

Dyslexia Committee
May 2, 2018
Administration Center Room 208
4:30 PM - 6:30 PM

Members Present: Sam Ames, Becky Anderson, Jen Benson, Erin Chargualaf, Christy Clausen, Bruce Cordingly, Renita Degriff, Kristie English, Donna Gallagher, Audee Gregor, Aileen Hammar, Sherry Krainick, Elizabeth Meza, Heather Miller, Milt Miller, Denise Need, Krystal ParkerMeyer, Sam Ramirez, Krithika Rangan, Karen Rogers, Pamela Stevenson, and Jen Welch.

Unable to Attend: Leah Sawyer

Old Business

Minutes from the April 4th meeting were reviewed. One member asked that the reference to the triangle on page three should be more specific regarding the discussion of three and four tier models and general vs. special education representation. The minutes were approved as corrected and will be posted on the Dyslexia Committee website.

New Business

Presentation: District Core Reading Committee (Christy Clausen/Assistant Director of Curriculum and Instruction and Katie Peffer/K-5 ELA TOSA)

Christy and Katie oversee the K-5 ELA Curriculum Review process. Lynn Brewer, Special Education TOSA representing LAP is also present, as well as Sam Ramirez, a member of the committee who represents the administrative element.

The ELA adoption process is a two-year process. Christy noted that the driving force for their work is to provide equitable access to high quality curriculum for all students. The first task of the committee was to develop a common vision.

- 1) The WHY: Student learning
- 2) The WHAT: Resources aligned to standards and NSD strategic goals; support teaching and learning
- 3) The HOW: Best practices in literacy instruction

Definition of ELA: English Language Arts, which includes

- Reading
- Listening and speaking
- Writing
- Language

5/2/18 ad FINAL

Common Abbreviations/Acronyms Used: ELL (English-Language Learner), Hi-Cap (Highly Capable), LAP (Learning Assistance Program), MTSS (Multi Tiered Systems of Support), PBIS (Positive Behavior Interventions & Supports), PD (Professional Development), RTI (Response to Instruction/Intervention)

The Process: Year 1 (this year)

- August-September 2017: Team of 30 committee members gathered 14 available curricula to study
- October-December 2017: Sub-committees analyzed and screened 14 curricula
- Full committee conducted in-depth evaluation of top 6 resources, identifying three programs to pilot

The Process: Year 2 (next year)

- Pilot process, training teachers for first round of pilot curriculum
- Conduct pilot of top 3 programs, provide training for each round of pilot
- Select a program to present to CMAC for recommendation to the School Board

Q: Will community input be gathered at any point in the process?

A: Yes, community input will be gathered before taking the curriculum to CMAC for recommendation, and if there are any major concerns they will be addressed prior to seeking approval.

Q: What will be the opportunities for parent feedback? Any curriculum has a parent/family component, such as online resources. Technology at home is a large equity impact. It feels as if the process is very district staff focused, and the family component is not adequately articulated.

A: Christy answered that these comments are very timely, as the Curriculum & Instruction department has been having discussions regarding how to best solicit feedback from parents and families, though they haven't come to a clear direction yet on how to achieve that.

One member noted that the Lake Washington School District has parents on every curriculum adoption committee, so that parents' voices are heard throughout the process.

Additional Considerations for Curricula:

- Curriculum must have the 5 components of reading
- Essential early literacy skills
- Early intervention is key
- Phonological Awareness and Phonics
- Research-based instructional practice
- Tiered supports for student learning
- Technology integration

During the process, teachers have been receiving professional development in phonics, phonemic awareness and vocabulary development.

The Pyramid of Support is being considered in this core adoption:

- Tier 1 – ALL Students
- Tier 2 – SOME Students
- Tier 3 – FEW students

5/2/18 ad FINAL

Common Abbreviations/Acronyms Used: ELL (English-Language Learner), Hi-Cap (Highly Capable), LAP (Learning Assistance Program), MTSS (Multi Tiered Systems of Support), PBIS (Positive Behavior Interventions & Supports), PD (Professional Development), RTI (Response to Instruction/Intervention)

Though all three tiers are critical, they are focusing on Tier 1 – Core Classroom Instruction. The most important thing to do first is provide good core instruction, with all the components of balanced literacy. However, they also believe strongly in the Tier 2 and Tier 3 supports.

Q: Regarding Tier 2 instruction: Are you collecting data about what is effective so it can be generalized in other buildings?

A: Lynn Brewer answered: LAP requires focus on K-4 literacy, and they must report annually to OSPI regarding identification of students, how we do progress monitoring, programs that are used, etc. The State doesn't require a specific assessment to identify students; in NSD IRRs are used. At each building there are some differences in delivery models, based on their specific student population needs. Some schools do a cycle of services, some a push-in or pull-out model, some a combination. Staff provides an enrollment report monthly reflecting which students have been added or exited, with exit reasons noted (i.e. met growth goals, etc.). Part of Lynn's job is to maintain contact with the LAP teachers in the buildings to monitor these.

Adra Davy, Assistant Director for Elementary Special Education, was also asked to provide a special education perspective to the ELA committee:

- Consistency is key – core curriculum should be consistent across the district
- Prevention is better than a cure

Right now there are several curricula being used, which makes it difficult for the Special Education staff to support students.

Make-up of the committee:

- 3 classroom teachers for every grade level K-5 (18 teachers total)
- LAP/title teacher
- 2 Special Education teachers
- One ELL and one Dual Language teacher
- Two HiCap teachers
- One Teacher Librarian
- Two technology experts
- Three principals and one administrator

The goal was to have all 20 elementary schools represented, and they do have 17. The three schools who don't have representation do have a liaison keeping staff apprised of the committee's work. Christy noted that they looked at just about every core curriculum program available.

Q: What makes something a core rather than supplemental curriculum?

A: A core curriculum is designed to address every critical area of a content area. A supplemental curriculum may be a targeted focus on specific skills or strategies.

Q: Teachers College Units of Study – has anyone tried it?

5/2/18 ad FINAL

Common Abbreviations/Acronyms Used: ELL (English-Language Learner), Hi-Cap (Highly Capable), LAP (Learning Assistance Program), MTSS (Multi Tiered Systems of Support), PBIS (Positive Behavior Interventions & Supports), PD (Professional Development), RTI (Response to Instruction/Intervention)

A: It's hot off the press, it has only been field tested by publishers. We have reviewed drafts of the program, how it is designed, etc. Some districts have purchased it without piloting, but we want to pilot first.

Q: Do any of the pilot curricula contain explicit instruction?

A. Yes, that is an important component. That is why some of the curricula didn't make it to the pilot, they didn't contain explicit instruction components. Teacher's College (Lucy Calkin's Units of Study) didn't start off intending to write a complete curriculum, their focus was on instructional practice, but *Writer's Workshop* was so well received they wrote the reading curriculum. Now they have added phonics and have plans to add vocabulary development. We need something solid to get started, with acknowledgement that we will learn and change over time as we continue to grow and understand more about how kids learn.

Katie provided some information regarding the differences in components of the three curricula chosen for piloting, noting that the three are all quite different in their approach. Next up is the piloting next school year.

A committee member suggested that an explicit look at the needs of dyslexic learners within the curriculum selection process is very important and would be valuable.

Presentation: Supplemental Reading Committee (Adra Davy/Assistant Director of Elementary Special Education)

Adra is the Assistant Director for Elementary Special Education. Four teachers accompanied her:

- Radhika Shyamsundar, Learning Center (LC) teacher at Cottage Lake
- Megan Crane, LC teacher at Kokanee
- Nichole Halvorson, LC teacher at Crystal Springs
- Renita Degraff, Arrowhead Mid-level teacher

Two supplemental curricula were brought to CMAC and recommended to the school board for approval:

- *Phono-Graphix* (K-5)
- *REWARDS Intermediate* (grades 4 and 5)
- Targeted to students who qualify for special education in the area of basic reading (decoding and phonics)
- Connection to Common Core: Reading Foundational Skills K-5 - print concepts, phonological awareness, phonics and word recognition. *REWARDS* also addresses fluency and vocabulary. Both programs also improve spelling, which falls under Language Standards K-5 - conventions of standard English.

Selection Process – Two Year Process

- Committee was made up of LC teachers (small, med, large schools) and Blended teachers, 2 SLPs, one principal and Adra.

5/2/18 ad FINAL

Common Abbreviations/Acronyms Used: ELL (English-Language Learner), Hi-Cap (Highly Capable), LAP (Learning Assistance Program), MTSS (Multi Tiered Systems of Support), PBIS (Positive Behavior Interventions & Supports), PD (Professional Development), RTI (Response to Instruction/Intervention)

- Research
- Training – information on the five areas of reading, training from a specialist in reading disabilities
- Defining Purpose – To identify the supplemental curriculum to enable students to get the targeted interventions they need to access the general education curriculum
- Made recommendations to newly formed assessment committee
- Evaluated the general education curriculum for areas needing supplementation for special education students' needs
- Found 11 supplemental curricula to evaluate (from a variety of sources), narrowed it down to 5 to pilot, then reduced that to 4.
- Training for pilot
- Began piloting in September 2017
 - Two teams of 2 teachers + SLP each took 2 curricula to pilot for 6 weeks, then switched
 - Progress-monitoring along the way

Q: When the pilot curricula switched, how were students monitored? In other words, was progress tracked with the first curriculum, then compared to progress made with the second curriculum? **A:** Students were always getting the same progress monitoring measures, but it also depended on the needs of the students and the type of curriculum being piloted.

Curriculum was evaluated on ease of use, student growth, and would it be an intensive supplement to the core? The two ultimately selected were so well received by the pilot teachers that they wanted to delay the CMAC presentation so they could continue using the curriculum rather than give it to the CMAC committee to do their review. Adra noted that she is pleased and proud of the work that the committee did.

Adra shared student growth data from the *Phono-Graphix* pilot to support the effectiveness of the curriculum. Committee members asked questions to clarify the data that was presented. Adra noted that *Phono-Graphix* peer review data mirrors the progress they experienced in the pilot. One of the teachers shared her experiences with the progress of her students as a result of the *Phono-Graphix* pilot materials.

Q: What are some of the other supplemental resources that learning centers use?

A:

- Benchmark Reading
- Corrective Reading
- Reading Mastery

Adra then shared data for the *REWARDS* pilot curriculum, based on pre- and post-tests in the program:

- 10% increase in average accuracy for multisyllabic word parts
- 17% increase in average accuracy for multisyllabic words

- Increase of 20 parts per minute in average fluency for multisyllabic word parts
- Increase of 6 words per minute in average fluency for multisyllabic words
- Anecdotal feedback from teachers: "My kids love to read now!"

Was *REWARDS* also adopted several years ago by secondary? Yes, an older version has been on the approved list for several years, for use with struggling readers. Becky noted that a new edition has to be approved for use by CMAC, although it is a different level of review.

A committee member commented that these supplemental curricula were chosen based on needs identified in the current general education core curriculum. Will these curricula be available for students in the Tier 2 and 3 students, before they reach the level of identification for special education? Becky noted that is something that could be answered in the recommendation of this committee.

Adra continued with the Professional Development Plan:

- *Phono-Graphix* requires 30 hours of training. Training will be offered in late June with the *Phono-Graphix* trainer, as well as during August Summer Institute. Online training will be available for anyone unable to attend either of the live training.
- Next year specialty programs teachers will be brought in to evaluate fit for their student populations
- Potential online training for paraeducators may be offered

REWARDS is a scripted program, there will some optional training offered.

Q: Regarding scripted programs, how much flexibility do teachers have to adjust for their individual students?

A: There is flexibility in each program, though we have to much sure not to deviate to far from the curriculum to maintain the fidelity of the program. "Scripted" is just a guideline, teachers have to add their own elements based on their students.

Q: Were there any kids that didn't make progress and how many students were involved in the pilot?

A: Yes, there were some "outliers" – students affected by attendance or behavior issues that impacted their access to the materials and instruction. About 25 students participated in the pilot.

Becky thanked Adra and the presenters.

Becky called on a committee member who had emailed a question:

WA Kids has been implemented for all kindergarten students, which allows for family interviews before school starts. In addition, the first two months of school focuses on data collection. Is there a way teachers can develop a group of questions for parents at these interviews that might cover information that would be helpful to identify needed interventions early? A parent

member suggested that there could be a “pre-screener” type of question or questions that parents could be given at the beginning of the year to identify “look-fors”.

Based on information from OSPI, family history is a good indicator of propensity to dyslexia. OSPI, however, cautioned about FERPA requirements protecting student and family privacy.

Becky noted that it's important to remember our charge, such as recommending using WA Kids data to aid in identifying students. Becky suggested consulting with Denise Waters, former Kindergarten TOSA (now principal at Hollywood Hill) whether that is a feasible use of the WA Kids data. Heather asked Milt to make that contact with Denise. A first grade teacher member said that it would be beneficial to start asking those questions in kindergarten, because she sees students in first grade who are already behind when they come to her. A parent member said that research shows that children with dyslexia are already behind their peers before even starting school, and that is important information for teachers to know. Heather said that part of the committee's recommendation might be to provide professional development to teachers on dyslexia.

Continued Business

“Why” Statement Agreement: Becky distributed the compiled “Why” statements from last meeting, plus a statement that Becky and Heather developed based on the committee charge, and an additional statement submitted by Sam Ames. Sam explained that after further reflection on the compiled statements from last meeting she felt that some important things were missing, especially that “dyslexia” wasn't mentioned in any of the statements. Becky also stated that if members don't feel they are ready to agree on the “Why” statement tonight, she wants to be sure members have the opportunity to be heard.

One committee member noted that she doesn't feel it's productive to spend a lot of time on wordsmithing the “Why” statements. Though it's important, she feels it could hold up the progress of the committee's charge. One of those charges is to have something on June 1st to indicate progress and she is concerned about spending too much time on *why* and not on figuring out *what* we are going to do.

Heather suggested that members look at the five statements submitted and ask themselves “can I live with one of these”? If so, we vote. If not, according to the will of the group, we could go back to the drawing table.

Christy asked if it is our work to “design a district wide framework for literacy...”, as the third submitted statement shows? She believes that is the purpose of the ELA Core Curriculum Committee. Becky referred to the committee's charge, which includes “...develop a model for proactively identifying, instructing, and assessing all students learning to read...”

There was additional discussion about the components needed in a “Why” statement. Heather proposed that committee members send their additional input to Becky and Heather by May

11th, they will compile that information in a draft to members, and come back ready to adopt a statement at the June 6 meeting. A member asked that we do the same with the NSD definition of dyslexia, and be ready to adopt that at the June 6th meeting.

Next steps: Looking ahead to the June meeting, we will want to think about what we have accomplished and where we are. A member asked if we can work on the definition of dyslexia in the same way we are processing the "Why" statement? Becky agreed, but cautioned that we be cognizant of the definitions of dyslexia created by the experts (copies of which have been given to members) and not deviate too far. Members agreed, and a survey will be utilized for this purpose.

The meeting was adjourned at 6:29 pm.

Next Meeting:

June 6th 4:30pm in Room 208

Acronyms:

PD – Professional Developmental

RTI – Response to Instruction/Intervention (academic)

PBIS- Positive Behavior Interventions & Supports (social/emotional)

MTSS – Multi Tiered Systems of Support

LAP- Learning Assistance Program. State funded grant for students who are below grade-level standard in English and math.

5/2/18 ad FINAL

Common Abbreviations/Acronyms Used: ELL (English-Language Learner), Hi-Cap (Highly Capable), LAP (Learning Assistance Program), MTSS (Multi Tiered Systems of Support), PBIS (Positive Behavior Interventions & Supports), PD (Professional Development), RTI (Response to Instruction/Intervention)