

**Teaching, Leading and Learning Committee Special Meeting  
April 28, 2022  
Dyslexia Guidebook- Handout**

**Table 1. Requests received via email per Chair Manchester's request of the Teaching, Leading and Learning Committee on March 14, 2022**

Request Number	Board Member	Section & Page Number March 2022 Draft	Board Member Request	Ohio Dyslexia Committee Decision & Page Number April 2022 Draft
1	Martha Manchester	Executive summary, page 2	Remove sentence: <i>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.</i>	ODC discussed- No action
2	Martha Manchester	Executive summary, page 2	Edit sentence: <i>Section 1 explains best practices in literacy instruction <u>for children with dyslexia or children displaying dyslexic characteristics and tendencies</u></i>	ODC discussed- No action
3	Martha Manchester	Executive summary, page 3	Changes in wording align exactly with wording in ORC 3323.251 (A)(1)(b)(ii) and ORC 3319.077 and adding in the ORC section citations	ODC discussed- Revision made pgs. 3-4
4	Tim Miller and Michelle Newman	Executive summary, page 3	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	ODC discussed- Revision made pgs. 3-4; ODC decided to keep the table at the beginning of section 2 as well

Request Number	Board Member	Section & Page Number March 2022 Draft	Board Member Request	Ohio Dyslexia Committee Decision & Page Number April 2022 Draft
5	Michelle Newman	Executive summary, page 3	Add the following sentence to the end of the executive summary: <u><i>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.</i></u>	ODC discussed- decided to add the revision requested by Mr. Kern and Ms. Newman at the Feb. and March TLL meetings instead of adopting the requested sentence; pg. 2 <i>"All best practices in this guidebook are recommendations only."</i>
6	Martha Manchester	Introduction, page 7	Remove sentences: <i>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.</i>	ODC discussed- replaced sentences with sentence on Ohio NAEP results pg.8 <i>"In 2019, the percentage of students in Ohio performing at or above the NAEP Proficient level was 36 percent in fourth grade and 38 percent in eighth grade."</i>
7	Martha Manchester and Tim Miller	Introduction, page 7	Ms. Manchester- Remove sentence  Mr. Miller's comment- I will argue again that the 15-20% figure given without the low end percentage also included and explained is misleading to many reading this guidebook.  <i>The percentage of students experiencing characteristics of dyslexia has been reported to be as high as 15%–20% (Elliott &amp; Grigorenko, 2014; Fletcher et al., 2019; International Dyslexia Association, 2012).</i>	ODC discussed- revised sentence pg. 8 <i>"The percentage of students with dyslexia ranges from 5%-17%, while the percentage of students experiencing characteristics of dyslexia is reported as high as 15%-20% (Elliott &amp; Grigorenko,</i>

Request Number	Board Member	Section & Page Number March 2022 Draft	Board Member Request	Ohio Dyslexia Committee Decision & Page Number April 2022 Draft
				2014; Fletcher, et al., 2019; International Dyslexia Association, 2012; Odegard, et al. 2020)."
8	Martha Manchester	Introduction, page 7	Edit sentence: <i>The <del>severity and</del> resources needed to address these characteristics will vary based on the individual needs of a student.</i>	ODC discussed- revised sentence pg. 8 "The resources needed to address these characteristics may vary based on a student's reading profile."
9	Martha Manchester	Introduction, Page 7	Remove sentence: <i>Myths and misunderstandings about dyslexia are prevalent and persistent (see gaablab.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.</i>	ODC discussed- no action
10	Martha Manchester	Section 1, page 9	This section should be bold, larger font, and highlighted. <i>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.</i>	ODC discussed- no action

Request Number	Board Member	Section & Page Number March 2022 Draft	Board Member Request	Ohio Dyslexia Committee Decision & Page Number April 2022 Draft
11	Martha Manchester	Section 1, page 9	Remove: <i>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.</i>	ODC discussed- sentences removed
12	Martha Manchester	Section 1, page 9	Remove: <i>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.</i>	ODC discussed- no action
13	Martha Manchester	Section 1, page 9	Edit: <i>This guidebook aims to support Ohio's school districts to become better prepared to meet the needs of <del>the full range of students with reading difficulties</del>, including those with dyslexia.</i>	ODC discussed- no action
14	Martha Manchester	Section 1, page 9	Remove: <i>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.</i>	ODC discussed- removed third sentence pg. 10
15	Martha Manchester and Diana Fessler	Section 1, page 10	Ms. Manchester: Remove  Ms. Fessler's comment: This reflects a negativity that suggests that all readers, not just struggling readers are not	ODC discussed- no action

Request Number	Board Member	Section & Page Number March 2022 Draft	Board Member Request	Ohio Dyslexia Committee Decision & Page Number April 2022 Draft
			<p>being served well. It is a blanket statement that reflects an opinion.</p> <p><i>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.</i></p>	
16	Martha Manchester	Section 1, page 11	<p>Move language from page 30 to page 11: <i>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</i></p>	ODC discussed- revision made pg. 12; Removed paragraph from pg. 30 in April document; moved reference to appendix C to top of pg. 30
17	Martha Manchester	Section 1, page 12	<p>Remove: <i>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 &amp; 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.</i></p>	ODC discussed- Removed second sentence pg. 13

Request Number	Board Member	Section & Page Number March 2022 Draft	Board Member Request	Ohio Dyslexia Committee Decision & Page Number April 2022 Draft
18	Martha Manchester	Section 1, page 13	Remove entire page	ODC discussed- no action
19	Martha Manchester	Section 1, page 14	Remove: <i>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?”</i>	ODC discussed- no action
20	Martha Manchester	Section 2, page 21	Highlight/use bold font/larger font <i>Screening assessments are not designed to diagnose dyslexia but rather to identify risk.</i>	ODC discussed- Revision made pg. 22 to bold this sentence
21	Martha Manchester	Section 2, page 21	Remove: <i>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.</i>	ODC discussed- no action
22	Martha Manchester	Section 2, page 21	Remove: <i>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.</i>	ODC discussed- no action
23	Martha Manchester	Section 2, page 22	Changes in wording align exactly with wording in ORC 3323.251 (A)(1)(b)(ii)	ODC discussed- revision made pg. 23

Request Number	Board Member	Section & Page Number March 2022 Draft	Board Member Request	Ohio Dyslexia Committee Decision & Page Number April 2022 Draft
24	Martha Manchester and Diana Fessler	Section 2, page 23	<p>Ms. Manchester’s comment: I’m not sure how to say this, but isn’t this the reason for the diagnostic assessments/universal screeners that we have in place right now for Third Grade Reading Guarantee. Based on those results reading improvement plans are put in place for at risk students. Is the ODC suggesting nothing is being done now based on those assessments/screeners? This blue highlighted section seems like overreach. Should it go, I’m not sure.</p> <p>Ms. Fessler comment: To say that "a significant (what is significant?) number of students identified as at risk is a strong indicator that reading instruction is generally not effective" is judgmental and does not mention any number of other reasons for children not progressing the way they should.</p> <p><i>Grade-level and/or building-level teams review the results of universal screening (tier 1 dyslexia screening) to identify students who are at risk. The needs of individual students must be addressed within the context of the needs of all students. The percentage of students who are identified as being at risk of dyslexia on the universal screening (tier 1 dyslexia screening) serves as an indicator of the overall effectiveness of the tier 1 reading instructional system. 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</i></p>	<p>ODC discussed- Revised sentence with “significant number” pg. 24</p> <p>“If a significant number of students are at risk on universal screening, it is a strong indicator that structured literacy is needed.”</p>

Request Number	Board Member	Section & Page Number March 2022 Draft	Board Member Request	Ohio Dyslexia Committee Decision & Page Number April 2022 Draft
			<i>student with more intensive support. Therefore, universal screening (tier 1 dyslexia screening) provides an opportunity to check the effectiveness of tier 1 instruction for all students.</i>	
25	Martha Manchester	Section 2, page 30	Highlight/use bold font/larger font <i>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.</i>	ODC discussed- this sentence was removed and placed in section 1 per Chair Manchester’s request pg. 12
26	Martha Manchester	Section 3, page 36	Highlight/use bold font/larger font <i>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.</i>	ODC discussed- revision made pg. 37
27	Martha Manchester	Section 4, page 47	Edit- <i>Other districts may <del>need</del> <b>choose</b> to start at stage 1 to help them meet the legal requirements.</i>	ODC discussed- revised sentence including removing “to help them meet the legal requirements” per BASA request pg. 48





**Table 2. Comments provided during the March 14, 2022 Teaching, Leading and Learning Committee meeting**

Committee and Board Member comments on the Ohio Dyslexia Guidebook (begins at 4:13:28 of [The Ohio Channel recording of March 14, 2022](#) and ends at roughly 05:31:00)

Comment Number	Board Member	Section & Page Number March 22 Draft	Board Member Comments	Ohio Dyslexia Committee Decision & Page Number April 2022 Draft
1	Brandon Kern	Executive Summary, page 2	Reiterated that it is important to explicitly state that best practices are not required by state law.	Revision made- sentenced added pg. 2
2	Michelle Newman	Executive Summary, Page 2	Supported Member Kern’s comments above about being very clear on what recommendations are and what requirements are. Educators seem concerned that recommended best practices seem to indicate that their current tools and practices do not work. Educators want to be able to use all available resources.	Revision made- sentenced added pg. 2
3	Meryl Johnson	Throughout	Concerned with the tone of the guidebook being negative and implying that there is only one way to provide instruction.	No action
4	Meryl Johnson	Page 14	1 <sup>st</sup> paragraph and the following five bullets should be removed. Suggests that practices do not work for any students. Appendix A should also be removed	ODC discussed- no revision made
5	Kirsten Hill	Executive Summary	Need to be clear about what the legal requirements are. Mrs. Manchester pointed out that the Legal Requirements are contained in tables on pages 3 and 22.	Revisions made pgs 3-4 and 23
6	Tim Miller	Throughout	The tone of the guidebook is ‘bad’.	No action
7	Diana Fessler	Throughout	Concerned that ‘parental rights’ are not addressed in the guidebook.	No action
8	Diana Fessler	Throughout	Concerned that best practices contained in the guidebook are mandatory by their inclusion.	Revision made- sentenced added pg. 2

<b>Comment Number</b>	<b>Board Member</b>	<b>Section &amp; Page Number March 22 Draft</b>	<b>Board Member Comments</b>	<b>Ohio Dyslexia Committee Decision &amp; Page Number April 2022 Draft</b>
9	Diana Fessler	N/A	Concerned that members of the Ohio Dyslexia Committee stand to benefit financially from recommendations and requirements in the guidebook.	ODC discussed
10	Diana Fessler	N/A	Would like another round of public comment.	No action
11	Diana Fessler	Page 3	'Communication with Parents and Guardians' – Parental Consent is not addressed. Chair Manchester noted later that page 22 does indicate that parental permission is needed beyond universal screening. Ms. Fessler indicated that permission is not the same as informed consent.	No action
12	Diana Fessler	Page 7, 3 <sup>rd</sup> paragraph	Believes that this paragraph indicates that dyslexia is a 'health issue' and not a reading issue. As such, parental consent is important.	No action
13	Diana Fessler	Throughout	Concerned with the many third-party links in the document and that State Board approval of the Guidebook affirms the content of those links. Not willing to affirm as content could change.	ODC discussed
14	Diana Fessler	Page 8, last bullet	Concerned that this is vague	No action
15	Diana Fessler	Page 9, 2 <sup>nd</sup> paragraph, 1 <sup>st</sup> sentence	Does not like the term 'struggling' and believes it is overused in the guidebook.	No action
16	Diana Fessler	Page 9, 2 <sup>nd</sup> paragraph, 2 <sup>nd</sup> sentence	Although not required by law, best practices are strongly encouraged by the language used here.	Revision made- paragraph removed
17	Diana Fessler	Page 11, 2 <sup>nd</sup> paragraph	'I thought this was a perfect example of outcome-based education'	No action
18	Diana Fessler	Page 11, 4 <sup>th</sup> paragraph	Doesn't not like that structured literacy will be used for 'all' learners.	No action

<b>Comment Number</b>	<b>Board Member</b>	<b>Section &amp; Page Number March 22 Draft</b>	<b>Board Member Comments</b>	<b>Ohio Dyslexia Committee Decision &amp; Page Number April 2022 Draft</b>
19	Diana Fessler	Page 12	'All students deserve access to teachers who are prepared to deliver reading instruction that is grounded in the science of reading and structured literacy.' – concerned about the number of teachers that will require professional development in these areas.	Revision made- removed sentence
20	Diana Fessler	Page 14	First paragraph and bullets should be removed as it is rude and offensive. 'Tone deaf'	ODC discussed
21	Diana Fessler	Page 15, 1 <sup>st</sup> paragraph	Opposed to '...it is preferable to provide effective reading instruction and intervention to all students...'	ODC discussed
22	Diana Fessler	Page 16, last paragraph	We should call it 'diagnostic assessment' and not 'screening.' States it is important for parents to know that it is a 'diagnostic'.	No action
23	Diana Fessler	N/A	Who made the decision to not record the February 22 Ohio Dyslexia Committee meeting?	No action
24	Diana Fessler	Page 17	Definition of 'stakeholder' is vague to me.	No action
25	Diana Fessler	Page 17	Concerned that there is guidance or how districts can align existing teams to the functions of MTSS and requirements of Ohio's dyslexia support laws.	No action
26	Diana Fessler	Page 19	Doesn't know what the framework on page 19 is all about.	ODC discussed
27	Diana Fessler	Page 21	Stated that information about best practices being recommendations should be 'up front' in the guidebook.	Revision made- sentenced added pg. 2
28	Diana Fessler/ Jenny Kilgore	Page 20	The definition of assessment does not align with what is said below it.	ODC discussed

<b>Comment Number</b>	<b>Board Member</b>	<b>Section &amp; Page Number March 22 Draft</b>	<b>Board Member Comments</b>	<b>Ohio Dyslexia Committee Decision &amp; Page Number April 2022 Draft</b>
29	Jenny Kilgore	Page 7	'The percentage of students experiencing characteristics of dyslexia has been reported to be as high as 15%–20%' – this figure seems extremely high in her experience. Chair Manchester clarified that this is the percentage of student experiencing the 'characteristics' of dyslexia and there are references cited for this estimate.	Revision made- sentenced revised pg. 8
30	Jenny Kilgore	N/A	Why would we screen all kindergarten students when some come to kindergarten with the ability to read.	ODC discussed- legal requirement
31	Jenny Kilgore	Page 7	'Myths and Misunderstandings' – this should be removed or placed elsewhere in the guidebook as part of a mission statement or goal.	ODC discussed
32	Jenny Kilgore	Page 9	Need to include the sources for best practices in the guidebook. Dr. Tambyraja noted that sources for best practices are cited throughout the document and that 'best practices' is defined in the glossary.	ODC discussed
33	Mike Toal	N/A	Stated that the State Board's role and responsibility requires a different focus than that of the Ohio Dyslexia Committee. As a Board Member, is concerned about potential legal action against Board/Department due to content of the guidebook. Need to be very clear about what is NOT required by law and that best practices are things that can be used. Need to clear up any misunderstandings about requirements and best practices.	Revision made- sentenced revised pg. 2
34	Meryl Johnson	Page 10, last paragraph	Cited this as an example of what she believes is the poor 'tone' throughout the document. Felt that much of what is stated here as ineffective can have benefit.	ODC discussed