

Oregon Department of Education
Oregon Dyslexia Advisory Council (ODAC) Meeting
February 15, 2018 ~ 1:00 - 4:00
Public Service Building - Basement A

x	<i>Morgan Allen</i>		<i>Paulina Larenas</i>		Guests:
x	<i>Cheryl Anthony</i>	x	<i>Sylvia Linan-Thompson</i>	x	Danielle Thompson (Sub)
x	<i>Mary Apple</i>		<i>Barry Nemec</i>		
	<i>Debbie Armendariz</i>	x	<i>Mariaeugenia Olivar</i>	x	Lyn Seres
x	<i>Gina Biancarosa</i>	x	<i>Justin Potts</i>	x	Megan Filiault
	<i>Judith Brizendine</i>		<i>David Putnam</i>		
x	<i>Jennifer Cappalonga</i>		<i>Betsy Ramsey (Has substitute)</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>		
	<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 introduced the parking lot and asked for off-topic issues to be directed to that area. Always assume positive intentions. The group will not always be in agreement.</p> <p>Focusing on 3 issues: screening for family history, areas to screen in grade and Special considerations for English learners. There are differing viewpoints due to different background and roles.</p> <p>Carrie assigned roles to members to assist with facilitating the meeting: - Summarizer: Chris Demianew - Writer: Gina B & Jen C. - Time Keeper: Morgan, then Kelly after Morgan has to leave - Moderators: Catherine C.</p> <p>Carrie reviewed the tasks for ODAC between now and September of 2018 when report is due for legislature.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Updating and finishing plan for universal screening. Need to draft OAR's. Guidance specific for English learners. • Timeline for task completion. <p>State board did not meet in February, Meeting again March 22nd.</p>	

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> April meeting changed to the 19th for OARs to go back to state board for second read. <p>If a good draft is made and feedback is received, we should be in good shape to get adopted.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Rule-making Timeline: If we want state board to adopt the rules, we have to file the rules with Secretary of NO LATER than 2/20/18. Emily Nazaroff: draft that she files does not have to be perfect, but have until March 1st. This is the day official notice of rule making goes out. <p>How does the public get the info? There is a notice that goes out through ODE. Not sure who was on the list. Action: Talk To Emily Nazaroff</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Stakeholder List April 9th hearing followed by April 19th possible adoption of language. 	<p>Talk To Emily Nazaroff</p>
<p>Today's Meeting Objectives</p>	<p>Need to Finalize OAR language.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> List of approved screeners Question asked: How much about planning for next school year, need to know which screeners so they can get it set up. Nervousness setting in, running out of time. <p>Budgeting, have some potentially low cost options. Training component and staffing component. Cannot put teachers and kids in an awkward position. If we know the screener, we know the timelines.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Carrie heard the concerns and will walk through process at the end of the meeting. <p>Met with Emily Nazaroff last week, went through OAR's carefully. Emily reminded: the law is always the most vague. OAR's will be somewhere in between. The process for implementing is the piece that will always be the most specific. How we develop approved screeners, dyslexia training.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Are OAR's specific enough? Just enough language to open the door. Makes the law specific enough to be able to implement like a bridge. 	
<p>OARs: Screening for Family History of Reading Difficulty</p>	<p>Referred to OAR handout. Also available on google drive.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Screening of Family History <p>If student shows risk factors for reading difficulty, school district must screen for family history in the same subject.</p>	

Status and progress. Start low and make progress, may not be at risk.
If we maintain that low level, we will need to take steps into exploring family history.

- Question from member- Is there a timeline for how long intervention can/should occur?

This was a question that was raised with Emily? Suggested to keep worded as it is, though the group will discuss.

See flow chart

- When do we ask this question about family history? Defined vaguely in the OAR.

Universal screening at the top followed by two categories: Not At risk or At Risk Carrie explained the flow chart.

- Evidence based core instruction. Kids most at risk would also get tier 2 support. Progress monitor. You will find some kids are not making progress. Tier 3 intensified group instruction for those still struggling.

Tier 4 for most troubled, need individual problem solving.

- What is important at the top frame, with the way the law is phrased, screening for parent history occur when the school identifies a student at risk, when you are at the top, you are not at risk. The way the screening measure works is that, the kids who perform well are likely not at risk. The pool who performs poorly are not necessarily at risk.

Universal screening is the first filter, we get some but not all. When we do evidence based etc. and progress monitoring, we get another filter. How many times do we filter before we take action and involve parents.

Better to think after Second Filter (Tier 2): info about what may be potential family based issues.

- If you wait until tier 3 gets to individualized instruction, favor second option.

What is problematic is defining: what is adequate progress? If left loose, it will get enacted in different ways.

How would the group define "Adequate Progress?"

- MCII website has new criteria for progress monitoring measures around reliability of slope, how well tool measures progress. Instead, define the tools that show how you know the progress that has been made.
- Justin- Each tools have different reliability of slope- how likely is it that these data points will predict the next data point? Slopes vary from tool to tool. Challenge in defining what adequate progress is.
- Parents want information. Example of Oral cavity screening not being reliable.
- Question clarifying “any risk” rather than “risk. Categories of risk vary by publisher.

Different ways to determine risk.

- Is our goal to know by the end of kindergarten what the timeline is to observe reading difficulties or dyslexia signs?

This will vary based on the child.

- Need for various options to contact parents.

Guidance on what it would look like in writing opposed to verbally.

Where does the information go? How does that information get used? What role will it play later?

- Carrie introduced an exercise involving placing of a “dot” (placeholder) to choose an option of 1, 2, or 3 for screening of family history.

Option 1 had the majority of votes.

- What do we mean by adequate progress?

Getting language around risk to be more clear.

Agreeing on where the info goes.

How will it be used?

We must be careful about what questions?

- How would we interview and who would do that? Add to guidelines so districts know what teachers are asking.

Parameters and latitude within districts.

	<p>Early intervention should be able to take place no matter what the learning challenge is.</p>	
<p>OARs: Universal Screening in Grade 1</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 1st graders when they first enroll. Would include measures in the 5 categories: phonological awareness, letter sound correspondence, rapid naming, word pseudo, oral reading fluency. • What are areas that need to be screened in first grade for a child with risk of dyslexia, learning difficulty? Letter sounds is recommended Word reading is better than letter sounds. Why go back and give letter sounds if we already established word reading? • 1st grade-administer sounds When first enrolling in first grade, need to go back and double check. Don't overlook underlying component skills. • Can we live with it saying word or pseudo word reading, knowing they will also be assessed on letter sounds? Yes, it's measure dependent/test dependent. • Concern from a teacher- Does EasyCBM look deep enough within phonological awareness, not pseudo word reading. Would be nice if we had a checklist of what district we should be looking for. *word reading fluency *pseudo word reading fluency *word or pseudo word reading fluency Adding pseudo adds emphasis (In English language) 1)Must Screen In all areas 2)Include more specific recommendation and guidance 3) Screening in pseudo words applies to English language and not Spanish • Why Would we wait 30 school days? What are the Test developer guidelines? Why treat kids' mid-year different than those who started on time? There are many enrollment transitions before and after winter and spring breaks. 	

<p>OARs: Screening Els</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Carrie introduced the slide for Special Considerations for Screening ELs. Must begin universal screening process no more than 30 days after enrollment • Emily Nazaroff- Originally in OAR's under division 22, if you are screening native language, districts have to address measures A, B, C etc. Contradicts a law. To allow a district to use a homegrown native language, Must apply for a waiver. • One big issue- EQUITY. The way this term is defined differs. Some say there is an equity issue. If we don't use the same formula for all students, we will get differing results. • *Alphabetic vs logographic* While it may be best practice to identify screeners in each language, there is also an issue of screen and phonological awareness. May not always be appropriate in certain languages. <p>•</p> <p>*How do we reduce the barriers to making good instructional decisions and changes based on the data you have?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Biggest area of concern for OEA: need to look at waivers that put control in hands of school communities. Need language, power and waivers back in their possession. • Are you supportive of screening in language of instruction when many languages have measures that aren't well validated? <p>Members placed their vote on the flip chart. Majority of votes in column 4. Column 3 had the second most. Column 5 had one vote.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • What have other states done? -Needs further research and discussion to identify. • Assessing dominant language for early literacy. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Upload Materials Cheryl shared about Texas Education Agency
<p>List of Approved Screeners</p>	<p>March 22- First read of OAR's April 12, ODAC Meeting April 19- BOE Meeting- possible adoption of OAR's</p>	

Meeting Closure/Next Steps	Process and adjust all of this language. Share with council members before showing to Emily. Next meeting April 12 1pm-4pm in room 251 /B of Public Service Building	

Parking Lot: