

## **Literacy Brown Bag**

Meeting Minutes

October 16, 2002

### **In Attendance:**

Marian Crislip, REA, ED Specialist

Joanne Fujio, SPED Literacy RT, DOE

Landry Fukunaga, CDS

Donna Grace, COE, TECS, UH

Carolyn Hamada, SPED, DOE

Vivian Ing, PCNC, Family Support, DOE

Jean Johnson, CDS

Suzanne Langford, Literacy Specialist, DOE

Carolyn Len, SPED, DOE

Maureen Malanaphy, SPED Literacy, DOE

Shannon Simonelli, CDS

Helene J.O. Tom, REA, Ed. Specialist

Elaine Tsuchiyama, SPED Literacy RT, DOE

Beverly Wong, DOE

### **Goals:**

To examine what is currently available for pre-service and in-service training to teachers around the subject of literacy, and how to coordinate these efforts between the DOE, UH, and other community agencies.

- In the beginning, there was more collaboration from all partners, but as time passed, the DOE participation dropped off. This is the first meeting since July.
- Different community based people have come to share and look for opportunities to utilize this group.

**Our goal is to look at how we can collaborate together to create pre-service and in-service that will aid educators in promoting literacy.**

Each agency shares their current status and hopes for future goals.

### **DOE:**

**Suzanne Langford.** Educational Specialist for literacy, SPED 504

Reading Excellence Act – Several people are representing the DOE from this cadre.

Reading for Excellence Act, DOE:

We are currently in the middle of the REA program and just had a conference covering the REA directed instruction. There will be three upcoming summits: Ka Hulina a ka Lau – This title was carefully chosen and translates to... turning the pages, the lau leaves, the search for knowledge, seeking wisdom.

- This team is a state team that serves the state by looking at the Felix decree. The IEPs have to reflect strong reading goals and strategies. This has been found to not be the case for SPED students. These reading goals need to be specifically stated as the first foundational step to teaching literacy. These conferences will be focusing on understanding the IEP. The breakouts will include several foci. *Star teachers* – people that are really teaching literacy to these kids. They will be bringing students with them and talking about what teachers need to do to teach literacy. Also, *Bev Wong* – Teaching the rubrics that link the DOE policies to practice, the No Child Left Behind mandate, the wording, the why, and the how.
- The teachers will practice on an IEP, with a specific child in mind. They will then work with colleagues to rewrite an IEP. This mock IEP will be rewritten to make improvements and teachers will then do a real IEP revision following the summit. These will be submitted and evaluated by the DOE. A “3” IEP is a good IEP.
- This information will be shared again at later meetings/trainings, but not in the summit format, as a way to provide SPED teachers with *in-service training* to continually improve each teacher’s ability to utilize the IEP in creating specific reading goals.

The main outcome is for every SPED student to be a professional reader and writer.

1. Students will develop and maintain the motivation to read.  
Have the vocabulary needed to decipher and understand material.
2. The parents, family, and community will be involved in promoting the literacy of students and understand the importance of collaboration.
3. Drop out rates need to be impacted and research shows that literacy has an important role in student retention rates.
4. Academic achievement will improve for students with disabilities at the same rate as students without disabilities
5. Specific instruction and technological assistance will be available to students.

- Currently there are seven reading specialists altogether in the state:

Maui has no specialist

Hawaii has two specialists

### **Reading For Excellence Act**

- Only the schools that applied for the grant are getting the support from their office.
- *In-servicing* by this department includes SPED teachers from 0-3.
- The testing for students is not modified for other students with special needs.
- No Child left behind requires highly trained individuals to be working with literacy. Many of the tutors do not have their AA, so this group helps to provide *in-service* training to alleviate this problem.

- Some Reading programs include;
  1. Success for all
  2. Houghten Mifflin – meets the no child left behind requirements.
  3. Open court
  4. Reading mastery
  
- Activities for this group include:
  1. Scientifically based reading research
  2. Provide tutors
  3. Provide engaging materials for their students
  4. Fund family literacy programs
  5. Fund Kindergarten transition programs and early literacy programs

The requests for assistance (RFA) for students with severe problem are assigned to appropriate supplementary programs. Different schools used school-wide different programs. They can choose to purchase a packaged program, and the funds will be allocated for that literacy program as long as it's used school-wide, not just with SPED kids or visa versa. However, the money is only for Title 1 schools

- Demographic data will be collected later. Current data is about correlations and decoding,
- This would be good data to have over time to evaluate success over time, how it translates to later skills.
- Why aren't they looking at comprehension? Because testing for decoding skills is a faster assessment. Most comprehension tests take about 20-30 minutes, and this isn't feasible. Comprehension tests that they are considering take about a 3-4 minute oral test. Trying to find something that will satisfy everyone. Comprehension and fluency has been found to be correlated, but there are always disbelievers.
- When testing for comprehension, decoding skills are already assumed.

### **Collecting and Analyzing Data**

- one great thing about the direct instruction group from OR is that they are very specific about making sure that what you are studying is what you want to find out about. Comprehension testing does take longer, but it really is what you want. We should look at some of the pilot schools that are really struggling and get in-depth, quality data about things that you really want to know. Then correlate it with the bigger research that was conducted on a superficial level. Look at a couple of pilot studies and compare.
- This idea is included in Suzanne Langford's write-up. UH is included as a partner in this endeavor. A change to analyzing the schools that don't have all the resources.
- Realizing the importance of multiple evidences. Not just decoding or comprehension. They are both a part of the big picture. How are they doing along the way, even from kindergarten.

Carolyn Hamada- What have you all noticed in terms of in-service needs to teachers? What do they need to catch the kids before they fall? What can we do up front?

## **Families for Real**

- A major focus is now on educating families and schools about the importance of building literacy from birth. We need to put some money in this area to catch them up front. By the time students reach kindergarten, it may be too late. Teachers need early childhood education supports, training on how to relate to parents, and the families need to support the education of their children. We aren't paying enough attention to the early years.
- Drop out prevention surveys show that putting money into early childhood education affects drop out rates.
- Maybe we need a kind of family resource center. We really want all parents to have access, regardless of who they are, so that they can get the information as easily as possible. *Families for Real* has thousands of people on the waiting list. All parents are accepted, and are required to be with their children. It can't be a teacher or a TA, etc. This is based on the belief that the parent is the teacher and builds on the idea that the parent is a partner. Community education is offered in trimesters. Meetings are held a couple of times a week, depending on the classes. Results are positive, and teachers can really tell the difference between students that are involved in this program. THIS IS FREE!!!
- Also have PCNC. Not funded totally. PCNC has four phases.
  1. parent reaches out
  2. parents makes relationships with the teachers
  3. parents go into the classroom to make training/classes salient
  4. Did not address this step
- PCNC also coordinates VISTA volunteers. PCNC is the largest network of volunteers in the state.

## **UH – College of ED**

- Early childhood endorsement for the students.
- New Masters program for early childhood.
- Proposal for two new reading programs:
  - \* Teachers to get a reading endorsement (18 credits) to get certified. To become a specialist they will need (30 credits).
  - \* Ran a pilot this summer for secondary teachers, but will be moving into the elementary schools.
- The Language Arts Standards, DOE, Other literacy groups in the state.

- The focus is on helping teachers with professional development in literacy and keeping in line with national standards.
- The undergraduate program is changing to stress identifying the strengths and weaknesses of students in terms of literacy and intervention strategies.
- What kinds of strategies do you consider intervention strategies, and how do they differ from the regular program? – The focus is on identifying factors directly related to reading, comprehension, etc.

An Example of a What's Working Practice:

Head Start, Reading Teacher, SPED students were present. No one stood out as being SPED, or in poverty. This was all pre-Kindergarten, but there should be more times for teachers to see this... A special ED student that was mainstreamed and has been successfully included. There were two EAs, but all the children followed directions, behaved appropriately, and this was only two months into a program!

**The SEEDs for our next meeting:**

- Lets create a project, something to show for our efforts.
- What can we do? How can we collaborate to make pre-service and in-service training better? Maybe create a training, a video, be creative!
- Three previous ideas to ponder:
  1. To create a statewide database with reviews of reading programs offered nationally.
  2. To create trainings for classroom teachers that are widely available through technology.
  3. To establish professional training to teachers to address the diverse needs of students outside of prepared programs. Give them a bag of tools to make appropriate learning strategies and interventions for a variety of students.

**Funding**

UH?

DOE? perhaps it would be better to build on something that is existing already. There are some start up funds.

- The SIG ends in January of 2004, and there may be an extension. But this doesn't mean that anything that we get started has to end.
- Sustainability issues- not starting something that will die, especially if it is useful.
- Transitioning into a Workgroup- moving things forward. Ideally, at the end of this grant, we want to have something to show for our efforts.

- What is happening in the College of ED in terms of pre-service training and coursework for teachers that don't know how to begin assessing their students? What is available? Are these resources being utilized? What is needed additionally? After studying what is happening currently, perhaps we can make recommendations to the college based on what is needed in the field.
- Another use may be in the area of mentoring. All of us need support groups and opportunities to share ideas. It would be helpful to share what the DOE is doing and perhaps using UH to disseminate this information. To bring discussions, to provide data, to look at the literature. To use this as an opportunity to move our frontier forward.
- We should bring a parent to the next meeting.

**Tentative Meeting schedule for upcoming literacy brown bag:**

November 8th, 2002

DOE office