

Ohio Dyslexia Committee

March 29, 2022

Ohio Department of Education

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

Ohio Department of Education Presenters: Melissa Weber-Mayrer - Director of the Office of Approaches to Teaching and Professional Learning, Elizabeth Hess - Assistant Director of Literacy, 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.

Report from the Department of Education

Melissa Weber-Mayrer shared with the committee that she and her team met with the Teaching, Leading, and Learning Committee last week to discuss the guidebook revisions. Melissa also provided the committee with updates on the RFQ for assessments. The office of Assessment currently has all the applications in and will complete a technical review. Ohio Department of Education will put out a survey for external reviewers.

Parent and Student Spotlight

There was no parent spotlight.

Committee Discussion: Certification Pathways

Certification Language to consider adding

- A multidisciplinary team member must be certified or in the process of certification not later than the fall of 2022.
- The certification process is to be completed within two years of the start date.

- Amy Murdoch explained to the committee the Ohio certification requirements that matched the IDA certification. Amy provided to the committee the IDA requirements for accreditation from different accrediting bodies so that the Ohio Dyslexia Committee could match the requirements for individuals who have trainings in different areas.
- Melissa Spangler and Olivia Weisman presented to the committee on the certification language to consider adding into the guidebook.

Questions and Open Comments

Q: The requirements are identical to the requirements of accrediting bodies?

A: Yes, we wanted to parallel the body.

Q: Who would they submit this to in order to receive the certification?

A: This would be up for discussion.

There was further discussion about the details of the proposed adjustment.

Committee Discussion: Professional Development

Olivia Weisman and Melissa Spangler recommended to delete the “training provided by qualified instructors of Multisensory Structured Literacy Certification Programs”

Recommendation: Delete Language

Training Provided by Qualified Instructors of Multisensory Structured Literacy Certification Programs

Individuals qualified to provide the coursework and practicum approved for multisensory structured literacy certification may develop and provide training courses for the purpose of this requirement. If the qualified instructor is developing a course different from what is already approved through the multisensory structured literacy certification program, the course must be at least 18 hours and include the above content recommended by the Ohio Dyslexia Committee.

Questions and Open Comments

There were several clarifying questions about the possible impacts of deleting this language.

- Steve Griffin brought back a previous conversation that the committee had. The deletion of this language makes it more difficult and narrower to get the 18 hours. The assumption is that the Ohio Department of Education course will meet all the requirements needed. The need of each district is different, it is not a one size fits all.
- Steve Griffin suggested to the committee the following two options:
 - Broaden the language to include anyone who has instructor level training in any of the course offered by IDA and not just the accreditation plus certification courses to curate training specifically outlined by the Ohio Department of Education
 - Change the language to include anyone with the following licensing -You can insert the type of license you want. This can also include instructor level training accredited by IDA.
- Rebecca Tolson made a motion to pass the approved language of the Professional Development portion that the committee has put out. Amy Murdoch seconded the motion. The committee continued to discuss this issue.
- Steve Griffin made a motion to recommend language he submitted.
- Olivia Weisman and Chair Mike McGovern requested additional time to review.
- Beth Hess noted that ODE will reach out to Steve Griffin for additional information and at the next meeting will address whether the current recommendation was accepted by Ohio Department of Education and whether additional discussion is needed.

- Steve Griffin expressed his concerned about waiting until the next meeting as this information is urgently needed by districts.

Action Item: Vote on professional development options

Voting item: Professional Development options

Rebecca Tolson made a motion for the dyslexia committee to make a recommendation to the Department of Education to pass the approved language of the Professional Development that the committee has put out. Amy Murdoch seconded the motion.

Affirmative Votes: Dana Hamilton, Melissa Spangler, Olivia Weisman, Mike McGovern, Amy Murdoch, Rebecca Tolson

Negative Votes: Chinnon Jaquay, LM Clinton, Steve Griffin, Trevor Thomas

Motioned passed to recommend the Department of Education to approve the language of the professional development piece the Ohio Dyslexia Committee has put out.

I. Carve out for teachers of unified arts

Melissa Spangler addressed the committee with the next portion of the professional development and current recommendations, a carve out for teachers of unified arts. The Carve out includes Teachers of Art, Music, and Physical Education in grades K-3.

Carve out for teachers of unified arts

- **Teachers of Art, Music and Physical Education in Grades K-3**
- By the beginning of the **2023-2024** school year, teachers with a multi-age PreK-12 license in **Art, Music and Physical Education** who are teaching those subjects in **grades K-1** must complete **6 instructional hours** of approved professional development courses.
- By the beginning of the **2024-2025** school year, teachers with a multi-age PreK-12 license in **Art, Music and Physical Education** who are teaching those subjects in **grades 2-3** must complete **6 instructional hours** of approved professional development courses.

16

- Melissa Spangler stated that since reading is involved in all subject matters, this plan will give teachers a background in what helping a student with dyslexia looks like.
- It is important that teachers of unified arts get that additional professional development in order to best serve our students.
- Would this be a subject area that we can include into the

Recommendations on the content of the carve out courses were presented.

Questions and Open Comments

- Melissa Spangler asked the committee if they would like to include technology or technology teachers in this section as well?
- LM Clinton and Beth Hess stated that it would be based off the licensure of the subjects.
- Steve Griffith related his concern on the pathways and how to get teachers there.

- Olivia Weisman stated that Ohio Department of Education would put out the RFQ to have someone else create this content that would align with what is currently there.
- Elizabeth Hess addressed the committee that what the committee would be voting on is pertaining to the contact hours for those specific areas which would be required to complete the 6 hours of training as opposed to other teachers. This will feed into the approved list that the Ohio Department of Education maintains.
- Chair McGovern informed the committee that those 18 hours do count if you do go through IMSLEC or IDA. What does not count is for those trainers who created their own content or did not follow the IMSLEC or IDA content.
- Steve Griffin mentioned that it would be beneficial for our teachers

Action Item: Vote on the carve out for teachers of unified arts

Voting item: Carve out for teachers of unified arts

Olivia Weisman made a motion to approve the carve out for teachers of unified arts. Melissa Spangler seconded the motion.

Affirmative Votes: Chinnon Jaquay, LM Clinton, Steve Griffin, Trevor Thomas, Dana Hamilton, Melissa Spangler, Olivia Weisman, Mike McGovern, Amy Murdoch

Committee Discussion: Review requested Guidebook Changes from the Teaching, Leading, and Learning Committee.

Elizabeth Hess presented to the committee the general comments from the Teaching, Leading, and Learning comments regarding the guidebook. The committee had a robust discussion on the requested guidebook changes and or revisions.

The Dyslexia Committee members had a round of introductions to discuss their role in their districts for the Teaching, Leading, and Learning committee.

I. Comments from Ms. Fessler

- Ms. Fessler states that the guidebook as currently written overreaches in some its' recommendations. The guidebook repeatedly indicates that best practice is to screen three times a year. It must be clear what is required, or misinterpretations may lead to unnecessary conflict with families who interpret the Guidebook as an absolute.

II. Request from Mr. Miller

- First and foremost I'd like a response from the Dyslexia Committee regarding evidence based screening and intervention as required by ORC 3323.25 (E), and the conflict with ORC 3323.25 (E) that Orton Gillingham and other similar multi-sensory structured literacy programs are not evidence based, but research based. Can the Dyslexia Committee provide examples of evidence based multi-sensory structured literacy programs, so they are not in conflict with ORC 3323.25(E)?

III. Executive Summary

- Delete the following sentence of **Although the focus of Ohio's dyslexia support laws and this guidebook center on screening, intervention and remediation procedures, the guidebook additionally highlights that, as best practice, alignment among all levels of**

instruction that incorporate a structured literacy approach will reinforce the learning process for children with dyslexia or dyslexic characteristics and tendencies.

- Amy Murdoch objects to removing this sentence as this is a clear best practice for children with dyslexia. This sentence reiterates that our work is to outline best practices and this to me is considered a best practice.
- Olivia Weisman agreed with Amy Murdoch as this aligns our work from different tiers to support our readers.
- Trevor Thomas stated that he struggles with accepting this recommendation although he hears the concern from the Teaching, Leading and Learning Committee.
- Steve Griffin suggested re-wording this sentence
- Vice Chair Johnson stated she'd like to see the re-wording Steve suggested so she can take it back to the Teaching, Leading, Learning Committee for review

This revision was marked as not accepted by the Ohio Dyslexia Committee

- An addition of: The Ohio Dyslexia Guidebook is structured to directly reflect the obligations of the Ohio Dyslexia Committee and the dyslexia support laws. • Section 1 explains best practices in literacy instruction for children with dyslexia or children displaying dyslexic characteristics and tendencies
- Olivia Weisman stated that she would object this, however, reading back to this, this is referring to Ohio's plan to raise literacy achievement.
- Amy Murdoch stated that one large piece of the Guidebook was to connect to the larger work of Ohio and not have it be a separate set of disconnect
- Chair McGovern stated that about 2/3 of the state and country of K-12 students has been around for decades and are not proficient in reading. There is a need for better instruction. We have to address all students that are struggling.
- Vice Chair Johnson mentioned to the committee that one of the struggles the board is having is whether this is the law. Vice chair Johnson's question to the committee was on whether or not this the law?

Trevor Thomas made a motion to add a sentence at the end of the executive summary. LM Clinton seconded the motion to accept the revision.

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

This revision was marked as accepted by the Ohio Dyslexia Committee

IV. Page 3

- Request to add the revised code reference to the table
 - Requirement Start date or deadline Screening and Progress Monitoring (page 21) ORC 3323.251

The committee had no objections to the above request to add the revised code to reference the table.

- There was a request to remove the highlighted section and to add the follow "...student's parent, guardian..." Administer universal screening (tier 1) to all students in grades K-3. • Administer universal screening (tier 1) to students in grades 4-6 whose parents/guardians request, or teacher requests (with parent/guardian approval), and the student's parent, guardian, or custodian grants permission for the screening measure to be administered.

- Administer universal screening (tier 1) to students in grades 1-6 whose parents/guardians request or teacher requests (with parent/guardian approval) ,and the student's parent, guardian, or custodian grants permission for the screening measure to be administered. 2023-2024 school year and beyond
- Communication with Parents and Guardians (page 29) **ORC 3323.251**
- Multisensory Structured Literacy Certification Process (page 47) **ORC 3319.078**
- ~~Districts must establish their multisensory structured literacy certification process.~~ Each city, local, and exempted village school district shall establish a multi-sensory structured literacy certification process for teachers providing instruction for students in grades kindergarten through three employed by the district. Each process shall align with the guidebook developed under section **3323.25** of the Revised Code. 2022-2023 school year
- Teacher Professional Development **ORC 3319.077**
- The committee would like this to be a copy and past for exact language

The committee had no objections, and the above revisions were accepted of removals and additions.

V. Page 4

- Mr. Miller and Ms. Newman would like the table of screening requirements to be incorporated into one large table of requirements as part of the Executive Summary. Then to add the following sentence:
 - The remainder of this guidebook was developed by the Ohio Dyslexia Committee (ODC) as required by ORC 3323.25 (C)(1). The following information provides the ODC's recommended best practices for schools as they implement multisensory structured literacy into their curriculum.

This revision was marked as accepted to add the requested addition sentence.

- Olivia Weisman stated that this statement is accurate
- Amy Murdoch stated that within the first paragraph of the Executive Summary that we do make it clear what best practices are and that it is not misleading as the committee has done a good job of delineating best practices
- Trevor Thomas asked the committee: "Should we asked the committee whether we should add "recommendations not required by law?"

VI. Page 7- Introduction

- Revision to remove the following sentence from the introduction page: ~~Far too many Ohio students are not reading on grade level. In many cases, differences in student outcomes can be linked to differences in access to high-quality educational experiences.~~
 - Amy Murdoch had an objection to removing the above sentences on page 7.
 - Trevor Thomas accepted the above sentence on page 7 as the state board has made it clear that the committee may be editorializing.
 - Chinnon Jaquay asked if the following sentence could be revised. Chair McGovern stated that we could.
 - Amy Murdoch stated that it is important to say that we are not doing okay with literacy. Heightening the awareness and the issue is what we are doing here.
 - Rebecca Tolson recommended to use NAEP data –
 - Dyslexia is the most widely studied and the most common form of a reading disability, affecting 5–17% of the population (Elliott & Grigorenko, 2014; Fletcher et al., 2018; Lyon et al., 2003).

- Olivia Weisman stated what if we changed the language to provide factual data and remove the sentence after.
- Vice Chair Johnson stated her concern with the above statement. When you make a statement such as the above, you are placing the blame where it does not belong. There is an uncomfortable tone that lays here.

Amy Murdoch motioned not to accept the revision to delete the sentence. In place, Amy motioned to replace the two highlighted sentences with Ohio NAEP Data. Chinnon Jaquay seconded the motion.

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

The following revision was not accepted by the Ohio Dyslexia Committee.

- Revision to remove the following sentence from the introduction page: ~~The percentage of students experiencing characteristics of dyslexia has been reported to be as high as 15%–20% (Elliott & Grigorenko, 2014; Fletcher et al., 2019; International Dyslexia Association, 2012). The severity and resources needed to address these characteristics will vary based on the individual needs of a student.~~
 - Rebecca Tolson objected to removing the following sentence. Rebecca suggested adding the actual data.
 - Amy Murdoch seconded the motion to objecting the removal of the following sentence
 - Olivia Weisman suggested changing the word “severity and”
 - Steve Griffin made a motion to re-word the following sentence to read: “The resources needed to address these characteristics will vary based on the severity on the individual needs of a student.
 - Olivia Weisman and Dana Hamilton proposed the following sentence: “The resources needed to address these characteristics will vary based on the students reading profile”

Olivia Weisman motioned to remove the word “Severity and” to replace with the following sentence. “The resources needed to address these characteristics will vary based on the students reading profile”. Chinnon Jaquay seconded the motion.

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

- Revision to remove the following sentence from the introduction page: ~~Myths and misunderstandings about dyslexia are prevalent and persistent (see gaablub.com for some common examples). Teachers desire to have every student learn to read. As the collective knowledge about dyslexia grows, parents and educators are seeking support to more effectively educate students with dyslexia and dyslexic characteristics and tendencies. The Ohio Dyslexia Committee believes the topic of dyslexia has the power to unite parents and schools around the common goal of raising reading achievement for all students. It is from this perspective that this guidebook is written.~~
 - Amy Murdoch objected to remove the following statement as it is an important section and a positive statement.
 - Ms. Fessler stated the reason why this statement was an issue and how it is editorializing.
 - Vice Chair Johnson reminded the committee to focus on what truly needs to be in the guidebook. The more you choose to leave information in this guidebook that does not need to be in here will have a difficult time being approved.
 - Trevor Thomas accepted to keep the paragraph
 - Olivia Weisman stated that the reason that the Myths and Misunderstandings is needed here as there are lots of myths around dyslexia.

- Board member Fessler made a comment to the committee that this piece could go in the professional development piece.

Amy Murdoch motioned to keep the statement and not delete. Olivia Weisman seconded the motion.

Affirmative: Dana Hamilton, Melissa Spangler, Olivia Weisman, Mike McGovern, Amy Murdoch, Rebecca Tolson

Abstained: Chinnon Jaquay, LM Clinton, Trevor Thomas, Steve Griffin

VII. Page 9- Section 1: Best Practices in Literacy Instruction

- The following was requested by Chair Manchester to make the following text in bold and all caps: **The recommended best practices described in this section should not be construed as legal requirements but are offered as guidance to providing the most effective literacy instruction to students with dyslexia or who may be at risk of dyslexia.**

There was no objection to the above request made by Chair Manchester.

- The following revision was requested to remove the following two sentence in section 1 of best practices in literacy instruction: ~~When best practices are not followed, struggling readers, including those with dyslexia, are unlikely to become proficient in reading. Although best practices may not be legal requirements for reading instruction, they are supported by extensive research with empirical data and will lead to significantly better outcomes for students.~~

The following revision was accepted by the Ohio Dyslexia Committee.

- That being said, a significant percentage of students struggling with reading do have dyslexia (Fletcher et al., 2019). The approaches outlined in this guidebook, based in the science of reading, are focused on providing systems of support that will prevent reading failure for most students and identify and support students who are challenged with reading, including those with dyslexia and other reading disabilities.

Amy Murdoch made an objection to not remove the following paragraph.

Chinnon Jaquay offered to accept the revision.

Chinnon Jaquay motioned to accept the deletion. Trevor Thomas seconded the motion.

Affirmative Votes: LM Clinton, Chinnon Jaquay

Abstained Votes: Steve Griffin, Dana Hamilton, Rebecca Tolson, Melissa Spangler, Olivia Weisman, Mike McGovern, Amy Murdoch

The following motion to remove the following sentences failed. The following sentences will remain.

- There was a request to remove the following sentence: This guidebook aims to support Ohio's school districts to become better prepared to meet the needs of **the full range of students with reading difficulties, including those with dyslexia**

There was no objection to the above request

- There was a request to remove the following sentence: **Best Practices for Effective Reading Instruction**
- There was a request to remove the following paragraph within the best practices section: **Because reading is not a natural or innate skill, becoming a reader must not be left to chance. Reading instruction is most effective when it is taught explicitly and systematically. Teaching**

methods focusing only on student development or maturation, creating a literacy-rich environment or fostering a love of reading are insufficient, likely leaving many students without the basic literacy competencies.

Steve Griffin suggested to remove the last sentence.

Trevor Thomas motioned to remove the third sentence. Chinnon Jaquay seconded the motion.

Affirmative Votes: Chinnon Jaquay, LM Clinton, Trevor Thomas, Dana Hamilton, Melissa Spangler, Olivia Weisman, Mike McGovern, Rebecca Tolson

Abstained Votes: Amy Murdoch, Steve Griffin, Mike McGovern

The following was accepted by the committee to keep the first two sentences and remove the 3rd sentence.

VIII. Page 10- Explicit and Systematic Instruction

- On page 10, there was a request to delete the following sentence: Instruction that is not explicit and systematic often is described as constructivist, problem-based, student-led or discovery learning approaches. These approaches involve minimal teacher structure and guidance as students construct their own knowledge. They are typically less effective when building the foundational reading skills to a level of automaticity that allows students to gain meaning from text (Kirschner et al., 2006; Sweller et al., 2007). This may be especially true for young students who are just acquiring reading and for older struggling readers, such as those with dyslexia.

Mike McGovern objected to remove this sentence.

The following request on page 10 was rejected.

IX. Page 11- Bottom of page/ next to the last paragraph

- Chair Manchester made the following comment for the paragraph at the bottom of page 11: The term “structured” refers to the systematic way teachers organize the sequencing, presentation and integration of the language components that support skilled reading and writing within a systemic hierarchy of tiered supports for all learners. Structured literacy approaches facilitate children’s ability to learn how to map speech to print, which is the core difficulty for students with dyslexia and students with dyslexic characteristics and tendencies.
- The following request was made to add the following sentence copied from page 30: Students who experience risk for dyslexia do not necessarily have dyslexia. The goal of early identification of risk is the provision of early intervention that can prevent or minimize the impact of reading difficulties such as dyslexia. Appendix C provides more information on what parents and guardians can watch for in their children’s language, literacy, and academic development
- Chinnon Jaquay motioned to accept the change on page 11. Trevor Thomas seconded the motion.

Affirmative Votes: Chinnon Jaquay, LM Clinton, Steve Griffin, Trevor Thomas, Dana Hamilton, Melissa Spangler, Olivia Weisman, Mike McGovern, Rebecca Tolson

Abstained Votes: Amy Murdoch

- Motioned passed. The committee had a robust discussion of removing the language from page 30 that has now been added to page 11.
- Elizabeth Hess stated that a reference could be kept to appendix C.

- Elizabeth Hess made a reference to adding a reference note on page 29 referencing appendix C provides more information if this language were to be removed.

X. Page 12 – Common Instructional practices defining structured literacy approaches include the characteristics of effective reading instruction

The following request was made to remove the following sentences on page 12: While structured literacy approaches are especially effective with struggling readers and students with reading disabilities, students with language-based disabilities, students for whom English is not their first language and students without reading difficulties benefit from this approach (Snow & Juel, 2005). All students deserve access to teachers who are prepared to deliver reading instruction that is grounded in the science of reading and structured literacy.

- Amy Murdoch made a motion to object the following request. Amy suggested keeping the first sentence with removing the last sentence as it is editorial.

Amy Murdoch motioned to keep the 1st sentence but to delete the 2nd sentence. Steve Griffin seconded the motion.

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

XI. Page 13- Delete the entire page

- The following request was made by the Teaching, Leading, and Learning committee to delete the entire page 13.
- Chinnon Jaquay objected to removing the entirety of page 13.

The following request on page 13 was not accepted

XII. Page 14

The following request was made to remove the following paragraph on page 14: The following is a list of common instructional practices that are not consistent with a structured literacy approach and may impede the progress of children with dyslexia or at risk of dyslexia because they are not effective at triggering orthographic mapping and instant word recognition. Research and additional resources supporting this list are provided in Appendix A. • Drawing shapes around words • Vision therapy and using colored overlays • “Brain-based” exercises such as “crossing the midline” • Assessing with tools that rely on the three-cueing system such as running records/reading records • Prompting students to decode with cues such as “does it look right?”; “does it sound right?”; “does it make sense?”; “does the word look like another word you know?”

- Olivia Weisman objected to the following deletion request on page 14.
- Vice Chair Johnson stated the reason for this request.
- Amy Murdoch stated that the committee softened this language to show how these practices do not work for struggling students
- Steve Griffin asked the following question Would it be best to take out “At risk of dyslexia” and focus on the children with dyslexia
- The following request was not accepted by the Ohio Dyslexia Committee

XIII. Page 21

The following request were made on page 21.

Section 2: Methods for Screening, Intervention-Based Assessment and Progress Monitoring

Highlight/use bold font/larger font

- **Screening assessments are not designed to diagnose dyslexia but rather to identify risk.** To effectively identify students with dyslexia or children at risk of dyslexia, schools must first start by screening all

students. An effective screening process includes the full student population and, through a process of deduction, identifies students demonstrating risk factors. A multi-tiered process then takes those students who have been identified through an initial screener and assesses them further to determine the students' need for intervention and support. Casting a "wide net" at the beginning of the process ensures that students who may have dyslexia do not somehow "slip through the cracks" and miss the opportunity for interventions and supports that could help them during the critical early years of literacy development.

There were no objections by the Ohio Dyslexia Committee. The following request was accepted.

- Recommendations pertaining to best practices in administering screening and progress monitoring assessments will be noted in bold within this section of the guidebook but are not required unless specifically stated in Ohio's Dyslexia Support laws (ORC 3323.251). **It is strongly recommended by the Ohio Dyslexia Committee to conduct brief universal screening (tier 1 dyslexia screening) three times a year to students in kindergarten through grade 3.**

Amy Murdoch objected to removing the following sentence.

The committee did not accept the following request

- **By providing robust structured literacy instruction and intervention at the first sign of risk, educators can positively impact all students at risk for reading concerns.** Through a multi-tiered system of supports, educators can identify and meet the needs of students at risk for dyslexia and those with other reading concerns. An immediate instructional response to the early signs of difficulty uncovered during universal screening (tier 1 dyslexia screening) can positively impact the future for students at risk for dyslexia.
- Chair McGovern objected the request.
- Chinnon Jaquay accepted the request due to the sentences that follow afterwards

Chinnon Jaquay motioned to accept the changes. Steve Griffin seconded the motion.

Affirmative Votes: Chinnon, LM, Trevor, Rebecca Tolson

Negative Votes: Steve Griffin, Dana Hamilton, Melissa Spangler, Olivia Weisman, Mike McGovern, Amy Murdoch

The following request was not accepted by the Ohio Dyslexia Committee

XIV. Page 22

The following requests were made to make additions by the Teaching, Leading, Learning committee:

- Grades 1-3: Administer a tier 1 dyslexia screening measure upon request of a student's parent or guardian or request of a student's teacher **with the permission of the student's parent or guardian.** **and the student's parent, guardian, or custodian grants permission for the screening measure to be administered**

There was no objection made by the Ohio Dyslexia Committee

- Grades 4-6 by Request: Screen students in grades 4-6 upon request of a student's parent or guardian or request of a student's teacher **with the permission of the student's parent or guardian.** **and the student's parent, guardian, or custodian grants permission for the screening measure to be administered**

There was no objection by the Ohio Dyslexia Committee

XV. Page 23

The following request was made by BASA:

- As noted above, although Ohio’s dyslexia support laws (ORC 3323.251) require students to be administered one universal screening measure (tier 1 dyslexia screening), it is considered best practice to screen all kindergarten-grade 3 students with a universal screening measure (tier 1 dyslexia screening) three times a year.
- If a significant number of students are at risk on universal screening, it is a strong indicator that reading instruction generally is not effective. Additionally, it is difficult to claim that any individual student who is learning in this instructional context has dyslexia and difficult to provide the student with more intensive support.

XVI. Page 30

The following request was made to bold the following sentence:

- **Students who experience risk for dyslexia do not necessarily have dyslexia. The goal of early identification of risk is the provision of early intervention that can prevent or minimize the impact of reading difficulties such as dyslexia. Appendix C provides more information on what parents and guardians can watch for in their children’s language, literacy and academic development.**

Steve Griffin motioned to revise the above sentence.

XVII. Page 36

The following request was made to bold the following sentence:

- **Tier 3 is not synonymous with special education. It is not necessary for a student to have a diagnosis of a disability such as dyslexia before getting reading support, even intensive reading support. It is not necessary for a student to wait for a contrived period of intervention before receiving intensive reading support. In fact, careful monitoring of how students respond to intensive instruction is an accurate way to identify the students whose need for support will be ongoing and may require special education resources.**

XVIII. Page 47

The following request was made to remove the following:

- Other districts may need choose to start at stage 1 to help them meet the legal requirements. Each of the four stages outlined below includes a bulleted list of recommended ways districts may choose from to meet the goal at each step.

Action Item: Discuss recommended revisions to Guidebook

Public comments

There were no public comments

Next Steps

Our next meeting is April 28, 2022

Adjournment

Mike McGovern adjourned the meeting at 4:05 p.m.

