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Learner Outcomes

Based on the content of the workshop, participants will be able to:

1. Describe 3 educational or diagnostic groups at higher risk of sensory and/or motor difficulties
2. List 3 strategies which can be employed in an educational setting to support sensory and/or motor needs
3. Identify 3 assessment tools available for the identification of sensory and/or motor needs in education
4. Discuss the considerations to be made when selecting sensory and/or motor assessment instruments for education

Agenda

1:00 p.m. – 1:10 p.m. Overview of the Clinical and Educational groups which typically present with motor and sensory needs
1:10 p.m. – 1:20 p.m. Input and output demands of educational tasks
1:20 p.m. – 1:40 p.m. Sensory and motor assessment options for education
1:40 p.m. – 1:55 p.m. Strategies to support sensory processing and motor needs in education
1:55 p.m. – 2:00 p.m. Questions and Answers
Overview of the Clinical and Educational Groups Which Typically Present with Motor and Sensory Needs

Percentage distribution of students ages 3–21 served under the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA), by disability type: School year 2018–19

Students ages 6–21 served under the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA), percentage who spent various amounts of time inside general classes: Fall 2000 through fall 2018

- 80 percent or more of time inside general classes
- 40–79 percent of time inside general classes
- Less than 40 percent of time inside general classes


NOTE: Data are for the 50 states and the District of Columbia only. Fall 2016, 2017, and 2018 include fall 2015 data for 6- to 21-year-olds in Wisconsin due to unavailability of fall 2016, 2017, and 2018 data for children served in Wisconsin. Fall 2017 also includes fall 2016 data for 6- to 21-year-olds in Maine and Vermont due to unavailability of fall 2017 data for children in that age group served in those states.

DSM-5: Estimated 5 to 15% of school-age children struggle with a learning disability. Estimated 80% of those with learning disorders have reading disorder in particular*

- Difficulty with reading accuracy / fluency: **Dyslexia**
- Difficulty with spelling / written expression competence and fluency: **Dysgraphia**
- Difficulty mastering number facts: **Dyscalculia**

*American Psychiatric Association (APA), 2013; APA, 2018*  
https://www.psychiatry.org/patients-families/specific-learning-disorder/what-is-specific-learning-disorder
Motor and Spatial Dysgraphia

- DSM-5 term: SLD with impairment in written expression
- Can stem from difficulties with fine motor development, visual-motor skills and sensory processing, resulting in slow and/or poorly formed letters.
- Lower level perceptual-motor processes (motor planning and execution) not fully automatic; impacting higher level cognitive processes (for example planning, language generation, reading and editing)
- Prevalence largely unknown, studies cite from 5 – 27 % (Van Hoorn et al., 2013) to 5-33% (Overveide & Hulstijn, 2011)
- Low-detection rates (Chung & Patel, 2015)
- Poor legibility = lower marks (Engel-Yeger et al., 2009)

Developmental Coordination Disorder

See criteria in DSM-5 (APA, 2013); World Health Organization (WHO) ICD-11 (2018)

Prevalence: 5%-6% of school aged children (Blank et al., 2012)

Reduced motor performance = elevated risk factors for other health conditions

Low recognition rates:
Survey of 1297 parents, teachers and physicians (from Canada, USA and UK): Only 20% of the sample had knowledge of DCD, with 41% of pediatricians and 23% of general practitioners having knowledge of the condition. Furthermore, only 10% of teachers were aware of the condition. 70% of physicians and teachers identified the common physical characteristics of DCD, less than 30% identified the psychological and secondary consequences of DCD, including low self-esteem, poor fitness, anxiety and depression. (Wilson et al., 2013)
Autism

DSM-5:

Hyper- or hypo-reactivity to sensory input or unusual interest in sensory aspects of the environment

Sensory Processing differences between ASD and Typically Developing populations (Dellapiazza et al., 2020; Little et al., 2018)

Sensory Profile 2: Children with Autism were different to their peers in all school companion scales. For the child scales they were different to their peers on all scales except visual processing. Visual processing often a strength for Autistic individuals (Dunn, 2014)

Up to 87% of children with Autism at risk for motor impairment too (Baht, 2020)

ADHD

Prevalence in children and adolescents approx. 10% (Xu et al., 2018)

Highly co-morbid with other conditions (e.g. behavioral, anxiety, autism)

Most Frequently Co-occurring condition with DCD (APA, 2013)

Sensory Processing differences between ADHD and Typically Developing populations (Dellapiazza et al., 2020; Little et al., 2018)

Sensory Profile 2: Children with ADHD were different to their peers in all scales, with the exception of Avoiding in the School Companion form (Dunn, 2014)
Self-advocacy challenges
When overwhelmed, individuals may respond with:

- ‘Fight’ response (responding with anger, irritability or oppositionality), or
- ‘Flight’ (responding with avoidance, fear, or withdrawal) or
- ‘Freeze’ response (simply shutting down).

Reduced motor performance = elevated risk factors for other health conditions

Other Conditions
- Cerebral Palsy
  - Varies in severity and impact
- Developmental Delays
  - Motor delay may be sign of more global developmental delays
- Social-Emotional
  - Relationship with sensory processing
- Speech or Language Impairment
  - Communicating sensory needs
  - High co-morbidity with DCD
Sensory Processing Needs

(Dunn, 2014)

Input and Output Demands for Educational Tasks:

What is needed for student success?
Defining Input and Output Demands

**Input Demands**

Demands a student is receiving from others, the environment, and their own body.

**Output Demands**

The expectations for action and performance from a student given the set of input demands.

When are input and output demands important to consider?

- **Assessment Process**
  - Determining areas of suspected need to target
  - Completing task analysis
  - Completing functional behavior assessments
  - Determining testing accommodations
  - Choice of assessments

- **Providing Support**
  - Identifying intervention focus
  - Determining assistive technology options
  - Supporting self-regulation and participation
  - Providing options for choice making
  - Enhancing learning tasks
  - Access to all school environments
  - Determining appropriate accommodations

(Cook & Tankersley, 2013; Coster et al., 2013; Frolok Clark & Chandler, 2013)
Classroom Input Demands

**Task Demands**
- Reading words on the board
- Reading text in a book
- Working within time limits
- Following verbal instructions
- Interpreting pictorial stimuli
- Using physical objects
- Following a demonstration
- Audio/video recordings
- Interpreting non-verbal cues

**Sensory Demands**
- Visual Functions
- Hearing Functions
- Vestibular Functions
- Taste Functions
- Smell Functions
- Proprioceptive Functions
- Touch Functions
- Interoception

**Environmental Factors**
- Physical (e.g., building architecture, lighting, furniture)
- Social (e.g., rules, attitudes)
- Cultural (e.g., norms, expectations)

(OTFP-4 (AOTA, 2020)  
(WHO, 2007)

Classroom Output Demands

**Task Demands**
- Completing timed tasks
- Attending to task
- Finishing assignments
- Engaging in class activities
- Copying text or shapes
- Using technology
- Following directions
- Responding to requests
- Tolerating the sensory input

**Motor Demands**
- Managing materials/supplies
- Fine motor action
- Gross motor action
- Simple written response
- Maintaining seated position
- Moving within classroom
- Walking between locations
- Putting on jacket for recess

**Social Demands**
- Answering teacher’s questions
- Small group with peers
- Whole group activities
- Appropriate behavior
- Safe interactions with others
- Joint attention
- Responding to non-verbal cues
Output Demands

- Written/fine motor response
- Maintaining postural control
- Copying from near-point model
- Following oral directions
- Shifting attention
- Disregarding irrelevant sensory input

Input Demands

- Listening to group instruction
- Interpreting visual stimuli in book
- Using physical objects
- Tolerating the sensory environment

Other School Settings

Virtual learning
Art room
Science lab
Music room
Band hall
Cafeteria
Gymnasium
Auditorium
Sports fields
Sports stadium
Bathroom
Locker room
Stairwells
Hallways
Recess area
Playground
Transportation
Community outings
Output Demands
- Written/fine motor response
- Shifting attention between teacher, classwork, and family
- Using technology
- Displaying appropriate online behavior
- Maintaining seated position

Input Demands
- Following teacher instruction via technology
- Tolerating the sensory environment
- Interpreting visual stimuli
- Using physical objects

Output Demands
- Fine motor response
- Dynamic postural control
- Communicating with peers
- Sharing materials
- Maintaining personal space

Input Demands
- Using novel objects
- Requests from peers and teacher
- Tolerating the sensory environment
- Following demonstration

Output Demands
- Following teacher instruction via technology
- Tolerating the sensory environment
- Interpreting visual stimuli
- Using physical objects
Output Demands
- Opening food items
- Carrying lunch tray across room
- Oral motor control to eat meal
- Static and dynamic postural control
- Following rules and routines
- Interacting with others appropriately

Input Demands
- Following group direction
- Tolerating the sensory environment
- Using materials
- Finishing meal within time limits

Output Demands
- Gross motor skills
- Dynamic postural control
- Using sensory information effectively to move on bars
- Interacting with others safely
- Following rules
- Making personal choices

Input Demands
- Using playground equipment
- Tolerating sensory environment
- Peer interactions during unstructured task
- Accepting end of recess

This Photo by Unknown Author is licensed under CC BY-SA.
Sensory and Motor Assessment Options for Education


See also: Sanches-Ferreira Silveria-Maia, & Alves (2014) and Sanches-Ferreira et al. (2017)
Application of the ICF

Neurodevelopmental Conditions

Body Functions & Structure
  E.g.: Movement; voice; vision; hearing; pain; sleep; nervous system

Activity
  Mobility; learning; eating & drinking; dressing

Participation
  Playing; after-school clubs; riding a bike with friends; online computer games

Environmental Factors
  Complex home environment; attitudes of others; Building design; social services; educational policy

Personal Factors
  Frustration; self esteem; age; personal interests

Functional Skills
  Assessments that measure engagement in meaningful activities and/or assessments that measure participation

Performance Skills
  Assessments that measure body function and body structures
Functional Skills Assessments

- What is important to the individual
- Determine the bigger picture
  - Environment
  - Participation
  - Functional performance
- Document change
- Supports collaborative goal setting

Performance Skills Assessments

- Detailed analysis of components of skills to address underlying causes of challenges and/or strengths
  - Movement
  - Visual perception
  - Reading
- Effective for data collection and monitoring of outcomes
- Often standardized, to facilitate comparison with peers
- Support eligibility for services
  - Best used alongside functional assessments
Using a Combination of Tools to Support a Top-down and Bottom-up Approach

- Screening
- Context & environment
- Outcomes and monitoring
- Intervention planning and accommodations
- Dynamic assessment
- Comprehensive assessment

• Caregiver or teacher questionnaires
• Sensory processing in context
  • School
  • Home
  • Community
• Strengths focused
• Assessment and planning report
• Provides insight for caregivers and professionals
• Adolescent / Adult Sensory Profile
• Appendix D: Ecological Assessment of Sensory Processing Features of the Context (Dunn, 2014)
Context & environment  Screening

Comprehensive assessment  Intervention planning and accommodations

(Dunn, 2014; Frolik Clark & Chandler, 2013, pp. 406 & 423)

- Caregiver, teacher or clinician questionnaire
- Computer adaptive
- Functional skills
  - Daily activities
  - Mobility
  - Social / cognition
  - Responsibility
- Mobility device filters
- Autism scale
- Short and comprehensive version

(Haley et al., 2012; Haley et al., 2020)
Screening

Outcomes and monitoring

Context & environment

Intervention planning and accommodations

Dynamic Assessment

Comprehensive assessment

Beery VMI

- Performance Skills
- Visual-motor integration
  - Visual perceptual subtest
  - Motor coordination subtest
- Short form available
- Group or individual admin

(Haley et al., 2012; Haley et al., 2020)

(Beery et al., 2010)
• Aligns with ICF framework
• Game like tasks
• Functional skills related to school participation
  • Fine motor
  • Gross motor
• Additional observational checklists for participation in school and home environments

(Miller, 2006)
Screening

Context & environment

Outcomes and monitoring

Intervention planning and accommodations

Comprehensive assessment

(Miller, 2006)

School Function Assessment (SFA)

- School based functional skills
- Variety of physical and/or behavioral conditions
- Collaborative program planning
- Use in regular and/or special-ed settings
- Focus on function regardless of the methods used
- Evaluates support needs

(Coster et al., 1998; Frolek Clark & Chandler, 2013, pp. 406 & 423)
Context & environment

Outcomes and monitoring

Comprehensive assessment

Intervention planning and accommodations

(Coster et al., 1998; Frolek Clark & Chandler, 2013, pp. 406 & 423)

• Performance skills
  • Fine motor
  • Gross motor
  • Total Motor
• Brief version available

(Bruininks & Bruininks, 2005)
Screening

Outcomes and monitoring

Intervention planning and accommodations

Dynamic Assessment

Comprehensive assessment

(Bruininks & Bruininks, 2005)

Performance skills
Handwriting speed
Group or individual
Accommodations

Telepractice options

(Barnett et al., 2007, Barnett et al., 2010)
Screening

Intervention planning and accommodations

Comprehensive assessment

Strategies for Success:

Supporting Sensory Processing and Motor Needs in Educational Settings

(Barnett et al., 2007; Barnett et al., 2010)
Indicators of Participation in the Educational Setting

- On-task behaviors
- Engagement
- Response time
- Following rules and directions
- Academic performance
- Independent work
- Attention to task
- Collaborative work with peers
- Frequency of classroom contributions

(Grajo et al., 2020)

Participation in educational settings

Physical Environment
- Design of the buildings
- Sensory qualities of the environment
- Furniture and materials
- Weather

Social Environment
- Proximity of adult support
- Attitudes of others
- Classroom culture
- Rules

Appropriate Services
- Difficulty accessing needed services
- Services not individualized
- Transportation

Task Demands
- Physical
- Sensory
- Motor
- Cognitive
- Social

What are the barriers to participation for the student?

(Coster et al., 2013)
Supporting Participation for Students with Sensory or Motor Needs

- Building on Student's Strengths
- Respecting Student's Preferences
- Understanding the Classroom Culture and Routines
- Observing in Various School Environments
- Identifying Areas for Improvement
- Improving the Fit: Abilities, Task, and Environment

Strengths-Based Approach

- Build on a student's strengths
- Shift away from thinking how a student can "fit in"
- Shift away from deficit-based focus
- Aligns with WHO ICF Model (2007)
- Encourages self-advocacy
- Improves self-determination
- Closing the gap between capabilities and expectations

(Dunn et al., 2017, p. 240)
Improving the Fit: Abilities, Tasks, and Environment

• Support students where they learn
• Identify the gaps: student capabilities, task, and setting
• Create a better fit between the context and the person’s level of functioning
• Provide accommodations for all when one or more can benefit (Cook & Tankersley, 2013)
• Implement universal design for learning to support all students -- context, instructional materials, and methods (Frolek Clark & Chandler, 2013)
• Professional models for this approach
  • Person-Environment-Occupation (PEO) Model used in OT (Law, et al., 2017)
  • Person-Environment Fit model from American Association on Intellectual and Developmental Disabilities (AAIDD; Thompson et al., 2013)

Supporting Sensory Needs

Universal Design for Learning

• Engagement
  • Minimizing distractions
  • Providing options for self-regulation
• Representation
  • Enhancing the sensory presentation of content
  • Offering alternative presentation of content
  • Supporting information processing and visualization
• Action and Expression
  • Allowing various methods for response
  • Consider assistive technology (low or high tech) (CAST, 2018)

Students Identifying Own Preferences

• Acknowledging all individuals have sensory preferences
• Providing options for the entire class to allow choice
• Allowing accommodations for success
• Ask the student
• Pay attention to the behaviors that might indicate sensory challenges (Frolek Clark and Chandler, 2013)

Additional Supports

• Embed sensory supports into student’s routines
• Sensory Profile 2’s Appendices include Intervention Strategies (Dunn, 2014)
• Tier 1 opportunities for school-wide sensory or self-regulation supports
• Referring to Related Services
• Sensory supports for helping students manage behavior (Alexander & Kuhaneck, 2015)
Common Sensory Supports in the Schools

- **Movement (Proprioceptive and Vestibular)**
  - Classroom errands
  - Brain breaks, movement breaks, yoga
  - Multi-sensory learning

- **Visual**
  - Changing lighting to more natural light
  - Reduce visual stimuli on walls
  - Preferential seating

- **Auditory**
  - White noise or classical music
  - Preferential seating
  - Noise reducing earmuff or ear plugs

- **Tactile**
  - Self-care
  - Alternative materials and methods (art, etc.)

(Asher, 2017; Bodison & Parham, 2018; Dunn, 2014)

Outcomes of supporting sensory processing in academic settings

- Self-Regulation
- Peer Interactions
- Participation
- Classroom Performance

(Bazyk et al., 2018; Kinnealey et al., 2012)
Supporting Motor Needs

Environmental Considerations
- UDL principles
- Adapting the environment
- Accommodations
- Alternative materials
- Alternate seating options

Assistive Technology
- Low tech
- High tech
- Augmentative communication devices

Skill Development
- Pre-vocational skills
- Self care skills
- Independent living skills
- Functional communication

Additional Supports
- Referrals to Related Services provider
- Referral to Adaptive PE services where available

Common Motor Supports in the Schools

Environmental Modifications
- Accessibility and Safety
- Promote participation
- Positioning and seating options

Activities of Daily Living/Self-Care
- Independence and autonomy
- Dignity
- Preparing for transition to post-secondary life

Self-Advocacy
- Student participation in decision making
- Advocating for needs
- Self-determination

Inclusion
- Peer supports and buddy system
- Accommodations and modifications
- Technology

[Asher, 2017; Cahill & Berisher, 2020]
Outcomes of supporting motor needs in education

Key Take Aways

- Work with the child and not the label
- Use top-down and bottom-up approach to assessment
- Employ a strengths-based perspective
- Provide opportunities to increase self-advocacy and personal choice
- Adapt for success