of them come during school, actually, but for them to have to come and have extra school on top of school, and for parents to pay extra. I don't think that's okay as far as for outside stuff.

I also don't think it's okay for kids to be pulled out of class and have to-- When we have that, where we're doing small group, we do small group all the time as far as with Able. Some kids have to have intervention one-on-one.

They have to have that transitioning, not for years.

But another thing that we do a lot in schools that I see

happening all the time in schools that we have people like, "Yeah, we're going to do Able, but we're also going to throw this on and this on and this on and this on." So the gains don't happen, and people will tell me, "Oh, they've been doing Able in remediation for two years." Not possible.

It's not. Even people who have lost part of their brain wouldn't take two years, which we've taught. Because what's happening is we've got this crystal clear Able water. Now let's throw in some of this and some of that and some of all these other things because we need to supplement.

We need to do extra. As far as foundational instruction, it's all we teach here at our reading center. That's all.

So we get

gains much further, much faster, but it's really hard, and teachers have been conditioned to--

Typically, all the schools that I work with, they have five to seven different reading initiatives. Now it may be things like Heggerty and this, that, but then it's like, what's the teacher supposed to do?

I'm going to use number four today and two here and three there, and so it's a different thing all over, and it's overwhelm.

Lots of money, lots of time, lots of teacher energy, and teachers are confused and kids are confused, and everybody's overwhelmed, and our scores stay bad. So simplify, to me, is the answer. Simplify.

And then give our kids what they need, but if we're giving them that really strong, efficient instruction that works really well, and then we're supporting those, there are going to be a lot less of those, though, that need intervention.

So I'm not at all against intervention.

We have kids, if you're in middle school, high school, adults, we got to help them. We got to help them

be taught in a way that's going to work for them. Are we going to get to them all?

There's millions. Yeah, I would love to.

Together we can, but not if we keep fighting.

But together we can.

Yeah. So hopefully that also answers Jennifer's question about, "I understand you want to target K3 for gen ed classrooms, but within EBLI, are there also changes you recommend if it's remediation?" Yes, we have a full intervention-

Oh, yeah

... for K-12. Yeah.

We have a K-12 intervention that has three tiers.

We're spectacular at intervention, but classroom

teachers are the first line of defense

for this. But yes, intervention, yeah, we

understand that. And we're not saying don't, but we're saying we can't intervene

our way out of this problem that we've got nationally and in every

English-speaking country, unfortunately.

And Patricia's is a little bit less of a question, but I feel like so many people

can relate: "I was taught in my college reading courses back in the '70s to teach sight words by sight, by memory. That's the approach I used in my 32 years of teaching, and even with tutoring after I retired 12 years ago.

I totally understand the speech to print approach in teaching sight words now, but it is so hard to switch my mindset to that after having taught this way for so many years, and I'm trying to switch to a different mindset, but it's hard."

You know what? Change is hard. It's great in theory, but it's hard in practice for everybody, for all of us. Changing to this Zoom thing, okay, I was a little crabby this morning because we were like, "Yesterday we changed to make sure we could get everybody on." And I'm like, "Seriously?

We're going to do this today?" And then we're practicing this morning, and I'm like, "No, I don't want to do something different." But we did, and I took a breath, stepped back. We all learned, everybody on here all learned together, and here we are, and nothing has blown up. That's really exciting.

So yeah. But change is hard. And the more you've done it, then it becomes automatic. Like kids that guess. Kids that guess, and they come here, it would take us a lot less to teach them if they weren't guessing.

They know that guessing isn't working.

They know that, but it's so deeply ingrained and embedded into their neural pathways, and that connection is so strong, breaking it, even if they know it's not serving them well, they know it's not working well, they know they're not reading the word right, but it's just a habit that's become repeated so many times that it's automatic.

We want the habit repeated so many times of accuracy, accuracy in reading, accuracy in spelling, accuracy in

sentence and paragraph and every kind of writing. That's what we want.

All of us, I'm sure.

Terry is wondering: What percent of kids would you say pick up the patterns of the language naturally, like daughter number one, present and accounted for?

Well, she was taught ABeka, which was a real strong traditional phonics program.

And interestingly, when she was taught EBLI, before her ACT, because she had a 31 on the ACT, and we did it again, and we did some EBLI, and she got a 32. And Hannah talks, too, about how-- What do you say, Hannah?

She'd play a trick to spell certain words. Can you explain that?

The Q-U-E. Yeah. Well, I remember after one or two years of teaching EBLI, I was teaching words with the sound /cu/ with different spellings for /cu/. And so we were doing the words grotesque and picturesque and looking at that Q-U-E spelling /cu/ at the end of the word, and I just thought to myself, "Oh my gosh. I don't have to read that in my head as /qua/ and then switch it real quick to /cu/. I don't have to do that trick anymore.

I'm just that much more efficient." So it's just the efficiency of this is a /cu/, just like the /cu/ in cat, just like the /cu/ in back and in skip.

It's just a different spelling for the same sound.

Wow, that's just so much quicker than what I was doing to have to help myself remember.

Which is a really important thing, because EBLI, we've taught doctors, we've taught lawyers, we've taught a lot of valedictorians who then did poor on an ACT, because when they read, they read too slow because they were using inefficient strategies.

But they take just a couple of hours to really move them far and fast.

But this is the important thing. When you do this kind of process, this delivery of the instruction from the speech to print in increasing your efficiency, everybody benefits.

When I train teachers, they tell me all the time, "Oh my gosh, I'm a better reader. I didn't know this." Parents are just like, "I didn't know this," when they're watching their kids. We didn't know it.

We can't do something about something we didn't know.

But then when we do know it, and it's like everything, it's clunky at first, but when you have a process and a system that is really logical and it makes sense and it works really well,

if you'll allow yourself that uncomfortableness in the teaching of it, the kids go to it like a duck in water real quick.

But if you'll do that teaching thing, and you notice when you're falling back, when you're doing the things that are your habits.

But it's just like, "This is fun." Our EBLI teachers tell us all the time, like, "Oh my gosh, this is just so exciting and fun." And

the kids think it's fun, too,

which is cool.

Because it makes sense. We really want the make sense thing.

So I feel like you've got four questions here, but they're very similar vein, so

I'm going to read them all to you. So the first one is 12 hours once a week.

The second one is how far apart are those tutoring hours spaced?

Does the frequency make a difference? So about the frequency of that.

And then the next one is how do we teach students who've done the 12-ish

hours of intervention but are not on grade level? Should they have been extended?

Is there some sort of systematic review?

And then Jen was wondering if you could clarify for everyone what is exactly

achieved in those 12 hours. Is it reading on grade level, meeting a specific

benchmark, et cetera. So if you could speak to the 12-hour thing.

Yeah. All right. So for our intervention at our reading center, we teach one hour a

week, typically, for an average of 12 weeks. Okay?

Some are less, some are more. In schools, in intervention, they will

teach-- Everybody does everything different in schools, quite frankly.

Sometimes they'll have 15 minutes, like, "Could we do every day?" And I'll say,

"Well, how about every other day for a half hour?

Could we do that?" Because you lose so much time in that transition.

So typically, it's probably 20 to 45 minutes in schools,

and sometimes it's every day, sometimes they'll do it every other day.

Small groups, a lot of times. I really encourage them to do one-on-one with those

very lowest, which are not a lot, but

for them. So in 12 hours, what we want to get them to,

ideally, we

use the Woodcock WJIII,

which is a standardized nationally normed test that gives you standard scores

that you can get effect sizes from. It also gives you grade levels.

And we also do a fluency assessment, to see how many words a

minute. We don't do the whole assessment.

We look at real words

Word identification and word attack, which are pseudo words, and

see how well they're doing, and then their fluency and accuracy.

So all of those things.

Now, typically, the thing of it is, it's not like we've taught them and they're

going to stop there. It's a cumulative effect if they keep using the process

that we've taught them. Okay? That's the other thing.

We have kids, sometimes if they come in kindergarten or first grade, they'll come

back maybe in fourth grade to get a lot of the higher level.

But even mostly it's like you use this process whether you're reading a

10 syllable word or a three sound word.

It's the same process, use the same skills, same strategies, all that type of

thing. So what we're wanting them to do is ideally to grade level

or close to grade level. Now with word ID and word attack, what we find if we do a

comprehension, that word ID and word attack are typically about a year

below where your comprehension would be. Okay?

Because they're really looking more at skills that helps us analyze the mistakes they're making, that type of thing. So in 12 hours.

Now, like I said, we had a gentleman,
he was an adult.

He'd lost part of his brain. He had tried to commit suicide and been cut down by his dad. He had been on 42 medications. He'd been in jail.

He had a lot of stuff. He could read the word "is" kind of by sight.

Sometimes yes, and sometimes no. He couldn't do a sound.

And he was probably 130 sessions, I would

say. And he was like, "You're going to be relegated to living in your parents'

basement, and you will never be able to function on your own," type of

thing. And the school told his mom, "We'll pay for you to take him to this place as long as you never bring him to us. He could stay till 26." He was 25.

"Keep him out of our school. Don't bring him back in, and we'll pay for him to go there." So he came to us, and he was

scary, to be honest. So he was about 120

sessions. Now he has gotten his GED, he has his driver's license, he lives on his own, he has a girlfriend, he has two businesses.

His whole life has turned around. It took a good bit
more time.

He had the letter name stuff, too, that you had to undo. So there's that.

But mostly, it's not very often even 36 hours.

That's rare. But some will be 18 or 24,
and our goal is to get you so that you are using
the process and you've gotten rid of your bad habits, whatever they may be,
so that you're now using this and you're doing that, and you're reading, and
you're reading out loud to your mom or dad, and they can tell if you're
misreading words,
and what's going on, and helping you doing the process that we do for trained
fluency and that type of thing. So that is what we're looking at so that
you have this. It's about the processes, not the information.

That's a huge difference with this, what I'm
calling linguistic phonics. And again, I'm not sure if it's all the right term.
I don't know if we should make up a-- Maybe we could make up a whole new term that
most of them start with a S, so we could start with something else.

But anyway, the
speech to print stuff with that. So hopefully that answers those
questions.

Okay, so three that are in a similar vein about non-verbal or
articulation issues or
pronunciation.

So how does speech to print work for non-verbal kids?

I work with students with special needs, many functioning at a one to two-year-old
level with minimal or no speech. Another one about students with articulation
issues, will this be as effective?

And then my students have very poor language skills.

English is their first language, but pronunciation is so far from the actual word. As a result, it's very difficult to train phonemic awareness to have effective speech to print. Any suggestions?

Okay. Can I have the first one first? I've lost my mind.

Yep.

Or lost my track of this. Not my mind, hopefully.

So non-verbal kids functioning at a one to two-year-old level.

Okay. At a one to two-year-old. So now the lowest IQ that I've worked with is 40.

And I had to do hand over hand and do all that kind of stuff to help.

So what I would do is if they're not speaking, okay, we're going to do the word at.

Okay, say a. Maybe they won't say anything.

So I would just hold their hand and try a, and this person was like a fifth grader, actually.

T- at, and say and do that. Now we have had kids that are non-verbal that will speak, but there's a lot more involved in that than just teaching them how to read, so you've got to do some pre-stuff, I would say.

But even

I would think, okay, my one-year-old grandson that's almost two, so I keep them on Wednesday. He and his sister on Wednesday.

So he has this big grid of letters, imagine that, and he dumped them all out, and we were playing and throwing them in there and stuff.

And then I say, "Christopher, say m." And I had a m.

He said, "M." "Say a." He'd say a. "Say t." T.

Or whatever the next letter was. Mat. And so he's repeating to me.

So am I doing explicit instruction? No.

However, I'm having him parrot me, and I'm giving

him exposure to segmenting, to blending, to sound to symbols.

He knows these letters. He'll walk by the refrigerator and say t and

touch a letter. And actually, a lot of times, it's actually the right sound that go

to the right letter. But these kids can do so much.

Segmenting, blending, all of those things are not natural.

So if they're at a one to two-year-old level, doing those kinds of things for them,

okay, and then building on them is what I would say.

What was the next one, Hannah?

Students with articulation issues, will this be as effective?

We love students with articulation issues because,

and I don't know why it is, but this is my

hunch, somebody could do research on this. We had Penny. Remember Penny, Hannah?

And another one. We had two. One of them was the youngest of six,

and one I think was also the youngest. But when they talked, it was like .

Okay, when they came to us, and we were like every human in their life,

in their family could translate for us, and we were like,

"We don't even know what you're saying." So when we're doing this, and I think that

it's separating the sound to symbol in the context of a word, okay, not in

isolation. And so we would say it, we would build, we would say it right, we would do sound lines, and do speech to print.

Both of these kids, they were both six, both of them, all of us could understand.

Now, they were not speaking as clearly as we are, but we could all understand them. So their articulation problems, it puts it on

warp speed fast for improving those articulation problems, which is really interesting. And also expressive and receptive language.

The processing stuff. My nurse mind, I'm real interested in cognitive processing and sequencing and simultaneous processing and all those kinds of things. All of that is embedded into the instruction that we do.

And then we do some extra stuff in our remediation intervention stuff too, that is specifically for cognitive processing improvement. But a lot of those things with expressive language and receptive language improve, and also math improves, which is really interesting. There are so many things I don't know because I wish somebody would research it because, so researcher people, there's a lot of questions out there.

And a lot of things that I wonder, but I know from the thousands and thousands of kids and adults that have come through here, and also tens of thousands in classrooms,

those neural connections are doing a lot of really cool things, but I don't know how or why. It's kind of like my phone.

Don't know how you're doing this, but it's pretty impressive that you are.

So,

yeah.

And the other one kind of in the same vein, Laura asked about her students with very poor language skills. So English is their first language, but pronunciation is so far from the actual word. As a result, it's difficult to train phonemic awareness to have effective speech-to-print.

So any suggestions for helping them?

Yeah. With them, too, with that,

in the context of a word, it's kind of the same thing as those articulation kits, to be perfectly honest. And also, especially if they're looking at a word and the word is, I don't know, tap, and they say something like, mattress or who knows what they might say here. So if they're just winging it and saying some stuff because like, "I know those letters mean something, so I'm going to say a word and see if you're good with that." So breaking it down, but putting it-- It's that simultaneous processing of a lot of things. Like every activity we teach in EBLI teaches a whole bunch, phonemic awareness, phonics, vocabulary, blah, blah. A lot of different things, and handwriting, spelling, all in one activity, sometimes comprehension, sometimes fluency, depending on the activity. So all of these things intertwined helps really amp up those neural pathway connections. So for them, I think the context of words for them, really important. We had a school once with nine

preschool classrooms, three to four-year-old kids, and they were all doing EBLI in the preschool, which wasn't really our idea, but they were like, "Okay, cool." And I went in in October, and all of them were blending. I was just like, "Wait a minute." In the first classroom when I was coaching, I thought it was a fluke. By the time I got to the fourth classroom, I'm like, "What is going on here?" I didn't even know that was-- The teacher's like, "We're just doing what's in the lesson plan and just going with it, and the kids are doing it." So these kids are capable of so much more than what we realize, I think. And a lot of times we discover by accident because the teacher's like, "I didn't realize I was supposed to be doing that," with a lot of things. And so we're like, "We knew they could go fast, but they can actually go faster in the classroom." Yeah.

Okay.

I think I got off track there, so sorry.

No, that was good. I'm trying to find the one that I wanted to ask you. These questions just keep coming fast and furious. We still have 39. I'm trying to get through them.

39 more questions?

Mm-hmm. A lot of them very EBLI specific, granular stuff.

Oh.

So that's for different-- I feel like another answering video or something, but...

Yeah, I'm probably not going to type those all out tonight.

Yeah, no. I figure a video might work.

When would you actually teach the letter names?

There's a quick one.

We teach the letter names in-- If you go to, and I bet Alyssa could find this for us, the handwriting fluency and something or other webinar that we did. It shows you the process of when we teach the letter names.

Please, some researcher, do some research on this.

This is a miracle cure. And anybody who's done it could tell in the chat about your experience with this. But what we do is we have the kids write the alphabet,

A, B, C, D, in lowercase letters and see how many they can

do in a minute. Now, there's some Peterson handwriting, did some research, and Dr.

Rose, I forget what his first name was. He's since been deceased.

Bob?

Bob Rose, yes. He's been deceased for a few years.

But anyway, he and the Peterson, Rand Nelson, they

did this research and found that if kids could write the lowercase

letters, 40 in a minute, especially kindergarten, first-grade kids, but we do it

up through adults, that they won't have reading problems.

Now, we've been finding that this is really true.

So we see how many they can write in a minute, and then we train them, but that's where they do the letter names

for us. And quite frankly, they learn them.

The letter names are everywhere,
really. And they learn them quickly, and really, it doesn't matter how quickly they
learn them or not, because the only time they need them was for a test, unless they
get to a spelling bee, which isn't till about fourth grade.

So.

Ruth and a couple other people-- Oh, Melissa is asking for
clarification. 40 in a minute?

Yes. Yep. If you look at the-- Get that, like I said,

Alyssa will give you that

link, and Lou will make sure we put it in tomorrow in the email.

But it tells you just how to do it. It has the Peterson handwriting prompts, all
the resources. I've got everything in there.

I'm doing my next webinar one because I needed more to show you how to
correct the handwriting, I think because this child didn't have as much-- I did
some correction with the video you'll see in there.

But I've been videotaping kids with handwriting that need a lot of correction

so I can show you how you do that drill down to support, and

then gradually release them as far as doing the top to bottom, left to right,

making the letters correctly, really important for a

lot of things. But the really crazy thing on that, and it's crazy,

we do it with everybody here now, but when you see the increase where they're
getting closer to that 40

letters in a minute, whatever age, the increase in fluency goes at the exact same

time. It's just like, eh.

And if they're down here, they're down here.

And when they move here, they move-- It's just fascinating, actually.

Ruth is wondering, and a couple people, about a scope and sequence.

So is that something we want to include, or do we want to have them email us if they want to see a scope and sequence?

I don't really give out our scope and sequence, and I'm going to tell you why.

It freaks everybody out. When

administrators call, and they say, "Let me see your scope and sequence.

We're trying to decide between what things," I said, "I would rather that you talk to somebody who's teaching EBLI so you can talk

Administrator to administrator, teacher to teacher, principal to principal, whatever, with somebody who's doing this that can explain from your perspective of what you're doing, how it works.

Our scope and sequence, they're like, "What?

You're teaching kids five ways to spell /s/

in,

I don't know, December or whatever.

Or you're teaching them three and four-syllable words and little kindergartners, you can't do that. You're only taking one week to teach four sounds, and then you move on to the next four sounds?"

It's just like the 12-hour thing that everybody's like, "That's just not possible."

It's like if somebody says,

"I taught my kids to read before they were three," and people say, "That's not pos--" Well, I did it. I didn't do that.

But if somebody says that, "Well, tell me how you did that," or, "Explain that to me." But for that--

I forgot the question that was answering. Sorry, Hannah.

I went off on a tangent, which I tend to do.

It's okay. I already moved it over, but I'll find it for you. Hang on.

Truly, I forgot totally what I was talking about,
and it wasn't about that.

That's what happens when we're on the almost hour three.

The scope and sequence. You don't share it.

Yeah.

Maybe email me about that.

Let us talk about that a little bit.

But I-

Yeah, email me

... typically, that shuts everything down because we realize that we're too

far, it sounds

like the washing your hands thing. You can't not kill the women or whatever.

It sounds just too far-fetched. So, it

kind of scares people off,

to be honest. So that's about it.

Okay. I think this is an easy one.

Let's see. I've got to go back to my open questions here.

Lily, there was a name that was a creative phonics program before Whole

Language. What was that name? Was it Lily?

Nope, it was Nellie. Good job, Nora.

Nellie Dale, D-A-L-E. And I'm pretty sure,

Nikki can say, I think that Nikki has some stuff about her.

I think I saw something that she had a link in the Science of Reading exploration page, or Speech to Print, whatever it's called. Hello, sorry.

Speech to Print exploration. If you Google her name, you'll find stuff about her, though, too.

Great question from Karen: Do you find their ability to spell follows along as quickly as their ability to read using Speech to Print?

Yes, and that's a really, really great question, and thank you for asking it.

We focus a lot on the spelling because spelling is so much more challenging than reading, as we all know. So when you increase the spelling, which we do right away, you increase the reading even more.

So we have that spelling, and we're teaching them together, but that spelling, it's phenomenal what they can do, especially if you really follow our process, what they're capable of by the end of kindergarten.

If we have any kindergarten EBLI teachers on here, share a little bit about what your kids are doing at this time of the year in writing. It's unbelievable.

We're obsessive, obsessive with accuracy and automaticity, but accuracy, quality, and then quantity.

So accurate spelling, and we teach these kids how to do it, and I know they're all going to spell perfectly on their

whatever rough draft. No, I don't even spell perfectly on my rough draft, right?

So we move them to accuracy

with higher level words so quickly, and kindergartners are fun because they don't have any undoing or much undoing to be done. So that's pretty cool.

But yeah, the spelling, and then you increase that spelling, you increase that reading, you increase that spelling, and it's just like this domino, wonderful snowball effect.

Yeah.

A couple things, Nora, about

syllable types. So basically, so Catherine talks about how she's

kind of listening, and so far, everything you're saying that you do with EBLI, I do, and I'm

assuming

that it's OG, but I'm not positive of that.

Soundline sorts reading and spelling taught simultaneously, mapping letters to sounds for sight words, focusing on phonemes, yada yada, all that stuff that's similar. I do teach syllable types, but not for memorization.

What do you think about this? And then somebody else said, and I just want to read this because it was so respectfully-- Oh, is it the same person?

Yes, it's the same person.

Catherine: With all due respect, if we want to have a compassionate dialogue with

respect to something like syllable types, I think it would behoove you to know the syllable types and why practitioners teach them.

Then you can more objectively critique that approach versus your approach.

If you have already, I would love to know what you think.

So just those questions around syllable instruction.

Yeah. I know I couldn't tell you if you said, "Nora, talk-- " I know that there's an open syllable, a closed syllable, and a L-E.

So I know about them.

And we teach all of those things, but this is the problem with syllable types that I see as far as efficiency, along with rules as far as efficiency. There's so many exceptions.

And it stops our kids cognitively, or our learners, whoever they are, as they're going along, and they're thinking about all these, marking the things, and doing that instead of going for-- We teach syllables how they fall out of your mouth.

Now, if I say,

I don't even know. My brain is losing it here.

We try to force syllables a lot of times so that it'll be a closed syllable when really how it falls out of our mouth, it ends at the vowel, even though it's the short vowel sound type of thing.

So I know enough about-- I can't rattle off the syllable types, I should say, but I definitely know enough about them to have an intelligent conversation and know what's included in there.

And so as far as syllable types, we'll talk to kids

about,

I don't know, like relation, let's say,

that A before tion, and how-- We talk about the patterns, the tendencies, we talk

about the prefixes, we talk about the suffixes.

We talk about those things, but we don't

do explicit instructional time really on them because it comes up--

It's hard to explain in just this thing, especially when I'm probably going to need

to quit answering questions because my brain is just like, "Whoa, I've lost it."

So yes,

I guess

I don't even know what I'm saying.

I was going to say, have we both lost our questions too?

I feel like if you have an easy question you can ask me, but really, I'm like, "I

don't even know what I'm talking about.

I know I'm talking about vowels."

I was going to say, the rest of the questions are really more about, it's either

simple, easy to answer, or comparing Able to other programs, or

specifics like, "Tell me about how you did this word," or, "Should we do two sounds

at a time, or can we do five with students who are struggling?" That kind of

thing. So I feel like those ones that are really granular-

And with students who are struggling, who are everybody here,

our little kids, we start out with two because the

W-H and W for "wuh." And

we do four to five, like kindergartners.

Typically five-ish for first grade.

And it's not like this is the first grade.

It depends on where they're at as far as their progress.

We don't really go for their grade.

But then we do mostly six

once they're second grade and above.

So even with our real struggling kids, and our

Able people, maybe you can help me out here and talk about that with your kids.

Most everybody, we had this whole,

from now veteran Able people, "Tell us when you were back at the beginning,"

they're like, "We thought you were crazy. These kids can't do that. She's nuts.

This lady's cuckoo." And then we're like, "Okay, well, you can." Which

is surprising, which is okay. I don't mind if everybody thinks I'm nuts, but just

try it type of thing. But it's amazing because these kids are

capable of so much more than what we think.

Even my high bar, they can go higher. It blows my mind.

But then there's those that need to slow it down and have more error correction

and

repetition and all that type of thing, too.

So there's that art that teachers have, and

that it comes too, especially once you become more proficient at actually

teaching it, too.

But the kids are pretty good. All right, I feel like I need to stop.

Yeah. Yep, and as far as the remainder is possibly a video rather than typing answers might be easier for you.

Yeah.

But we'll think about that tomorrow. Another day.

Yeah, another day. I thank you guys all for coming, and thank you for your great questions and for your openness and willingness to learn and hang out here, especially those of you who are hung for this whole two hours.

And I apologize that my brain has decided, "Nora, lights out here." So

I appreciate all of you and all that you're doing for literacy and together, you know what, you guys, let's teach the world to read.

We can get to this 95-- I got to tell you one last thing.

I was told that somebody said some schools can get to 95% to 100%, and I know those who have. Thank you, Angie Hanlon and Julie Van Leer, and a bunch of people, the principals, that have gotten their kids there.

But that's not scalable. And I'm like, "What do you mean it's not scalable?

Of course, it's scalable." We have to change what we're doing and how we're doing it, but we can make that scalable. So you run a 10, what is it, 10, whatever it is, 10 second something in sprinting or whatever that, oh, nobody has run that fast before.

That once somebody does it, then it starts happening and everybody's doing it.

So it's shown it can be done. Let's all just do that. Let's do that.

But we can't do it keeping doing the same things that we've been doing.

We have to evolve and keep moving along.

So let's do that together. And thank you guys again

for showing up and being here.

Oh, Pam made it on. I'm so glad. "Let's teach the world to read," she said.

Who is it?

Pam. Remember, our one who didn't get the email. But she's here.

Oh.

So I'm happy.

Oh. All right. Yay, Pam. Okay. We'll send you the recording if you're not.

All right. Very good. So good night, everybody.

Thanks again for being here, and hopefully we'll see you next week for the handwriting and literacy stuff.