

# Dyslexia Working Group

## 2020 Annual Report

Submitted to:  
**Katy Anthes, Ph.D., Commissioner of Education**

By:  
**Dyslexia Working Group**

Authored by:  
**Debbie Hunsaker, M.ED., Facilitator of the Dyslexia Working Group**

July 2020

---

The Dyslexia Working Group is staffed by the  
Colorado Department of Education.  
For more information, contact Melissa Colman, Associate Commissioner for Student Learning  
201 E. Colfax Ave., Denver, CO 80203  
303-866-6737  
[colman\\_m@cde.state.co.us](mailto:colman_m@cde.state.co.us)



**COLORADO**  
Department of Education



---

# Table of Contents

**Introduction** 3

---

About the Dyslexia Working Group

**Process of the Dyslexia Working Group** 3

---

Formation and Facilitation of the Dyslexia Working Group

Work Plan for the Dyslexia Working Group

Progress and Activities of the Dyslexia Working Group

**Outcomes and Recommendations** 5

---

Appropriate Dyslexia Screening Tools

Appropriate Dyslexia Screening Process

Comprehensive Assessments

**Next Steps for the Dyslexia Working Group** 10

---

Planned Activities of the Dyslexia Working Group

**Appendices** 11

---

Appendix A

Appendix B

---



## Introduction

---

During the 2019 legislative session, the Colorado General Assembly called for the creation of a Dyslexia Working Group (DWG) through the passage of H.B. 19-1134. See section 22-20.5-103, C.R.S. Under the statute, the Commissioner of Education was required to convene a working group to improve the educational outcomes for student with dyslexia. The DWG has seven tasks outlined in statute:

1. Analyze current national and statewide data related to students identified as having dyslexia, including but not limited to identification rates and achievement rates;
2. Analyze the implementation and demonstrated effectiveness in other states of statewide legislation for dyslexia screening, educator training, and other dyslexia related laws;
3. Identify and recommend appropriate dyslexia screening tools and processes as well as comprehensive assessments that address the recognized challenges of dyslexia, including phonological processing, phonemic awareness, and decoding and encoding skills;
4. Identify and recommend a statewide plan for supporting students who are identified as having dyslexia, including specific intervention structures and their components, which must include evidence-based interventions, progress-monitoring systems, and data collection systems;
5. Identify and recommend components of dyslexia awareness training for Colorado educators, including the content, target audience, time frame for training, and projected cost;
6. Identify and recommend educator training for in-state approved programs of preparation for teacher and alternative teacher programs and recommended training for current educators, based on effective practice in other states, as well as recommendation from state and national organizations focusing on literacy. The recommendations concerning educator training may include the content, target audience, time frame for training, and projected cost; and,
7. Provide recommendations to CDE concerning the design and implementation of the pilot program.

In addition, the Dyslexia Working Group must, “analyze and integrate, as appropriate, the work and recommendations of other previous and ongoing state initiative related to improving the identification and support of students who have dyslexia.”

## Process

---

### Selection of Working Group Members

The authorizing legislation for the DWG required the group to include the following members:

- A parent of a child identified with dyslexia;
- A parent of a child identified with dyslexia and a disability;
- A school district literacy specialist;
- A school district director of special education;
- A state or national literacy expert;
- A state of national dyslexia expert;
- Two elementary grade teachers, one of whom teaches in a rural or small rural school district;
- A principal of an elementary school in rural school district or an employee of a BOCES who has expertise as a literacy specialist;



- A faculty member of an IHE who teaches in an approved educator preparation program for elementary grade teachers; and
- A member of the local chapter of the international dyslexia association.

CDE solicited nominations and applications for the DWG to determine appointment recommendations for the Commissioner of Education. The application was open from June 2019 through August 2019 with 79 applications received for the 11 positions on the DWG. CDE recommended applicants to the Commissioner for appointment based on the quality of their application packet and their ability to serve through the duration of the working group. At the direction of the Commissioner, CDE made it a priority to include members who were representative from across the state, including small rural and rural districts, urban and suburban districts. Table 1 shows the membership of the DWG.

**TABLE 1: Dyslexia Working Group Membership by Region and Role**

Member	Region	Role
John Alexander	Out of State	A state or national literacy expert
Jamie Brackney	Pikes Peak	A parent of a child who is identified as having dyslexia and a disability
Alex Christy	Metro Area	Two elementary grade teachers, one of whom teaches in a rural school district or a small rural school district
Kathleen Collins	Northwest	A principal who is employed at an elementary school in a rural school district or an employee of a board of cooperative services who has expertise as a literacy specialist
Tamara Durbin	Northeast	A school district director of special education
Amanda Harris	West Central	Two elementary grade teachers, one of whom teaches in a rural school district or a small rural school district
Karin Johnson	Metro	A parent of a child who is identified as having dyslexia and a disability
Andrea Kamper	Northwest	A parent of a child who is identified as having dyslexia
Karen Leopold	Metro Area	A member of the local chapter of an international dyslexia association
Kathy McCall	North Central	A school district literacy specialist
Laura Santerre-Lemmon	Metro Area	A state or national dyslexia expert
Jennifer Urbach	North Central	A faculty member of an institution of higher education who teaches in an approved educator preparation program for elementary grade teachers

### Facilitation of the Working Group

CDE contracted with an objective, skilled, third-party facilitator to manage the working group meetings and record the working group’s recommendations through regular reports required within the authorizing statute. After conducting a transparent process to solicit proposals from interested individuals, the department selected Ms. Deborah Hunsaker, M.ED., as the facilitator of the Dyslexia Working Group. Literacy expertise, content knowledge of dyslexia, as well as facilitation experience was considered in making the decision.



## Process for Conducting the Working Group

For the 2019-20 school year, the department scheduled the DWG meetings for the following dates:

- September 20, 2019
- October 17, 2019
- December 6, 2019
- January 8, 2020
- March 12, 2020
- April 8, 2020
- May 22, 2020

The initial focus of the DWG was on the first two deliverables within their charge:

- Analysis of current national and statewide data related to students identified as having dyslexia, including but not limited to identification rates and achievement rates; and
- Analysis of the implementation and demonstrated effectiveness in other states of statewide legislation for dyslexia screening, educator training, and other dyslexia-related laws.

Due to the COVID-19 health crisis, the DWG continued their work through on-line virtual meetings in April and May. Several small working groups were formed, and a team lead was identified from each group. Team leads met with the facilitator to determine the agenda for the small working groups and for the DWG virtual meetings. The focus of the DWG was on the third and final deliverable within their charge:

- Identify and recommend appropriate dyslexia screening tools and processes as well as comprehensive assessments that address the recognized challenges of dyslexia, including phonological processing, phonemic awareness, and decoding and encoding skills;
- Provide recommendations to CDE concerning the design and implementation of the pilot program.

All meetings of the Dyslexia Working Group were open to the public; however, only working group members have an active role in the meeting. CDE has developed a DWG webpage (<http://www.cde.state.co.us/coloradoliteracy/codydyslexiaworkgroup>) where all meeting dates, locations, and notes are posted for transparency.

## Outcomes and Recommendations

---

### Analysis of Dyslexia Policies of Other States

The DWG researched and reviewed nine other state plans. These nine plans were selected by the facilitator, using the International Dyslexia Association website (<https://dyslexiaida.org>) outlining the legislation status of each state.

According to the International Dyslexia Association review, in the “2013 initial review, only 22 states had dyslexia laws. Furthermore, many of these states only hinted at dyslexia within their existing laws, but there was little guidance as to how to identify and help individuals with dyslexia. As of the review in March of 2018, 42 states have dyslexia-specific laws, and, among the states that have passed laws, most have updated their education codes to clearly define dyslexia and provide guidelines to school districts on how to identify dyslexia and provide evidence-based interventions. Ten states now have a dyslexia handbook and one



state has a resource guide, and the term dyslexia is now an integral part of parent-teacher conferences, Individualized Education Plans (IEPs), 504 plans, and the school community as a whole.”

The nine states selected had web accessible written guidance or handbooks that were available for review. The group divided into subcommittees to review and analyze the states plans. The group used the following guiding questions when reviewing each plan:

- As you read the state plan and reviewed the website, what stood out to you about statewide legislation for dyslexia? What are the highlights?
- How has each state implemented statewide legislation for dyslexia screening, educator training, and other dyslexia-related laws?
- What is the effectiveness of the statewide legislation for dyslexia screening, educator training, and other dyslexia-related laws?

From this review, the group eliminated further study into Arizona, California, and Tennessee. The DWG members determined that these state plans lacked specificity, professional development aspects, and actionable guidelines. The group continued to review and analyze plans from Arkansas, Louisiana, Mississippi, New Jersey, Oregon and Texas. While strengths varied plan to plan, the group determined that further time and research would be valuable on the basis of website (i.e., tools, support, accessibility), specificity in screening and curriculum, professional development and teacher training. Full notes on the state plans are included as Appendix B of this report.

### **Analysis of Current National and Statewide Data**

In the fall, the group analyzed the National Assessment of Educational Progress (NAEP) data for reading using the available 2017 data for 4<sup>th</sup> grade students. This set of data was selected because it is standardized across the country so states can be compared. Colorado ranked higher than 21 states, lower than 3 states, and not significantly different from 26 states. Colorado remains below the national average in Scaled Score for Students with Disabilities. The group determined that while the data was useful for determining general achievement in reading in each state, the NAEP data includes subsets for students with disabilities, but lacks specificity to dyslexia and that achievement scores are only one measure of student success. Dyslexia specific data sets are not often collected, and when they are, states are not making that data accessible to the public. The NAEP data did give the group another source to consider achievement success when reviewing the selected plans. Of the state plans listed for further exploration, only one, New Jersey, had a higher scaled score than Colorado (233 compared with 225) in 2017. Likewise, only New Jersey and Colorado performed higher than the national average scaled score (221). A summary of NAEP data is included in table 2.



TABLE 2: 2017 NAEP Scores in 4<sup>th</sup> Grade Reading

**National Assessment of Educational Progress (NAEP)  
2017 Reading Data for Reviewed Dyslexia State Plans**

State	2017 At or Above Basic	2017 At or Above Proficient	2017 Scaled Score	2017 Scaled Score for Students with Disabilities*	2015 Scaled Score for Students with Disabilities*
<b>NATION</b>	67%	36%	221	186	186
Arizona	61%	30%	215	183	177
Arkansas	63%	31%	216	171	181
California	62%	31%	215	175	165
<b>COLORADO</b>	71%	40%	225	178	178
Louisiana	56%	26%	212	180	184
Mississippi	60%	27%	215	182	181
New Jersey	78%	49%	233	204	203
Oregon	63%	33%	218	182	183
Tennessee	65%	33%	219	182	176
Texas	60%	29%	215	186	182

\*The students with disabilities groups includes all students with disabilities and may contain students with dyslexia depending on identification guidelines of each state.

In December, the group examined the 2019 NAEP data for 4<sup>th</sup> grade and compared the results to the 2017 data to determine if additional state plans needed to be selected for review. The group discussed if there were any changes to states NAEP data from 2017 to 2019, if the group needed more time to research and analyze the 2019 data, and if the group felt any different in moving forward with the state plans, they were currently reviewing. The group determined that the selected state plans for review would stay the same.



TABLE 3: 2019 NAEP Scores in 4<sup>th</sup> Grade Reading

National Assessment of Educational Progress (NAEP) 2019 Reading Data for Reviewed Dyslexia State Plans					
State	At or Above Basic	At or Above Proficient	2017 Scaled Score	2019 Scaled Score	2019 Scaled Score for students with disabilities*
NATION	67%	36%	221	220	184
Arkansas	63%	31%	216	215	173
COLORADO	71%	40%	225	225	184
Louisiana	56%	26%	212	210	180
Mississippi	60%	27%	215	219	193
New Jersey	78%	49%	233	227	197
Oregon	63%	33%	218	218	183
Texas	60%	29%	215	216	181

\*Students with disabilities score includes all disabilities with no specificity for dyslexia.

### Recommendations

The DWG used a consensus process to propose and decide on recommendations. The process involved three phases: initial, substantial, and final. Initial recommendations would be proposed by the small working groups, and the DWG would ask questions and provide feedback. During this, the small working groups would answer the questions and sometimes do additional research to bring back to the DWG. Then, the facilitator would ask for a vote for a substantial recommendation, which meant the DWG had consensus (enough of an agreement on substance) on what was being recommended. DWG members would indicate if they agreed with the substantial recommendations. If they had any final questions or feedback, the substantial recommendations would be tabled until the next meeting when additional information could be provided. If there were no additional questions, the facilitator would ask for a vote on final recommendations to be written into the final report.

### Final Recommendations for Appropriate Dyslexia Screening Tools

The DWG researched dyslexia screening tools by analyzing other state plans and the content of the CDE Dyslexia Handbook. Based on that analysis, the DWG recommends five criteria for inclusion on a dyslexia screening tool.

The recommended criteria are:

- **Difficulty with phonological processing**, which impacts one’s ability to effectively decode letters into blended sounds to form words. A fundamental phonological processing problem may block access to more advanced aspects of reading, such as word identification and comprehension.
- **Slow, inaccurate, or labored oral reading**, i.e., lack of reading fluency.
- **Difficulty with spelling**, as demonstrated in an inability to efficiently write the letters comprising words from memory; increased time needed to spell words; and spelling errors that may be apparent.
- **Difficulty with rapid naming** may be evident, making it difficult to quickly retrieve the speech sounds and the correct letter-order patterns required to be an efficient reader or speller.
- **Letter naming identification** as an important benchmark in winter kindergarten and spring and fall and winter for first grade.





The DWG recommends that CDE develop guidance on differentiating the five criteria for dyslexia screening tools by grade level. A specific suggestion is to develop a chart that shows each of the five criteria and appropriate times for administration by grade level in conjunction with the READ Act procedures in place. The chart should be posted next to the READ Act approved interim assessments list on CDE's website. The DWG also recommends requesting additional information from the seven approved vendors on the READ Act approved interim assessments list around the five criteria for dyslexia screening tools, so educators are able to see at a glance which assessments meet each of the five criteria. The DWG recommends that the READ Act be amended to require the five criteria for dyslexia screening tools to be a part of all READ Act approved interim assessments.

In addition, the DWG recommends that CDE provide guidance to schools that the READ Act screening process shall assess for dyslexia risk and that significant reading deficiency is indicative of the characteristics of dyslexia (difficulty with phonological processing, slow, inaccurate or labored oral reading, difficulty with spelling, difficulty with rapid naming, letter naming identification for kindergarten and first grade). The DWG recommends the legislature require that dyslexia screening tools be used by all schools. The DWG will develop a flowchart to guide schools in situational models for appropriate administration of the dyslexia screening process, including dyslexia specific screening tools. The DWG also recommends the legislature provide a timeline for implementation after the 2021 legislative session with schools implementing a dyslexia screening process recommended by the DWG by the fall of 2021.

### Initial Recommendations for Comprehensive Assessments

During the research on comprehensive assessments, the DWG identified several considerations for comorbidities, which is defined in the CDE Dyslexia handbook as the coexistence of dyslexia with one or more other identified conditions (e.g., dyslexia + attention deficit hyperactivity disorder; dyslexia + anxiety). The DWG identified initial recommendations for the consideration of comorbidities, including consideration at all stages of the *comprehensive diagnostic assessment for dyslexia identification*. The DWG also recommends consideration of potential co-occurring concerns, including common comorbidities such as expressive language, reading comprehension, listening comprehension, written expression, attention/EF, mathematics (i.e., memorizing numbers, multiplication facts, story problems), executive function, fine-motor and social/emotional challenges, and as the risk factors and co-occurring challenges increase, so should intervention and consideration of referral for special education. The DWG will continue their work on identifying substantial and final recommendations for comorbidities in the fall of 2020.

### Final Recommendations for Comprehensive Assessments

The DWG researched comprehensive assessments, including analyzing other state plans and the content of the CDE Dyslexia Handbook. The DWG recommends using the term *comprehensive diagnostic assessment for dyslexia identification* instead of *comprehensive assessments*. For the *comprehensive diagnostic assessment for dyslexia identification*, the DWG recommends the following dyslexia reading battery measures, with specific examples listed for each measure:

- Phonological processing (e.g., Comprehensive Test of Phonological Processing (CTOPP-2))
  - Phonological awareness, phonological memory
- Rapid naming (e.g., CTOPP-2 Rapid Naming subtests)
- Single-word and nonword tasks
  - Untimed (e.g., Woodcock Johnson (WJ-IV) Letter Word-ID & Word Attack; Wechsler Individual Achievement Test (WIAT III) Word Reading & Pseudoword Decoding)
  - Timed (e.g., Test of Word Reading Efficiency (TOWRE-2) Sight Word Efficiency, Phonemic Decoding Efficiency)
- Complex paragraph-level tasks – reading fluency (e.g., Gray Oral Reading Test (GORT-5) Fluency)
- Spelling (e.g., WJ-IV Spelling, WIAT-III Spelling) & Letter Knowledge for younger students



- WIAT-III & Kaufman Test of Educational Achievement (KTEA-3) now have “Dyslexia Index Scores” for screening purposes
- WIAT-IV (release date Fall 2020) – to include additional fluency measures
- *Associated domains considered and assessed throughout process* – e.g., expressive language, oral & reading comprehension, written expression, attention/executive function, mathematics, fine-motor, social/emotional
- Seek information about family history of reading difficulties when a concern in reading development arises or at time of comprehensive assessment for identification of dyslexia

### **Initial Recommendations for Appropriate Dyslexia Screening Process**

A small working group presented initial recommendations for appropriate dyslexia screening processes. They identified their overall goal, which is to detail a state-recommended protocol for dyslexia screening that is grade-level specific, identifies characteristics of dyslexia not identified in universal screeners, and will inform a body of evidence should students’ progress to a comprehensive dyslexia evaluation. The DWG came to consensus that this small working group was on the right track and should move forward with identifying substantial recommendations in the fall of 2020.

### **Recommendations for the Dyslexia Pilot Program**

The University of Oregon has been selected as the contractor for the dyslexia pilot program through a competitive request for proposal process. CDE will work with the University of Oregon over the summer of 2020 to continue revisions to the dyslexia screening protocol and continued communication will occur with the DWG. At the time of this report, the dyslexia pilot program will begin in January 2021, with the site selection process occurring in the fall of 2020.

The DWG met with the University of Oregon virtually in May 2020 and provided the following recommendations:

- The pilot program needs to be clear and explicit that identification of dyslexia and screening are two different processes.
- The pilot program draft protocol is overly reliant on a composite reading score for the identification of reading risk. This could result in students who have a relative strength in one component of reading (i.e., comprehension, vocabulary) not being identified for intervention. A comprehensive phonological assessment is needed for students who are found at risk in an initial screen.
- The pilot program professional development needs to explicitly include a strong component about dyslexia to establish the importance of strong core and intervention instruction. Students who have deficiencies with phonological awareness skills will struggle with universal reading instruction and with targeted interventions.
- The researchers for the pilot program need to study the Early Literacy Grant and Early Literacy Assessment Tool project.
- Schools in the pilot program need to understand dyslexia first before they can set up appropriate systems of support. When a school looks at screening results through the lens of dyslexia, they see students differently, and have a more targeted response to children.
- The development work of the University of Oregon and that of the DWG needs to be working together and not duplicating work or moving down a different path altogether.



## Next Steps for the Dyslexia Working Group

---

For the 2020-21 school year, the DWG recommends that it continues to meet virtually through small working groups and with the entire DWG until face-to-face meetings are initiated by CDE. The DWG will first focus on finalizing recommendations for dyslexia screening processes and comorbidities, thus meeting the first three deliverables within their charge:

- Analysis of current national and statewide data related to students identified as having dyslexia, including but not limited to identification rates and achievement rates; and
- Analysis of the implementation and demonstrated effectiveness in other states of statewide legislation for dyslexia screening, educator training, and other dyslexia-related laws; and
- Identify and recommend appropriate dyslexia screening tools and processes as well as comprehensive assessments that address the recognized challenges of dyslexia, including phonological processing, phonemic awareness, and decoding and encoding skills.

The DWG will take the final recommendations from the first three deliverables and build upon those recommendations to meet the remaining deliverables within their charge:

- Identify and recommend a statewide plan for supporting students who are identified as having dyslexia, including specific intervention structures and their components, which must include evidence-based interventions, progress-monitoring systems, and data collection systems.
- Identify and recommend components of dyslexia awareness training for Colorado educators, including the content, target audience, time frame for training, and projected cost.
- Identify and recommend educator training for in-state approved programs of preparation for teacher and alternative teacher programs and recommended training for current educators, based on effective practice in other states, as well as recommendation from state and national organizations focusing on literacy. The recommendations concerning educator training may include the content, target audience, time frame for training, and projected cost.

The DWG will continue to provide input for the Dyslexia Pilot Project.



# Appendices

## Appendix A

---

### Links to Data and State Plans

National Assessment of Educational Progress data – [nationsreportcard.gov](http://nationsreportcard.gov)

Louisiana: <https://www.louisianabelieves.com/docs/default-source/academics/a-guide-to-dyslexia-in-louisiana.pdf?sfvrsn=4>

Arizona: <https://cms.azed.gov/home/GetDocumentFile?id=5ada56093217e11d10341d52>

Arkansas: [http://dese.ade.arkansas.gov/public/userfiles/Learning\\_Services/Dyslexia/DRG-Final-12-13-17-JS1.pdf](http://dese.ade.arkansas.gov/public/userfiles/Learning_Services/Dyslexia/DRG-Final-12-13-17-JS1.pdf)

California: <https://www.cde.ca.gov/sp/se/ac/documents/cadyslexiaguidelines.pdf>

Illinois: <https://www.isbe.net/Documents/Dyslexia-Handbook.pdf>

Mississippi Handbook: <https://www.dyslexie.lu/dyslexiahandbook.PDF>

Mississippi Best Practices:

<https://www.mdek12.org/sites/default/files/Offices/MDE/OAE/OEER/Dyslexia/mississippi-best-practices-dyslexia-handbook-2010-12-13.pdf>

New Jersey: <https://www.state.nj.us/education/specialed/dyslexia/NJDyslexiaHandbook.pdf>

New York Guidance: <https://www.jdsupra.com/legalnews/new-york-state-education-department-98330/>

New York Q&A: <http://www.p12.nysed.gov/specialed/publications/documents/q-and-a-students-with-dyslexia-dysgraphia-dyscalculia.pdf>

Oregon Screening and Support: [https://www.oregon.gov/ode/students-and-family/SpecialEducation/RegPrograms\\_BestPractice/Documents/dyslexiascreeningplanappendix.pdf](https://www.oregon.gov/ode/students-and-family/SpecialEducation/RegPrograms_BestPractice/Documents/dyslexiascreeningplanappendix.pdf)

Oregon Plan for Universal Screening:

<https://www.ode.state.or.us/wma/initiatives/idea/dyslexia/dyslexiascreeningplansept2016.pdf>

Tennessee - [https://www.tn.gov/content/dam/tn/education/special-education/dys/dyslexia\\_resource\\_guide.pdf](https://www.tn.gov/content/dam/tn/education/special-education/dys/dyslexia_resource_guide.pdf)

Texas: [http://ritter.tea.state.tx.us/rules/tac/chapter074/19\\_0074\\_0028-1.pdf](http://ritter.tea.state.tx.us/rules/tac/chapter074/19_0074_0028-1.pdf)

Washington: <https://www.k12.wa.us/sites/default/files/public/reading/pubdocs/dyslexiaresourceguide.pdf>

Wisconsin <https://dpi.wi.gov/sites/default/files/imce/sped/pdf/sld-dyslexia.pdf>



## Appendix B

---

### State Plan Review Notes

This section contains the working group's notes on state plans it reviewed.

#### Arizona

Positives:

- IDEA definition for dyslexia
- Includes guidelines for parents of what they could do at home

Negatives:

- Organization difficult to follow
- Lacks specificity
- Needs to identify and direct information more clearly to intended audiences

Overall Recommendation: Arizona is early in this process. Legislations just passed in July 2019 and is not as specific as Colorado's legislation. Arizona is adopting similar screening processes as other states. Interesting statute: students are held back from 4<sup>th</sup> grade if they do not pass 3<sup>rd</sup> grade state reading assessment unless the student has dyslexia. In the current form, this guidance is not recommended for continued review.

#### Arkansas

Positives:

- Website is intuitive to use
- Transparent process
- Manual has a section on screeners which is age appropriate and skill specific
- Dyslexia specialists trained and used throughout the state to help schools for reporting and support
- Different level of screeners and specificity for each grade level, including students beyond 3<sup>rd</sup> grade
- Rapid naming screener including colors and access for teachers

Negatives:

- None noted

Overall Recommendation: The specificity of this plan makes it recommended for further study. Reviewer recommends conference type style for getting out the information. Maybe follow up with a phone call on resources.

#### California

Positives:

- Used International Dyslexia Association definition of dyslexia
- Broke down symptoms of dyslexia and how to identify and assess
- Handbook was accessible
- Chapters were short and easy to digest
- Lists assistive technology resources and resources for families
- Formal identification tools
- Includes social and emotional (grit and motivation) indicators
- Law passed in 2015 and had a Dyslexia working group, which included Sally Shaywitz and included a Shaywitz screener and list of assessments in appendix of plan

**Negatives:**

- Screeners and assessments are where the plan breaks down
- Uses MTSS process for checklist with pre- and post-tests which leaves room for error and delays support for students
- Does not specify high-quality curriculum despite indicating one needs to be used
- List is not for classroom teachers and needs to be administered by psychologist or special education teacher.

Overall Recommendation: While some pieces of this plan are good, it is not recommended for further research. No specifics on teacher training. NAEP data grew only slightly (2 points). Includes social and emotional (grit and motivation) indicators that is an important piece.

**Colorado****Positives:**

- Has a guidance document that is an on-line format which includes accessible written material, links to resources and videos
- Materials are downloadable and printable chapters
- Guidance document but also includes a lot of professional development
- Contains research studies that other states are lacking
- Descriptions and resource for dyslexia and children with disabilities, English Learners, ADHD, autism, and twice exceptional learners; comorbidities
- Begins with a comprehensive literacy program and the importance for all students

**Negatives:**

- Not all text will be relevant to all readers due to the depth and amount
- It is designed to digital, so presentation is different than most states due to the on-line format
  - How will it look when it enters the phase of lots of people coming to the website, so it is not too overwhelming?
- Unclear about the lists of the approved assessments and programs the READ Act already has in place

Overall Recommendation: More needs to be done to merge current information into a full guidance plan.

**Louisiana****Positives:**

- Website is informative and very accessible for all roles
- Very specific with lists including screeners on the five components of reading
- Plan narrow downs and gives choices
- Provides a table of programs, age groups, and costs
- Includes two dyslexia specific screeners and other global tools
- Includes specific information about process for parents and teachers
- Lists five characteristics of students with dyslexia
  - Clear process
  - Recommendations for who should be on the student appraisal committee
  - Connections to MTSS

**Negatives:**

- None reported



Overall Recommendation: Move forward with this plan. Louisiana has had a Dyslexia law since 1998. There is good growth data, pathways for 504 plans, and special education. Professional growth ladder system in place for teachers (master, mentors, etc.). Gives clarity for developing guidance in Colorado.

### Mississippi

#### Positives:

- Describes the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act and identification regarding dyslexia
- Includes a comprehensive list including targeted assessments with a descriptor of how to use the tools and what to look for in the results
- Includes a state dyslexia screening assessment
- Includes definitions, identifications, accommodations
- No approved list but multisensory program review process with lists of programs
- Requirement for local school boards to provide interventions for students but left it open to districts on how to determine that
- NAEP data showed positive score improvement for children with disabilities and students eligible for free and reduced lunch

#### Negatives:

- None noted

Overall Recommendation: Mississippi began legislating for Dyslexia in 1996. An early pilot program and a dyslexia therapy program showed some strengths but not overall on 3<sup>rd</sup> state assessment. The state develops institutes on strategies and accommodations for elementary and secondary. The website has tools and supports and has a K-3 early reading program to pay attention to. Some parts of the guidance are exemplary; however, other parts are outdated. The state is revising the handbook again. The long-term effort and persistence to find the correct guidance is compelling for further study.

### New Jersey

#### Positives:

- Handbook is thorough
- use of International Dyslexia Association aligned definition
- Every teacher K-3, special education, and English language arts teachers receives 2 hours of professional development every year in screening, accommodation, and technology
- Extensive chapter on structured literacy
- Tools to help teachers

#### Negatives:

- Resources online but not the laws
- Details left unspecified and indicates that districts need to determine and include resources on website schools can use
- Not sufficient resources for teachers on websites
- Screening information must be provided by state to districts
- Handbook includes an indicator checklist and a screening instrument but not recommendation on how to do it or how to use it
  - What does it look like?
  - What are the recommendations?



Overall Recommendation: There are enough details in this handbook to make it a candidate for further review. NAEP data for New Jersey is another compelling reason to continue reviewing this plan.

### **Oregon**

#### Positives:

- Similar to READ Act in Colorado with making reading a priority for all students with good core instruction
- Parent notification and involvement with entire process
- Not lengthy and concise
- Website is inclusive of:
  - Universal screening tools
  - Targeted assessments
  - Different training opportunities for teachers to access
- Includes a training model
- Provides screening of all students for dyslexia

#### Negatives:

- Nothing specific about dyslexia screening effectiveness could be found

Overall Recommendation: Senate Bill 6-12 was enacted in 2015 and required hiring a dyslexia specialist who convened a working group. Each school must have one K-5 teacher to receive training and then provides training to their school. All pre-service teachers receive training on dyslexia (although reviewer is not sure whether this happens at university or at district level). Updates in 2017 include teacher training in dyslexia and screening upon entry to school. Guidelines are concise and current. Reviewer recommends this plan for further study.

### **Tennessee**

#### Positives:

- Name of the law ("Say Dyslexia")
- Excellent Dyslexia Advisory Council annual report
- Notification of parents
- Created a 24/7 hotline

#### Negatives:

- Materials are presented in a way to sway opinion
- Lacking clarity
- Broad use of terms and definitions
- Not very clear and actionable
- Tiered process not well spelled out
- Legislation identifies council and testing that should exist but not details about processes and programs
- The 2013 to 2017 data does not show good change

Overall Recommendation: Not recommended for further research. [Dyslexiatennessee.org](http://Dyslexiatennessee.org) is a more interesting site/resource to explore.

### **Texas**

#### Positives:

- Screening for all kids in kindergarten





- Teacher training is strong and professional development is required for all teachers and teacher candidates including identification of students with dyslexia
- Includes identification information using both qualitative (behaviors) and quantitative data
- Discusses training and differences for general education teachers and specialists

Negatives:

- Lists screener components but not the specific screeners

Overall Recommendation: Effectiveness data included interviews that showed teachers were familiar with laws and requirements but needed more training and resources. Handbook describes a lot about English Learners and Spanish and English reading in both languages and twice exceptional students. This state is recommended for further review.