

# Improving educational outcomes for children born preterm: A new approach to intervention

Samantha Johnson Professor of Child Development



#### **Overview**

- The preterm phenotype
- Impact on educational outcomes
- How can we improve outcomes at school?
- Towards a new approach . . .



### **Neurodevelopmental outcomes**



#### **Cognitive difficulties:**

- Difficulties problem solving
- Poor simultaneous processing
- Poor working memory
- Poor visuospatial skills
- Poor fine motor skills
- Slow processing speed
- Difficulties planning & organising (executive function)

### **Psychiatric disorders**



[Source: Johnson et al. J Am Acad Child Adolesc Psychiatr 2010]

### Attention, social & emotional problems



**Psychiatric disorders** 

### The preterm phenotype



#### **Special educational needs**



Figure 1 Type of special educational needs (SEN) resource utilised by extremely preterm children and classmates in mainstream schools at 11 years of age.

#### **Special educational needs**



# Academic attainment (age 7)



Degree of prematurity at birth

## Academic attainment (age 11)



Mean difference (95% CI) in teacher ratings of academic attainment for extremely preterm children compared with term-born controls

### Putting it all together



[Source: Johnson et al. Arch Dis Child Fetal Neonatal Ed 2009; Pediatrics 2009; J Am Acad Child Adolesc Psychiatr 2010; J Pediatr 2010]

How can we improve educational outcomes for children born preterm?



# Do nothing?



#### Do nothing?



### Do nothing?





350

Odd D, et al. Arch Dis Child 2019;104:348-353. doi:10.1136/archdischild-2018-315441



#### **Improve neonatal care?**



Adjusted mean difference (95% CI) in WIAT-II z-scores for extremely preterm children vs. controls

#### Mean deficit (95% CI) in z-scores in EP children vs. controls in 1995 vs. 2006

adjusted for sex, gestational age, birthweight z-score, multiple birth, maternal age & SES: Reading: -0.2 (95% CI -0.6 to 0.3); Mathematics: -0.3 (-0.7 to 0.1)



#### **Improve neonatal care?**



#### **FIGURE 1**

Differences on standardized cognitive and academic scores comparing 2005 cohort with both earlier eras. A, Continuous scores. B, Dichotomous scores <-2 SD vs  $\geq -2$  SD. Solid line is adjusted for age at assessment, age of mother, and sociodemographic variables; dashed line is adjusted for age at assessment, age of mother, sociodemographic variables, and perinatal variables.



#### **Early intervention?**

#### Analysis I.I. Comparison I Early developmental intervention versus standard follow-up (all studies), Outcome I Cognitive outcome at infancy - DQ (Bayley and Griffiths).

Review: Early developmental intervention programmes provided post hospital discharge to prevent motor and cognitive impairment in preterm infants

Comparison: | Early developmental intervention versus standard follow-up (all studies)

Outcome: I Cognitive outcome at infancy - DQ (Bayley and Griffiths)

Study or subgroup	Treatment N	Mean(SD)	Follow-up N	Mean(SD)	Std. Mean Difference IV/Random,95% CI	Weight	Std. Mean Difference IV,Random,95% CI
APIP 1998	179	96.3 (17.1)	88	92.9 (18.7)		9.2 %	0.19 [ -0.06, 0.45 ]
Bao 1999	36	104.5 (10.8)	41	89.9 (12)	-	5.5 %	1.26 [ 0.77, 1.75 ]
Dusing 2015	3	106.67 (12.58)	4	97.5 (17.56)		0.9 %	0.49 [ -1.06, 2.04 ]
Goodman 1985	40	101.5 (10.5)	40	101 (11)		62 %	0.05 [ -0.39, 0.48 ]
LHUDR 1990	343	102.6 (19.37)	532	92.84 (19.08)		11.1 %	0.51 [ 0.37, 0.65 ]
Johnson 2009	91	91.3 (18.6)	103	92.9 (18.2)		8.7 %	-0.09 [ -0.37, 0.20 ]
Kaaresen 2006	69	94.7 (17.3)	67	90.5 (20.7)	+	7.8 %	0.22 [ -0.12, 0.56 ]
Koldewijn 2009	81	92.5 (18)	77	90 (17.5)	_ <b>+=</b>	8.2 %	0.14 [ -0.17, 0.45 ]
Melnyk 2001	20	102.5 (6.1)	22	88.9 (24.4)		4.1 %	0.73 [ 0.11, 1.36 ]
Nelson 2001	15	82.67 (21.65)	12	74.67 (17.26)		31%	0.39 [ -0.38, 1.16 ]
Nurcombe 1984	25	115.6 (12.4)	28	109.6 (11.1)	· · · + + - + - + - + - + - + - + - + -	4.9 %	0.50 [ -0.04, 1.05 ]
Ohgi 2004	12	76.4 (15.4)		67.9 (15.1)		2.7 %	0.54 [ -0.30, 1.37 ]
Sajaniemi 2001	49	92.61 (17.41)	51	93.67 (16.26)	<b>_</b>	6.9 %	-0.06 [ -0.45, 0.33 ]
Spittle 2009	58	99 (12.8)	57	95.6 (12.6)		7.3 %	0.27 [ -0.10, 0.63 ]
Teti 2009	33	96.59 (11.8)	42	92.63 (9.9)		5.9 %	0.36 [ -0.10, 0.82 ]
Wu 2014	98	99.17 (9.08)	45	96 (9.4)		7.5 %	0.34 [ -0.01, 0.70 ]
Total (95% CI)	1152		1220		-	100.0 %	0.32 [ 0.16, 0.47 ]
Heterogeneity: Tau <sup>2</sup> =	= 0.05; Chi <sup>2</sup> = 3	89.38, df = 15 (P =	0.00056); l <sup>2</sup> =	62%			
Test for overall effect:	Z = 395 (P =	0.000079)					
Test for subgroup diffe	erences: Not ap	plicable					

-1 -0.5 0 0.5 1

#### **Early intervention?**

#### Analysis I.3. Comparison I Early developmental intervention versus standard follow-up (all studies), Outcome 3 Cognitive outcome at school age - IQ (WISC, Kaufmann).

C 1 1

**C** 1 1

Review: Early developmental intervention programmes post-hospital discharge to prevent motor and cognitive impairments in preterm infants

Comparison: I Early developmental intervention versus standard follow-up (all studies)

Outcome: 3 Cognitive outcome at school age - IQ (WISC, Kaufmann)

Study or subgroup	Intervention		Follow-up		Dif	Mean ference	Weight	Sto. Mean Difference
	N	Mean(SD)	N	Mean(SD)	<b>IV</b> ,Rand	om,95% Cl		IV,Random,95% CI
APIP 1998	124	99.7 (15.3)	63	101.1 (15)		-	263 %	-0.09 [ -0.40, 0.21 ]
LHLDR 1990	336	90.7 (18.2)	533	90.9 (17.8)	-	-	31.1 %	-0.01 [ -0.15, 0.13 ]
Kaaresen 2006	66	102.3 (13.5)	65	95.6 (19.2)			24.9 %	0.40 [ 0.06, 0.75 ]
Nurcombe 1984	24	110.5 (11.7)	31	97.2 (13.7)			17.7 %	1.02 [ 0.45, 1.59 ]
Total (95% CI)	550		692		-	-	100.0 %	0.25 [ -0.10, 0.61 ]
Heterogeneity: Tau <sup>2</sup> = 0.10; Chi <sup>2</sup> = 16.68, df = 3 (P = 0.00082); l <sup>2</sup> =82%								
Test for overall effect:	Z = 1.40 (P = 0.1	16)						
Test for subgroup diffe	rences Not appli	cable						
					-1 -0.5	0 0.5 1		
				Fax	ours follow-up	Favours Interv	vention	

### **Early intervention?**

**DEVELOPMENTAL MEDICINE & CHILD NEUROLOGY** 

COMMENTARY

# Timing and content of interventions to enhance cognitive performance of very-low-birthweight children

Previous research has indicated that interventions in infancy may have short-term but not positive long-term effects on cognitive or academic performance.<sup>2</sup> It is not surprising that interventions in the first few months of life may not be enough to solve the complex issue of cognitive deficits in preterm children at school age. This highlights the need for intervention at around school age



# Working memory training?



#### **Conclusions**:

We currently do not recommend administration of Cogmed for early school-aged children born extremely preterm/extremely low birth weight to improve academic functioning.

Figure 2. Treatment group differences in academics, working memory, immediate verbal memory, immediate visual-spatial memory, attention, and behavior at 2 weeks, 12 months, and 24 months post-training. Point estimates reflect regression coefficients from mixed-effect models where a group difference >0 reflects a higher score in the Cogmed group, and a group difference <0 reflects a lower score in the Cogmed group. Vertical error bars represent 95% Cls.



#### **Research priorities**

#### **Open access**

**Original research** 

**BMJ Open** Joint production of research priorities to improve the lives of those with childhood onset conditions that impair learning: the James Lind Alliance Priority Setting Partnership for 'learning difficulties'

Ai Keow Lim <sup>(0)</sup>, <sup>1</sup> Sinead Rhodes, <sup>1</sup> Katherine Cowan, <sup>2</sup> Anne O'Hare<sup>1</sup>

#### **Research priorities**

Engage partners 79 charities & 23 professional societies Gathering uncertainties 367 respondents submitted 828 suggestions 29 individuals affected by learning difficulties, 147 parents/carers and 191 professionals) Verifying uncertainties 761 classified as in-scope; 67 outof-scope; 40 indicative questions forumlated; all confirmed as uncertainities from research Interim prioritisation survey long list of 40 questions ranked by 41 individuals affected by learning difficulties, 125 parents/carers and 195 professionals

Final prioritisation 5 young people with learning difficulties, 6 parents, 5 health professionals, 7 educational professionals and 2 third sector professionals

Figure 1 Flow chart showing the process and numbers of participants and research suggestions and questions at each stage.

### **Top research priority**

Table 3	Top 10 research questions agreed as shared priorities
(1)	What knowledge, skills and training do educational professionals need to identify the early signs of learning difficulties and provide optimal support for children and young people affected to help them achieve the best possible outcomes?
(2)	What is the best educational and community environment for children and young people with learning difficulties?
(3)	How can multiple types of professionals work together with parents and carers to improve identification, diagnosis, interventions and treatments and achieve the best outcomes for children and young people with learning difficulties?
(4)	Which early interventions are effective for children and young people with learning difficulties, at what ages and stages are they best introduced and what are the long-term outcomes?
(5)	What knowledge, skills and training do health, social work and 'third sector' (eg, charities and support services) professionals need to understand the best support to give children and young people with learning difficulties and their families/carers?
(6)	How can parents, carers, brothers and sisters and extended families of children and young people with learning difficulties, be best supported to achieve their best quality of life before, during and after the diagnosis or identification in home, school and community contexts?
(7)	How can we best identify early features, symptoms and signs of learning difficulties among children, young people and their families/carers?
(8)	What is the best way to assess learning difficulties in children and young people?
(9)	Which strategies are effective in preventing stigma and bullying towards children and young people with learning difficulties?
(10)	Which strategies are effective in helping children and young people with learning difficulties live independent lives, including during times of transition?

#### Education professionals' knowledge of preterm birth



#### Education professionals' knowledge of preterm birth



#### Education professionals' knowledge of preterm birth



# A different kind of difficulties



Further details about the project can be found on the 'Project information' page, reached by clicking on the named button to the left. To access the three tools which make up the Engagement for learning resource framework, please click on the 'Project resources' button or the photo buttons below. This new generation of children and young people includes some . . . who survived extreme prematurity . . . These children have complex learning difficulties and disabilities. They learn and respond differently to previous generations of children with profound and multiple or severe learning difficulties.

Training for staff to recognise the possible learning disabilities and difficulties associated with extremely preterm birth.

### **PRISM e-learning resource for education professionals**

- For education professionals
- 5 short sections
- ~ 1 hour of learning
- Control own pace of learning
- Interactive multimedia content
- Case studies & animations
- Figures and graphs narrated
- Provides strategies to support children in the classroom





#### Preterm Birth Information for Education Professionals

Welcome to the Preterm Birth Information for Education Professionals home page. These five learning resources have been developed to improve your knowledge and confidence in supporting prematurely born children in the classroom.

Please navigate through the resources by selecting each image below.



#### 1. What is preterm birth? A

[opens in new window] Learning outcomes:

> To define preterm birth
>  To understand that the more preterm a baby is born, the greater the risk of developmental problems later in life



#### Learning outcomes:

- To understand that children born preterm may have difficulties with IQ, processing speed, working memory, and hand-eye coordination
- To understand how these difficulties may impact on learning



#### 5. How can education professionals support preterm children?

Learning outcomes

- To understand what kind of strategies might be helpful for supporting children born preterm
- To understand that preterm birth is a risk factor and an individual assessment is always necessary to provide appropriate support

#### 2. Educational outcomes following preterm birth

#### Learning outcomes:

- To understand that children born preterm are at risk of special educational needs and poor academic attainment
- To identify which school subjects children born
  preterm are most likely to struggle with

#### 4. Behavioural, social and emotional outcomes following preterm birth A

Learning outcomes:

notional outcor

- To understand that children born preterm may be withdrawn, anxious, and inattentive, and have
- difficulties developing relationships with their peers
   To understand that children born preterm don't tend to be disruptive so their needs may be overlooked in the classroom



### **Co-designed with stakeholders**







# Practical strategies for use in the classroom

- Strategies for providing support for children with:
  - Inattention
  - Poor working memory
  - Slow processing speed
  - Poor visuo-spatial processing
  - Social & emotional problems
  - Mathematics difficulties

#### 4. How you can help



## **Evaluation study**

- 61 teachers from primary schools in England
- 1 month access to the resource
- Before and after using the resource:
  - Assessed knowledge of outcomes following preterm birth
  - Assessed confidence in supporting preterm children



### **Evaluation study**

- Preterm Birth Knowledge Scale: mean score
  - Pre-resource use: 13 (SD 6.2); range 0-25
  - Post-resource use: 28 (SD 3.5); range 18-33; p < 0.001</p>
- Greatest increase in knowledge

Item	% accuracy pre resoure	% accuracy post resource	% difference in accuracy
Risk for mathematics difficulties	7%	100%	93%
Risk for poor social skills	15%	95%	79%
Risk for inattention	15%	89%	74%
Risk for poor visuospatial skills	26%	100%	74%



#### **Evaluation study**





# 6 month follow up





# Changing practice – 6 month follow up

• 90% changed their thinking; 61% changed the way they work





# Available online: www.pretermbirth.info

#### • 6,883 users in 53 countries in 10 months

- Structural/organisational change
- Staff training in schools
- Teacher training programmes
- Support staff in higher education
- Educational psychology training
- Clinical recommendation
- Allied health professionals

S

Teacher (34%)

- Educational Psychologist (7%)
- Other education professional (9%)
- Health professional (18%)
- Academic/Researcher (3%)

🗖 Parent (29%)

#### **Empowering parents**

My son was very preterm but because he has no behavioural issues, we have had real difficulties getting his differences acknowledged and understood by his teachers. This site is really excellent in getting the issues across to busy teachers who cannot be experts in everything but do need to know how to help these precious children. Thank you so much. This is amazing, and I can't wait to share it with my son's teachers. They really need it.

> I've felt FOREVER that I wanted a resource like this for the teachers of my Former Micro Preemie Daughter.. Thank you so much!!!"

As a parent of premature children I would like all teachers and people involved in their lives to read this. It rings true I have shared the teacher resource from the Prism study so often: it has enabled parents and teachers, and young adults to advocate for themselves using verified information for the first time. This is hugely empowering for both the parent and child







# Thank you

Email: sjj19@le.ac.uk

