From the Dyslexia-Friendly School to the Dyslexia-Friendly Classroom

This chapter will help you to evaluate whether your classroom setting is dyslexia-friendly. To help you to do this, the chapter contains:

- teaching and learning considerations, including marking and individual education plan (IEP) targets
- children’s views about what makes a primary school dyslexia-friendly
- assessment considerations within the classroom
- some suggestions about dyslexia-friendly resources for a limited budget
- practical suggestions and tools relating to classroom practice; these include:
  - a consideration of target setting in IEPs
  - a sample lesson plan with dyslexia and disability access features
  - a dyslexia accessibility guide for text resources
  - a self-evaluation/audit tool for developing and monitoring a dyslexia-friendly classroom.

The lesson plan, text resources guide, and self-evaluation tool are all photocopiable.

One of the changes of perspective brought about by dyslexia-friendly policy lies in the expectation that it is school practitioners, rather than external specialists, who will make the difference for a child experiencing mild to moderate dyslexic-type difficulties. If the purpose of dyslexia-friendly policy is for children to make progress, and if what happens in the classroom makes a difference, then, finally, the focus has to turn to the work of classroom practitioners in bringing about necessary change. Earlier chapters have looked at the changes in philosophical and theoretical perspectives inherent in the dyslexia-friendly initiative. Suggestions for practice change have been made throughout. The focus now is on methods of planning, monitoring and sustaining the dyslexia-friendly approach within the classroom.
Teaching and learning

For a long time, separate teaching was seen as necessary for children experiencing dyslexia. To some extent, this was because dyslexia was defined as an inability to gain skills in spite of regular teaching methods. Additionally, a career strand of dyslexia specialism developed at a time when less was known about dyslexia, and there was not the present-day emphasis upon inclusion. Children who had not been successful in learning by other methods were often found to learn from highly structured, repetitious dyslexia programmes which rehearsed and revisited small units of learning. These programmes built on what learners already knew, creating a different way of accessing literacy skills from that experienced by their peers, and were the province of specialists.

Gavin Reid (2005b) now points to a changing perspective. This indicates that what is needed for children experiencing dyslexia is adaptation and intensification of techniques already known to practitioners as part of their regular professional repertoire. While there may be common features for children with learning needs of a dyslexic nature, there are also variations, to the extent that it may no longer be necessary or useful to think of a solely specialist pedagogy.

Separately, Reid (2005a) also points out that a repetitious, isolating approach risks losing the language context and the social richness to which it is linked. While the traditional programme approach may remain valuable for children whose learning needs have proved to be particularly intractable, the overall ethos of the dyslexia-friendly initiative is that the responsibility for helping children experiencing dyslexia is increasingly that of classroom practitioners.

What do children who experience dyslexia say?

Research by Johnson and Phillips, described by Mike Johnson in 2004, was funded by the DfES and carried out in partnership with the BDA, in order to explore pupils’ opinions about the kind of teaching that they felt was dyslexia-friendly. The results showed that, for pupils, good teaching was the most important characteristic of a dyslexia-friendly setting, followed jointly by the willingness of teachers to go over again what they had covered (recapitulation), and the classroom ethos that they created. The provision of resources was considerably less important to children experiencing dyslexia. Primary school children think that for dyslexia-friendly teaching, teachers should observe these guidelines:

- Check if children have understood information and instructions.
- Allow children the opportunity to ask questions.
- Avoid giving instructions too fast.
- Allow children time to think about and understand instructions.
- Allow children time to do the work.
- Ensure that children can see the board.
- Avoid rubbing out what is written on the board too soon.
- Avoid standing in front of the board.
- Avoid shouting – apart from anything else, it disrupts children’s ability to think.
- Avoid embarrassing children in front of the class.
Good practice will involve listening to children’s views, reflecting upon them, taking them into consideration, and acting accordingly. This last part, where action leads to change, may get overlooked for a number of reasons. For example, pupils’ views may not be seen as a reason for change. Nevertheless, action leading to change is important; otherwise, the whole process of gaining pupils views is devalued.

**Assessment in the class context**

In the first instance, practitioners need to be able to identify children who are experiencing difficulties, and view their difficulties with some sensitivity. It serves little purpose to think of children as lazy; the likelihood is that they would prefer to please adults, and keep pace with their peers, if they could. The processes that may interfere with learning are so many and complex, that a judgement of laziness is perhaps the least useful. Sensitive practitioners use their eyes and ears to notice when and in which tasks children experience difficulties, and also to notice which approaches gain a good response. Teaching and working diagnostically in this way, sensitive practitioners can use every new piece of information and understanding that they gain about a child’s learning, to contribute to their own effective practice.

Baseline assessments, reading and spelling tests, SATs and other assessment processes are already in place in the primary school, providing information about a child’s literacy levels. However, observation can add quality to these and provide a key to progress. What should the practitioner be noticing? MacKay (2005: 172) suggests looking for a ‘pattern of strengths and weaknesses’, this would highlight the ‘unexpected difficulty’ described in the British Psychological Society definition. Moreover, as in the case study below, a consideration of the learning environment may show that a child’s attitude to the task set, even to the extent of ‘acting out’ and violent behaviour, can indicate a learning difficulty.

Rather than focusing upon a child’s perceived shortcomings, it would be best if the observer’s attention focused on the dynamics of the setting and the social context. However, observation needs an extra adult to be available, and this is not always easy to arrange. It would be advisable, and ethical, to have a parent’s or carer’s agreement before undertaking observation.

**Prescribed literacy requirements**

All teaching can inform practitioners’ understanding of how children learn, especially when children are experiencing literacy difficulties. The continued and consistent practice of hearing children read obviously tells the practitioner a great deal about their difficulties, especially if a miscue analysis is carried out, as shown below. However, in the mainstream primary school, literacy has such an important focus that it is underpinned with strongly prescribed approaches, with which all practitioners have to be familiar. The content of the National Curriculum is delivered through the process of the literacy strategy within the primary strategy, by means of the Literacy Hour. Within these carefully structured requirements, the question remains as to how practitioners can help children who do not make necessary progress in literacy, since present-day education also requires personalised learning.

Dorothy Smith (2000) makes the point that the Literacy Hour may benefit children experiencing dyslexia because it is closely organised and structured. For work at text level, shared work
and plenary work, there is no reason why children with dyslexic-type difficulties should not participate and contribute in the same way as children without such difficulties. However, word-level work is where children experiencing dyslexia might need a more individualised approach, which requires further organisation on the part of practitioners.

Creative ways need to be found to make tasks relevant but also manageable for children experiencing dyslexia. They need ways of showing their knowledge, and should not be ‘setted’ in a low-achieving, low-ability group. A decision has to be made whether any individual intervention programme work takes place within the Literacy Hour or external to it, but Dorothy Smith points out that a certain amount of flexibility is possible within the National Literacy Strategy, and that its objectives and interventions can be matched. It is also true that literacy activities take place throughout the day, not just in the literacy hour, and care needs to be taken to make those activities similarly accessible.

**Marking**

In terms of classroom practice, the question of marking should also be considered. Schools should have marking policies in place that are clear and followed by the whole staff. It would be helpful if the marking policy gave guidance for marking the work of children who experience dyslexia. This could then be made clear to children themselves as well as to parents and practitioners.

There is a general feeling that covering a page with red ink corrections is not altogether helpful, since it is a depressing sight that both discourages the learner and makes it difficult to see the original work. Today, marking is often limited to a portion of the writing rather than the whole, and some markers will avoid red ink, with its connotations of failure. In spite of modern trends, both of these approaches can disturb those who feel that a page closely marked in red ink is a sign of a marker’s job properly done.

Writing in a secondary context, Riddick et al. (2002) recommend marking with two pens (neither of which would be red); one for structure, and the other for content and ideas. The BDA also recommends the use of two pens; this time, one is for content, and the other for spelling and presentation, correcting only those spellings that have been taught. Either method would require marking a piece twice, or swapping pens, and both methods may be difficult practically. Nor will different colours of marking help a child whose colour vision is affected or who is reading through a coloured overlay.

Nevertheless, it is important that the purpose of marking is made clear. Too often, marking focuses on spelling and grammar; this has been the convention, and not to mark in this way may attract criticism for the teacher. For children experiencing dyslexia, this means that their work is always likely to be adversely marked. In addition, they may not be able to make out a teacher’s own written comments unless the handwriting is very clear. Overall, advice seems generally to be to mark for content. Comments should be positive.

The DfES (2005) CD-ROM, *Learning and Teaching for Dyslexic Children*, gives some useful guidance. It suggests that work be marked only in relation to the learning objective, which has been explained to children beforehand, so that they understand what is being marked and why. Further, it suggests that only one or two errors be identified and that these should relate to what children have already been taught. It is best to mark with the child present, and to suggest ways of avoiding the same error in the future.
There are some other useful points to consider. Dyslexia Action suggests that if spelling is particularly weak, ticks can be placed on words that are correct rather than corrections placed on all the errors. Another helpful strategy is to tick a line where no errors are made, using a dot in the margin to indicate an error.

A further important point to make about marking has been emphasised by Neil MacKay (given in an address at the Conference of the UK Literacy Association, 2005). He points out that if in the dyslexia-friendly classroom alternative methods of recording work are going to be encouraged, marking has to take account of this. Whatever the format, similar considerations apply; it has to be clear what is being marked, whether content, ideas, accuracy, technique, or presentation.

Spending £50 to make my classroom more dyslexia-friendly

At this point, it is relevant to consider the question of resources. The cost of resourcing the dyslexia-friendly initiative within the classroom is not much addressed, so the issue is worth considering here. While a primary classroom that is properly stocked for general purposes will have many useful materials and resources, it would also be advisable to have some materials with dyslexia in mind.

For older children in the primary school, practitioners might want to have some games and resource items that support multisensory learning but that do not look immature to sensitive children. Alphabet-sequencing resources will still be useful, because these are important for dictionary and index activities. A magnetic board with magnetic words and letters would be valuable, plus extra magnetic strips to add to other shapes and outlines as required. In addition, the *ACE Spelling Dictionary* (Moseley, 1995; available from the LDA) is well thought of, so a copy of this in the classroom with a book of exercises to go with it would be helpful (available from the TTS Group, Nottinghamshire, or Amazon). Practitioners would need to take the time to read and understand the method behind the *ACE Spelling Dictionary* in order for it to be effectively employed.

A short shopping list would easily use up a £50 budget, but if there was more money available, a class selection of readers that are age-appropriate and of high interest, but with accessible text for children who find reading difficult, would be valuable. An up-to-date list of reading resources is provided by Suzanne Baker (2006).

The dyslexia-friendly standards: classrooms

Standard Three of the Dyslexia-Friendly Quality Mark Initiative (BDA, 2004) focuses on the classroom environment. Requirements for the classroom are relatively modest and are linked to the LA through the identification, monitoring and sharing of good practice. To meet the standard, LAs are expected to promote the development of self-review for the classroom, and to monitor the use of recognised dyslexia-friendly access strategies, making the classroom learner-oriented. Suggestions for a self-review process, together with other planning and self-monitoring tools, are given below.
Principles and practices

The suggestions in this section represent practical aspects of classroom work.

Some practical points about target setting in IEPs

- Make IEPs based on the learning setting, rather than on child deficit. They should say what practitioners are going to do, and how the learning setting is going to be changed, to bring about necessary progress for a child. There should always be a built-in expectation that such progress will take place, even if targets are set cautiously.

- It is generally considered advisable that children should be involved in setting targets for themselves, but care must be taken that this process does not cause children to feel inadequate in their literacy skills.

- Reading targets may be based on any number of attributes – months of gain in reading age; completion of a particular book or scheme; number of words, lines, paragraphs or pages read on a regular basis; number of times per week a child is heard reading; completion of a level in a computer program; amount of time on task; amount of autonomy; reaching a National Curriculum level within a time frame; answering questions related to the text; and so on – the possibilities are limited only by imagination.

- Other targets for a child experiencing dyslexia may relate to developing characteristics such as phonological awareness, identifying rhyme, building phonic blends, focusing on word endings, establishing correct visual direction, etc., all through designated tasks.

- The possibilities are endless but the aim, as always, is that children should make recognisable progress, and if the targets are clear, the methods should follow from them. The kind of focus that is possible for reading targets also applies to spelling and writing skills.

- Whether or not IEPs are ever replaced by an alternative method of monitoring pupil's programmes and progress, targets and programmes for an individual child should follow the SMART outline. Citing Lloyd and Berthelot (1992), Gavin Reid (2005c) gives the original configuration of these as specific, measurable, achievable, relevant and timely. Modified by popular usage, one may also hear variations such as short, manageable, achievable, reviewed and timed. All these will work. The point is that targets are not useful to children if they are broad and open-ended, carried over from one IEP review to another without change.
Some photocopiable resources to support a dyslexia-friendly approach

Three photocopiable resources are offered here to help practitioners to maintain a dyslexia-friendly perspective:

- a sample lesson plan that accommodates dyslexia and other disability access needs
- a dyslexia accessibility guide for making and monitoring text resources
- a self-evaluation/audit tool that asks: how dyslexia-friendly is my primary classroom?

These are offered as models or suggestions, and practitioners are free to amend them in order to develop their dyslexia-friendly involvement as they see fit.

A sample lesson plan

Working practitioners have their own ways of recording and planning, probably based in part on what they were taught in their training, and in part on what their head teacher requests. As a result of the literacy and numeracy strategies, the school improvement agenda, and the National Curriculum, practice is quite closely prescribed already, and this includes planning. It is not the intention to impose a further layer of lesson planning on top of those processes already in use. However, the attached lesson plan model takes account of the dyslexia-friendly approach, and, in giving space to individual access arrangements, acknowledges the duty to promote opportunity for disabled people under the Disability Discrimination Act as amended in 2005.

Practitioners can use this model to monitor their own practice by occasionally planning out a lesson in the format shown here. Lesson attributes can be checked off from the dyslexia access list, and highlighted if not present, with the intention that further lessons will cover all the elements in due course.

Text resources dyslexia accessibility guide

The checklist that forms this guide can be used to monitor established resources or to build new ones. The guide ensures that all written resources placed before children experiencing dyslexia are as accessible as possible. When practitioners have used the guide a couple of times in monitoring or producing resources, the process becomes routine. Again, it is suggested that schemes and resources are monitored at manageable intervals.

A self-evaluation/audit tool: how Dyslexia-friendly is my primary classroom?

This self-evaluation checklist and audit tool is drawn from a number of sources that include both literature and experience. Its purpose is to provide practitioners with a memory aid, to remind them about dyslexia-friendly classroom characteristics. The self-evaluation/audit tool is in two parts. The first part considers the classroom learning setting; the second part considers the classroom within the larger school setting, looking at the support needed from the school by practitioners seeking to establish a dyslexia-friendly ethos in the classroom.
# Sample lesson plan for a dyslexia-friendly class

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Topic:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## Learning Outcomes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Teacher activity</th>
<th>Learner activity</th>
<th>Supporter activity</th>
<th>Material resources</th>
<th>Dyslexia access reminders</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Visual input</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Aural input</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Kinaesthetic input</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>All these close together</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Materials checked to be</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>dyslexia-friendly</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Short spelling list</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Scaffolded writing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Minimum board copying</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Use of diagrams, charts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Small work chunks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Individual targets</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Recapitulation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Opportunities for:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>● extra time</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>● working with peers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>● showing knowledge</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>● pupil ICT use</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Access arrangements for individual children**

**Assessment of outcomes**

(B. Pavey, adapted from Hillier, 2002).
# Text Resources Dyslexia Accessibility Guide

## Readability
- Reading age of text checked for accessibility
- Interest level of text appropriate to age range
- Font/print clearly distinguishable, with rounded shape (preferably 14-pt)
- Photocopy clean and clear
- Text in small groups: five lines maximum
- Frequent subheadings, shown in bold
- Off-white or tinted paper

## Layout
- Blocks of text are clearly separated
- Headings/subheadings are clearly separated from text
- Diagrams and illustrations are used
- Bullet points or numbered lists are used
- Diagrams/illustrations give the same information as, or relate to, the text
- Diagrams and illustrations are near relevant text
- Colour is used as a visual identifier: highlighting, colour coding, blocks of colour isolating important content

## Instructions
- Instructions are clearly identified on page
- Instructions are clearly broken down into small steps
- Statements are clear, without ambiguity (check with another person)
- Timescale is clearly stated
- Amount of work to be produced is clearly stated
- Assessment/marking criteria are clearly stated

## Content and concepts
- Subject-specific words are linked to clear concepts, and are clearly explained, reinforced, and spelled
- A glossary/key words/vocabulary list is provided
- Subject-specific techniques have written or diagrammed reminders and guidelines
The self-evaluation/audit tool does not address the professional teaching of reading. It seeks to take a social model approach in moving the emphasis away from child deficit and toward the improvement of the learning setting. For this reason, it does not focus on individual learning characteristics. For anyone seeking this information, lists can be found in the literature or on the BDA website. The self-evaluation/audit tool covers the following areas:

Part One: The dyslexia-friendly classroom
   A. Text resources available in the classroom
   B. Focused dyslexia-friendly teaching to support literacy skills
   C. Classroom arrangements
   D. Affective aspects
   E. Classroom interactions
   F. General dyslexia-friendly teaching and learning

Part Two: The dyslexia-friendly classroom within the school setting

In scoring the self-evaluation/audit tool, responses should be anonymised, and scores for the items should certainly not be used as an identifier of any practitioner’s difficulty. Nevertheless, the checklist can serve a useful purpose, because without self-monitoring it is possible to drift away from the best conditions, and because carrying out the audit is evidence of the developing self-evaluation process required by Standard Three of the Quality Mark protocol.

Practitioners can complete the checklist at agreed intervals, at least annually, and can compare it with their own results year by year, and if there are other adults attached to the class, they might compare results with each other. Alternatively, the classroom adults can complete the evaluation as a group, or by having someone else evaluate them. It could be that older children complete the evaluation. Additionally, the audit tool could be used as a whole-school self-evaluation. Items may be added. It does not matter too much how the evaluation is done, because the main purpose is to revisit dyslexia-friendly characteristics and assess classroom progress toward a good ethos. The process could be completed annually, providing a quality cycle (Fig 7.1).

![Figure 7.1 The continuous process of a quality cycle](image)

Audit tool items are scored by ticking a box for each one, using a scale with the categories ‘never’, ‘sometimes’ (less than 50 per cent), ‘middling’ (about 50 per cent), ‘usually’ (more than...
50 per cent), and 'always.' The self evaluation/audit tool is divided into seven areas, six for the classroom and one for the school, and each can be scrutinised to see which areas are the weakest and which are the strongest. The aim of the process is, of course, to increase the number of ticks in the 'usually' and 'always' boxes in Part One, and the 'I think Yes' box in Part Two, and to use low-scoring items, or areas, as a basis for future developments.

Scores should not be given too much prominence as a source of measurement. The self-evaluation tool simply brings together recommendations for good dyslexia-friendly practice, and invites practitioners to see where there are strengths and where there is scope for development. The self-evaluation/audit tool is located at the end of this chapter.

A case study that shows the value of observation in understanding a child’s learning needs

**Case Study**

**Tony**

Nine-year-old Tony's mother was worried about the reports that she was getting regarding his behaviour in class. He seemed to be disruptive, and at times aggressive. He damaged resources and furniture, would not settle to his work, shouted out, and 'answered back' to the teacher. His mother knew Tony to be a bright and lively boy, interested in everything, constantly building and designing with his construction kits. She expressed her concerns to the SENCo.

The SENCo looked at Tony's reading test results. He had gained some basic reading skills, and these did not immediately give cause for concern. She then looked at his drawing and writing and was immediately struck by how different these were from the work of other children. In drawing, the marks were large, black and straight, as if gone over many times. The written work was of small amounts, untidy and frequently rubbed out. Consequently, it was difficult to make a judgement about spelling.

With his mother's agreement, the SENCo asked a learning support assistant to sit at the back of Tony's class and list what happened for one morning over three consecutive weeks. At the end of this period, the SENCo could see that Tony's behaviours were at their most problematic when there was a strong written work element, particularly in the handwriting sessions. At these times, he would sharpen his pencil; move around the room; and lose, and then seek, erasers, rulers or paper. He would regularly rub out and eventually destroy his work. He would attempt to strike up conversations with other children, sometimes hitting them. He would move the furniture about noisily, sit in awkward positions, and fall off his chair. Sometimes he would try to involve the teacher in a conversation; this could then become argumentative. Overall, it was clear to see that the written work task was causing Tony considerable difficulty, and possibly quite a lot of stress.

When the observation was discussed by the SENCo, the head teacher, the class teacher and Tony's mother, they agreed that their concerns were sufficient to ask the educational psychologist to become involved. A cognitive assessment confirmed that Tony experienced significant learning difficulty in literacy skills, particularly where writing and spelling were concerned. Although Tony had gained some reading skills, these were not in line with his evident ability in other areas. They had masked the real difficulties that he was experiencing.
A suggestion for practitioners: making opportunities for observation

We can try to ensure that there is room in our busy schedules to carry out observations such as the one described above. This may be difficult because time is allocated to helping children by working directly with them, and there is always likely to be more demand for help than there is help available to give. However, the case study shows how observation can be used to understand a child’s learning needs when otherwise they may be misunderstood, masked by other characteristics. Precious time taken to observe objectively a child experiencing difficulties can result in support better focused to help them. The dyslexia-friendly focus enables observation practice such as this to move away from the province of an education psychologist to that of a school’s practitioners.

A suggestion for parents and careers: let us have dyslexia-friendly input too

When a school takes the dyslexia-friendly approach, we can ask via parent representation or via the SEN governor for the school to provide dyslexia-friendly guidance for any of us who are interested. Included in this process should be accessible input for adults when English is not their first language. Guidance of this kind could lead to increased understanding of a school’s approach to dyslexia and enable us to carry over the approaches in the home setting where appropriate, as well as helping to build a mutually supportive home/school process. Shaping dyslexia-friendly guidance for parents and carers would help schools to clarify their dyslexia support processes for themselves.
You can try

A technique used to gain a better understanding of how children experiencing dyslexia approach their reading tasks, and the types of errors they make, making it easier to focus appropriate teaching: carrying out a miscue analysis

Miscue analysis

Miscue analysis is a useful process that has been one of the tools of the SENCo. It is not a difficult process, and once they have learnt it, mainstream practitioners can use it to identify the kinds of errors that children are making when they are learning to read, and to design an intervention that will help to overcome them. The likelihood is that if one child experiences such errors so may another, and practitioners can build up a bank of resources to help overcome common errors.

To carry out a miscue analysis, you need a text that the individual child can read with some skill so that not all the words are error prone, but also one that is not so easy that there are no errors. You can decide whether the text has a picture or not, to enable the reader to have contextual clues. You can also let children choose the text that they read, as this informs your understanding of what kind of choices they make for themselves. It does not need to be a long text, just long enough to display a pattern of errors. It also needs to be a text that the child has not read before.

To begin the miscue analysis, you need an identical copy, usually a photocopy, of the text the child is reading. On your copy, as the child reads, you mark refusals, omissions, non-responses, substitution, hesitation, self-correction, or repetition (Reid, 2005a). Some teachers underline or cross out the affected word, and you can write in the alternatives offered by the child when reading words erroneously. Systems often show coding symbols attached to this process, but teachers could inscribe the text in ways that suit themselves, since the analysis is for their own use only (although it has been used in the past as a measurement process).

Once the text has been inscribed with the errors, quite a lot of information can be gained from this process. The errors can be counted to see if any prevail, or whether there is an even spread. Children’s choices of text can be scrutinised to see whether they are similar to texts used regularly in the classroom or whether their preferred choice is something quite different. You can tell from the kind of errors how children go about attacking the reading of words. You can also tell whether children have an understanding of the text, and whether they are taking a lead from contextual clues.
Omissions and reversals may suggest a difficulty with visual tracking. Errors that are in words that resemble other words may indicate a lack of transfer of visual or aural patterns and sequences. Getting a word wrong that was previously correct may say something about memory. Self-correction suggests a strategy worth further investigation. What are readers responding to that helps them make a positive change? Word choices indicate whether contextual cues are being relied upon. Does reading improve when only one or two lines are visible? If so, masking lower lines can be used as a strategy to aid reading.

You can practise with a friend who is pretending to be a reader making errors; it takes only one go to get the hang of it. If you doubt your ability to keep up with the speed of children’s reading, a reader can be taped and the miscues analysed afterward. This process will provide more information than many reading tests. It is not subject to the ‘practice effect’ that can result in children learning the test, and is more natural and comfortable for children.

The DfES has a considerably more detailed description of miscue analysis on its website: www.dfes.gov.uk/readwriteplus/bank/Miscue

Key points to remember

1. Although the full dyslexia-friendly initiative is a top-down process, following a lead set by the LA, there is a great deal that practitioners can do to make classroom interactions and resources more supportive of children who experience dyslexia.

2. The process of maintaining an internal dyslexia-friendly policy will be helped by a quality review cycle based upon a self-review process. This process can be carried out by practitioners as individuals or as a group.

3. Good practice requires listening to children’s views, and involving parents and carers in knowledge of the dyslexia-friendly process.

Further reading

Some useful websites to help primary schools to sustain their dyslexia-friendly approach

- The SNAP (special needs assessment profile) website has contributions from three highly respected professionals: Charles Weedon, Gavin Reid and Rob Long. It contains screening and assessment materials, resources and advice. It can be found at: www.SNAPassessment.com

- The original BDA publication, Achieving Dyslexia-Friendly Schools can be downloaded free. It can be found at: www.bdaweb.co.uk/bda/downloads/wholedocument.pdf

- Schools can obtain a copy of the free CD-ROM from the DfES, Learning and Teaching for Dyslexic Children (ref. DfES, 1184-2005), and the content is downloadable from www.standards.dfes.gov.uk following this path: Standards Site home; Primary National Strategy; Publications; Inclusion; Teaching and Learning for Dyslexic Children. The CD-ROM itself is available from the DfES Publications Centre.