

Ohio Dyslexia Committee

May 31, 2022

Ohio Department of Education

25 S Front Street, Columbus, OH 43215 | May 31, 2022, | 8:45 a.m. – 1:30 p.m.

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

Committee Members Attending Virtually: Chinnon Jaquay, Olivia Weisman

Ohio Department of Education Presenters: Sherine Tambyraja, Dyslexia Administrator; LM Clinton, Third Grade Reading Guarantee Administrator

Department Staff Providing Information:

Recording Secretary: Kyaundra Ellis, Ohio Department of Education

Opening

Mike McGovern, Dyslexia 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. There were no objections to the meeting minutes. Minutes were approved.

Chair McGovern shared with the committee a comment made during the last state board meeting: “Dyslexia is a neurological brain defect”. Chair McGovern stated to the committee that dyslexia is another skill set for how we process language. It is not that the brain is defective, it’s the fact they don’t have the specific skill set. Dyslexia is another divergent skill.

Committee member Rebecca Tolson commented that a brain of a dyslexia individual is innovative and creative. We have to shift our instruction and thinking about how a child processes written language and become more intensive and explicit in certain areas for children with dyslexia.

Committee Member Amy Murdoch stated that the good news for educators is the kind of instruction children with dyslexia need is also effective for all human brains.

Report from the Department of Education

Dr. Melissa Weber-Mayrer, Director of the Office of Approaches to Teaching and Professional Learning at the Ohio Department of Education shared with the committee updates about House Bill 583 and what this means for some of the language in the Dyslexia guidebook.

Dr Melissa Weber-Mayrer introduced superintendent, Mr. Steve Dackin.

Dr. Sherine Tambyraja, Ohio Department of Education Dyslexia Administrator shared with the committee the Tier 1 screener process is moving along. The Ohio Department of Education’s professional development course is moving along as contracts are being developed. Sherine also shared with the committee that the department is partnering with the Ohio State University to develop the family toolkit in helping districts being able to communicate with families.

Questions and Comments:

- Committee Member Steve Griffin asked what is the rationale on the language to screening?
- Melissa Weber-Mayrner answered that part of the rationale is the screeners still have not been identified.

Parent and Student Spotlight

There was no parent and student spotlight.

Committee Discussion: Review and give feedback on Implementation Supports

Sherine Tambyraja, Dyslexia Administrator, and, LM Clinton, Third Grade Reading Guarantee Program Administrator presented the implementation supports manual and the reporting requirements.

The audience of the implementation support manual is for districts leaders and building leaders who focus is logistics.

Dr. Sherine Tambyraja addressed to the committee on the two sections the committee would be covering during today's meeting.

LM Clinton commented on the federal funding guidance table with resources in federal funding such as title funds, IDA part B: school-age agencies and IDA part B: school-age Childhood and Special Education ages 3-5 to show which parts of the Dyslexia laws could be funded through each of these sources such as. This information is available on the Ohio Department of Education website as a stand-alone document for districts to use to see which federal funding could be used for different parts of the dyslexia laws such as screeners, professional development, etc.

LM Clinton noted that EMIS has a 90-day public comment review process. Once the process is complete, reporting mechanisms of instruction will be added to the EMIS schedule. There is also the piece of reporting of the professional development which is done through a separate system at the Department of Education known as forms which will be available for superintendents to access.

Dr. Sherine Tambyraja opened the discussion for general thoughts, feedback, comments and questions regarding the implementation manual and the structure of it.

Questions and Open Comments

- What is covered within the website for certification?
- Trevor Thomas commented that he likes the allow lease funds for federal funds which is easier for administrators to access as it answers most questions.
- Amy Murdoch asked if this document is meant to be slim or more comprehensive to support implementation?
- Sherine Tambyraja answered that this document is meant to be slim and place all laws in one document.
- Trevor Thomas stated the implementation supports document is a document he sees being used by people like himself or those not on the dyslexia committee who need to understand how to hold their districts accountable.

- Amy Murdoch pointed out that the word “implementation” is how to implement something. Is there a more descriptive title that could be used?
- Dr. Melissa Weber-Mayrer mentioned that with the Third Grade Reading Guarantee laws and guidance document, we may be able to follow the same language for the implementation document. There will also be professional development opportunities around documents such as the implementation document.
- Dana Hamilton suggested removing the word “implementation”
- Chair McGovern suggested the title be changed from “implementation manual” to “administrative guide”
- Rebecca Tolson commented on chair McGovern’s idea and change the title to “administrative guide for dyslexia support laws” for our audience to be clear
- LaMonica Davis stated that she likes the appearance of the document and commented that “guidance” would be more beneficial.
- Dr. Sherine Tambyraja brought a topic to the center of the discussion to get the committee’s opinion:
 - Page 8 of the manual in the middle section of “what comes next” speaks about the “parent guardian or custodian of the individual”
 - The law makes a distinction between children with dyslexia tendencies versus dyslexia markers and the different actions to be taken. Would the committee like to make any suggestions on how to manage the distinction of the law?
- Rebecca Tolson pointed out that when we have these tendencies, she looks at all different aspects which could potentially happen for students (which is why screening is important) such as family history, ADHD, etc. The clear markers come after the screening.
- Amy Murdoch commented that in the law after tier 2 screening per is when the tendencies become a concern.
- Olivia Weisman commented on the language within the dyslexia screening. The first part states that within that tier 2 screener, there is a delineation between tendencies and markers. Would it be best practice to inform guardians or parents of the RIMP, the interventions and risk factors? How would we word it that after the tier 2 screener, if there are more concerns that would be when we would provide a structured literacy intervention program?
- Sherine Tambyraja stated that for individuals looking at the law, there are two letters which will go out to parents or guardians. The guidebook does an excellent job explaining tendencies, however, markers is not clear.
- Steve Griffin suggested that we screen, we intervene immediately, then re-screen in 6 weeks and provide an update every 6 weeks. We should try to connect this to the third grade reading guarantee. The marker is the response in instruction.
- LM Clinton shared with the committee the timelines within the law for the Third Grade Reading Guarantee reading diagnostic and that parents of dyslexia children must be notified immediately and contacted in writing.

- Olivia Weisman asked if within the guidance document we are able to provide a flowchart of the parent communication piece? If we could provide more clarity on the parent communication piece would provide support to parents.
- Dr. Sherine Tambyraja answered that Olivia's idea is a wonderful idea.
- LM Clinton stated that districts will likely report tier 1 results in EMIS
- Trevor Thomas mentioned a concern that was shared by BASA was parents' concern about their child being flagged for dyslexia

Committee Discussion: Certification

I. Training Requirements for Educators Providing Dyslexia Services

Dr. Sherine Tambyraja presented on the certification process training requirements for educators providing dyslexia services with the committee.

- The certification table talks about and is modeled after the Texas dyslexia guidebook which lays out all the certification programs
- Dr. Sherine Tambyraja shared her appreciation to Ashley Dyckson, Literacy Policy Intern for putting together the certification table.
- The certification table is easy to compare the different types of requirements which are needed for each program

II. Training Requirements of Approved Professional Development Courses

Dr. Sherine Tambyraja shared the training requirements of Approved Professional Development Courses with the committee.

III. Certification

Dr. Sherine Tambyraja presented the certification pathways process originally proposed by Amy Murdoch.

- Dr. Sherine Tambyraja mentioned the template that was put together by the dyslexia committee for individuals to use to document the completion of IDA courses, hours, and the K-PEERI exam.
- Amy Murdoch shared the ideas of the certification pathway process with the committee by placing all of the components that are required for certification together to make sure they had all the pieces in line.
- Additional column of current and updated information – Amy Murdoch suggestion with articulated examples. The big hoop is K-PEERI – Requiring a high score of before applying would be beneficial

Questions and Open Comments

- Amy Murdoch expressed her concern about verifying the accuracy of problems and keeping the list updated. Do we have the power to revise this table and list to maintain it's accuracy?
- Chair McGovern suggested a standing committee that meets once a year to review this specific chart
- Rebecca Tolson commented on one piece of the certification table where the practicum is 16 hours. Does this mean that the individual is certified? What does it mean to someone reading this chart?

- Dr. Sherine Tambyraja responded that the real value in this is that the list changes which is the important piece of this document. Sherine shared that she likes the idea of an annual review of the certification table.
- Amy Murdoch asked for more clarification on what the first 18 hours of any course that meets the requirements for the dyslexia certificate?
- Dr. Sherine Tambyraja explained the first 18 hours is one of the options for coursework towards certification or for anyone working towards certification once they have done 18 hours of that work within the professional development requirement.
- Amy Murdoch stated the training was pertaining to an IDA accredited course which covers the knowledge of practice standards outlined by IDA which is comprehensive. It would not be just 18 hours in one course.
- Trevor Thomas stated those who do the 18 hours will likely do the Ohio Department of Education course. Those that are signing up for their own program may stop at 18 or do their own coaching.
- Rebecca Tolson stated she would be happy to put together a review committee if needed by the committee to review the certification pathways.
- Rebecca Tolson- Accrediting bodies do have expiration dates on the certifications and exams. Continuing education requirements
- Dr. Sherine Tambyraja asked if the committee foresaw any issue with the timeline of completing these requirements?
- Rebecca Tolson answered there are some accreditations that have expiration timelines for trainings.
- Amy Murdoch suggested adding an additional column to the table: Evidence of current updated information.
- Dr. Melissa Weber-Mayrer asked whether we could have someone go straight to the exam to become certified?
- Rebecca Tolson answered that to be certified you have to have coursework and a practicum.
- Melissa Weber-Mayrer asked whether an educator could take and pass the exam similar to testing out of an area and then have an option to be certified that way?
- Rebecca Tolson answered that we'd also have to look at the teacher level work.
- Amy Murdoch answered that it would be how these individuals are trained in structured literacy.
- Dr. Melissa Weber-Mayrer asked if an educator passes the exam, they then receive a teacher certification, what does this mean?
- Rebecca Tolson answered that IDA has levels of certification. The first level which is a knowledge level is the teacher certification for passing the exam.
- Steve Griffin asked would individuals be impacted if they did a practicum with the passing of the exam?
- Amy Murdoch stated to the committee that if the individuals was in one of the IDA accredited courses, then yes. IDA does not accredit you unless you have completed a practicum that is accredited by IDA. It has to be a structured literacy practicum reviewed by IDA.

Committee Discussion: Professional Development

Dr. Sherine Tambyraja revisited the conversation from the March meeting on professional development.

Dr. Sherine Tambyraja shared with the committee the possibility of adding an additional pathway under the professional development section.

Questions and Open Comments

- Trevor Thomas shared with the committee one of the concerns that many districts are running into the issue that once someone is hired on who can provide professional development.
- Tricia Merenda informed the committee of who will be facilitating the professional development for the Ohio Department of Education course in early fall.
- Rebecca Tolson suggested a waiver for the 18 additional hours
- Steve Griffin reviewed the suggestion he made during March 31st committee meeting on professional development.
- Chair McGovern indicated that the committee had spend considerable time discussing the issue and recommended that the committee consider taking a vote.

Voting Item

Steve Griffin made a motion to approve the proposed pathway; Trevor Thomas seconded the motion.

Affirmative Votes: Chinnon Jaquay, Trevor Thomas, Steve Griffin

Negative: Olivia Weisman, Dana Hamilton, LaMonica Davis, LM Clinton, Mike McGovern, Melissa Spangler, Rebecca Tolson, Amy Murdoch

Motion not passed

Public comments

There was no public comment.

Next Steps

Our next meeting is June 28, 2022

Adjournment

Committee Chair, Mike McGovern adjourned the meeting at 1:30 p.m.