

**Oregon Department of Education  
Dyslexia Advisory Council  
August 3, 2016, 1:00 pm - 4:00 pm  
Public Service Building - Basement A**

online	Alishia Anderson	x	Rhonda Erstrom	x	Liliana Jimenez	x	Myrna Soule
x	Carrie Thomas Beck		Stephanie Ewing	x	Paula Kinney	x	Diana Sticker
online	Judith Brizendine	x	Alicia Roberts Frank	online	Colleen McCombs	online	Tania Tong
online	Jennifer Cappalonga	x	Amy Frazee Johnson	x	Jennifer Larsen	x	Lynetta Weswig
x	Aaron Cooke		Ronda Fritz		Rinda Montgomery		Kara Williams
online	Christine Culverwell		Colt Gill	x	David Putnam		George Winterscheid
	Lisa Darnold		Beth Harn	x	Betsy Ramsey	x	Cathy Wyrick
x	Chris Demianew	x	Kathy Helgesen	online	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"> <li>• <i>Today's Meeting Objectives</i></li> </ul>	<p>Carrie Thomas Beck shared the objectives for the meeting:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Based on information collected, continue to further refine the proposed model for screening and providing instructional support for students at risk for dyslexia.</li> <li>2. Outline main objectives of the plan for screening to present to legislature in September.</li> <li>3. Gain input on the vetting process for approving training opportunities and discuss related training issues.</li> <li>4. Determine the criteria for districts to secure a waiver from the teacher training requirements to address instances when noncompliance is outside the control of the school district.</li> </ol>	
<p><i>Report from Measurement Work Group</i></p>	<p>Carrie Thomas Beck presented a report from the Measurement Work Group meeting on 07.07.16. At the Measurement Work Group meeting, Carrie shared information on (a) the percentage of students scoring at risk on the DIBELS measures in winter of K and fall of grade 1 based on 2015-16 data from the DIBELS Database, and (b) initial discussions she had with Jack Fletcher, Ed Kame'enui and Hank Fien regarding the potential need for a traditional RAN measure and using the screening data to determine students at risk for dyslexia.</p> <p>Dr. Fletcher shared that the most predictive measure is letter-sound knowledge in K. By the middle of grade 1, it is word reading. He stated that an equation that weights Oregon's measures against an outcome in grade 1 with an evaluation of sensitivity and specificity is needed. He stressed that RAN is irrelevant for treatment and does not yield information different from letter naming fluency. The most predictive version of RAN is letter naming fluency.</p> <p>Ed Kame'enui and Hank Fien wanted evidence that a traditional RAN measure would provide information that would help specify the intervention. In the absence of this evidence, they suggested it may make the most sense to administer this measure as one component of a formal evaluation process.</p> <p>Drs. Kame'enui and Fien suggested considering a model where all students who score in the "at risk" range on a subtest in the screening receive Tier 2 support. Students who score at risk on 2 of the 3 or 3 of the 3 measures may</p>	

	<p>require more frequent progress monitoring. They stressed the importance of looking across points in time (e.g., winter of K and fall of grade 1) to identify students who were at risk at both time periods as it indicates a different level of risk. They also suggested that by the end of grade 1/beginning of grade 2, if a student is still low on NWF and a school has exhausted intervention options (and poor instruction has been ruled out), then a formal SPED evaluation may be needed at that point.</p> <p>Based on the information presented, members of the Measurement Work Group suggested that in the absence of having an empirically-based formula for identifying students who are at risk for dyslexia, it may be best to focus on a pragmatic process for providing instructional support, similar to what Kame'enui and Fien described. Members wondered if it would make sense to use percentile cuts as a way to consistently identify students at risk across the measurement systems.</p> <p>In general, Measurement Work Group members were supportive of using the information provided by the experts to update the proposed screening model so that a traditional RAN measure is not required as part of universal screening, but wanted to hear additional information gathered from other experts to help refine the steps in the process.</p> <p>ODAC members discussed the information shared from the Measurement Work Group meeting, highlighting the importance of addressing the needs of students who are at risk for dyslexia quickly and utilizing instructional methods that are intensive and specialized based on an individual problem solving process. The group stressed that RtI/MTSS needs to be implemented appropriately to accomplish these goals.</p>	
<p><i>Proposed Screening Plan</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>Information from Experts</i></li> <li>• <i>RAN</i></li> <li>• <i>Determining Risk for Dyslexia</i></li> </ul>	<p>Carrie Thomas Beck shared additional information collected from dyslexia experts Patricia Mathes and Louisa Moats regarding the use of a traditional RAN measure in universal screening and how to use screening data to identify students at risk for dyslexia.</p> <p>Carrie then summarized the input from across all experts into the following organizing principles:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• It is important to differentiate screening from identification.</li> <li>• We can use Oregon's designated measures to screen for risk of reading difficulties, but these measures may or may not indicate dyslexia.</li> <li>• Identifying if a child is dyslexic requires additional assessment.</li> <li>• We need to be less concerned with the cause of reading difficulties.</li> <li>• LNF is a strong predictor of reading difficulties.</li> <li>• RAN may be best used for identification vs. screening.</li> <li>• Focus on providing intervention as quickly as possible.</li> <li>• All reading difficulties should be addressed through providing multiple tiers of support that provide appropriate instruction by qualified individuals.</li> <li>• It is not wise to create a separate delivery system for students with dyslexia.</li> </ul> <p>Next, Carrie Thomas Beck shared recommendations for the effective implementation of SB 612 and HB 2412 from the College of Education at the University of Oregon from written testimony provided to TSPC dated July 26, 2016:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Rather than a targeted focus on students identified with dyslexia, implementation of this legislation should support all students who display delays in reading acquisition.</li> <li>2. Monitor students' reading progress regularly</li> </ol>	

	<p>across the grade span (k-12).</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>3. Focus investments and training on supporting evidence-based reading instruction in K-1. (The use of core reading programs which teach the five components of reading explicitly and systematically, differentiate instruction, and scaffold the learning of struggling readers, minimizes the need for in-depth intervention in later grades. Multi-sensory interventions should only be specifically required if they have been shown to be effective.)</li> <li>4. For students who continue to struggle despite evidence-based core reading instruction, provide targeted supplemental instruction.</li> <li>5. Teacher preparation to support struggling readers should focus on effective instructional techniques, data-based decision-making, knowledge of language and reading acquisition, and instructional differentiation skills.</li> <li>6. Do not focus investments on introducing new screeners.</li> <li>7. In developing specific rules or requirements for these important legislative bills, we urge ODE and TSPC to (a) take stock of current practices in schools and teacher preparation programs; (b) convene an external panel that includes experts in both dyslexia and reading instruction; and (c) commission an external report to further inform best practice in screening, core instruction, and intervention for struggling readers in K-12.</li> </ol> <p>ODAC members were supportive of the organizing principles based on input from experts and the recommendations from the UO. Members shared their belief that there is research for multi-sensory approaches, but that the studies of this approach may not meet criteria for inclusion by some reviewing bodies. Members stressed that reading is a multi-sensory process and the need to look at promising practices.</p>	
<p><i>Oregon's Model of Serving Students with Risk Factors for Dyslexia</i></p>	<p>Carrie Thomas Beck shared an updated DRAFT of Oregon's Model of Serving Students with Risk Factors for Dyslexia dated 07.21.16, highlighting the main changes which included (a) the use of LNF as measure of rapid naming in universal screening, and (b) the elimination of a specific "formula" in step 3 to indicate which students are at risk for dyslexia. Updated steps were reported as follows:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Screen for family history of reading difficulties at the time of school enrollment.</li> <li>2. Initial universal screening of K students in fall, winter and spring and grade 1 students in the fall to include measures of phonological awareness, letter-sound correspondences, and rapid naming (via LNF).</li> <li>3. Students identified as showing risk factors for dyslexia are provided with additional instructional support daily in the general education context (i.e., Tier 2 support). The instruction must be aligned with the IDA Knowledge and Practice Standards, systematic, explicit, and evidence-based delivered under the direction of the teacher in the building who has completed the dyslexia related training.</li> <li>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 participation in daily, targeted instructional support.</li> <li>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</li> </ol>	<p>Carrie Thomas Beck will make additional refinements to the language in the DRAFT steps for Dyslexia Screening and Instructional Support based on the discussion from today's meeting and share the updated version with ODAC members.</p>

	<p>context of general education (i.e. Tier 3 support). The instruction must be aligned with the IDA Knowledge and Practice Standards, systematic, explicit, and evidence-based delivered under the direction of the teacher in the building who has completed the dyslexia-related training.</p> <p>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 and continues to make insufficient progress, a SPED referral may be made.</p> <p>Carrie Thomas Beck shared information on the systems of universal screening commonly used in Oregon districts that meet the criteria as outlined by ODAC (e.g., AIMSweb, DIBELS, easyCBM). She shared that these systems have different formats for assessing letter/sound correspondence, varying schedules for subtest administration across grades K and 1; and different conventions for determining and labeling level of risk.</p> <p>ODAC members discussed how the state can reconcile the differences in type of measures, schedules for administration, and designation of risk across these universal screening systems. Options discussed included either establishing a set standard for risk across measurement systems (e.g., students who score below the 20<sup>th</sup> percentile are at risk) or utilize the guidelines of test developers to determine risk. The group agreed that for the strongest predictions, schools should determine risk based on test developers guidelines. Specifically, districts should select a universal screening system that administers each of the required subtests at least once per year, follow test developer guidelines for administration schedule of the complete “package” of measures at each point in time and determine risk based on guidelines of test developers at each point in time.</p> <p>Members felt that these universal screening systems have the power to predict students who are at risk for reading difficulties and that it did not make sense to layer systems on top of existing systems. Members shared that these measurement systems include all of the required subtests, but what’s missing is districts using these measures as intended and providing high quality instruction based on the data collected to meet the needs of all students. Members agreed that there needs to be training to change current practices, and that should be a main focus of this work.</p> <p>Carrie Thomas Beck provided a summary of the type of parent notification to be provided by districts following each step in the screening and instructional support process. Members were supportive of the plan.</p> <p>Finally, the group discussed potentially further defining the components of Tier 2 and Tier 3 instructional support in the OARs (e.g., number of minutes, group size, frequency of progress monitoring), but agreed that these recommendations are best made as part of a guidance document for districts. Members suggested that providing examples of what Tier 2 and Tier 3 support looks like in effective schools would be helpful for districts.</p>	
<p><i>Report on Plan to the Legislature</i></p>	<p>Carrie Thomas Beck shared that the plan that is to be presented to the legislature in September of 2015 is specific to the universal screening and parent notification requirements of SB 612. Carrie will use the Oregon American Indian/Alaska Native Education State Plan 2015 as a model for how to format the plan. Based on the model, Carrie will list the main objectives of the plan and include strategies for implementing each objective along with the related metrics and milestones. The objectives for</p>	<p>Carrie Thomas Beck will draft a plan for the legislature in the upcoming weeks and share the draft with members by the end of August to solicit feedback.</p>

	<p>the plan are clearly delineated in SB 612:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Ensure that every student who is first enrolled at a public school in this state for K or 1<sup>st</sup> grade receives a screening for risk factors of dyslexia.</li> <li>2. Provide guidance for notifications sent by school districts to parents of students who are identified as being at risk for dyslexia based on the screening factors.</li> <li>3. Identify screening tests that are cost effective and that screen for the following factors: phonological awareness, rapid naming skills, the correspondence between sounds and letters; and family history of difficulty in learning to read.</li> </ol>	
<p><i>Report from Training Work Group</i></p>	<p>Carrie updated members on the Training Work Group meeting on 7.21.16.</p> <p>On 7.21.16, the Training Work Group discussed the need for program-neutral training to be included in the list of training opportunities. The group members discussed the specifics of the vetting process for training opportunities. Vendors will need to submit information about the training as outlined in a Request for Information that will be posted through the ORPIN system. Projected timeline is to try to post the RFI by the end of August, begin reviewing information received in September/October, and release an initial list of training opportunities in late November or December so teachers could potentially begin training as early as January 1, 2017. The RFI should remain posted throughout the year to allow for vendors to submit new training opportunities as they become available. Group members discussed the content of the RFI and how the department can take the information submitted on training opportunities to develop different potential pathways for teachers to complete training requirements. The pathways would need to include the following components:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Understanding and recognizing dyslexia;</li> <li>2. Essential elements in beginning reading – 101 – for teachers who have not received solid training on how to provide systematic, explicit, evidence-based instruction in the foundational skills of reading); and</li> <li>3. Evidence-based strategies to intensify and amplify reading instruction.</li> </ol> <p>Group members also suggested that including training on how to provide professional development to colleagues would be highly useful for these teachers. The idea of requiring participants to demonstrate their knowledge upon completion of the training was also discussed.</p> <p>ODAC members suggested the idea of using a learning management system to organize and track completion of training modules. The difference between virtual knowledge and virtual education was discussed. The group suggested using content already developed by experts (e.g., modules from Reading Rockets), and curating them for an educational purpose.</p> <p>Organizations such as ORBIDA and Decoding Dyslexia have developed presentations on understanding and recognizing dyslexia. The idea of the department collaborating with these organizations to develop a common online module on this topic was discussed.</p> <p>A scoring rubric will be developed for the RFIs. At least two ODAC members will review each submission.</p>	<p>Carrie Thomas Beck will draft language for RFI for dyslexia training opportunities by the end of August, and submit to Training Work Group members to elicit feedback.</p>

<p><i>Teacher Training</i></p>	<p>Members recommended defining the types of teaching positions that could be considered the “K-5 teacher” in the building to receive the dyslexia-related training in Oregon rules. The group stressed the importance of offering districts flexibility to find the right person. The designated teacher will play a very important role as a support/resource for educators, parents, and the community. Members hope that other teachers in the building will be inspired to participate in the training as well. They felt it would be ideal for all elementary teachers to complete a general online training.</p>	<p>Carrie Thomas Beck will draft OARs around designating the K-5 teacher in each building to complete the dyslexia related training and present at the next ODAC meeting.</p>
<p><i>Waivers</i></p>	<p>SB 612 states that the board shall adopt by rule the criteria for a waiver from the training requirements to address instances when noncompliance is outside the control of the school district. ODAC members did not have time to discuss potential scenarios that would result in a district applying for a waiver from the training requirements. ODAC members were asked to send their ideas to Carrie Thomas Beck. Carrie will synthesize ideas and bring to the next meeting to discuss.</p>	<p>ODAC members will consider possible situations where it would be necessary for a district to apply for a waiver from the training requirements and email their ideas to Carrie Thomas Beck by the end of August.</p>
<p><i>Wrap-up and Next Steps</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>Work Group Meetings</i></li> <li>• <i>Next ODAC Meeting Date</i></li> <li>• <i>Expense Forms/Sub Reimbursement</i></li> </ul>	<p>Carrie will schedule Measurement Work Group and Training Work Group meetings as needed in the upcoming months to complete necessary tasks.</p> <p>Carrie Thomas Beck suggested the week of September 19<sup>th</sup> for the next ODAC meeting. She will set up a Doodle Poll to schedule the meeting.</p> <p>Johanna Easter distributed travel expense forms and sub reimbursement for members to complete.</p>	<p>Carrie Thomas Beck will set up Doodle Poll to schedule September ODAC meeting.</p> <p>Council members should submit expense forms along with their invitation letter to Johanna Easter (<a href="mailto:johanna.easter@state.or.us">johanna.easter@state.or.us</a>) 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>