

Early Language Working Group

July 14, 2017, 2:00-5:00 p.m.

HawaiiUSA Federal Credit Union Conference Room
1126 College Walk, Honolulu Hawai'i

MEETING MINUTES

Attendance:

Working Group Members: Jennifer Blohm, Ed Chevy, Amanda Kaahanui, Nikki Kepo'o, Steve Laracuenta (for Angel Ramos), Coleen Momohara, Emily Jo Noschese, Gwen Palmer, Kristine Takekawa, Jill Taosaka, Jennifer Hokulani Tarnay, Colin Whited.

Facilitator: Linda Colburn

Observers: Patricia Heu, MD, Linda Lambrecht, Margaret Laracuenta, Dale Matsumoto-Oi, Keiko Nitta, Po Kwan Wong.

1. Introductions

Attendees introduced themselves by name and indicated which role they were representing. Facilitator Linda Colburn introduced herself and explained that she was asked to assist as Leolinda Parlin was not able to attend due to a family matter. Ms. Colburn posted her Discussion Guidelines and group agreed to them.

2. Minutes – 5/19/17 meeting

The Working Group would like minutes 1 week prior to the meeting and have transcription posted on the Early Language Working Group website as soon as it is available. It was suggested that the Community Resource Listing include contextual information as to why it was created and would like minutes to reflect that the Working Group was concerned that it was not making sufficient progress to fulfill recommendations of the bill. Group decided the minutes were accepted with the proposed amendments. Group would like Leolinda Parlin to provide an update on a separate website and how to access if available. Group recognizes that the in-depth report will be due to the Legislature in January.

3. Tools to assess and plan language development services

The assessment tool matrix was shared at the meeting. Since this was the first time the group was seeing the document, facilitator suggested they review and discuss to bring the document in alignment with Working Group expectations and in time for Legislative report in January.

It was suggested that an additional column on data and results based on grade level tests would inform information on age level and data on skills. Group expressed concern if that was appropriate for this matrix or if it should be included in the data conversation. Individual expressed desire to be able to present data to bosses that show evidence of growth and more concrete progress at data points. This may need to be included in the data conversation and this matrix is specific to the assessment tools.

Matrix and assessments are not stand-alone tools to give to the child. A column on "What is this assessment for (language, vocabulary, speech, etc.)?" may be needed. The Assessment Matrix was a tool to assist in the transition between Part C to Part B which was an aspect in the legislation. The matrix could be rearranged so that it shows clusters of like material. Group suggested two proposed new columns include:

1. Purpose of Assessment (Purpose)

2. Who is Responsible for it (Responsibility).

Group was reminded that under the bill, the purpose of the document is to find tools for departments to standardize what is used. This Matrix reflects what is currently being used but may need to include recommendations on other assessments so legislators can see the complexity of choices. A possible way of presenting the information is to cluster what see what other states are using and rank them according to the Group's criteria.

It was clarified that the current matrix is a list of tools that speech-language pathologists use to determine the needs of each individual child at a particular time. Professionals use the tests to give information on each child and the use of tools cannot be standardized. This information needs to be included on the matrix. Group decided that the matrix be revised to include background/introductory statement or preamble:

1. Preamble to explain what the matrix of assessment currently is and that it is highly individual depending on the needs of each child and on a case-by-case basis.
2. This is a comprehensive representation (not exhaustive) of what is currently used in Hawaii.
3. It could document if anything of significance missing and why it should be included.

The following information was discussed to make improvements to the matrix:

- A. Add a purpose column (what is the purpose of the assessment)
- B. Add a Responsible column (indicate whose responsibility it is, who handles this tool, what is done)
- C. Break the matrix into different categories (e.g., hearing, language, literacy, vocabulary, etc.)
- D. Share the work via email as long as it does not conflict with Sunshine Law. The group may work via email since it is not a decision-making body and not finalizing the document. Work will be brought to the Working Group for finalizing therefore the Public Interest will not be compromised by this.
- E. Smaller workgroup from DOH and DOE will review the Matrix and send it to the Working Group. Dale Matsumoto-Oi will receive edits and feedback by August 11 and will review at the August 25th meeting.
- F. An introduction or preamble will be added that explains the purpose and use of the Matrix.
- G. Need to address best practices and recommendations for consistency in what is happening statewide and what can be improved to address inconsistencies in the State.
- H. Families want to know if there is a flowchart for this process. Parents want to address parents' perspective "if your child is deaf then start with this" or ensuring they have information that is important and what best practices are.
- I. Need a chairperson or someone to track the bill deliverables. Suggestion for individuals to refresh their understanding of the legislation and Group to be responsible for addressing the focus of the bill.
- J. Group would like a roadmap of what is needed from now until October 20.

4. Availability of data on language development and literacy

Group discussed the data needs relevant to the legislation to inform policy around language development. Current task is to identify where data resides and what are the boundaries and parameters around data. Group decided on the following:

- A. Age: birth to age five, separated by age 0-3 years (DOH) and 3-5 years (DOE)
- B. All children, all hearing loss.
- C. Who qualifies for Early Intervention and Special Education.
- D. Recommendations from the work group based on data needs.

It was clarified that the DOH Early Intervention (EI) uses the Battelle Developmental Inventory to determine eligibility, is completed on an annual basis, and is used for all EI-enrolled children.

Newborn Hearing Screening provides data on hearing screening at birth (Pass, Do Not Pass). Children are followed until age 3. Data is collected on:

- # of children identified with hearing loss at birth;
- # of children referred to early Intervention Section;
- No information is available on # of children who pass at birth but develop hearing loss later.

DOH EI database does not include language age. A correct ICD-9 (or ICD-10) diagnosis code is needed to identify children who are deaf, hard of hearing, or deaf-blind. The EIS database only includes three diagnosis codes – so multiple conditions and hearing may not be identified if they are not among those three codes.

DOE does not measure literacy until grade 3. DOE does work with the P-20 Longitudinal Data System (LDS) and there may be information available through them. ECSSS (DOE Database) has records of report but not scores. Individualized Education Plans (IEP) may have reading or reading readiness score. The eligibility category may not pick up deaf/hard of hearing. Existing reports are available for public review and use in the ELWG submission of data.

Indiana Center of Deaf and Hearing has a good data system for birth-22. There may be other examples elsewhere. Group may need to assign a data group to paint the bigger picture for those who can make changes to the system:

- What data we have now;
- What data do we have on language and literacy;
- What data we have, where it stops, where it should go;
- Known data sources that are accessible.

5. Future meetings in 2017

Next meeting will be August 25, 2017, 3:00-5:00 p.m. at the HawaiiUSA Federal Credit Union Conference Room at 1126 College Walk, Honolulu Hawai'i.

6. Public Comment

Group thanked Facilitator for keeping them on track and felt that there was a lot accomplished in this meeting.

Nikki Kepo'o requested that everyone look at the Community Resource Listing and check/complete the information about the resources. It addresses an item in the ELWG bill.

Meeting Adjourned.