

# Ohio Dyslexia Committee

## February 22, 2022

### Ohio Department of Education

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

**Ohio Department of Education Presenters:** Sherine Tambyraja, Dyslexia Administrator – Office of Approaches to Teaching and Professional Learning, LM Clinton, Third Grade Reading Guarantee Program Administrator

**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 8:55 a.m. *Mike called roll.* A quorum was present to proceed with committee. Meeting minutes from the previous meeting were approved.

Mike McGovern welcomed Chair Martha Manchester from the Teaching Leading and Learning Committee.

The recording of the State Board Meeting which took place on February 14<sup>th</sup> and 15<sup>th</sup> is now available on the Ohio channel. You may access the recordings here: [theohiochannel.org](http://theohiochannel.org)

## Notes from Chair

Teaching, Leading, and Learning Chair, Martha Manchester was present for today's meeting to provide insight from the board meeting which place on February 14<sup>th</sup>.

Melissa Weber Mayrer, LM Clinton, and Sherine Tambyraja presented to the Teaching Leading and Learning Committee during February 14<sup>th</sup> State Board Meeting.

Chair, Mike McGovern addressed the concerns around the Dyslexia Guidebook during the State Board Meeting. Questions and comments came to the TLL committee during the public comment on both Monday and Tuesday of the State Board Meeting. Some of the concerns were around cost. Chair McGovern asked, do we think that due to the additional cost, does this mean we should not teach children how to read? The core reason schools exist is to teach children to read. All of the costs into teaching reading have to be considered. "A child has the right to learn how to read, while the school has a duty to teach that child to read". This is what should be kept in mind when it comes to the Ohio Dyslexia Guidebook.

## Parent and Student Spotlight

There was no parent spotlight.

## Committee Discussion: Ohio Department of Education – Office of Assessment

Peggy Sorensen provided an update to the committee on the progress to the screening process for the approved list for tier 1 screeners.

- Currently, there will be two categories of approval for the tier 1 screener

Tier 1 categories:

- The office of Assessment will allow for screening to be embedded in the K-3 diagnostic
  - Stand-alone tier 1 screener – There will be some streamlining
- When criteria is chosen, the office of assessment will look at the:
  - Legal requirements
  - Stakeholder and Staff input
  - Research and Best Practices

A number of documents will be required for the office of assessment (The office of assessment is moving away from Vendors sending in entire packets of sales materials)

- There will be a group of 3 content readers for each assessment for Reader Scoring
- Scoring on a “yes”, “no” criteria (Did they meet the minimum criteria)
- The Reading process overview will allow for appeals which will be read by a single team and the final determination will be made by ODE Leadership
- If there are criteria’s that do not meet the requirements, vendors have two weeks to appeal
- If any “no’s” appear in the results section, the section will automatically turn red and an appeal letter will be sent out
- The current timeline is as followed:
  - RFQ Process, Application Deadlines, Application Read, Vendor Appeals, Lists Published –
  - Timeline is currently aiming for 2-4 weeks
  - The office of assessment is currently waiting on approval from the legal office for the RFA

## Questions and Open Comments

Q: Can you explain how the appeal process works?

A: When the appeal comes in, depending on whether it is a technical issue, it will go back to the readers

Q: Once added, do you have to qualify and wait, or can we do a rolling process?

A: Pulling together the people we will need to continue a rolling process is not doable. It’s a very labor-intensive process.

Q: With the Third Grade Reading Guarantee lists and the dyslexia law lists, if you are in the approved TGRG lists are the K-3 diagnostics rolled in here?

A: The K-3 Diagnostic are not rolled in. Individuals can choose to apply. If they are applying based on

## Tier 2 Reporting Discussion

LM Clinton presented to the Committee the Tier 2 Reporting Mechanisms

- LM Clinton provided to the committee the statutory requirement which reads; “Districts must report to the department of education the results of screening measures administered under ORC 3323.251 which includes both Tier 1 and Tier 2”.

### Tier 1 Dyslexia Screening Timeline

2022-23	2023-24 and Beyond
<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• <b>Students in grades K-3</b> (Kindergarten students must be screened after January 1, 2023, but prior to January 1, 2024)</li><li>• <b>Students in grades 4-6</b> as requested by a parent or a teacher with permission from parent</li></ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• <b>Students in Kindergarten</b> (after the first day of January, but prior to the following January)</li><li>• Students in <b>grades 1-6</b> as requested by a parent or a teacher with permission from parent</li></ul>

- LM Clinton provided the committee with the proposed tier 2 reporting mechanisms.

### Proposed Tier 2 Reporting

- Districts report student level results into EMIS
- End of year reporting
- Districts report one of the following:
  - Student is “At Risk” for dyslexia based on results
  - Student is “No longer At Risk” for dyslexia based on results

- Trevor Thomas addressed the committee on EMIS reporting. As local districts, we are not reporting directly into the EMIS system, we have to enter information in progress books, power schools or whichever system being used. One of the good things about these proposed reporting methods is there will be one place for districts to report their data. The only issue is for the students who do not screen “at risk” in tier 1.
- Trevor Thomas mentioned to the committee that there should be some clarification on the law when it comes to EMIS reporting so it is clear to educator since we are dealing with language of the law versus best practice.
- Steve Griffin addressed the confusion with week 1 and week 6.
- Elizabeth Hess stated to the committee that both areas are allowed by statute however, the reporting needs to allow for both pathways. You may want to consider having both reporting mechanisms for both students and districts that days that tier 2 was administered prior to results or after the progress monitoring report.
- Steve Griffin stated to the committee that the Third Grade Reading Guarantee should be tied into the Dyslexia Guidebook
- LaMonica Davis if all this information could go into the RIMP so that this is mandated?
- Elizabeth Hess stated that this would be locally determined. Everyone is going to need a way to report this information into EMIS.

### Questions and Open Comments

Q: Will there be a reporting function for educators to list or enter data for students who did not screen?

A: LM Clinton stated that he could pass this question along to the Director of the Office of Data Quality. I would presume that this option would be a separate element to data being reported. These options would be available for students who were registered in tier 2 screening.

Q: Is the May timeframe for everyone or is this at a local level?

A: This is at a local level.

### **Action Item: Voting on Tier 2 Reporting Options**

LM Clinton proposed the committee with the following options for Tier 2 Reporting

Option 1: Student is “At Risk” for dyslexia based on results

Option 2: Student is “No longer At Risk” for dyslexia based on results

Option 3: At risk, no progress monitoring

Option 4: Not at risk, no progress monitoring

LM Clinton motioned to approve the language of the tier 2 reporting options. Olivia Weisman seconded the motion.

Affirmative Votes: LM Clinton, Dana Hamilton, Olivia Weisman, Trevor Thomas, Steve Griffin, Melissa Spangler, LaMonica Davis, Rebecca Tolson, Amy Murdoch, Mike McGovern.

## **Review Teaching Leading and Learning Committee feedback**

Dr. Sherine Tambyraja shared with the committee the feedback from the Teaching Leading and Learning Committee during the February State Board meeting. The committee had a robust discussion around the provided feedback and changes from the Teaching Leading and Learning Committee.

- The Teaching Leading and Learning Committee reviewed and discussed the dyslexia guidebook during the February 14<sup>th</sup> State Board meeting.
- Chair McGivern shared that board member Christina Collins asked chair Manchester to explain what the State Board tasks would be with the guidebook. Per Chair Manchester, *“We were not asked to approve what was mandated by the Dyslexia Committee, however, to put in the guidebook what was mandated by the Dyslexia Committee. It’s whether the committee did what the law states they must do”*.
- Jason Wagner addressed the committee with what he is able read within the law. *“The dyslexia guidebook is to be developed by the Dyslexia Committee and alternately approved by the state board of education prior to distribution”*.
- The provided recommendations for revisions were grammatical and substantive.
- Chair Martha Manchester addressed the committee on the recommendations on the revisions of the guidebook. The concern is that there is an overreach.

Substantive Changes:

- I. On page 2- insert the following sentence: “All best practices in this guidebook are recommendations only” and at the beginning of the Best Practices section

- Amy Murdoch and Mike McGovern stated to the committee that they would not like to change this sentence.
- Trevor Thomas suggested a change to sentence on page 2 - taking the last sentence of paragraph two and mentioning “the guidebook outlines best practices throughout”
- Olivia Weisman mentioned that the change to add “best practices and methods for universal screening” is fine as it is directly from the law
- Steve Griffin suggested to the committee on revising the last sentence as it is redundant

All committee members agreed to the suggested change of the “best practices and...”

II. On page 7 – remove the following sentence: “The percentage of students experiencing characteristics...” and to remove the paragraph stating: “Myths and misunderstandings”

- Amy Murdoch stated her objection to both changes as it is important to state why this is often misidentified
- Melissa Spangler also stated her objection on why Myths are important. Melissa stated teachers are shocked in her district when she mentions myths around Dyslexia.
- Rebecca Tolson stated, “over the 30 years she has visited the classroom, teachers state they have never had a student with dyslexia. Rebecca felt passionate to have the current data on this information.
- Elizabeth Hess stated the editorial language, would the committee want to consider moving the Myth and misunderstandings upward but deleting the additional portion (Keep the fact-based sentences)
- LaMonica Davis asked if the piece about teachers could be kept? If this is a guidebook, this is for everyone as we want to include research. LaMonica suggested keeping the portion about teachers and parents continue to struggle to teach students with dyslexia.
- Chair Martha Manchester expressed to the committee the issue that raised with the paragraph. The committee wants to see data to support everything that is listed in that paragraph
- The committee agreed to keep the following sentence beginning with Myths and Misunderstandings as is.
- ODE staff asked whether it would make sense to change the language to “teachers have the struggle to know how to teach...” or whether “every teacher has a desire to teach a child to read” and then follow-up with “teachers have the struggle to know how to teach
- ODE staff suggested a sentence to go after the percentages area: “the severity and resources needed to address these characteristics will vary based on the individual student”

III. On page 13- Remove the 3<sup>rd</sup> column of this table, remove the list of common instructional practices

- Dana Hamilton stated that teachers need guidance, and they want all the help they can get! Teachers want to do what is best for students! Dana states this section is needed and wanted.

- Amy Murdoch stated this section clearly outlines what we are talking about and believes this section should be kept.
- Rebecca Tolson mentioned when she changed her practice, she saw the shift. Rebecca feels strongly to leave this table in as she does not want to miss guide educators
- Steve Griffin stated the changes come from the language by building a bridge between common practices and (middle ground)
- Rebecca Tolson mentioned referring to Appendix A for pivoting to structured literacy as it provides a lens into the Professional Development section
- Olivia Weisman mentioned changing the header of comparing a structured literacy approach – Olivia see’s this column as a helpful tool, however, changing the wording
- Amy Murdoch suggested flipping the two columns showing the shift to structured literacy
- Amy Murdoch purposed to leave in the lists of practices we don’t want to see on the bottom of page 13

IV. On page 19 – Remove the content of this page except for the top paragraph, keep links and link out to a separate document on Ohio Department of Education website that has the model

- Amy Murdoch stated that since most of the problem-solving practices were cut out of the guidebook previously, this piece is important of MTSS and should stay
- Sherine Tambyraja stated that if the Ohio Department of Education is able to do the webpage, this would be helpful for those who cannot access the guidebook
- Beth Hess asked the committee to consider either removing the graphing or changing the language to where we could shorten this page

All Committee members were in agreeance to shortening page 19 by removing the graphic

V. On page 23- Remove the bulleted list under “Identifying Universal Screening”

- The committee was in agreeance to remove this section
- Trevor Thomas pointed out a brief edit on page 22 – On the table with the dates for grades 1-3, can we change beginning to only as it is only required 2022-2023

All committee was in agreeance with this change Trevor pointed out

VI. On page 28 – Remove the column “Practices to Avoid”

- Steve Griffin mentioned if best practices are mentioned, the column can go
- The committee was all in agreeance
- Amy Murdoch pointed out on Page 25, that the ongoing progress monitoring was linked to weekly progress monitoring not three times a year of screening
- The bullet will now read: Include alternate forms for screening and ongoing progress monitoring

VII. On page 39 – Remove the paragraph starting “In some schools...”

- Steve Griffin- The content needs to stay; however, the wording needs to be discussed differently
- Amy Murdoch suggested taking out the first sentence which is problematic
- Address that there are resources – By doing this we are protecting the students who will need the special education and supports
- The committee was in agreeance to have Beth Hess play around with the language of this paragraph
- Trevor Thomas pointed out on page 40 – Association letter – Some schools continue to use a discrepancy model – Could we take this out?
- Mike McGovern stated possibly to stop using the phrase “some schools”

All committee members were all in agreeance

#### VIII. On page 49- Providing additional information on what this definition means

- We wouldn't want to have teachers go through an additional certification such as going through CERI and IDA
- The committee agreed to take the “Note” out on page 49
- Trevor Thomas – Page 49 – CEUs aligned with Structured Literacy - Where is the 10 contact hours per year coming from if this is not on the list?
- Rebecca Tolson stated to the committee that contact hours have to be pre-approved and are required by something aligned to the science
- Adding in where the 10 contact hours came from and why it is listed
- Managed by the certifying organization- Definition of appropriate certification
- Some individuals are not in a pathway – In order to make it easier on educators and having the local control – we wanted to tie this into
- Due to a broad definition of appropriate certification, the language is incomplete on page 49 – We may want to consider removing this and just mention local
- Olivia Weisman mentioned keeping the first two sentences starting with “the committee recommends...” as it is needed

Q: Olivia Weisman asked if the upper case and lower-case issue of structured literacy has been taken care of?

A: Yes, that was another important issue that was raised during the meeting, and the department and legal team will address.

#### **Review Professional Development feedback**

- Dr. Sherine Tambyraja addressed the committee with the professional development feedback.
- The following were themes of the public comment feedback:
  - Number of hours – 18 hours may be difficult to complete in a year
  - Consideration of applicability for teachers of unified arts
  - Questions around what it means to have completed 18 hours vs. completed programs (e.g., LETRS)
  - Clarification on who is considered qualified to create and deliver an 18-hour course

- Teachers in grades 4-12 are required for the 18 hours
- Trevor Thomas stated to the committee to consider Special Ed teachers as core ed teachers may not have enough time with a lesser requirement of PD hours (18 hours are 3 full days)
- Olivia Weisman stated some overview recommendation for what this means for other teachers
- Specify who we are targeting when it come to the 18 PD Hours – Mike McGovern
- 6 hours for special area teachers and 18 hours for others per Trevor Thomas
- ESSER Funds – Where do SLPs fit in? Do they fit in under the 18 hours?
- Rebecca Tolson mentioned the LETRS training is a science training without a practicum. SLPs are extremely knowledgeable, however it is the dyslexia piece which is extremely important.

There should be clarification on who is considered qualified to create and deliver an 18-hour course.

Steve Griffin addressed the committee with the addition of deaf and hard of hearing students

Elizabeth Hess stated to the committee that for those providing curriculum training, a qualified provider for instructional practices is needed. It is up to the local district to determine that the individuals providing the training has the credentials

Q: Could a district facilitate an ODE professional development?

A: Yes, however, it necessarily is not the right choice for some districts as they make shifts

Amy Murdoch – The reason we chose IDA and other certification bodies was that there was a rigorous process around structured literacy that cover all areas – Use the existing certification bodies

Professional Development hours around universal screeners?

- Rebecca Tolson – Open to a broad category – It is about the specialization to which I can speak to the awareness
- Do we want to open this up to a broader category- Stay on a side of caution for integrity?
- The committee will get together with a workgroup to discuss this information.

### **Action Item: Vote on changes to the professional development section of the guidebook**

Trevor Thomas motioned to carve out for teachers in special areas such as art, music, physical education to have a requirement of less hours of professional development in structured literacy and for other teachers in special education to complete 18 hours of professional development.

Amy Murdoch seconded the motion.

Affirmative votes: Trevor Thomas, Steve Griffin, LM Clinton, LaMonica Davis, Dana Hamilton, Melissa Spangler, Olivia Weisman, Mike McGovern, Rebecca Tolson, Amy Murdoch

### **Review Certification feedback**

Dr. Sherine Tambyraja presented to the committee the feedback regarding certification. Do we want to consider broadening the section and then come back with actual language?

- May a district “Share” the services of a certified educator on their multi-disciplinary team? Such as working with an ESC consultant or an employee of another district.



- Our guidebook currently allows this per Mike McGovern, this was the purpose.
- From the IMSLEC list, can it be any program from any state? Questions about Brainspring which is approved in Michigan but not Ohio.
  - This is an approved program as it is approved by IMSLEC however it is just in another state
  - Provide a list of IMSLEC approved by state
- Questions around the timing e.g., by when does someone need to be certified?
  - Beth Hess – three issues here: Staff, Multi-disciplinary teams require certified personnel,
  - How do we help these districts next school year when there is a larger number of students who need to be screened (K-4)?
- Considerations for broadening what may meet requirements?
  - Required to have the exact ratio
  - Help guide educators- Certified means expert in that field
  - Beth Hess stated: to challenge one of those pieces which is the one-on-one certification process

## Voting items: Guidebook Revisions

*Olivia Weisman motioned to approve the changes to the guidebook. Amy Murdoch seconded the motion*

Affirmative Votes: Trevor Thomas, Steve Griffin, LM Clinton, LaMonica Davis, Dana Hamilton, Melissa Spangler, Olivia Weisman, Mike McGovern, Rebecca Tolson, Amy Murdoch

## Public comments

There were no public comments

## Next Steps

Our next meeting is March 29, 2022

## Adjournment

Mike McGovern adjourned the meeting at 4:00 p.m.