

Oregon Department of Education
Oregon Dyslexia Advisory Council (ODAC) Meeting
January 11, 2018 ~ 1:00 - 4:00
Public Service Building - Basement A

X	<i>Morgan Allen</i>	X	<i>Paulina Larenas</i>		Guests:
X	<i>Cheryl Anthony</i>	X	<i>Sylvia Linan-Thompson</i>	X	Megan Filiault
X	<i>Mary Apple</i>	X	<i>Barry Nemec</i>	X	Susan Farmer
X	<i>Debbie Armendariz</i>	X	<i>Mariaeugenia Olivar</i>	X	Shannon Cooper
X	<i>Gina Biancarosa</i>	X	<i>Justin Potts</i>		
X	<i>Judith Brizendine</i>	X	<i>David Putnam</i>		
X	<i>Jennifer Cappalonga</i>	X	<i>Betsy Ramsey</i>		
X	<i>Catherine Contreras</i>	X	<i>Amanda Sanford</i>		
X	<i>Chris Demaniew</i>	X	<i>Kelly Slater</i>		
X	<i>Richard Donovan</i>	X	<i>Bill Stewart</i>		
X	<i>Debra Fitzgibbons</i>	X	<i>Carrie Thomas Beck</i>		
X	<i>Marybeth Flachbart</i>	X	<i>Susan Zottola</i>		
X	<i>Lucy Hart Paulson</i>				

Agenda Item	Discussion	Action
Welcome/Introductions/Group Norms	<p>Carrie Thomas Beck, ODE Dyslexia Specialist, welcomed the council members. She had each member introduce him or herself, share his/her current position, and his/her role on ODAC.</p> <p>Carrie shared group meeting norms and then assigned roles to members to assist with facilitating the meeting:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Summarizer – Amanda Sanford - Writer – Susan Zottola - Time Keeper – Justin Potts - Moderators – Catherine Contreras and Debra Fitzgibbons <p>Carrie reviewed the tasks for ODAC between now and September of 2018:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Finalize a plan for universal screening in kindergarten (and screening in grade 1 for students first enrolled in a public school in Oregon in grade 1); • Develop Oregon Administrative Rules (OARs) related to universal screening to take to the State Board of Education for approval; • Develop a list of approved screening tests; • Develop guidance on parent notification; • Develop guidance for districts on providing instructional support to students who demonstrate risk for reading difficulties, including dyslexia; • Include guidance specific to EIs; and • Submit a report to the legislature by September 15, 2018 on best practices 	

	<p>for screening students for risk factors of dyslexia and best practices for instructional support.</p>	
<p>ODAC Tasks for 2018</p>	<p>In her PowerPoint, Carrie shared the timeline for completing the tasks:</p> <p>Drafting Oregon Administrative Rules (OARs) related to universal screening:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • March 22 – OARs to State Board for First Read • April 26 OARS to State Board for Second Read/Possible Adoption • Timeline for Task Completion (cont.): January: ODAC Meeting (Universal Screening) February: ODAC Meeting (Universal Screening/ Parent Notification) March: Remote collaboration April: ODAC Meeting (List of approved screening tests / Guidance on parental notification) April: ODAC Meeting (Guidance on Instructional Support) May: ODAC Meeting (Guidance on Instructional Support, screening beyond K/1) June/July/August: Remote Collaboration September: Report due to Legislature Districts begin universal screening <p>Members stressed the importance of providing districts as much up front time as possible to plan because some will be completing universal screening for the first time and will need to select a screening tool and ensure that teachers are trained to administer the measures. District budgeting season has already started and will continue through May.</p>	
<p>Today's Meeting Objectives</p>	<p>Carrie shared the objectives for today's meeting:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Review legislative requirements for universal screening. • Revisit plan for universal screening. • Begin discussion of screening EIs. • Use input gathered to help draft OARs related to universal screening. 	
<p>Legislative Requirements for Screening</p>	<p>SB1003</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Adds explicit requirement for districts to universally screen for risk factors of dyslexia in kindergarten (or 1st grade if a student first enrolls in an Oregon public school in grade 1) • Districts must use a screening test identified by the Department • Requires the Department to identify screening tests that are cost effective and take into account PA, L/S 	

	<p>correspondence, and rapid naming in kindergarten</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Requires districts to screen for family history of difficulty in learning to read IF the student shows risk factors for reading difficulties based on other measures • Requires the Department to provide guidance for notifications to be sent by school districts to parents of students who are identified as having risk factors for reading difficulties • These amendments to ORS 326.726 first apply to the 2018-19 school year <p>Question was asked: “Who is monitoring the screening?” Answer: Districts will sign-off on Division 22 Assurances to document compliance.</p>	
<p>Plan for Universal Screening</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • SB 612, enacted in July of 2015, directed the Department of Education to develop a plan to ensure that every student who is first enrolled at a public school in this state for kindergarten or first grade receives a screening for risk factors of dyslexia. • The plan was submitted to the legislature in September of 2015. <p>The group reviewed the organizing principles from the Plan for Universal Screening.</p> <p>Carrie identified two areas in the plan that need to be updated based on the passage of SB 1003:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Screening for family history of reading difficulties; and 2. Screening students who first enroll in public school in first grade. <p>Family History of Reading Difficulties: The council had an extensive discussion around when and how family history screening should be introduced into the screening process for a child. Some thought at the start of the school. Others thought that this approach could overwhelm staff and resources.</p> <p>It was agreed that when the family history interview was to occur, that it should be <u>one-on-one with positive supports in place</u> and a plan. It was agreed that <u>there should be a process in place for when a family member self identifies at the beginning of a school year.</u> It was suggested a form be created for this process. Cheryl said she will send an intake form used at her tutoring center to the group.</p> <p>Jen has been following the work of the state of Massachusetts on creating an outline for a</p>	<p>Cheryl will send an intake form used at her tutoring center to the group.</p>

screening plan that includes a more comprehensive understanding of family history than what is currently outlined. **Jen will share the documents from Massachusetts with Carrie.**

Chris asked who is doing the parent screening.

Amanda raised the question of at what point do we collect this information in the screening process – fall, winter, spring? Fall will have a high number of at risk students identified. We should be thoughtful about at what time we collect the information from families so as not to overload districts. Debbie expressed a concern regarding the financial cost of screening for family history based on the initial report in the fall due to the need for hiring interpreters to screen for family history when many of the students may be false positives.

Carrie suggested embedding screening for family history within the existing system of screening and support utilized in many districts - the family history would be collected if the student is not responding to Tier 2 instruction. David noted that if we are proposing to screen for family history up front as standard procedure rather than later, we need to be clear on the intent. Cheryl was concerned that if schools wait until Tier 3 to screen for family history, we could have helped the student sooner.

Lucy made the point of including family history earlier in order to add another puzzle piece to decoding a family and coming up with a viable plan for the student.

Sylvia expressed concern that way too many students will be over identified in the fall. Schools won't be able to handle student load right away especially with ELs if they were to screen for family history in the fall. She shared that something to keep in mind is that a determining factor of dyslexia or not dyslexia for ELs is the rate of progress.

Jen stressed that the intent of including family history in the initial screening was to get early services for children in schools and for families to have a voice when there is a history of dyslexia in the family that they wish to self report.

Summary/Next Steps for Family History:

- The group agreed that screening for family history **should be conducted in person.**
- Need to determine **when** districts should screen for family history - following Tier 2 support or sooner?

Jen will share the documents from Massachusetts with Carrie.

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Determine who screens for family history? • Need a process for when parents self-report • Need to decide on the content of the screener – include developmental history? <p>Universal Screening in First Grade: It was agreed that the screening for first graders will be different than the screening in kindergarten since the measures that are most predictive of reading success change over time. The group discussed the importance of screening for PA, rapid naming, and nonsense word fluency (orthography). Members shared that when screening in Spanish, a measure of Nonsense Word Fluency is typically not needed. In Spanish, students learn to break words in to syllables. Sylvia pointed out that Spanish orthography is so transparent that the same results are obtained on Spanish measures of regular word vs. nonsense word reading. She also shared that rate is more important than accuracy on these measures. Gina made the point that the universal screening systems available for grade one may not include subtests in all needed areas. Each system does miss certain students – adding one more 1-minute measure may be a good investment.</p> <p>Carrie reminded the group of the requirement that the screening systems are cost effective – this includes consideration of time for staff to administer and score.</p> <p>Carrie suggested looking at the model for screening utilized in New Jersey which includes universal screening followed by additional “dyslexia screening” for students who don’t respond to instruction. The additional screening could include gathering information using informal diagnostic assessments that provide additional information on phonological awareness, decoding, spelling, etc.</p>	
<p>Screening ELs</p>	<p>Carrie posed the following questions to the group:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Do we screen in English, in native language or both? • If we do screen in native language, what are the criteria for identifying screening tools in K/1? • What are special considerations to keep in mind when reviewing the screening data from ELs? • What resources are available to help 	<p>Group did not have time to discuss. Carrie will reach out to individual members to collect information/ recommendations prior to the Feb. meeting.</p>

	<p>make these decisions?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • What will districts need to meet the requirements for screening EIs? • Are we remembering to be cost effective? 	
OARs for Universal Screening	<p>Carrie developed an initial draft of OARs for universal screening and shared with the group via the Google folder. The OARs that require group input are left open on the draft at this point. These areas include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • process for screening for family history • areas to screen for in first grade • special procedures for screening EIs • addressing students that enroll midyear <p>The input gathered from today's meeting will help to further define the OARs, but more information and input will need to be collected prior to the February meeting.</p>	
ODAC Homework Meeting Closure	<p>Carrie thanked the individuals who acted as time keeper, writer, summarizer and moderators.</p> <p>At the next meeting, the draft OARs will be handed out, discussed, and final decisions will need to be made. The OARs need to be recorded with the Secretary of State by Feb. 16 if they are to be presented to the State Board at the March meeting.</p> <p>Next Meeting: Thursday, February 15, 1 to 4 p.m. in Conference Room Basement A at the Public Service Building in Salem</p>	<p>Carrie will follow up with members via email before the February meeting. She will gather information from targeted members of the group with expertise on particular topics and provide a further defined draft of the OARs to the group to respond to. Deonne will create a contact list with names, emails and phone numbers collected today to share with the group.</p>

Parking lot items:

- Connect with Early Learning Division for help with communication from early learning to K-12 with family histories. (Contact: Miriam Calderon)
- How to handle out-of-state transfers