



Dyslexia is characterized by difficulty with learning to read fluently and with accurate phonological processing. This includes difficulty with phonological awareness, phonological decoding, orthographic coding, automatic short-term memory, language skills/verbal comprehension, and/or rapid naming.

Developmental reading disorder (DRD) is the most common learning disability. Dyslexia is the most recognized of reading disorders, however not all reading disorders are linked to dyslexia.



"Here, Spot," said Sally.  
 "Here is a cookie for you."  
 "Oh, oh," said Jane.  
 "Where is one for Sally?"  
 "Here it is," said Mother.  
 "Here is a cookie for Sally.  
 A big, big cookie for Sally."

See It Go

### Marty the Clownfish

Marty was sad in the sea. As a clownfish, he felt like he should be funny. As a clownfish, he was not funny.

He was not funny at all. He was very serious and did not make anyone laugh.

He told jokes to the lionfish, but they did not laugh. He told jokes to the dogfish, but they did not laugh either.

"I am a clownfish, and I should be funny," Marty said aloud.





## House Ed Testimony / Proposed Changes to SB 567 - Dyslexia

Michael Latvis <latvism@resa.net>

Mon 6/3/2024 11:25 AM

To:Office of Rep. Koleszar <mattkoleszar@house.mi.gov>;Rep. Jaime Churches (District 27) <jaimechurches@house.mi.gov>;jenniferconlin@house.mi.gov <jenniferconlin@house.mi.gov>;Rep. Kimberly Edwards (District 12) <kimberlyedwards@house.mi.gov>;caglanville@house.mi.gov <caglanville@house.mi.gov>; NateShannon@house.mi.gov <NateShannon@house.mi.gov>;Rep. Dylan Wegela (District 26) <dylanwegela@house.mi.gov>;Rep. Regina Weiss (District 6) <ReginaWeiss@house.mi.gov>;maixiong@house.mi.gov <maixiong@house.mi.gov>;jaimegreene@house.mi.gov <jaimegreene@house.mi.gov>;ginajohnsen@house.mi.gov <ginajohnsen@house.mi.gov>;GregMarkkanen@house.mi.gov <GregMarkkanen@house.mi.gov>; BradPaquette@house.mi.gov <BradPaquette@house.mi.gov>;PaulineWendzel@house.mi.gov <PaulineWendzel@house.mi.gov>  
Bcc:Liam Bagley <lbagley@house.mi.gov>;Kyle Zawacki <KZawacki@house.mi.gov>;Anthony Borden <aborden@house.mi.gov>;Taylor Alpert <TAlpert@house.mi.gov>;Dave Ladd <dladd@kelley-cawthorne.com>

1 attachments (77 KB)

SB 567 Language Changes\_Wayne RESA.pdf;

Good Morning.

Given the timing constraints of tomorrow's committee hearing, I wanted to share the attached document and information below ahead of time as the committee considers Senate Bill 567. While I plan on testifying in opposition to the bill, I want to be clear about what our concerns actually are within the bill, and what solutions we propose.

In short, superintendents in Wayne County oppose this bill due to:

- 1. Banning Certain Curriculum and Interventions** - while we are supportive of leading with curriculum and interventions based in the science of reading, we simply cannot support a bill that would restrict a teacher from using all of the tools in their toolbox to assist a student. We know that not every student learns the same, and to handcuff teachers by telling them they cannot use specific interventions until a student has an IEP doesn't make sense. We should be trusting teachers to use their expertise and knowledge of each of their students to determine how best to help them.
- 2. Individualized Student / Classroom Data** - the bill would require that all individual IRIPs be collated by the ISD and sent to the department. Individualized data not only presents FERPA concerns, but has the ability to be weaponized against teachers, administrators, and schools. For example, Teacher A has 11 IRIPs in their classroom, and Teacher B has 4 - therefore Teacher A must be a bad teacher. We propose aggregating the IRIP data by building and then sending to the department.

Changes to these two issues included within the attached document would allow for the reconsideration of our position on the bill.

Also included within this document are, what we believe, changes that should be made based on the reasons included, but aren't directly tied to our position on the bill.

- 1. Dyslexia Screener** - while we are supportive of screening students for dyslexia and other reading disorders, without an existing "screener" already available, the legislature should ensure that the screeners developed are backed by data. Language within the bill only defines a screener as being "reliable and valid". We must ensure that we are flagging students with the characteristics of dyslexia and other reading disorders, and not just flagging students because of where they live or their household income.

2. **Districts Cannot Diagnose Students With Dyslexia** - there is language within the bill that infers that districts would be diagnosing ("if determined by the school district") students with the characteristics of dyslexia. Only a full and comprehensive dyslexia evaluation can determine whether or not a student has dyslexia.
3. **District Opt-Out** - there should be consideration of language that would allow for a district to opt out of the mandates included within this bill, if the district can demonstrate that the curriculum, interventions and processes they currently use are sufficient in both identifying students and improving literacy rates.
4. **School Board Member FERPA Concerns** - Language within the bill would allow for school board members to view individualized student data, which presents FERPA concerns. Additionally, the language is repetitive as schools are already required to communicate with parents of a student receiving an IRIP.

Not included within the document, but a significant concern, is that this bill remains an unfunded mandate. While this is a policy bill, there is not a comprehensive understanding of the increased resources that districts would require in order to properly implement this bill. At this time, we're going to be identifying more students, increasing the roles of literacy coaches, and mandating additional training for teachers, but aren't providing additional resources.

I appreciate the consideration, and would welcome any questions you may have.

Mike

---

Mike Latvis  
Senior Executive Director of Legislative Affairs  
Wayne RESA  
33500 Van Born Rd.  
Wayne, MI 48184  
C: 248-379-5897  
O: 734-334-1820

Wayne RESA's Proposed Changes to SB 567 – Dyslexia

1. Language within the bill needs to change to make the bill less prescriptive. Below is language that we would support including.
  - a. **(2)(c) Evidence-based instructional methods and the features of evidence-based interventions for pupils exhibiting the characteristics of dyslexia or pupils who have difficulties in learning to decode accurately and efficiently that include instructional methods and curriculum resources that use a code emphasis approach to address the decoding and word-recognition components of reading and that are supported by the science of reading INSTRUCTION, READING RESEARCH, AND BEST PRACTICE. ~~Except as otherwise provided in this section, the instructional methods and curriculum resources described in this subdivision must not include instructional methods or curriculum resources that minimize the importance of primarily using letter-sound information to decode or recognize unknown words, including, but not limited to, any of the uses of letter-sound information described in subsection (24)(c)(iii)(A) to (E).~~**
  - b. **(14) {7}-**~~Except as otherwise provided in this section, for a grade 3 pupil who has a reading deficiency based on the grade 3 state English language arts assessment, screening assessment, the school district or public school academy shall provide, only through grade 4, a reading intervention program that is intended to correct the pupil's specific reading deficiency, as identified by a valid and reliable assessment. This program~~**The intervention must include effective evidence-based instructional strategies necessary that are aligned to the research requirements consistent with the science of reading INSTRUCTION, READING RESEARCH, AND BEST PRACTICE to assist the pupil in becoming a successful reader.**
  - c. **(23) Beginning with the 2027-2028 school year, school districts, intermediate school districts, and public school academies shall ensure that reading instruction is evidence-based, with a focus on pupils' mastery of the foundational reading skills of phonemic awareness, phonics, fluency, and the development of other reading skills, including, but not limited to, development of oral language, vocabulary, and reading comprehension. ~~Pupils must be provided instruction aligned with science of reading methods that research shows improve literacy outcomes and help pupils achieve reading proficiency.~~**
  - d. **(24) (c) (iii) For the instructional methods and curriculum resources under this tier used to address the decoding and word-recognition components of reading, use a code emphasis instructional approach and be supported by the science of reading INSTRUCTION, READING RESEARCH, AND BEST PRACTICE. ~~Except as otherwise provided in this section, the instructional methods and curriculum resources described in this subparagraph must not include instructional methods or curriculum resources that minimize the importance of primarily using letter-sound information to decode or recognize unknown words, including, but not limited to, any of the following:~~**
    - (A) Prompting pupils to guess unknown words using pictures and illustrations.**

- ~~(B) Skipping over an unknown word or words to use the meaning of the passage to recognize the unknown word or words.~~
- ~~(C) Identifying only the first sound of an unknown word and then being prompted to guess the word using the word's initial sound and the meaning of the text surrounding the word.~~
- ~~(D) Memorizing a word in its written form.~~
- ~~(E) Using predictable text and leveled text to provide initial word recognition instruction and practice in reading new learned letter-sound correspondences.~~
- e. (24)(d) (ii) Tier 1 instructional data indicate a need for intervention to address difficulties in learning to decode and recognizing words. (e) Provide that tier 2 support, as described in subdivision (d), **must MAY** include instructional methods and curriculum resources that use a code emphasis approach to address the decoding and word-recognition components of reading and that are supported by the science of reading INSTRUCTION, READING RESEARCH, AND BEST PRACTICES. ~~The instructional methods and curriculum resources described in this subdivision must include, but are not limited to, specialized instructional procedures, duration, and frequency. However, these methods and resources must not include instructional methods that minimize the importance of primarily using letter-sound information to decode or recognize unknown words, including, but not limited to, any of the uses of letter-sound information described in subdivision (c)(iii)(A) to (E).~~
- f. (24)(e) Provide that tier 2 support, as described in subdivision (d), must include instructional methods and curriculum resources that use a code emphasis approach to address the decoding and word-recognition components of reading and that are supported by the science of reading INSTRUCTION, READING RESEARCH, AND BEST PRACTICES. The instructional methods and curriculum resources described in this subdivision **must MAY** include, but are not limited to, specialized instructional procedures, duration, and frequency. ~~However, these methods and resources must not include instructional methods that minimize the importance of primarily using letter-sound information to decode or recognize unknown words, including, but not limited to, any of the uses of letter-sound information described in subdivision (c)(iii)(A) to (E).~~
- g. ~~(33) The instructional methods and curriculum resources described in subsection (24)(c)(iii)(A) to (E) may be used, as appropriate, for purposes other than addressing decoding and word-recognition components of reading and for any purpose to comply with section 504 of title V of the rehabilitation act of 1973, 29 USC 794, or title II of the Americans with disabilities act of 1990, 42 USC 12131 to 12165.~~

2. All data requirements should be aggregated at the building level. Individualized data not only presents FERPA concerns, but has the ability to be weaponized against teachers, administrators, and schools.

- a. **(1)(v)(c) By the beginning of the 2027-2028 school year, provide technical assistance to school districts, intermediate school districts, and public school academies to aid the school districts, intermediate school districts, and public school academies in reporting information contained in a pupil's individual reading improvement plan.**
  - b. **(15) A school district or public school academy shall provide a copy of each pupil's individual reading improvement plan to the school district's intermediate school district or the intermediate school district that has geographic boundaries that include the area in which the public school academy is located. The intermediate school district shall collate the information received under this subsection and provide it to the department each school year.**
3. If the legislature is to pass a bill requiring the screening for dyslexia, MDE must require that vendors applying to provide such a screening have data to demonstrate the effectiveness of the screener they wish to provide. There needs to be a more detailed set of rules for what a "reliable and valid universal screening assessment" is.
  - a. **(2)(a) (a) The appropriate selection and use at each grade level of reliable and valid universal screening assessments for the identification of pupils who exhibit characteristics of dyslexia and pupils who display difficulties in learning to decode accurately and efficiently, including those described in subsection (1), to minimize the impact on instructional time.**
    - i. **(s) "Reliable" means something that is based on the consistency of a set of scores that are designed to measure the same thing.**
    - ii. **(y) "Valid" means the degree to which a method assesses what it claims or intends to assess.**
  - b. **Solution:** The screening of a student must include an examination of the student's: Phonological and phonemic awareness; Sound-symbol recognition; Alphabet knowledge; Decoding skills; Rapid naming skills; and Encoding skills
4. Language in Section 26 essentially describes the school district, ISD, or PSA as being responsible for diagnosing a student with dyslexia. Only a full and comprehensive dyslexia evaluation can determine that. This language should be removed, as it is already covered under (24)(j), which if confirmed, would require an IEP.
  - a. **(26) If it is determined by the school district, intermediate school district, or public school academy in which the pupil is enrolled that a pupil has functional difficulties due to characteristics of dyslexia or underlying factors that place pupils at risk for difficulties in learning to decode accurately and efficiently, the board of the school district or intermediate school district or board of directors of the public school academy in which the pupil is enrolled shall ensure that the necessary accommodations or equipment are provided to the pupil as required under section 504 of title V of the rehabilitation act of 1973, 29 USC**

**794, and title II of the Americans with disabilities act of 1990, 42 USC 12131 to 12165.**

5. There should be some sort of waiver or ability for districts to demonstrate that the curriculum, interventions, and processes they currently use are sufficient in identifying and assisting students with the characteristics or dyslexia or other reading disorders.
6. As it relates to a district having their own screening tool, there needs to be a documented process for the department to follow, along with an opportunity for districts to appeal a decision.
  - a. **(19) If the department determines that a benchmark assessment or a valid and reliable screening and progress-monitoring reading assessment suite selected by the board of a school district or the board of directors of a public school academy under subsection (9) includes a reliable and valid universal screening assessment, that assessment or assessment system selected under subsection (9) may be utilized to meet the requirement under subsection (16).**
7. Section 27 is repetitive and contains FERPA concerns – schools are already required to send communication to parents of students receiving Tier 2 interventions and supports. Further, board members having access to individualized student information presents FERPA concerns.
  - a. Section 27 should be removed.