

Notes for Task Force 10/26/17

Roll Call

Eleni Boston
Kelly Farrell-Oliverson
Chad Ludwig
Amy Kyler-Yano
Beth Schuler-Krause
Jeremy Saling
Kelly Farrell
Karen Brush
Tawna Sanchez
Adam Walsh
Travis for Laurie Monnes-Anderson
Marcia Zegar
Ron Sarazin
Sharla Jones

Note for group discussion: Can we get this meeting transcribed? Sharla will ask ODE if that's possible. They are already paying for 3 interpreters for the rest of the meetings. Besides the audio recording of the meeting, Sharla will also be distributing her notes - it helps her to make these notes as part of the process since she will also be writing the report on behalf of the task force.

Introductions from Ron:

Eleni Boston - with WESD
Karen Brush - Curriculum Specialist at OSD - happy to dive in and catch up
Kelly Farrell-Oliverson - parent of child who uses CIs
Chad Ludwig - community support member
Jeremy Saling - School Psychologist
Beth Schuler-Krause - mother of Deaf child
Malina Lindell - seated in the audience, teacher of the Deaf
Marcia Zegar - SLP, 25 years working with children with hearing loss
Kristy Karsten - on the phone - working for CRP - 24 years experience working with DHH, literacy specialist
Anne Smyth - on the web

Ron - Criteria for the assessments!

Working with the CA folks - at 10:30 we will be working with the CA team on the phone. Asking them any questions and we can learn from their experiences. Several of you sent Sharla assessments - she put together a spreadsheet. We need to become familiar with them today.

Approach: we will see what we are evaluating and pare down our list to 4-5 from the 15-20 we've mentioned and then see the criteria and be thorough in our selection. We want to talk about what it will take to make this work. We started this conversation. It'll be one thing to pick the assessment. Tawna has recommended that we identify what it will take to make it work.

Tawna - if there are existing assessments that work, great. If not, let's not be afraid to see if we need to modify what is out there.

Amy - I feel the same

Marcia - that would be critical. It's a broad category that goes from mild to profound. If we think there is one tool, to see language to literacy - it's a limited scope. We need to think broadly about literacy approach. Despite the different modalities. It should be comprehensive for their individual needs. This group is extremely diverse.

Karen - this assessment should not only cover language but social and cognitive and executive functioning - lots of aspects we need to assess.

Jeremy - from a cognitive standpoint definitely - under 3, there is not much yet. Batelle - yes that inventory is one option. Adaptive skills - all is included in that one. Above 3 - I strongly recommend Lieter. It has a non verbal component, no language instruction. It's more about the child matching things - for ages 3 - 8 or 9. 3 - 6 at 6 Lieter and after that, the Wechsler intellectual scale 5th edition.

Amy- we have some checklists too on the list. The HELP, the Batelle, and the AEPS and the Rosetti.

Jeremy - I'd like to add to our language assessments - It's important to have both LSL and ASL data for each child. If we administer both we will get some good information. Maybe accessing some of each... then see what's happening with the LSL. Then we can make appropriate recommendations.

That will advise any interventions suggested. If we see the child being more effective in one area, then next steps will be clearer.

Chad - I have a few things. IEP and IFSP already require cognitive assessment tools. I don't think we need to focus on that more. Our focus should really be language - that's our task for this task force. I need to bring us back to the task at hand.

Eleni - I see what you're saying Jeremy - doing both. However if your family is not using ASL and the child is not exposed to signing, unless you're looking at their visual abilities, the test may not give you any info. Chad is right - we need to look at specifically language development.

(Senator Laurie Monnes-Anderson arrives)

Amy - even if a family is not using ASL, someday they may or want to. In CRP, when we start with the babies we are required to do 2 assessments. An ASL and a LSL checklist. At this stage

they don't know yet how will they communicate so we start out with those and the families can see there are different ways of communicating. We continue to monitor on through those years. And we watch if they sway either way - we continue to check.

Beth - I wanted to say I agree with using both as well. I want to remind us - all children use visual communication. It is about eye contact and facial expression and getting meaning from those things.

Karen - yes - I value the assessment tools. I want to see if social skills development, mental development - research is showing that language deprivation is affecting their mental abilities. Can we see any parallels? Data pool for connections? It may seem too broad a thing.

Jeremy - no exposure to ASL, and then they are exposed - the data would show if no signing from 0-2 and then LSL not progressing like hoped, we then expose them to ASL - we can see their speech improving too. To have the data behind us, it would show us more info. Collecting it now would offer assistance for future research. 40% of DHH children have additional disabilities. That's very likely from the impact of language deprivation compared to their hearing peers. Having a cognitive assessment would help their parents see that.

Marcia - that's an excellent point from Jeremy. The % of children with hearing loss that demonstrate additional disabilities. Their own characteristics they are bringing to the table. It focuses our assessments - based on what we know and not from one assessment - no matter where you are on that continuum. A diagnostic can be differential. Another question - I need clarification - this task force was supposed to see children under the Code 20 umbrella. That includes unilateral hearing, mild hearing loss, mild to moderate. I don't know if that category of children, if they can assess sound comparable to hearing children, given the appropriate hearing devices, they don't compare to children with severe hearing loss. We need to be realistic with time, effort, money. Is our biggest bang for the buck to use our resources for a child to make sure they develop language and literacy? I need more clarification please. Entire population? More severe to profound?

Ron - Welcome senator.

Laurie - I represent the Gresham area. I chair the senate health committee, and I am passionate about the DHH population because of my Deaf sister.

Amy - I think we are here to look at all children who meet the HI eligibility - as stated in the state. I'm not sure about your question. Language assessment applies to all kids regardless of degree of hearing loss. All kids would benefit from this and then we monitor. When we talk about ASL monitoring - natural gestures and pragmatics - we have to remember that lots of hearing kids learn baby sign language - I don't think that just because we are talking about varying unilateral and mild degrees of hearing loss that it matters. Marcia - could you clarify?

Marcia - if the need is determined, then yes - they have SPED services and the eligibility shows needs in that area. If they have mild hearing loss it will reflect differently than a severe hearing

loss. That's my only comment about that. That's critical - the pragmatics - their facial grammar and gesture and intent for communication. Obviously included for little ones in that state of development.

Chad - I see some debate of where we are going. My strong belief is that we should be considering any type of hearing loss - we should be assessing. No child left behind. I think everyone no matter what the decibel level is - 0 - 21 but here 0-8.

Amy - I agree Chad. That's the requirement. If a child qualifies under HI for Code 20 on an IEP, they have to be assessed. Either EI - that's under SPED too - if they qualify, we should be assessing for language.

Eleni - targeted age group clarification... 0-5 or 0-8?

Chad - HB 3412 has it as 0-8. CA was 0-5. 0-8 was based on the LEAD-K team here as they wrote the rough draft. The team decided that.

Eleni - that brings up a different assessment topic. K-2nd grade assessments have different procedures - we may need 2 separate sets of assessments.

Amy - yes - multiple assessments.

Chad - to my understanding the test SKI-HI does focus on both areas LSL and ASL from 0-8 - does anyone use that tool?

Eleni - 0-5

Chad - does that mean 5-8 we can't use it?

Eleni - as with any assessment you can use a preface and it says a lot when an 8 year old is so underdeveloped that we can still use this test accurately.
The SKI-HI - we can talk about the features.

Chad - we can make recommendation for the next legislative meeting - but the previous team really wanted up to 8 years of age included.

Jeremy - I wanted to add that yes, there should be 2 separate groups for testing 0 -5 or 0-3 and then move up to 8.

Different tests are more appropriate for developing 0 -5

Also - Marcia - I want to come back to the topic of mild and unilateral hearing loss. Research has found that students with moderate hearing loss are more at risk because they are sometimes not recognized for services. They don't receive additional services to maintain academic progress. I spoke at the VA conference back in 2010 about this topic. We found children with the mild hearing loss more at risk. No matter the severity of loss.

Marcia - can I add a comment? I agree. It's impact of hearing loss - no question. On a website supporting success for children with hearing loss - they give a wonderfully detailed analysis of the classroom - well documented across the board. It's critical we continue to educate the parents and teachers on hearing loss, mild to severe - yes all is impacting. My point is, we need differential diagnosis for each child in their profile based on their needs. We need to see multiple assessments. I apologize if not clear on recognition of the impact.

Ron - let's change our focus - we can come back - it's all connected. The discussion - what is the criteria. Sharla went through and collected from the notes - the headings of criteria. We can add to it if we need to and then what do we do - checklist or prioritized list.

1. Age appropriate and normed
2. Accessible for child
3. Accessible for the parent
4. Measures emerging literacy skills
5. Measures Language Development
6. Respects both ASL and Spoken Language of the child's home
7. Can be used with multilingual or monolingual non-English speakers
8. Social Skills Development

Amy - playing devil's advocate here - I love the criteria, but the only problem is, we won't find many assessments for 0-8 - it's too broad a range. Maybe 0-5 and then 5-20 is more appropriate. I think the age group is important. It will be difficult to find both that respect LSL and ASL. I think probably we will find 2 - 1) for LSL and 2) for ASL and age groups.

Ron - so you're saying we need 4 different assessments?

Amy - I think that's what we're used to doing in the state. Kids vary in their needs at different age groups. The team either in the School District and the ESD will have a variety - it's normal practice.

Ron - Malina - how practical is it for all 4 to be done?

Malina - we have a selection of tests we use depending on the age of the child.

Eleni - true - we do a variety of assessment and sometimes on a 6 month basis. We do 0-3 differently than school age. Once you get to school (age K - 2nd) then in grade 5-8 you add on an additional assessment.

Amy - I don't think that assessment exists that respects both ASL/LSL.

0-8 social language development does apply more when a child reaches 5-8 - maybe we need also an 8th criteria for social development specifically.

I have done a lot of these assessments - the focus may be too narrow. And we're not looking at the social communication.

Jeremy - there is an assessment for social development. We see the difference between autism and underlying issues. That's a good measurement if we see how they are using communication in their environment. Some scream and point - with that assessment we can see their needs. It's a benefit to the process.

Last week I didn't understand the question at the end. We are very limited to a "deaf normed" assessment. Administering the assessment and having it normed - some are supervised but not normed. I know SLPs have a lot of assessments but one word expression and receptive tests - those could be used for both but separately. It's testing vocabulary. It will impact the reliability of the score. Duplication of the testing will impact the score (both languages).

Amy - so hard to wait for the mic!

I agree - in practice typically we use tests normed on typical hearing kids - we agreed last week that's the preference but when we write this report, we need to state that that's ok. What happens is that School Districts will say "It's not normed on deaf kids so we can't see it's a delay. Deaf kids weren't part of the sample." It's a small population, then they say "We can't give them services." I wanted to put that out there last week. We want to see normed tests - but make sure we say something in the law that it's ok and the SDs need to use that info.

Chad - 2nd page of the HB - I don't want to diverge too much from the bill. #8 is really not included in the language of the bill - criteria 8.

Framework to determine competency of language and literacy. Ready for kindergarten - let's stay with the language and intent of the bill. Leading to K readiness.

Jeremy - #5 - and #4 those 2 address the bill. Social skills...

Hearing babies have interaction with their parents and their social environment starts to develop with impacts to their literacy. LSL and ASL - will impact their literacy skills. There's a bridge either from their oral or their signed skills.

How do kids relate the vocabulary of the written work? Breaking things down into parts when they don't understand a language - awareness and understanding and put that meaning on paper. I'm thinking we left out that info.

Karen - I agree - pragmatic skills are critical and I respect that Chad wants to keep it simple - keeping it LSL and ASL - this bill will require, I hope, both with a strong emphasis to add pragmatic assessment as well. Will that help?

Chad - yes - the IEP already includes all of that. The point here - we need to fill the gap. Focus on the gap and add to the IEP where needed. Create a good summary to show the legislature.

Beth - this is a very interesting discussion - we all want to track and have data on every area of development of the child but seeing where we are now with Oregon - the focus should be on language acquisition. We use the AEPS to monitor basic cognitive, adaptive skills. That may be too basic. That's why we are here - to create a framework to adequately assess.

Amy - that was easier to wait for (the Mic). I know we need to look at building something that can happen more frequently so we can talk about it earlier in an understandable way. Maybe we don't need an 8th criteria.

Laurie - I wanted to comment regarding legislature - they put a lot of mandates on schools - I want to make sure from you that whatever we decide, we want implementable. I agree with social assessment - the behavioral piece, but i'm concerned we have something the schools can apply now. We can grow later on.

Eleni - yes - I agree - we in EI ECSE - we are doing lots of assessments - we need to see the mandate - thanks Chad - it's specific. We are supposed to be addressing:
One criteria - standardized, normed referenced and validated.

Ron - that clarifies.
Should we read through?

(Everyone read the bill closely)

Chad - we need to align our criteria with the bill. #8 - we can decide to add but we need to align with HB first and then add our own ideas.

Beth - I have a comment about what we are supposed to be doing. The language of the bill and the original goal, I think we are combining - a framework for assessment and milestones - that's a tool we could create that's very straightforward - "my child should be doing the following skills" - a handout for each IFSP so the parents can check it off. We need to be mindful about the language in the bill - talking about being accessible to the parent. This could be different than the tool itself and I want to know what we mean by "accessible to the child."

Jeremy - what do we mean by accessible to the child? Age appropriate, language appropriate.

Amy - that's exactly what I would say - accessible for the child is age-appropriate normed and make sure if the child is using one language - spoken Spanish or spoken English or ASL, then the assessment would respect it. I think as long as we have #7, that covers it.

Ron - can we take #3 off? As a team do you agree?

Jeremy - just adding that if we are accessible to the child - analyzing LSL skills and visual communication - using both for information. I don't want to miss that big picture about both communication modalities.

Amy - yes

Ron - let's take a break - at 10:30 we will talk to CA coming up next.

Chad - can we copy the HB? (Travis makes copies)

Kelly - I see a difference between being accessible for child and parent. It's covered by #1 - but for parent it's different - not just the assessment but the understanding of the results. It's separate.

Amy - Kelly - I agree. These assessments - part of the reason for more frequent intervals is that we can share with families in a parent friendly way we talk about them. Teachers can have that ability; some assessments compare your child to another 8 month old, that's more parent friendly than "2.85 standard deviations below the mean."

Kelly - I guess also - accessible to parents - would help when establishing education plans. Parents need to understand for that point.

Ron - CA is calling right now.

Beth - can we have one of the interpreters signing what is voiced?

Julie Rems-Smario - Hello!

Like REMS - Smario (Mario brothers)

Julie - I want to clarify what I'm sharing! The CA experience.

Chad - we are already heavy into the assessment tools.

Julie - Hello Oregon! You are a floor above us Oregon - 4th state in the nation to pass a similar bill! Very exciting! Here in CA we passed in 2015 and let me know if I freeze - before I move on, here's a little backstory from our LEAD-K experience through SB210.

It all began with a group of academics, audiologists - thinking of different options for students in CA. At first it was focused on listening and spoken language. Surprisingly the bill included deaf stakeholders - 2010. 7 years ago. The deaf community pushed back - town halls and they rallied against the bill - there was upheaval in the state. Through that we got to the point of LEAD-K - Arnold Schwarzenegger's desk - he was our governor back then. When it came to him there were lots of modifications to it.

We added a balancing of the languages both for English and for ASL, understanding the options for their child for both. The original proposer of the bill didn't support it anymore. Our school of audiology worked against their own bill.

Those senators and assembly members told both groups - the deaf community and the school of audiology - that they wouldn't work with us again until we could work together. That's the backstory. The ASL community and the school of audiology - we came together and met at the Option school. We all met there and worked together to propose a bil. We had a professional mediator.

And Tom Humphries came - professor from UCSD - he mediated as well. Both communities worked together to develop a bill. We were happy to have a mutual mediator. Tom Humphries helped to include ASL and Listening/Spoken languages - equivalent to English and it validates

English and included the family language - Spanish or any other language. We came together through this process - it's been a beautiful partnership ever since.

We agreed and the senators were aghast at this! It's about the deaf children. So putting our agendas aside and coming together for language acquisition - to support the IEP and IFSP process - all kids ready by 5 for K - you can't acquire literacy without the language foundation. Getting foundation solidly set will lead to literacy skills.

Since the 1960s ample amounts of research show that time and time again, deaf children are doing worse than hearing children living in poverty. On the average, deaf children are still reading at 3rd and 4th grade reading levels - generations and generations of children. The blight is language deprivation at a young age.

No language before school - regardless of why, where is the accountability - and also data - to see where the kids are. That data will help parents understand their child's development. Knowledge is the first step. They aren't linguists, they don't know how language impacts the mind.

We know it affects critical thinking and how it all ties back into language - parents aren't experts. When hearing parents give birth - the deaf baby is ready to acquire language - but there is a lack of exposure to visual language and when they don't have that privilege, they become instantly delayed.

LEAD-K bill focused on milestones for parents, families and teachers - we want to recognize where the child is at - have EI processes to support parents and measure where they are at and then refer them to appropriate support. Sending educators into the home immediately. Someone to walk along with them and measure milestones.

Parents watch physical milestones - to crawl, toddle, walk, then at 18 months running... we look for milestones. We know what to expect generally. If baby doesn't crawl by 1 we know something is wrong - we intervene. We support the baby to enable to start crawling; it's the same with language - if not speaking by 1 - something is up. It's an issue - what's going on - the brain? A child's brain triples in size from 0-2.

So critical - by 5 years old their brain is 90% developed. That's why we picked age 5. 90% of the way done - that language acquisition is so critical. You can acquire language after 5 but only 10% of that development is left. Too late at that point. That's why 0-5. Born ready to acquire - we can't play with that.

Any questions so far?

Amy - I have a literacy question: you were assessing language and then you know if a child would get to the literacy. Does CA assess literacy or the language building blocks, to be ready for K?

Julie - You're right - the need to have good language acquisition from 0-5 because that will set the foundation for literacy skills at 5. We only assessed the language acquisition for our LEAD-K. Language acquisition is different than language development. If no healthy acquisition for you, the literacy foundation will always be a struggle. I noticed a lot of people reframed the

discussion from delay to deprivation - it's different. Delay means lower cognitive skills - there may be a disability - given a good environment. If they have acquisition 0-5 appropriate, then natural language. But if there is something else - a barrier to language or no access - that's what we call language deprivation.

Beth - thanks for that clarification - very enlightening this whole conversation.

Curious - can you talk about the brain work you suggested, frequency of evaluation, and did you create a separate parent resource tool?

Julie - good question - first I'll respond with another question - how often does Oregon have IEP and IFSP meetings? 6 months? We built it into those meetings already - 2x a year in the IFSP - they are already assessing so many things, we just added language acquisition to those assessments already done.

Amy - so did they then have a separate conversation during the IFSP - do goals and then the testing?

Julie - right - the milestones - every 6 months the team would decide what goals to set both in English and ASL - what is their signing supposed to look like and what does speech look like - we don't pass the child as hearing - recognizing and giving parents info for informed decisions.

We have teams of 13 - many perspectives present. Standards for language development for hearing - we didn't want that because comparing only to hearing is not appropriate too. We have parallels. Milestones - set on research. Gallaudet, Sunshine Cottage (Texas) - do you know it? (Eleni - yes)

Sunshine Cottage is very popular. Gallaudet for ASL - we wanted to separate and already take advantage and align with CDE (California Department of Education) what they used for all students. We made notes - different tools are popular - you'd be surprised what can be used for deaf. Actually work nicely with hearing - so there is a resource sharing of different tools. We posted on the CDE website - I gave that list to Chad. Look at those so you don't have to reinvent the wheel - modify where appropriate. We made a cute brochure that folds out to look like Candyland - the journey of 0-3, 3-5 - very appealing showing the milestones - good for parents. It's still in draft form. Working on that now - when final we will post. People are already starting to access. Parents can see where the kid should be at home. It helps people setting different goals. They bring the milestones to the IFSP meetings and see how the child is doing and what they need in supports to reach each milestone.

Marcia - I have a question - thank you so much for sharing this time with us! It's wonderful to hear about the cooperation across different fields and opinions emphasizing the child. Bridging from language to literacy: You referenced the Gallaudet and the CASL - my question - under the guidance of LEAD-K - are both continued throughout the 0-5 years or at what point is one assessment tool used over the other? Thanks

Julie - it depends on the parents' choice - that's the key. Parents may prefer listening and spoken language or whatever they want to do - but the info is important to avoid the deprivation.

Jeremy - question - we discussed earlier - different assessment and their approaches - different thoughts and ideas. Do you recommend whatever the parent decides for modality - it's still important data to have both spoken and signed assessed - their visual communication recorded. We can score as a 0, that's fine if there is no signing on the IFSP, but both ways would be documented? May have less on one modality - that documented would show...regardless of what the parent chose?

Julie- we focus on not modality but on language chosen. English is a language and ASL is a language. For us, we were determined not to say modality. We talked about the language acquisition. If the parent decides no on ASL, fine - we look at the milestones in English.

Jeremy - is there any harm in assessing both? Regardless of choice?

Julie - no - no harm, with the data it needs to be documented which language is chosen. It helps us see ASL, English or another language, and shows where the child is at. Knowledge is power - then parents can make better choices for their family. If the child is struggling we can see the data and see a better picture of what is happening - it's a win win.

Jeremy - I'm thinking, for parents who focus on Spoken Language skills - suppose at age 3, the child is not meeting milestones for that age. How do you recommend the IFPS team to tell parents to add visual communication and ASL?

Julie - depends on the approach - a lot of times the parent is unaware that the child is behind. They need to recognize they have permission to discuss why the child isn't meeting milestones - if they don't know, there is no choice. They need to learn about language acquisition and the brain. It's not one or the other - there are other options. If the child has autism or something else - if they are exposed to all and still delayed it's indicative of something else happening and thus needs a change in programming. So keep in mind, a deaf child can reach milestones - and if they are not, we can investigate.

Jeremy - you can engage in healthy discussion about that.

Julie - I am a parent as well - IEPs are intimidating meetings - scary! We need to figure out how to make the meeting more safe and warm for parents - giving them info on how we support the child. I have talked to many parents - so many express regret - wishing they knew more about language and gaps and that's what we have faced for years.

Amy - I think I heard Marcia - Marcia, do you have any questions?

Marcia - no - I do appreciate the language milestones on SB 2010 and looking at language acquisition and tracking before age 3 so we know if on track - if not the course corrections can be made in a timely fashion and get the kid back on track - thanks!

Julie - thanks - I am appreciative too - LEAD- K (Spelled out) includes ASL, English - we bring everything to the table - so critical. The E is for Equity - recognizing that ASL and English are equitable. A - access to one language or another or both - I'm thrilled to see you're a good team to see that happens for every child - I recognize your hard work and I thank you.

Jeremy - I have a question - what are you doing currently with the bill?

Julie - we met 4x as a committee. The bill passed. We have a 13 person committee - similar to yours. We finished that last summer. We did a lot of hard work - coming together but you can see - it pays off. We were looking at frameworks - you are welcome to see our website and see what fits your state. We posted milestones, now a parent brochure - hoping to post November and last we need trainings for EI teachers and specialists who work with the families - how to use these tools and what to expect for milestones. Lots of webinars. CA is large state. 17,000 DHH children. Huge population. I know Oregon is smaller. Webinars and in person workshops - most people do like the in person workshops.

Hard to connect in a webinar - but we rely on the webinars. November, parents will get access. Every parent will get one milestone form and we will meet with every single parent and give them those resources. For example - I have 3 kids - it's controversial about vaccinations - we keep the records and track what we get for our kids. Same for those tools for parents - follow up where their kids are at. We are almost finished - hope in November to finish the last bit.

Marcia - it's wonderful how comprehensive the website appears - how is implementation of the specified assessment tool which will happen in the different school districts and what kind of monitoring happening to see it implemented?

Julie - and a question for you - on your IFSP - how do you monitor the plan you set there? Milestones already there? Our data is given to the state in CA through the DRDP - that's our information system with our infants and toddlers - we added the language acquisition assessment onto that.

Marcia - yes - Eleni - can you address that info?

Amy (wins the mic) - In this state of Oregon we operate on an annual basis - similar to yours. We do what's called AEPS - that's required annually. All areas of development are covered.

Eleni (adding) - yet it's not reported to ODE. The data is collected and put on the IFPS - through age 5. IEP starts when the child starts K. It's through our systems review at the state level when we look at corrective action. And the only data is the AEPS.

Julie - you don't report to the state. Ok. I love your system of IFSP til 5. The problem is writing another bill. Originally our IFPS stopped at 2. We see kids fall through the cracks. No intervention til 5 and then behind again. No language exposure until 5 and that's a big problem. That data - what do you do with the data on the IFSP?

Eleni - collected, annually, programs are monitored, put into the SPR&I (Systems Performance Review & Improvement) - a systems review - if not meeting the standard, then we write a correction plan. AEPS is sent in, but growth is through SPR&I. We are a hybrid state. Eligibility changes at 3 years. School age with the addition of DD - that's different from 0-3 to 3-5 and then drops off. DD going into K without eligibility but DHH - that eligibility carries forth.

Julie - that's great

Amy - if we can see educational impact. 3 years old - assessed, then technically they can lose their eligibility. Hearing levels - yes but they could have lost the eligibility piece.

Julie - some schools won't pay for SPED. 3 years old - looks good, then sent on their way. It's a CA issue too.

Amy - Marcia's question - sounds like you add on. Done every 6 months? Then those assessments VCSL or CASLLS - how is that data used and processed?

Julie - those 2 assessments are good tools - we pulled several things from there for our milestones on our website. If you chose those great - right now the only one we found - is the SKI HI. We felt some struggle with that because it's not comprehensive. The CASLLS and VCSL and Sunshine - we combined them. They are not compatible - they don't parallel - they don't line up 1:1 - hard to compare. SKI HI - didn't really satisfy all our criteria. We called SKI HI and told them we wanted to work with them to update their protocol and assessment to fit our needs. They were very willing to work with us. We are working together to update the SKI HI now.

Amy - are you creating your own assessment? For your milestones and collecting data for families?

Julie - yes - seeing what they have in common. Pulling those out for overview to meet milestones. We will use SKI HI with their amendments added.

Amy - and a separate milestones list that pulls from a variety?

Julie - exactly. That list of milestones we put out on the website - anyone can look at that. It's very accessible. They should work together with the assessment.

Ron - Other questions?

Julie - have you followed the family in WA? The DHH HS student who could not graduate because he had no formal language. The family was unaware. He is 18 and the parents are saying "We never knew." Those are not isolated stories. We need to give them all the chance to succeed in their lives. The lawsuit is on from the family against the school district.

So - in Fremont - that's where we have a school for the Deaf - there is a growing need for WRP - work readiness program - more and more deaf children aged 14, 16 - who have only been mainstreamed in small programs - ready to graduate yet still don't possess literacy skills. WRP buys more time until age 22. Voc training, interviewing and mentoring so they can get work at graduation - it's rehab. It's too late for them to acquire formal academic language at that point. Broad picture? We are starting over during those teen years to catch them up and give them tools to survive.

I'm so proud of Oregon!

Ron - let's break for lunch soon. Move back to our criteria. Chad has a couple of suggestions and then we want to see some assessments. Malina?

Malina - the interpreter did fabulous job. She mentioned SEE and Cued speech too - takeaway is that they invited all different modalities or choices within the state - we need to honor all choices that have been used by families.

Ron - other comments?

Jeremy - Julie said it so beautifully - we track physical development so language acquisition can be tracked similarly.

Ron - we will focus on all the assessments and start down the path. 12:20 people!

Lunch Break

Ron - any additional thoughts?

Amy - of course I want to talk - for the next two times I will be on the phone only! I really appreciated hearing the CA perspective and learning from their mistakes - we have had lots of people at the table from different language backgrounds - we have a good group of stakeholders at the table. My hesitation from what I learned from Julie is that the one concern I have - sounds like they're getting something changed that's not in existence - and maybe we can use it, but that's tricky for me. Sounds like it's still not the perfect thing. I'd rather pick 2 assessments we like 70% of - one for visual and one for spoken language. Then we will get what we like. I don't want to settle.

Jeremy - I agree. Right now standardized testing is focused on monolingual users. It's an unfair advantage for hearing children who have had language from birth. We have to use with great caution. LSL and their signing development - does SKI HI have both?? I think you're right - we need ASL and spoken language separate. The norms give us a confidence interval. Depending on how you want to have it - 90 or 95% - I'd prefer 95% , using the confidence between measurements and overlap regardless of what assessment you give.

Karen - Julie mentioned language acquiring is different from language development. How do we assess the acquisition compared to development?

Amy - I think when I think about language acquisition I think about how a child is learning language - that's individually based. One word every day, or one word a week - versus language development which has a trajectory - child has babbling and then next strings that sound like conversation then one word then combining 2 words - that's language development. Acquisition is individual. When they said they meant DHH kids moving steadily forward versus not acquiring language at all. Even if not typical - not developing.

Beth - I think you're on the right track Amy - there's a difference between acquisition and development - the focus should be on exposure. And if a child has access. So with language acquisition we see if they can and do meet early milestone versus looking for a specific roadmap of skill development: first, second, third. We might have a DHH child who has access but delay due to something else or not enough access...

Kelly - I'm concerned about having to create an assessment - we need lots of momentum to get a report to legislature in January - I'd hate to say to them "We need 3 years because we don't like any yet." It dampens the momentum - even if not a perfect solution, I'd hate to lose out on that. Sounds like CA has momentum too - and for the same reason.

Ron - focus your attention on the right side of the board. HB language - 3 required pieces. From the standpoint of selecting, I want to make sure the criteria is not a subset - we need to match it, but can exceed it. Help me go through the rest. For example - accessible for parents - something talked about in the bill but not in the requirement for the assessment.

Amy - we asked Julie because we wanted to know if that's something 0-3... of course there are things they should be doing, but not typically assessed until K. I was sort of thinking in this group - ready for K has a lot to do with language, and then literacy will develop - I'm fine with taking that off. What do other people think?

Kelly - what literacy skills are? I thought - from some testing Conner had - "Does he hold the book in the right direction? And know words go from left to right?" I thought those were literacy skills.

Amy - you are right on! That's what we expect for school readiness. 5-8 understanding print and corresponding sounds and word recognition and if we do separate assessment for that...

Kelly - I thought literacy skills is already included in IEP and IFSP - it's already done. I think that's not our job in this task force. Maybe some things we strongly encourage but not include in our recommendations.

Beth - from a parent's perspective - would you want your child assessed in literacy or are the milestones ok?

Kelly - I would want it spelled out for me - I didn't know that a child needed to know what way a book was facing - I would put it in the milestones.

Eleni - the bill is not saying literacy - it's saying language. When we do the AEPS, into K through the DRA, dibels - that's assessing literacy. That is taken care of in other areas. The language will impact it and that will be proof.

Laurie - when the bill was drafted - this attorney drafted the bill. If we feel we need it needs to be different... the lawyer may not have differentiated. We can interpret rather than literally follow what's in the bill.

Jeremy - It doesn't hurt to have some kind of literacy screening - parents need to be aware where their child is. If there is no literacy skills present, the professional could offer more resources. That's where it would help to know what info to be given.

Amy - I agree Jeremy - families need to have info. Either through the AEPS but I think if we need to consider criteria, it might hinder us.

Ron - Optional? Some required, some optional?

Beth - I'm wondering if we can separate the literacy from the language acquisition assessment and put a statement in the report that the members say literacy should be discussed at each IFSP.

Amy - Beth is right - some examples that were shared are language planning protocol that could be a part of this. If we add a literacy piece, there is a section there.

Tawna - we talk about legislative intent - K ready? In my opinion it includes literacy.

Kelly - at our IFSP when my kid was 2, in the fine motor section - it said, "Turns book right side up and turns pages one by one." - I agree. K readiness has to include literacy or we've lost the battle . It's already in the documentation.

Eleni - In the IFSP we document emergent writing, phonological awareness, rhyming sentences, blending sounds, reading sight words, and social interaction.

Ron - sounds like some coverage - Sharla will make sure we don't let go of that.

Jeremy - can we go back? Beth said for language assessment - looking at stages - age 1 or wherever the pre literacy skills begins - and then we refer to a literacy assessment at that age - referring to a literacy assessment. During the language development when those start, as we draw closer to that stage, we could refer parents to literacy development.

Ron - measures language development - is that picked up or additional? We agree with B, #14

Chad - my comment is related to #6.

Can we use the same words here in this group? The purpose of the bill is to use ASL and Spoken English - LSL is a branding name - can we ensure we are talking about spoken English - consistent in all our writing.

Ron - LSL- change it to Spoken English.

Amy - I think you need to say "Spoken Languages" since there are lots of spoken languages - 0-3 - home language - could be Spanish or Russian.

Ron - the focus is ASL - American Sign Language... ok
#6 - does it pick up directly?

Beth - Yes - targets #14 tracking expressive and receptive - we need to respect the language they are using.

Ron - #14 is the line in the bill.

Beth - it targets 17C because we need to be aware of the child's skill in both languages.

Ron - #7 -

Kelly - how is that different from #6?

Amy - I think I added that one - the intention - when we look at standardized assessment it's different for different populations. All are for students who listen to 1 language but here in Oregon we have students who listen to more. I understand these assessments and which school districts and counties are looking for, but I also want it for kids who are using other languages in the home.

Kelly - so it would be together with # 6

Ron - so both 14 and 17. Beth?

Beth - I'm not sure how much the language on the board matters at this point. We could combine by saying "ASL and the spoken language of home."

Ron - Take #7 out and modifying #6.

Chad - I'm okay with that - I want us to keep in mind the languages used in school is ASL and English - we don't have other languages of instruction.

Karen - I understand your point Chad - I'm trying to think of the bill and it's purpose for children to be competent in English. They need a foundation regardless of second language. Same train of thought.

Beth - for the record, I think that's exactly right.

Ron - what does that mean for #6?

Beth - if I understand Chad and Karen - we may want to focus on English because of the language of instruction. Like any other child entering K - leave it the way we've modified it.

Kelly - I'm not sure this is what we'll report - we can define later when drafting the report.

Ron - I want to agree on the criteria. Let's have a familiar understanding - and later we will formalize.

Eleni - when students are school age - if they are speaking Spanish - they are typically given the ELPA and that's assessing their ability to acquire English. That's annually starting with English.

Karen - I had a thought - OSD - I work there - 2 students from families using LSM (Mexican Sign Language). We won't be assessing their LSM skills. But I wonder if we need to broaden to "Signed languages"?

Chad - all I did was shake my head!

Amy - so I worry when you say that - maybe we'll be looking at SEE signs or other systems used then.

Jeremy - I want to clarify - what a child speaks at home - out of respect to their family - the modality in their house - I'm not sure how we fit ASL into the picture and making sure the child will be K ready - I'm not sure about that.

Amy - I have a question Jeremy - how does a Spanish speaking family learn ASL?

Jeremy - I'm not referring to that. We have resources for their child, but other than English speaking - Spanish - do we try and expose that child to then ASL and English as well? Ready to enter the class speaking English? How do we show respect for that Spanish?

Amy - when we go to their homes, kids now who are DHH - we teach that they can learn multiple languages - the emphasis is on amplification. If we tell families to stop speaking Spanish and say "English only!" they stop talking to the child or use broken English - we stopped recommending that. We now go to homes with interpreters and teach our strategies to the families and they use their spoken language. Then those kids come into K ready to learn

English with their native Spanish. We have other resources like ELL classes they can take. In some districts, immersion classes - learning academic language first - there are a variety of ways.

Karen - I want to follow up on Jeremy's question - how do we assess the child in their home language - to support the family - to get the child ready for an English speaking class...how do we investigate their skills?

Jeremy - we'd need Spanish-speaking assessors, harder in the rural settings - not many in the country - there could be a disparity between the Spanish and English learners. I'm still processing all of this.

Karen - trained professionals - who are they who are trilingual? Good question.

Chad - we can talk all day about different languages in this state we use. We have a ton. We have different resources for that - but this bill is about the foundation of language and becoming K ready - that can be through ASL, or spoken language. The parent - with a different linguistic background may need it explicitly stated that their language will be respected and honored, but that's a different issue than what this task force is for.

Amy - in testing - we don't test directly in Spanish - even in Portland, we don't assess in that language - we do it in English and use an interpreter.

Beth - that's also parent perspective - the parent report for those parents - they can give us a lot of info on what their child is doing in their native language.

Jeremy - no reinventing the wheel, but is that addressed in the IFSP? How to support that family? We should support the DHH children - keep it less complicated.

Ron - #6 is still okay? #8

Eleni - again, I think the AEPS covers social communication, again we are talking about the intent of the bill. That's up to the teacher to take that and put it into the IFSP.

Ron - nice to have but optional?

Kelly - I was looking at the IFSP and the IEP - they already have social skills built in, "self-soothing" - important for the DHH baby, having his needs met. Age 8 - "advocacy and how to join play and join kids in the middle of a conversation" - it's harder to join in with children. That's built into the IFSP and IEP - I think we want sentences to refer back to ensure it's being DONE. Consistency across the board. I'm not sure we need to put in the assessment with this task force.

Chad - I recommend eliminating #8 - it's already done

(Many agree)

Ron - let's look at the other side too - B or C.... A is included, but B or C we need to consider to include in our criteria? 1 3 5 6 our criteria. Any other?

Kelly - when we say "able to track"? Results of the assessment? Is that what we mean?"

Chad - I want ODE to collect all the data from every assessment for language acquisition - if we send it all in and develop a report that all the code 20 kids fall under, the state would become more accountable to see trends and gaps and address ongoing needs.

Kelly - That's what I thought you'd say Chad. How are we reporting or tracking and collating the info?

Ron - we are selecting assessments and then the processes are later on.

Beth - to respond - if we have a standardized normed assessment, we can send scores to ODE, but a checklist, would not help. We need a score.

Kelly - do we send to ODE? I thought it was no. We need a process.

Amy - so the AEPS info we gather on ECWeb - how we track on the IFSP?

Eleni - Yes - that is required by the state.

Amy - happy to hear it does. We can add into that same system with a language assessment.

Eleni - that's ODE's job to figure out their data system and tracking.

Chad - for example, the lowercase 'e' on the 2nd page #12 - reporting requirements to assure that DHH kids have a new ORS and OARs - right now there is no tracking, no data required. We are making a new requirement for ODE to track and come up with a reporting system.

Beth - question for Eleni - do you know what exactly is reported? They don't keep the protocol?

Eleni - I think they are interested in the increase of growth being made. EC data - then the data is uploaded at ODE.

Kelly - so then the other thing we need - maybe not included in our criteria - we don't say about comparing what we are getting to language appropriate peers. Compared to that data somehow.

Amy - like the AEPS - what skills they are doing - but no comparison to whatever other same age kids are doing. Are they looking at same age peers...

Ron - other criteria?

With that let's take a 10 minute break and start back with Amy walking us through a few assessments - Amy may not be here the other sessions - and we will miss hearing your voice!

We may need to score the assessments, but we may all see the benefits of each one.

Beth - Amy asked if I could talk about the VCSL - it's on the screen - the protocol starts with birth to 12 months up to 5 years 11 months.

Not for 7 or 8 years old however it's very easy to use - family friendly. Examples (reading off) Ability to mark if emerging, not yet, inconsistently used - definitions are in the manual. All in one protocol, all normed - norming charts. When completed, you can look and calculate an age equivalent. What if a 3 - 4 year old user of ASL should be doing. Percentile of mastering the skills.

Kelly - are the items focused on language development? Any cognitive? Social?

Beth -, I think some items further on have to do with specifics of language.

Amy - one thing I like is a basal and ceiling age - basal means where the child currently is and ceiling means starting to get some skills. You can say to a family - your baby is in between 8 - 14 months - 14 month range - here is their learning process and progression. For DHH kids learning ASL - they might feel better seeing they are getting progression forwards. And I like that it can be used with babies. I can say to a family "Even though you haven't exposed your child to ASL, hey look they are following your face, you're already building foundation for learning sign."

Beth - it's a growth perspective rather than a deficit perspective. Maybe not doing a lot of expressive language yet, but these milestones are reassuring to families.

Ron - questions about VCSL?

Kelly - I heard what you like - what's the downside?

Beth - it's 0-5. 0-8 - we would need something different for the 6-8 range.

Amy - I don't like that part of the norming - you need 10 in a row to show you have mastered. 10 in a row - looks in direction of the signer and they need to master? 0-6 months - I can't norm this test even though it's meant for that age because they are so new - I'm frustrated for it not being normed until 1. The child won't have 10 in a row.

Beth -very early on - hard to get that norming.

Eleni - it's a plus too - the administrator needs to be skilled in ASL. That's a given.

Beth- yes, especially since they progress in their ASL skills.

Chad - question regarding the teaching community - do we have enough qualified professionals to assess using VCSL?

Beth- our region - yes we do - PPS (Portland Public Schools)

Malina - we have 2 teachers who can assess in ASL - that is adequate.

Chad - all teaching staff at OSD are mandated to pass the ASLPI - they need a 3 on a 5 point scale - should that requirement apply for all professionals to meet the ASLPI 3 and above?

Karen - I think TSPC does require teachers of the DHH - they need ASL proficiency to be licensed.

Amy - TSPC does require that - newly licensed teachers. Older teachers are not required to go back.

Beth - absolutely - to recommend a certain skill level, but like Amy said - new teachers need that for certification. Lots of teachers haven't taken that examination - if it's not part of their licensure.

Amy - I work with kids who use spoken language anyway - please don't make me take that test!

Chad - I think EI and ECSE - if they choose ASL or English - I believe they have someone dedicated who works with the family typically. I know someone skilled in spoken language goes to work with them - I would hope the ASL specialist would also be skilled with ASL.

Beth - I don't know if all regional specialist staff are proficient or fluent in ASL.

Ron - Eleni?

Eleni - we have several who are. If you are going to put in that requirement you would have to work through TSPC. It's the older teachers and teachers moving in from other states who are not under the same requirements.

Chad - I believe we can make a recommendation and leave it open.

Amy - the recommendation could be those who are administering the tests in ASL need to meet the requirements.

Beth - down the road - if we require a passing score for certification, we will have more teachers able to administer tests in ASL - the problem will be met. Isn't this something that happened just 2 years ago? I totally see your point Chad - it would be amazing - systems are in place to help us get there.

Ron - does this committee want to include that as a recommendation?

Amy - can we table that?

Ron - if we could vote it would be even better.

Kelly - it would be dependent on what kind of assessment. If we use VCSL I think we should.

Ron - that makes sense.

Beth - other questions? We will move on.

Marcia - one question - I'm not familiar with VCSL - I just pulled up an article about this by Laurene Simms. It looks like a checklist - 2 questions - I don't have the manual - though this tool it's referred to as a screening. And another question - the article - don't see exact definition for administration requirements other than a person versed in ASL. I don't know if the manual addresses that.

Beth - the manual has a section talking about who should conduct it on pg 5. It says who should: "ideally administered by trained teachers, SLP, EI or ECSE providers who work with the families. DHH or interpreters can assist with a team approach."

Jeremy - the last phrase provides us an opportunity - those can use their judgement if need to bring an interpreter or a CDI (Certified Deaf Interpreter) - in that arena as a team. To document the child's skills. May not be appropriate if you don't have fluency. Lots of subtleties missed if they are not fluent - we have the deaf eye - it's critical that the professional be fluent or bring an interpreter.

Amy - I was assigned a family with parents who were both Deaf and they wanted a CI (cochlear implant) for the child. I was assigned because that's my background - I had an interpreter when we were together. I could track the language development, but my signing is not fluent enough. But parents and interpreter did the VCSL - we used a team approach to do that.

Beth - second part - Marcia, you asked about it being a screening tool - I'm not sure- I can't see that word in the manual. Where did you see that?

Marcia - I had just googled it and saw an article - by Diane Clark and Laurene Simms - it's through Sign Language Studies 2013. Just a question about how it was listed on the manual. I know criteria for the assessment - obviously I think we'd be board by what the authors indicated in their manual for who would be appropriate.

Amy - thank you, yes. Marcia - if you're reading a little more info about how it is used as a screener. I do know that Laurene Simms is out of the Clerc Center and they use it for kids who are older than 6 with lower language, like a 2 -3 year old, and they use this for driving goals, even though not used as a normed reference. They CAN use it as a screener for older kids - who have language delay.

Marcia - right - not questioning the normed referenced piece. I put it into that category because of the depth of analysis - more thorough analysis would be recommended. That was my only thing.

Amy - if you want to become more adept at using the VCSSL, WSD (Washington School for the Deaf) is putting on a training in November. Look at their website.

Ron - Let's move on to the next assessment.

Amy - CASLLS - these are checklists developed from Sunshine Cottage - an option school in Texas. Skills for children 0-8. These are not normed. Development and typical trajectory comparing with hearing kids at different ages - no standard score.

They have all the skills of developing language - babbling to themselves, adult would repeat and take a turn. Mom says "momommomom" and then baby says "agagaga" right after her. Kids who have typical hearing and then age ranges - I like it because of the age ranges. I can say 3 out of the 5 skills. I can say 6-9 month skill range accomplishing all - there's spoken language, emerging meaning or receptive meaning, and listening skills. Do they turn to sounds... 0-12 month, social interactive, cognitive and play.

It's available in Spanish. Not normed for Spanish speaking families, just translated. Spanish may have different milestones.

Chad - emg part?

Amy - Emerging, met and generalized. Met - done once or twice, generalized is all the time. Then more difficult at 36 months - questions, answering questions: where, what, who... what endings on words - the more difficult, the gaps pop up with DHH populations.

Gaps where they are not using articles: the, a, an, gaps. But again, not normed. Then also speech sounds and whether they are making them.

Any questions about CASLLS?

Kelly - did you give us downsides?

Amy - sorry - M means mastered. It's not normed. I can say "compared to typical hearing kids"... but how many hearing do that? I don't know. There is a scale developed but I can't say 50% of kids do that typically. I don't know if their kid is in the average range. I think parents have a standard score so they can say 75% of kids at this level. That's the downside. I think it's comprehensive and parent friendly, but no standard score.

Marcia - I do think it's great for parents - it's giving parents info about strengths and weaknesses and emphasis on each areas.

Amy - thanks Marcia. Any other questions?
CASLLS we can use from birth.

Marcia - that tool - is advantageous. Working with families, we can keep a close eye on their development - it's incremental in that sense.

Amy - I agree. Next is the PLS 5.

Preschool language scale normed on English speakers and Spanish - 2 different assessments - it's great.

This looks at auditory comprehension - receptive and expressive - total language score.

Normed. And can do on 0-8.

It has a parent report and questionnaire - things like glancing to the person talking, enjoy caregivers attention, smiling, vocal when talked to, do they understand what you want when you gesture to come here...pragmatic skills, vocal, and then picture comprehension test - spoon, ball - "Where's the ball?" And they point. I've never done this with a child who uses ASL. I'd have to look more in depth and see if we can.

Eleni - we have used with students who sign and we document when reporting results.

Amy - some accommodations wouldn't impact the standardization. Almost every School District in the state has this. I don't love it. Most kids shows they have higher level skills than what they do. Not my favorite. I like to pair with other assessments to give more accurate info.

Eleni - this is not a test to use every 6 months. We found it tests high as well.

Amy - if used with DHH, we must use with an interpreter who is skilled in the form the child uses.

Ron - so should we consider?

Eleni - we need to look at all and sort out the yes/no afterwards.

Marcia - I say the same - let's look at everything.

Chad - spoken English language testing... I think you hearing people decide this piece. With the ASL assessment I will watch closer.

Jeremy - one test I've used with another SLP - they used an expressive 1 word vocab test - it was Receptive One Word... this we could use for both. I'll let Amy talk more about that.

Amy - I love this assessment! *Receptive One Word* - normed on children age 2 - we'd need 0-2 and then 2 and beyond. They point to pictures - tree boy man tie... they point when asked "Where's the man?" And you can see eye gaze etc. At age 2 they can point. I think it's great. Normed skills to parents and mostly vocabulary - and not other aspects. 1 -2 step directions. Only vocabulary level. It's not all of language.

Beth - I wanted to say the same thing. My concern is language deprivation - using assessment to catch gaps, I don't think this is the right tool. Too many other aspects to language.

Amy - there is a bilingual version - on a child who is learning 2 different spoken languages. That's a plus.

Eleni - I've used this when I'm trying to prove a child needs an interpreter. We can't give this every 6 months. It's only vocabulary. The higher the age, they need to fingerspell or explain - they may not know the exact word. That's a good indication they know but not the label for it.

Marcia - I too second Eleni's comment - this is just one element of language. Doesn't encompass all. Possibly what you will show next is the PPVT - Peabody Picture Vocabulary Test - available in English and Spanish and normed, but only vocabulary.

Amy - I don't have it - I didn't bring it - I think you can use it every 6 months.

Eleni - it sort of invalidates unless you do form a and form b. I can bring the Peabody, but again, it's similar to this and tests vocabulary - the BOEHM test of basic concepts has it too.

Ron - please do bring with you as many assessments as you can. Let's take a 5 minute break.

Amy - Next is the MacArthur-Bates - there are a few ways - there is a signed version, but I'm not sure if it's normed with kids using ASL, but this is a vocab assessment that parents fill out. Which words they use and are using at home - parent friendly. This section - each word - apple (understand and says, understands and signs) - I don't know if normed. I don't have the manual. I have a Spanish version and it's normed - they learn the word *cigar*. Based on their norming. I asked the interpreter - and that was a word *cigar* - it's not word for word for Spanish - they use *tortilla* not *bread*. It's more culturally appropriate. It's a standardized assessment but not a normed one; it's a percentile score. They believe that's better for children of a same age. In the 75th percentile - versus they have a standard score of 57. That percentile helps parents better understand.

Eleni - I went to a conference last spring - evaluating for the state of Colorado - they did say the info on the student's language level were only based on the words used. It's only one set of words. The child may have a higher rate of knowledge, but score low if they don't know those specific words.

Kelly - we used this with my child. There were words in there we didn't use. Arf arf not bow wow - there were things like "Why would we use that with our 1 year old?" It was hard to understand the norming. We filled it out ourselves. In that sense - totally easy. I think it does by "understands and says" - it's easy for parents to do, but I don't know what it told me - lots of bubbles filled in... I thought we did well. No report or feedback after.

Amy - the NECAP - people are doing that in that state - they send it to the university and see how the DHH are doing - they have a couple assessments they use - it's not complete in itself. You are right. It's about how someone talks about this to you. How the provider has that conversation - there is interpretation. If I were a provider I would say, "At the age of one - we would expect the child would understand 150 words" and give you some guides. But if they are only using 20 words... there is a delay. It doesn't give you a certain norm. That's a limitation.

Beth - 2 things - 1) this assessment is for 8 months. Not early enough like CASLLS - and Amy - there is an ASL version - online it says it is for 8-36 months. It was normed on DHH children.

Amy - thanks - interesting! At the conference they tell us stuff and then you can't find it. That's all the assessments I had. Eleni - you are up!

Eleni - This is CELF - preschool version. In schools they give this a lot. Pretty comprehensive. 3-4 - those are core language scores. Kind of goes through a number of subsets - has core language receptive, expressive content and structure. It's 3-5 - a test - can use ASL with or Spoken language. It's at the desk - sit and give. Not preschool friendly but gets info.

SKI HI - I've been told the test doesn't look appealing - like it looks old. I brought the protocols in English and Spanish - expressive and receptive. Parent's report. Observation units - but units equate to age level. Unit one - 1-2 month - unit 10 - 18-20 months. What they did - typical language development and taken out the auditory component. So the children aren't at a detriment because they can't hear. It's talking about completely speaking or signing with descriptive words - it's able to be used with any language. It's normed, it's been in use a long time - 2nd edition - and that's been in use a few years too. That's SKIHI.

Beth - can you talk about how the SKIHI is scored? Percentage or what?

Eleni - it's marked whether done with + or - and emerging - it's "have it or don't." + for more than half, then they have done that unit. And go to the next unit. If you're in unit 2 and done 50% then you move on and say 2-4 month level and emerging 4-6 month.

The Clerc Center - done in 2010 - it's a language and communication profile. They see conversational skills and put into a report. One thing we use and not normed or standardized - Kendall Conversational Proficiency level - P-Level. Level one - they can understand what they are talking about down to level 7 with the child explaining clearly what they have in mind and provide background - rules of a game etc. It's looking at proficiency in conversation. It's based on development of kids.

Beth - with Kendall p-level it's not about specific items - you observe and try to match the criteria. It's not specific about their skills.

Jeremy - also I've done the Kendall working with the SLP in the past using it - the inventory they use, the SLP used my "deaf eye" view to help her. If it was given to an assessor it may not be able to be feasible. She called me in for accuracy.

Marcia - I have a comment to add. The preschool one is for phonological awareness and pragmatic profile - it's very comprehensive.

Amy - TACI 4th edition - this assessment is normed and its use is for looking at identifying with receptive language issues - oral communication. Looks at how the child is understanding. Not measuring expression. 3-13 - normed on 1100 children. They point at pictures like other assessments. Ball, bike, baby - show me.... Difficult levels include more like "show me left..." Language grows as children grow. It's to look at auditory comprehension and find gaps. Not using enough oral language. Does not meet all our criteria, but it is normed.

Ron - are there other assessments we need to see today?

Amy - the only other one listed is the Rosetti - that's 0-36 months. We could but that's the only one we haven't seen that's listed.

Chad - spoken language - any assessment can cover 0-8?

Amy - no - other than CASSLS, but that's not normed.

Marcia - that's the reasons when we were initially talking about protocols - more than one assessment to look adequately for their language abilities.

Chad - ASL assessment - any cover 0-8?

Amy - no - no ASL 0-8

Only 0-6. That's the only one for ASL users - VCSSL.

Laurie - if we are worried about meeting the letter of the law we passed - this group could make recommendations to go down to age 6 just because we didn't want to come up with the number of assessments.

Chad - I mentioned before, maybe we need to consider dropping down to 6 or even 5. There are for 0-5, for ASL - what about spoken language for 0-5?

Amy - yes- mostly for 0-3 and then 3 and up. Language changes so much at that point.

Like AEPS - state mandated they have 0-3 and then 3 and up.

We could follow what the state has deemed appropriate.

Chad - in regards to ASL we could pick one for 0-5 but pick two for spoken. If we picked SKI HI and adapted the whole thing - and adopt that as both if they made their changes.

Beth - I think the SKI HI does assess spoken 0-5.

Amy - but it's still missing the auditory comprehension - I think that's what they are trying to add.

Chad - I can find out if you want that information.

(Committee wants him to find out.)

Chad - if this group wants to pick SKI HI for both and add one more for auditory needs, and after the changes are made to SKI HI, phase out the second test if built in?

Ron - that would help us address this better in the future.

Amy - we have 10 more minutes. My favorite things - I like the CASLLS, and I like VCSL - I like them already. Can we look at all during homework time and see which look best to each of us? We don't have to follow CA.

Jeremy - I'm not so well versed in the language assessments myself, but the CASLLS is easy to follow because it's broken down into months and development 0-8 is very clear - I think that's easier for parents to track. I know it's not normed, but developmentally - I like that too. As a tool. SKI HI - I'm unsure about. CASLLS is clear and it's auditory English skill proficiency more than ASL, but SKI HI is confusing with units - I was busy up and down trying to figure it out. Normed - yes. Percentile? Not - standard scores. Ok.

Eleni - it tells you age equivalent in months in the scoring.

Marcia - Question for the group - I was taking notes while the CA speaker was mentioning that although the only tool for both was the SKI HI, the comment made was their concern - it was not comprehensive and Utah is willing to work on an update. It's not available now. Meeting both populations - but maybe not the best tool. Maybe we should not adopt it because that criteria is not all met. They used CASLLS and VCSL too - keeping all on the table.

Beth - I think it seems to me we've narrowed it down on what meets the criteria and the law - that's why SKI HI was chosen - I think it's the only one that meets all, but Eleni - you have the most experience - what are the limitations?

Eleni - limitations are: you're not given a lot of pragmatics - it does go through the language scale - you get up into the talking about 4-7 word sentences, syntax, semantics, gets into beginning K stuff like naming colors, counting, gets into responding to WH questions, contractions, it has some grammatical phonology, but really not a lot of pragmatics. Can I ask

the group - are we limited to one or can we do like the Clerc Center - do several and you have a more complete profile?

Ron - seeing nodding of heads.

Amy - VCSL could be also used

Eleni - same with 3 - 5 and 6 - 21. CELF - the PLS is 0-5 but scores high... the other thing if this is used as tracking - several assessment used together would be difficult for tracking.

Kelly - time is winding down - can I help summarize? We are not all familiar with these - I'm not that fast yet - can we have these next couple of weeks and one of us can put into the spreadsheet and make the check offs on a summary sheet? I hear you saying what you want to go with and I need more time. Can we put all our things on google drive? Any way to do that? Our email - you don't get to see a copy of the test - can we get permission? For a small group? It would be nice to look at and then put on a summary - getting us all on the same page.

Jeremy - I'm happy with our progress and to have it charted on the spreadsheet - making sure all our choices are compatible for our criteria and then we can leave additional comments - those who are familiar can make brief comments.

Ron - Here's what I recommend - Sharla - you can update our table on google docs, to change the columns and modify the list on what we are zeroing in on. You can add to the google docs info you know about it - that will help. We got there last week - we can only go so far in sharing materials because of the copyrights.

Beth - can we right now narrow down the number based on today's presentations?

Ron - first stab please Beth?

Beth - I think for example let's remove AEPS, Batelle and ASQ.

Jeremy - you want to remove Batelle? I have a concern - time is running out - I need more time to process and discuss more with my colleagues and different resources - so we have the best criteria list first.

Ron - let's leave the list - change the columns and any recommendations for any of these, fill it in.

Amy - I'm wondering, can we do a separate table or side or column - of pros and cons.

Sharla - I will fill in from the notes.

Kelly - we can remove the AEPS and the Ages and Stages - I'm with Jeremy too - leave the rest for us. We can take off quickly at the next meeting.

Eleni - Rosetti is on the list. I have extra protocols - they are 2 or 3\$ each - please bring them back.

Amy - also TACLS - back side 2nd page. I will talk to Sunshine and see if they wouldn't mind we look at a draft copy and will see if that's ok. We would obviously as a state be purchasing their product.

Ron - anything else needed? The job is to narrow down our selection and the rest of our duties. Jeremy?

Jeremy - one last question - cognitive perspective - wondering - do you feel it's important to assess cognition? 0-8, I'm thinking to recommend one in particular - the Leiter - it's a good reflection of the child. Any level of language - it's nonverbal intelligence. That can be used age 3 - 79. If we want to see that related to their language skills. If we narrowed our criteria to 0-5 then it's not necessary. It's super practical If we are dealing with DHH with additional disability. Let's narrow down to 5 assessments.

Ron - lets add on to the list and be prepared to talk about this more.
On the google docs - forum to discuss. Next meeting is November 27th, Room 103.