

Oregon Department of Education
Dyslexia Advisory Council
June 1, 2016, 1:00 pm - 4:00 pm
PSB Basement A

online	Alishia Anderson	online	Rhonda Erstrom	x	Liliana Jimenez	x	Myrna Soule
x	Carrie		Stephanie Ewing	x	Paula Kinney	x	Diana Sticker
online	Judith Brizendine	x	Alicia Roberts Frank	x	Colleen McCombs		Tania Tong
x	Jennifer Cappalonga	x	Amy Frazee Johnson		Jennifer Larsen	x	Lynetta Weswig
x	Aaron Cooke	online	Ronda Fritz	x	Rinda Montgomery		Kara Williams
online	Christine Culverwell		Colt Gill	x	David Putnam	x	George Winterschied
x	Lisa Darnold	x	Beth Harn	x	Betsy Ramsey	x	Cathy Wyrick
	Chris Demianew	x	Kathy Helgesen		Lori Sattenspiel		
x	Emma Lee Demianew	x	Elizabeth Israel-Davis		Jason Small		

Agenda Item	Discussion	Action
<p><i>Welcome</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Guiding Principles</i> • <i>Today's Meeting Objectives</i> 	<p>Carrie Thomas Beck shared principles to help guide the Department's work on implementing the requirements of SB 612. These include focusing on student success, stressing early identification/prevention, making decisions based on the best science available, and working within/strengthening systems for screening and support in Oregon districts.</p> <p>Carrie presented the objectives for the meeting:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Provide feedback on proposed screening plan. 2. Provide feedback on proposed model for serving students with risk factors for dyslexia. 3. Provide feedback on guidance for parent notification. 4. Provide initial input on list of training opportunities. 	
<p><i>Report from Measurement Work Group</i></p>	<p>Carrie Thomas Beck presented the report from the Measurement Work Group meeting on May 11, 2016. The report included survey results on types of RAN measures that districts currently own. Of the 48 districts that responded to the survey, 17 currently own the CTOPP-2. This is also the most common RAN measure used by school psychologists in Linn Benton Lincoln ESD. The Measurement Work Group discussed the cost/qualifications needed to administer the various RAN measures, and possible funding proposal scenarios in the event that the Department can find funds to provide some initial grants to districts to help them implement screening requirements. The timeline for implementing the new screening requirements will likely be the 2017/18 school year. The Measurement Work Group discussed different RAN options for districts – LNF vs. a more traditional format and the use of DIBELS, DIBELS Next, easyCBM, AIMSweb, AIMSweb Plus for screening PA and L/S correspondences. The group also discussed Spanish measures to screen for PA and L/S correspondences. The meeting concluded with a request for Carrie to draft a screening plan to send to the group for feedback.</p>	
<p><i>Proposed Screening Plan</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Measures/Timings</i> • <i>Opportunity for Feedback</i> • <i>Family History of Reading Difficulties</i> 	<p>The proposed screening plan will require initial universal screening of K students in fall, winter, and spring to include measures of PA, L/S correspondence, and rapid naming (LNF) as well as universal screening of all grade 1 students in the fall. The systems for universal screening must:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. have strong predictive validity, classification accuracy, and norm-referenced scoring; and 2. include measures of all three of the risk factors required in SB 612. 	

	<p>Districts will administer the subtests in each required area at the points in time during the year as per guidelines of the test developers.</p> <p>The department will provide a list of approved screening measures for districts to select from and administer to students. Districts may apply to select an alternative universal screening measure that meets the criteria.</p> <p>Carrie shared some possible screening options in Spanish and will follow up with Liliana Jimenez of Forest Grove SD as well as Julie Esparza Brown and Amanda Sanford of PSU to gain additional information.</p> <p>Carrie proposed winter of K and fall of grade 1 as the critical points in each grade for districts to administer all three of the required measures (PA, L/S correspondence, rapid naming).</p> <p>The group discussed the idea that many children may score low on early identification instruments in the first semester of K due to lack of opportunity to learn the skills prior to K. Universal screening of K in the winter will identify students who continue to exhibit risk and will require additional instructional support to prevent reading difficulties. It was discussed that universal screening for PA, L/S correspondence, and rapid naming again in the spring will ensure K students who are at risk have not been missed. Universal screening systems in fall of grade 1 typically include subtests on phonemic segmentation, letter/sound correspondence, and rapid naming (LNF). In winter and spring of grade 1, the critical measures become word reading and oral reading fluency, areas that are not required for screening by SB 612. Members expressed concern about the possibility that some students may not exhibit risk factors until later in first grade. The group discussed encouraging universal screening in winter and spring of grade 1, but not requiring it. The group agreed that any new student to enroll in grade 1 would be administered measures of PA, L/S correspondence and rapid naming at the time of school enrollment.</p> <p>Carrie shared a summary of group input from the 04.26.16 ODAC meeting regarding screening for family history of reading difficulties along with other input gathered from the Department and districts then reopened the discussion on how to best gather information on a family history of reading difficulties. Members stressed the need to consider how the information travels with a student from school to school. In paper form, it may take a long time to arrive at a new school. One suggestion was to add the data on family history of reading difficulties to the SSID in electronic databases. Members did not reach a consensus on how to best ask parents to share the information. Some members believed that collecting the information in the form of a question on paper can be viewed as too impersonal, and suggested a face-to-face meeting. This led to discussion to include both methods of collection, first on paper to meet the requirement of the SB to screen all K/1 students followed by parent /teacher meetings to gather additional information in person when possible.</p>	<p>Carrie Thomas Beck will contact Lilian Jimenez, Julie Esparza Brown, and Amanda Sanford to gain additional information regarding screening measures in Spanish.</p>
<p><i>Oregon's Model of Serving Students with Risk Factor's</i></p>	<p>Carrie shared a proposed model for serving students with risk factors of dyslexia.</p> <p>The proposed model includes new procedures specific to the dyslexia legislation, multi-tiered systems of support for students with risk factors within the general education setting, and linkage of teachers who receive training related to dyslexia to the instructional support provided.</p>	

	<p>Carrie shared a 6-step process for screening and support:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Screening for family history of reading difficulties at the time of school enrollment. 2. Initial universal screening of K students in the fall, winter and spring and grade 1 students in the fall to include measures of phonological awareness, letter-sound (L/S) correspondence, and rapid naming (LNF). 3. Students identified as “at risk” on all three of the universal screening measures are: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a. Administered a traditional assessment of RAN; and b. Provided with additional instructional support daily in the context of general education that is aligned with the IDA Knowledge and Practice Standards and is systematic, explicit, and evidence-based under the direction of the teacher in the building who has completed the dyslexia related training. 4. Based on progress monitoring data, students who do not respond to additional instructional support and continue to make insufficient progress will receive a second level of screening for risk factors of dyslexia no later than following 40 instructional periods of targeted support. 5. Information collected in the second level of screening will be used to develop an intensive, more individualized structured literacy intervention that is provided daily in the context of general education. 6. Based on the collection of progress monitoring data, if a student does not respond to the intensive, individualized structured literacy intervention after 6 to 8 weeks, a SPED referral may be made. * <p>The group expressed concerns regarding requiring students to be at risk on all three measures (PA, L/S correspondence, and rapid naming) to be considered at risk for dyslexia and receive the additional instructional support. Carrie will do additional research on this issue and seek input from experts in the field.</p> <p>Members suggested that ideally moving forward, all teachers in Oregon will receive training in dyslexia screening and strategies for instructional support. The group suggested greater emphasis on improving Tier 1 instruction as part of the overall system of supporting students.</p>	<p>Carrie Thomas Beck will contact experts in field regarding the number/combination of measures for a student to be considered at risk for dyslexia and receive additional instructional support.</p>
<p><i>Parent Notification</i></p>	<p>Carrie shared a summary of ODAC’s input on parent notification from the 04.26.16 meeting. The group discussed utilizing the notification systems currently in place through RtI models as a mechanism for notifying parents. This can include a brochure explaining the RtI process to all parents, followed by a letter specifically for students who show signs of being “at risk” for dyslexia through the initial screening processes. Additional notification was agreed on for more intensive, individualized instructional support, if needed, along with an invitation for parents to be included in the planning process.</p> <p>The group agreed that the guiding principle in communication with parents should be to provide information early and seek input often. Consent is not required for initial screening and progress monitoring; however, it is best to keep parents informed with data received. Parents should be made aware of any interventions that occur beyond the core curriculum, and should be invited to participate in the planning and implementation of any individual interventions. If the student is still not making progress after 2 group interventions and one individually-designed intervention, a special education referral will likely be made, at which point parent consent for evaluation is required.</p>	

	<p>The group suggested including the following in the parent notification:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The name and contact info for a staff member who can answer questions - An explanation of why the particular screening areas are important - Results as compared to benchmarks for each measure - Description of instructional support (explicit, systematic and evidence-based for X minutes daily in a group of X, etc.) - Possible links to parent resources 	
<i>Definition of Dyslexia for use in OARs</i>	<p>Based on feedback from ODAC members, the Department will use the IDA definition of dyslexia in the OARs. (The purpose is solely to define the word dyslexia in the rules. It is likely that the definitions for explicit, systematic, and evidence-based will also be included in the rules.). The IDA definition reads:</p> <p>“Dyslexia is a specific learning disability that is neurobiological in origin. It is characterized by difficulties with accurate and/or fluent word recognition and by poor spelling and decoding abilities. These difficulties typically result from a deficit in the phonological component of language that is often unexpected in relation to other cognitive abilities and the provision of effective classroom instruction. Secondary consequences may include problems in reading comprehension and reduced reading experience that can impede growth of vocabulary and background knowledge.”</p>	
<i>Report from Training Work Group</i>	<p>Carrie updated members on the Training Work Group meeting on 5.25.16.</p> <p>At the meeting, the work group discussed program-neutral training vs. program-specific training, increasing effectiveness of programs that are already in use for meeting the needs of students with dyslexia vs. adding another program, and providing a designated teacher in each building with knowledge to intensify, individualize instruction that can be used to enhance evidence-based programs. The group agreed that districts do not have the resources to purchase new programs. ODE will need to vet training based on the requirements as outlined in the SB.</p>	
<p><i>Wrap-up and Next Steps</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Summer Work Group Meetings</i> • <i>Next ODAC Meeting Date</i> • <i>Expense Forms/Sub Reimbursements</i> 	<p>Carrie shared information about the Summer Work Group Meetings.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Measurement Work Group – June • Training Work Group – June, July <p>The next ODAC Meeting is August 3rd, 1-4 p.m. and will be held in Basement A of the Public Service Building. Carrie shared information about the expense forms. Expense forms have to be complete when handed in – ODE staff will not be able to make adjustments to anything claimed, including meals, once the form is signed and approved. Members were asked to submit the forms to Johanna Easter at ODE.</p>	<p>Carrie will send out a Doodle Poll of possible June dates for the Measurement Work Group meeting and the Training Work Group meeting.</p> <p>Council members should submit expense forms along with their invitation letter to Johanna Easter (johanna.easter@state.or.us) at ODE.</p> <p>Council members who are teachers should have districts send an invoice for substitutes to Johanna Easter at ODE to process.</p>