

Iowa Reading Research Center Meeting Notes

Date: September 5, 2013 Time: 9:00am-2:30pm

Location: GRIMES OFFICE BUILDING ROOM B100

<u>MEMBERS PRESENT:</u> Mike Beranek, Mike Cormack, Kris Donnelly, Tracy Donohue, Lea Davidson, Salli Forbes, Lindsay Grow, Deb Hindman, Michelle Hosp, Amy Hutchison, Tania Johnson, Jobi Lawrence, Sara McInerny, Kristen Missall, Sandy Nelson, Barbara Ohlund, Claudia Reyes-Fry, Barb Shafer, David Tilly, Rick Traw, Phil Wise, Kirsten Missall, Tracy Donohue, Isaiah McGee

AGENDA ITEM: Welcome and Introductions

Expected Outcome	Lead	Follow Up
	Michelle Hosp	<u>NA</u>

Notes: Dr. Hosp, the new director of the Center, welcomed the Advisory Council. She provided a brief summary of her background. Dr. Tilly, Deputy Director of the Department of Education, reported on a meeting held with the Governor and Linda Fandel which provided them with an update on the progress of the Center to-date. He and Michelle shared the coordination of literacy efforts across the state.

Each member was asked to introduce themselves and what is their excitement about being part of the Advisory Council.

AGENDA ITEM: Recap of 2012-2013

- a) Budget
- b) Website
- c) Hiring Director

Expected Outcome	Lead	Follow Up
Information	Sara McInerny	
		<u>NA</u>

Notes: Dr. McInerny, interim director of the Center, shared how the FY 13 dollars were spent. (see document Final Report on Priorities FY 13 lowa Reading Research Center). She also shared the IRRC website that supports the dissemination of literacy information throughout the state: www.iowareadingresearch.org

Dr. McInerny also shared the process for hiring the new Director for the Center.

AGENDA ITEM: Summer Reading program

Expected Outcome	Lead	Follow Up
	Kris Donnelly	
Information/input for next	-	Consideration of participation
steps		by advisory members in next
		level of work.

Notes: A subcommittee was formed to cull the research around summer reading programs. The Department of Education Research and Evaluation team identified 41 research articles that the subcommittee applied a criteria of mediating factors which resulted in 24 articles that met the criteria. Summary report was written.

Next level of work: Identify Instructional programs

Clarify a definition of a summer literacy program

AGENDA Item: Needs Assessment

Ī	Expected Outcome	Lead	Follow Up
		Amy Hutchison	·
	Information/input for next	Salli Forbes	Task team needed to develop
	steps		a dissemination plan.
١			·

Notes: Dr. Hutchison and Dr. Forbes shared the results of the Needs Assessment. Methods: three surveys were created, one for teachers, one for administrators and one for AEA staff. Interviews were conducted from each AEA as well as follow-up interviews from Urban areas:

Classroom instruction:

Approaches to literacy Instruction at the Universal level; Core reading programs was the most popular response. Results indicate some confusion about what constitutes Universal instruction; Confusion also resulted from questions around curriculum. Intensive instruction: Reading Recovery listed as most used.

Minutes blocked for literacy instruction: There was concern that several districts indicated 1-30 minutes.

Data is disaggregated by district, AEA and statewide.

Most surprising:

- Principals were very informed, teachers uncertain about: Universal, intensive and targeted instruction.
- Lack of information about the Iowa Core by teachers- most common response was somewhat informed
- Minutes of instruction concern over how many fell into lower categories

- Teachers and principals felt least prepared to work with ELL students
- Allotted time for data analysis is positive.
- Core reading programs are not aligned to report cards.
- Just starting down the Iowa Core road was a common response.
- There is a lot of AEA support for professional development around literacy interventions.
- Professional development included professional learning communities.
- Large numbers of AEA staff assisting schools with literacy matters.
- Summer reading programs-surprised there were not more.
- Number one reason there was not a summer literacy program was funding.

Considerations:

The first evaluation was preliminary and not intended to give us final answers to the questions still facing Iowa and the Center.

We should consider a <u>long-term evaluation</u> that goes beyond perception and description and provides a deeper understanding of exactly why the reading performance of lowa students has been declining.

Recommendations:

The next evaluation should focus on several big issues and the clarification of some of our initial findings. One big issue would include Implementation Fidelity; we now know what literacy programs teachers and principals say they use, but we have no idea how these programs are implemented. Frequently, teachers will say they are using Program X, but actual classroom observations show they are not using it accurately or effectively.

Dissemination plan needs to be developed.

Executive Summary exists. Information needs to be provided to the Governor's office prior to dissemination.

FULL REPORT IS AVAILABLE AT:

https://www.dropbox.com/s/xucowgf7pnewde9/final%20report%20revised.pdf

Discussion around: Should all preservice student be required to have an ELL course? Consensus was that all teachers need to know how to work with diverse student population including social and cultural aspects.

Could we define a minimum threshold of competency of pedagogy and knowledge base for all educators in lowa? A standard of care around literacy through inservice as well as preservice.

AGENDA ITEM: Budget FY 14

Expected Outcome	Lead	Follow Up
Discussion	Michelle Hosp	
		NA

Notes: Dr. Hosp shared the proposed budget. See handout.

AGENDA ITEM: New staff

Expected Outcome	Lead Michelle Hosp	Follow Up
Information	Who helic 1 103p	<u>NA</u>

Notes: Both new staff started September 4, 2013. The secretary is housed at Grant Wood AEA Tracy Donohue- Literacy Consultant Therese York- Secretary

AGENDA ITEM: Collaborating for Iowa's Kids (C4K) and Phase one of Assessments and Data System Training

e jetem mammig		
Expected Outcome	Lead	Follow Up
	Barbara Ohlund	

Notes: Dr. Ohlund shared that there is a public C4K website with additional information. She reviewed the purpose of C4K and delineated the work teams:

- Standards and Curriculum (Universal Core and Early Literacy Framework, Standard Treatment Protocol)
- Response to Intervention-last week was the kickoff for the training on universal screener and progress monitoring tools, work team on intensive instruction)
- School Improvement (Identifying healthy indicators and continuous improvement process, Data System, Iowa Tiers)
- Educator Quality (working on collaborative inquiry process and tools)
- Professional Development (making sure content developed by other work tams is delivered consistently and utilizing adult learning
- Evaluation (newly formed)

AGENDA ITEM: Parent Information

Expected Outcome	Lead	Follow Up
	Michelle Hosp	
Information		Advisory members will be
		asked to volunteer to vet
		information.

Notes: The Center has contracted with Alison Bell. She is mining the information around parent literacy support, which will eventually be vetted by national experts.

AGENDA ITEM: Early Literacy Document

Expected Outcome	Lead Deb Hindman	Follow Up
Information/ongoing		Opportunity for advisory member to look at feedback from national experts to compile and synthesize the final document. Include deadlines

Notes: Deb Hindman shared the process used to develop the Early Literacy Framework (ELF). The lowa Department of Education, in conjunction with intermediate education agencies in Iowa (AEA) and local school districts, formed a collaborative network in order to begin to develop consistency of efforts across Iowa. Based on statewide data, the collaborative determined a focus on Early Literacy (PK-3rd grade). As a first task, the collaborative established the need for an Early Literacy Framework, which encompassed the Iowa Core ELA Standards as well as the Iowa Early Learning Standards.

Task Teams were formed: Content experts representing AEAs and LEAs, coordinated by the lowa DE.

Task Team 1: identified the instructional components of ELF and the research supporting those components. Comprehension, fluency, oral language, phonics, phonological awareness, vocabulary and written language. Using the Every Child Reads: Characteristics of an Effective Classroom, the RTI document for ELA and the research collected by Task Team 1; an Early Literacy Framework document was developed by Iowa DE.

Task Team 2: the first task was to review and compare findings across three sources of information: Every Child Reads B-3, 3-5, and K-3; the identified research from Team 1; and the drafted Early Literacy Framework.

In reviewing these three documents, team members confirmed the inclusion of the appropriate principles in the ELF document while also supplementing areas with weak representation of information.

Independent contracts were established with experts (Curenton, Kame'enui, Liben, Missall, Neuman, Rasinski, Shanahan, Strickland, Wasik) to review and offer feedback regarding Early Literacy Framework content and related research. Experts were also asked to supplement with additional research as needed. External Responses were saved on a Google site for future review.

AGENDA ITEM: Standard Treatment Protocol

Expected Outcome	Lead	Follow Up
Information/ongoing	Michelle Hosp and Kristen	
	Missal	Consideration of participation
		by advisory members in next
		level of work to develop rubric.

Notes:

Dr. Missal described the process used to mine the research.

Conclusions:

- STP's must have empirical evidence for effectiveness.
- STP's targets students classified as at-risk for specific early literacy skills
- STP's are delivered to small groups of children (3-6) with similar needs based on universal screeners
- STPs follow a prescribed delivery (e.g., scope and sequence, frequency, duration) with ongoing evaluation of fidelity and necessary training
- STPs include structured teaching methods
- STPs incorporate ongoing standardized assessment (progress monitoring) of key skills to evaluate intervention effectiveness

Next Steps:

Timeline	Plan
June - August 2013	 Review of Literature (National Experts) Vet reviews with additional national experts
Sept 2013	 Share information with Advisory Board of IRRC Develop Rubric to evaluate STPs
Oct – Nov 2013	Request for Information (RFI)
Nov – Dec 2013	Review RFIs
Feb – Aug 2014	 Training on STP (Phase I schools) Report for State on all STPs reviewed

AGENDA ITEM: LEGISLATIVE UPDATE

Expected Outcome Information/support	Lead David Tilly, Isaiah McGee, Phil	Follow Up
	Wise, Mike Cormack	Develop talking points

Notes: Isaiah shared Iowa Code: 279.68

IRRC was created as part of the Governor's package. There was no outside group that proposed the legislation, as a result the legislation was not prescriptive and many options were available. Education budget for this past year initially did not include funding for the IRRC; however funding was eventually supported by both houses. Most legislators are not aware of the Center. We need to be proactive. Literacy will not be off the table next year.

Next Steps: Opportunity to work with legislators to inform them about the mission of the Center. Be aware that there will be opportunities to participate in forums around the state concerning content for after school programming. The Center can be the go to place for Literacy questions.