

Dyslexia Committee
June 6, 2018
Administration Center Board Room
4:30pm-6:30pm

Members Present: Sam Ames, Becky Anderson, Jen Benson, Erin Chargualaf, Christy Clausen, Bruce Cordingly, Donna Gallagher, Audee Gregor, Aileen Hammar, Sherry Krainick, Elizabeth Meza, Milt Miller, Heather Miller, Denise Need, Krystal ParkerMeyer, Leah Sawyer, Pamela Stevenson, Jen Welch.

Unable to Attend: Renita Degraff, Kristie English, Krithika Rangan, Karen Rogers

Old Business

Minutes from the May 2, 2018 meeting were reviewed. There was one inquiry:

Q. We do not have an SLP on the committee. Will we have one next year?

A. Lana Van Boven wanted to be on the committee but had a conflict on Wednesdays. An attempt was made to fill the position but none of the SLPs were able to take on the commitment this year. Hopefully a SLP can be recruited for 18/19.

The 5/2/18 Minutes were approved.

Finalization of Why Statement

Members received a survey regarding the Why Statement and the dyslexia definition. Results were disbursed to the group. One member commented that she expected to see more options for the Why Statement based on the compilation of statements that were gathered. The statement as presented did not flow well and did not fully encompass the committee's focus. It was agreed that the wording needed to be further refined and after much discussion a final Why Statement was crafted:

"To recommend a whole child focused model for proactively identifying, instructing, and assessing the literacy needs of all students so that students with dyslexia acquire literacy skills and to ensure staff is provided the necessary tools, training, and resources to meet student need."

Selection of Dyslexia Definition

A review of the votes for the two dyslexia definitions showed that a larger number of members choose the International Dyslexia Association definition. Thirteen of the committee's 23 members voted.

On June 5, 2018 the Office of Superintendent of Public Instruction (OSPI) released Bulletin 046-18 entitled Learning and Teaching/Special Education. The bulletin was disbursed to members. The information focuses on Engrossed Second Substitute Senate Bill 6162 (E2SSB 6162) which defines dyslexia and the requirements of early screening. A Dyslexia Advisory Council will convene in the fall of 2018 and OSPI is seeking individuals from across the state to apply. The application period runs from June 4 through July 12, 2018. Members will be notified of selection by August 10, 2018. Applications are on the OSPI website (<http://www.k12.wa.us/>) and will be made available to educator, parent/guardian and stakeholder groups.

One member noted that OSPI has curated a list of people they would like to apply. They have targeted key players with expertise.

Continued Business

Report from Milt about WA-Kids Process and possible questions that could be asked of parents.

WA Kids was discussed at the May 2, 2018 Dyslexia Committee meeting. WaKIDS (Washington Kindergarten Inventory of Developing Skills) is a tool that teachers are required to use to interview parents to assist the transition into Kindergarten process and ensure a successful start to K-12.

Milt discussed ways to get acquainted with families and students to form relationships. Language development is a top focus. Asking questions about a family's academic background can be insightful but how do we obtain information without coming across as profiling? This is something that will be discussed with the Equity and Diversity team.

Key questions would include when the child started speaking and if there were delays; also, about receptive language. Is it appropriate to ask these questions?

Milt opened the discussion for committee feedback, suggestions, comments, and thoughts:

What kinds of things are on the list for incoming kindergartners?

If questions are labeled as optional then many parents would be OK with it.

Some questions were taken from the state brochure such as health/safety questions. The state wants to know if a child attended preschool. Is it possible to capture twice exceptional students? Milt indicated they would like to but not sure how to approach it. Members felt that asking about family history seems appropriate.

Face to face interviews are beneficial because verses just asking the parent to complete a form as it becomes more of a paper review and the personal connection is lost. One idea offered

was to give families a copy of the interview questions and their answers after the meeting. If something came to mind at a later time the family could make updates.

Make sure staff understand how family history, growth and development ties into the questions.

Perhaps the form could be given to families ahead of time so they could ponder the questions/answers in advance (i.e. These are some of the things we will talk about). This may be helpful to foster families if they need more time to collect information.

At present, this process is specific to Moorlands. With permission and a bit of data collection could Moorlands be a pilot for this method? If K teams are interested, could they speak with Milt for use in the future? Sharing this information with other schools and incorporating feedback from colleagues could be beneficial.

What is OSPI's requirement for data collection? This piece is a tool for teachers. It helps teachers learn about the skills and strengths of their students. WaKIDS is legislatively mandated to be part of state-funded, full-day kindergarten.

Email Milt with other resources and suggestions. mmiller@nsd.org

Task(s) timeline

The timeline of tasks was redistributed for the committee to review what we have done to date along with acknowledging we will need to map out our work for 2018/19.

Becky asked for suggestions of things we should add to the timeline,

Suggestions/comments included – Adding expanding the questions to the WA-Kids process and presentations by the staff regarding the elementary ELA core reading process and the sp. ed. supplementary reading materials to the timeline.

It was suggested that we need to continue building our knowledge/awareness in order to make recommendations.

It was suggested to have the district assessment committee do a presentation in October of next year.

Members gave the following thoughts and input:

Just because a student can read they still have dyslexia. Is it possible to put out “myth busting” information for teachers? We need education, awareness and outreach. How do we get the word out? Possibly via Dr. Reid’s Thursday Thoughts?

OSPI's Dyslexia Advisory Council application does not specifically include parents. People in the trenches are really struggling. Another member followed up "when writing the recommendation, the intent was to include representatives from multiple areas including parents."

Possibly have a FAQ section on the website.

How does Universal Design for Learning factor into our work? At this time it could be a recommendation.

- It fits the niche for our older students.
- Putting systems in place allows students to show what they know.
- It gives them access points through video or graphics.
- As long as it meets requirements for assignments.
- It is a part of our Tech levy.

Becky asked "What have we done and what do we still need to do?"

If there are additional things to add to what we have done thus far, please email banderson@nsd.org.

New Business

Consensus on core components of reading instruction

The standard components of reading (the big 5) are phonemic awareness, phonics, fluency, vocabulary, and comprehension. Do we want to stick with those five or do we want to consider a broader range of what is taught? A document was disseminated that showed an expanded to look at the components.

Member input:

The big 5 is just reading. Christy would like to broaden the picture. Writing and spelling are needed for explicit instruction through high school and beyond.

From a teacher's perspective: The big 5 have to be in place but expanding it is really critical. Writing can be a means to reading.

It was noted that decoding should be included or advanced word analysis (knowledge of prefixes, suffixes, and roots, and how to use them). Would we rather use decoding and encoding or is it implied in the items listed?

Example of supporting assessment structure

An example of a comprehensive assessment system was distributed which aligns with the MTSS framework. This particular model showed how universal screening, progress monitoring, and diagnostics were fully incorporated across the year for all students. The model also illustrated,

depending on the tiers of service a student received, how often progress monitoring would occur. Diagnostic measures were only given if needed not for all kids. This would be comparable to our current use of IRRs would only be administered if a student was struggling.

Along with the graphic the handout included a display of how general education services merge with special education, definitions of each type of assessment, specific tools, frequency of administration and amount of time required, and descriptions of the various types of assessments.

Discussion included:

If formative strategies are done along the way, the summative should not be a surprise.

One member suggested that the number of teams in the example process is overwhelming. They have teams and subsets of teams. Take a look at what already exists in NSD. We may have something similar in place that we could build on.

The reason for sharing this information is to expose different ways assessments can be done. How can we implement a formative process and what would we like it to be?

Do we want our mid-year report to be Universal Screening? Is there a budget available to bring people in who have a process in place? We have a great opportunity to create something unique. Is part of our charge to bring in an expert who is already doing the work? If we think there is value, we could bring other districts in for collaboration. We could also combine efforts with other departments/committees.

Research, development, and data are needed. Do it right and bring in the very best people and see what the research says.

Look at folks who are already doing it. Many other states are already drilling down and getting results. Carol McDonald Connor, Ph.D from the University of CA. Irvine will be presenting at Bellevue College November 6, 2018. Would it be possible to have her come and present to the committee. Becky has interacted with Dr. Connor in the past and would be happy to reach out to her. The following link will take you to information about her and there is a link at the bottom of the article with a short You Tube video of her speaking. <http://isilearn.net/carol-connor/>

Dr. Connor is doing cutting edge work developing a tool that uses computer algorithms <http://www.united2read.org/learningovations/> to translate assessment results into educational recommendations. Dr. Connor did a demo for Becky and indicated she might be willing to do a small scale pilot within Northshore. She is a very busy person but maybe we could get lucky and have her come.

Members contributed the following thoughts:

- The idea of a universal screener is great. Is there a screener out there who can help identify dyslexia students? Kids who are below grade level?
- Why are IRRs given to all students? Why would we use it if we already know who is flat? We need a progressive screener for academics: narrow down to find students we need on our radar; another screener to determine which skills they are not grasping.
- IRR given in the fall identifies low reading level – it is very time consuming. Should follow up with a screener in the spring.
- A screener is useful for specific deficits and we should have something in place for teachers to utilize. You can't have a screener and not know what to do with it.
- Psychologist's perspective – a screener may be the first indication that there is a deficit, especially for younger children.
- Family history is one of the 4 indicators of Dyslexia
- Teachers need a prescriptive piece. We have identified the gap; now we need to know what to do with it.

Interim report

Becky and Heather will write up an interim report and accomplishments for Dr. Reid. This report will be shared.

Future Business:

Aileen shared that resources are being compiled and the possibility of a book club could be considered. So far 12 book titles have been collected in addition to various websites and pod casts. Worked with King Co. library and should connect with Sno-Isle library to further influence the collection of books available.

Q. Is it possible to create a book collection through Professional Development?

A. At this time we do not have a Professional Development Library

Q. Would funding be available to help seed efforts to remove barriers to staff learning?

A. It is something we can look into.

Another resource idea is to ask WABIDA (Washington Branch of the International Dyslexia Association) to bring in a speaker around Dyslexia.

2018/2019 Meeting Dates

Wed Sep 12, 2018	Board Room
Wed Oct 3, 2018	Room 208
Wed Nov 7, 2018	Room 208
Wed Dec 5, 2018	Room 208
Wed Jan 9, 2019	Room 208
Wed Feb 6, 2019	Room 208

Wed Mar 6, 2019 Room 208

Wed Apr 3, 2019 Room 204

Wed May 8, 2019 Room 208

Wed Jun 5, 2019 Room 208

Exit Report

An exit report was provided asking committee members to assess our teamwork and provide feedback. We only grow as leaders with feedback.

A thank you was extended to all team members for their time and participation and wishing everyone a wonderful summer.

Acronyms:

PD – Professional Developmental

RTI – Response to 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.