Using Simultaneous Prompting to Teach Restaurant Sight Words and Classifications as Non-target Information

What is the evidence base?

- This is a promising practice for **students with disabilities** based on one methodologically sound single-case study across four participants with disabilities.

Where is the best place to find out how to do this practice?

The best place to find out how to implement simultaneous prompting to teach restaurant sight words and classifications as non-target information is through the following research to practice lesson plan starters:

- Using Simultaneous Prompting to Teach Restaurant Sight Words and Classifications as Non-target Information (Smith, Schuster, Collins, & Kleinert, 2011)

With who was it implemented?

- Students with
  - Intellectual Disability (n = 1 study, n = 3 participants)
  - Other Health Impairment (same study (n = 1), n = 1 participant)
- Ages ranged from 15 - 19
- Males (n = 3), females (n = 1)
- Ethnicity
  - None reported (n = 4 participants)

What is the practice?

Non-targeted Information (NTI), or incidental learning occurring without direct instruction, is information embedded within one of four locations of the instructional sequence: (a) antecedent, (b) task direction, (c) prompt hierarchy, or (d) consequent event (Smith et al., 2011). Simultaneous prompting has been defined as a response prompting strategy used to teach chained or discrete trial tasks involving the instructor providing a controlling prompt immediately following the discriminative stimulus which results in lower error rates for students and minimal teacher preparation for lessons (Smith et al., 2011).

In the study used to establish the evidence base for using simultaneous prompting to teach restaurant sight words and classifications as non-targeted information included:

- Simultaneous prompting was used to teach four students with moderate to severe intellectual disabilities to read 12 randomly presented community restaurant sight words at a 3s time delay to pause for student responses and an inter-trial intervals of 5s while examining the generalization of non-targeted information (knowledge of food classification) that was provided in the discriminative stimulus (Smith et al., 2011). The researcher presented a food and provided a prompt for students by asking for the food by naming the category (e.g., if chips and salsa was depicted on a card, the researcher prompted "what appetizer?").

Where has it been implemented?

- One-on-one, (researcher with participant) at a small table in the special education resource room

How does this practice relate to Common Core Standards?

- CCSS.ELA-LITERACY.CCRA.R.4: Interpret words and phrases as they are used in a text, including determining technical, connotative, and figurative meanings, and analyze how specific word choices shape meaning or tone.

How does this practice relate to the Common Career Technical Core?

- Hospitality and Tourism Career Cluster (HT)
  - Restaurants and Food/Beverage Services Career Pathway (HT-RFB)
    - Demonstrate safety and sanitation procedures in food and beverage service facilities.
    - Describe career opportunities and qualifications in the restaurant and food service industry.

References used to establish this evidence base:

Smith, B. R., Schuster, J. W., Collins, B., & Kleinert, H. (2011). Using simultaneous prompting to teach restaurant words and classifications as non-target information to secondary students with moderate to severe disabilities. *Education and Training in Autism and Developmental Disabilities*, *46*, 251-266. Retrieved from: http://www.jstor.org/stable/23879695

IDEAs that Work

U.S. Office of Special
Education Programs