

Ohio Dyslexia Committee

October 26, 2021

Ohio Department of Education

Committee Members Attending: LM Clinton, LaMonica Davis, Steve Griffin, Dana Hamilton, Melissa Spangler, Chinnon Jaquay, Mike McGovern, Amy Murdoch, Rebecca Tolson, Trevor Thomas, Olivia Weisman

Ohio Department of Education Presenters: Kim Davis; Tricia Merenda

Department Staff Providing Information:

Recording Secretary: Kyaundra Ellis, Ohio Department of Education

Opening

Mike McGovern, Committee Chair, welcomed the committee members and called the meeting to order at 8:45 a.m. *Mike called roll.* A quorum was present to proceed with committee. Minutes from the previous meeting were approved.

Dr. Sherine Tambyraja provided the committee with an introduction. Dr. Tambyraja is joining the Department from the Crane Center for Early Childhood Research and Policy. Her research has focused on the language and literacy development of young children with communication disorders.

LM Clinton reported that the Department is looking into providing a broadcast feed of the committee meetings for public viewing.

Parent and Student Spotlight

We heard from Jeff Hoffman, a Physical education teacher and Erica Hoffman, a literacy intervention specialist who shared their story of their child's challenges and success. The committee thanked the Hoffman's' for sharing their story.

The committee also heard from Dr. Megan Arbor, associate professor of nursing at the Ohio State University who shared her story of her children's challenges and success. Dr. Arbor shared her recommendations and considerations with the committee as the following:

- Require dyslexia specific continuing education
- Once diagnosed, require dyslexia science-based intervention
- Re-design Ohio's reading curriculum to a science-based structured literacy program for all students

Action Item – An Interactive presentation on the progress of the Kindergarten Standards revision workgroup

The purpose of the interactive presentation was to involve the committee in the life of a kindergartner teacher and understanding why the standards are important.

Dana Hamilton, LaMonica Davis, Tricia Merenda, and Kimberly Davis shared an interactive presentation on the progress of the kindergarten standards with the committee to take them into the life of a kindergartner and understand why the standards are important.

“Supporting our teachers and students, we know standards don't tell teachers how to teach, but they do help teachers figure out the knowledge and skills their students should have so that teachers can build the best lessons and environments with our classrooms. The workgroup worked hard and want to make sure these standards help students We feel the best way to do this is by setting core and realistic goals for success”.

Dana Hamilton introduced the changes within the Kindergarten ELA standards - “when we know better, we do better”. All Ohio students to have an education environment that focuses on evidenced based language and literacy practices.

LaMonica Davis introduced Maggie Oliver, State Teacher of the Year Finalists, and a literacy coach from Akron shared her journey from balanced literacy to structured literacy. “Student success is a measure of educator success”. Most of Maggie’s students were showing hyperlexia where they could read anything you placed in front of them. “Reading opens up our worlds!”

LaMonica Davis presented the process for sharing the standards- which will describe the change, give an opportunity to look at the standards, and provide an opportunity for feedback. The proposed standards the committee looked at today revolved around what happens after kindergarten success and the trajectory of what is going forward on how to support our educators, teachers, and administration.

The three major areas of change of the standards are:

- Reading fiction and informational text combined
- Reading foundation standards
- Writing fluency standards

The committee had a robust discussion on the old standards, the proposed standards, and the changes that were made. The committee discussed how to make the current standards better, more effective, and more easily understood.

Kimberly Davis provided data feedback from the public comments.

- 564 responses for individual comment
- 266 responses to Likert scale questions
- 102-160 open text responses

Roles that individual identified during their public comment feedback: Several things of note

- We did not have school psychologists listed as one of our roles for the standards school, however, psychologists respond, and we were able to pull out
- Literacy specialist was another one that was within the stakeholder group that we pulled out as well so we can see that they provided individual feedback and to identify their school typology.
- The public comment had a nice mix of suburban, urban, and rural districts included. There was also a nice cross section of organization within Ohio which is remarkable when you look at the number of years of experience for most of the individuals
- We are looking at teacher professionals who have extensive years of experience within education who took the time to provide their feedback and make their recommendations about these standards which was one of our largest feedback responses we've gotten especially for a single grade level and a single subject area.

Combining the informational and literacy text to allow student to comprehend the vocabulary.

Open Q&A/comments

Discussion Item: Kindergarten Standards Revision

- Reading informational text and Reading foundations
 - 91% agreed with the expansion of the foundational skills
 - 35 positive comments received for the expansion of the foundations skills and having a clear alignment to the science of reading
 - A few negative comments received around the read alouds
- Appropriate fluency

- Defining fluency through accuracy, prosody, and rate
- The first expectation is the consonant digraphs
- The second expectation is our data over five years within our kindergarten population
 - RF4: recommend reading decodable control text with appropriate accuracy rate prosody to gain support from the text
- Writing fluency standards
 - Overall, there's the foundational skills in emphasis, letter formation, handwriting, and habits being that it is an essential piece of orthographic mapping and placing everything together
 - Concern was on the emphasis of letter formation
 - Size, spacing, automaticity
 - What do we need to do at the department level?
 - How can we best support our teachers?
 - Teachers are overwhelmed by the number of standards that have shown up within the foundational writing and how it bleeds into the or other writing our process writing pieces as well
 - Develop a model curriculum to break down information
 - Model curriculum standard piece revolve around Each Child Reads Grant
 - Professional development would be beneficial
 - Writing has a hierarchy

"I work with students at the younger levels and when I am doing assessments with them, I always look to see how they are forming their letters, directionality, and top to bottom. When I bring that up to teachers, most teachers are unaware, so I think we need a lot of professional development around writing".

Open Q&A/comments

Q: Is it developmentally appropriate to have kindergarten children by the end of the year able to recognize and read digraphs with automaticity?

A: It comes down to whether kindergartners can understand the concept of adjacent consonants and be able to articulate. It's the understanding that opens the gateways in the automaticity translator that makes sense and the scaffolding that's needed.

Q: Is it necessary to have short vowel and the most common consonants(nasal) together as an expectation?

A: I believe students need to be saturated with the sounds, so they have the experience. They also have to feel the vibration, so yes, it would be beneficial to have the short vowel and consonant together.

Q: What is your take on skywriting?

A: I know that's something that we emphasize on. Just the kinesthetic aspect of skywriting helps secure them in understanding. It is important that students can express to you their thoughts are on writing and see if there is a barrier in the mechanics.

Discussion Item: Dyslexia Guidebook Feedback

Stephanie Stollar shared where she currently is with the guidebook and asked the committee for their feedback. Stephanie is working on a draft which she will send to the committee by the end of the month. The committee had a robust discussion around the Dyslexia Guidebook format and provided Stephanie with feedback.

Focus of the guidebook:

- Center the needs of students with dyslexia in instruction and have that centered within the MTSS framework so that early assessment and intervention and structured literacy approach within the classroom are all front and centered.
- This document serving as a tool to guide educators and also inform and engage parents and family members.
- Guidebook to be heavy on diagrams, graphics, tables, and provide hyperlinks that would take individuals to places to learn more.

MTSS framework to guide the implementation of the law and to link in the specifics of the law

- First Step -Screening- Tier 1 dyslexic screener
- Second Step- Consideration around differentiating, analyzing, and improving the core reading instruction
- Third step – monitoring student progress- the law states if there is no progress, then at step 4 there will be a tier 2 dyslexia screening measure given which triggers sending the results to parents within 30 days. If the student has dyslexic tendencies on the tier 2 screening measure, parents would be given information about reading development, risk factors for dyslexia, description of evidence-based interventions.

The committee provided Stephanie with the following feedback:

- Setting the stage for things that need to be in place such as teacher training, building level planning team, and who would be directing this work. This team would help with building the screeners and systems of support.
- With the screening data, we want to punctuate instruction although it is not within the law but would be able to do this within the guidebook. Talking more on the science of reading based tier 1 instruction. Apply instruction within the graphics

Open Q&A/comments

Q: Should we change the wording around universal reading instruction to tier 1 reading instruction? Is this where we should add what type of instruction we are looking at?

A: The intention was to clarify and articulate what the universal instruction should include and what a classroom-based reading instruction should look like along the lines of the structured literacy definition. Using tier 1 reading instruction is important because that is what Ohio's plan to raise literacy talks about and with a tier 1 instruction, everyone receive this. It would be great to match the language in Ohio's plan to raise literacy to help make the connection.

Q: In Ohio's plan to raise literacy, is the tier 1 screener called the universal screener?

A: Tier 1 is called out, but the word screener does not appear within Ohio's plan to raise literacy.

Q: When looking at the tier 2 screener which doesn't show up until step 4 is this after we have begun intervening?

A: The tier 2 screener measure is triggered by no progress.

Q: Is the tier 2 screener the diagnostic?

A: Have tier 2 screeners described as intervention based-diagnostic assessment- informal or formal- linked to instruction.

Q: For tier 2, would districts also have to use the approved list?

A: No, the term used informal academic diagnostic assessment for tier 2. This is where we said it could not be teacher created. We could provide examples within the guidebook and list the foundations as a placement of intervention. The key to tier 2 is to link directly to drive the intervention of instruction.

A concern the committee had was with the Tier 1 screener which may not give enough detail into what the skills are. We have best-practices in line, however, this should be articulated within the guidebook as we want to make sure what is used for universal screener does connect to

reading concerns specifically dyslexia. There may be a smaller number of screeners that fit this bill and what is within the third grade reading guarantee. The hope is for individuals to choose one that is sufficient, however we have those criteria which is important. Districts will have to choose from the Ohio approved lists for the tier one screeners.

Discussion Item: Appropriate Certification definition

The committee had a robust discussion around the definition of Appropriate Certification. The committee discussed the topic of IDA certifications. A question of whether teachers who have such certification can be grandfathered in. If we can get the old list from IDA, we may be able to compare a handful of teachers who are already certified with or without the practicum. The committee was all in agreeance to hold off on posting the appropriate certification definition on the dyslexia website.

- Educators need to be equipped in the certification in order to provide instruction to students
- Continued education should be attached to appropriate certification
- What would we want a person with appropriate certification to look like? What skills should they have?

Other Questions/Comments from Committee

Public comments

No public comment

Next steps

The next meeting will be in person on November 30, 2021.

Adjournment

Chairman Mike McGovern adjourned the meeting at 3:00PM