

Iowa Dyslexia Board

Final Meeting Minutes – October 12, 2022

Meeting minutes taken by Kathy Bertsch.

CALL TO ORDER

Nina Lorimor-Easley, board chair, called the meeting to order at 10:00 a.m.

Present: Barb Anderson, Kristen Craig, Stephanie Edgren, Katie Greving, Nina Lorimor-Easley, James Northwick, Kay Stork, Ben Walizer, Shane Williams, Tammy Wilgenbusch, Kara Wishman.

Absent: Matt Cretsinger, Mark Hennigar

1. Welcome

a. Public Comment:

- i. Elyse Fredin provided public comment regarding the newly released Department of Education dyslexia website. They noted that they were happy to see it posted and wondered how the Department would make sure information is shared and used. Elyse noted that misinformation about dyslexia is deep rooted and will take time to address. Elyse recommends that the Department provide training on dyslexia website information.
- ii. David Roston, a lawyer, provided public comment regarding the dyslexia knowledge of administrative law judges. David discussed several cases where he believes administrative law judge knowledge about dyslexia interfered with sound decisions. He suggests the Dyslexia Board work the the Department of Education and Department of Appeals to provide education regarding dyslexia related laws to administrative law judges.
- iii. The board reviewed virtual public comment from Jenny Corkrean.

b. **Approve Agenda:** Shane Williams moved to approve the meeting agenda and James Northwick seconded the motion. The motion carried.

c. **Approve Meeting Minutes from September:** Katie Greving moved to approve the September 2022 meeting minutes and Tammy Wilgenbusch seconded the motion. The motion carried.

d. Board Member Announcements/updates

- i. Katie Greving noted that Decoding Dyslexia Iowa (DDIA) has shared the Department's website and received many positive comments. Stakeholders have also inquired about how the department will share the website information. Katie reemphasized the importance of having a formal guidance document, something the dyslexia task force also wanted, and would like the Department to take a leadership role in developing.

- ii. Stephanie Edgren discussed ways of propelling information to the field about dyslexia. Suggestions included looking at what other states have done and having a state guidebook.
- iii. Board members discussed ways the dyslexia information could/is planning to be shared. James Northwick noted that as a principal they are talking about how to distribute. Stephanie Edgren asked if it is possible to get on the School Administrators of Iowa agenda. Katie Greving noted that this has not been possible in the past, but DDIA has been an exhibitor. Shane Williams noted that each month is a statewide curriculum network meeting that is largely facilitated by the AEA with the Department providing updates. He suggested that joint updates, spread over several months, is more likely to increase understanding. It was also suggested that perhaps the IRRC's Dyslexia Overview could touch on some of these items.
- iv. Shane noted that there has been a lot of focus on what AEAs and schools need to do and higher education needs to be a part of that conversation as well. Stephanie Edgren suggested that perhaps when the Department provides news to Iowa Association of Colleges for Teacher Education (IACTE) they could include news about dyslexia/dyslexia website in that conversation.

2. Dyslexia Endorsement Program Approval

- a. Nina Lorimor-Easley provided an overview of dyslexia endorsement approval. The IRRC is legislated to approve dyslexia endorsement program applications. Ben Walizer, interim director of the IRRC, shared that there are several institutes of higher education that are in the process of developing dyslexia endorsement programs and the IRRC believes that the IRRC may have a conflict of interest in approving endorsement programs from other institutions while at the same time the University of Iowa (IRRC's host) is admitting students to their own dyslexia endorsement program. Ben proposed that the Dyslexia Board be part of the approval process to provide a second opinion.
- b. The board entered discussion on logistics for being a part of the program approval process. They discussed two possible roles of the board:
 - i. Providing feedback to the IRRC on the program approval recommendation criteria; and
 - ii. Having an ongoing role in dyslexia program approval applications which would include reviewing endorsement program applications and making recommendations for approval/non approval to the IRRC.

The board agreed to provide feedback on the program approval criteria and table the possible role of the board in the review and recommendation for program approval.

- c. Ben provided a [draft of the program approval](#) process and reviewed it with the board. The board entered discussion and feedback on the program recommendation approval criteria. Feedback included:
 - i. A need to perhaps offer a tentative approval prior to formal approval.
 - ii. Discussion about one-time versus ongoing approval/review. Katie Greving asked if the program would need to notify someone if they change after approval. Ben Walizer noted that this could be part of the approval requirements. Kathy

Bertsch, Department staff to the board indicated that Iowa Code says the IRRC will write procedures and processes for approval. If they would want ongoing review as part of the process this could be something that would go into the rules writing process for Iowa Administrative Code. This could include how often programs are reviewed and the specific requirements for approval. Right now it just says that the IRRC approves.

- iii. Katie Greving and Stephanie Edgren discussed how specific qualifications and credentials for teaching staff are important to include in the approval criteria. Stephanie noted that she thought 3 years of teaching experience seems low compared to other endorsements. Nina Lorimor-Easley noted that a lot of the expertise for teachers of the endorsement are from private providers and speech language pathologists as opposed to the public school system right now, so some flexibility with teaching experience may be needed.
- iv. James Northwick noted that the people who are most qualified, like the teachers doing a great job teaching title/special education could do a decent chunk of this. It would be nice to have a better connection between the endorsement and these persons. Kay Stork shared that as a title reading teacher and private tutor that it is unlikely for a teacher to be the dyslexia consultant. Districts are struggling for teachers
- v. Stephanie Edgren suggested looking at the criteria for the 7 year education program review as it is deeper and more comprehensive.
- vi. Stephanie Edgren suggested the program also provide documentation of the number of hours in the classroom working with students with dyslexia.
- vii. Discussion took place about frequency of approval. The board discussed if a review every 3 years was too daunting. Faculty and syllabi get updated every year anyway. They discussed if review should be based on timeline or based on turnover. Tammy Wilgenbusch suggested it is on a timeframe based on if they are approved or conditionally approved. Katie Greving inquired if it was important to require a review if there is substantial turnover in teaching staff. Stephanie Edgren suggested that perhaps after approval they just submit their faculty list for ongoing approval. Stephanie Edgren and Ben Walizer both noted that submitting faculty every year (and possible change to unapproved) could interfere with students getting their endorsement. Ben suggested a 2-year review. Tammy Wilgenbusch suggested the first review should occur after a program's first cohort meets program criteria.
- viii. Dyslexia endorsement program approval recommendations for the IRRC review were revised to address discussion. Nina Lorimor-Easley called for motions to approve the review recommendations. Kara Wishman motioned to approve the review recommendations, Tammy Wilgenbusch seconded the motion. Nina Lorimor-Easley and Ben Walizer abstained. The motion carried in favor of approval with 100% of voting members.

3. Legislative Report

- a. The board reviewed final edits of the Board's legislative report. James Northwick moved to approve the report subject to final formatting. Tammy Wilgenbusch seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously.

4. Department update

- a. The Department provided an update regarding the Department's search for their science of reading and dyslexia consultant position. The Department engaged in interviews during summer and fall and believe they will have a better fit and candidate pool with a search in the spring.

5. Subcommittees

- a. Board subcommittees met to discuss board actions. The following subcommittees reported out:
 - i. The Institutes of Higher Education (IHE) subcommittee reported out and discussed ways to hook and get information to institutes of higher education. Suggestions included the Dyslexia Board rating IHEs and then getting this information out to school administrators who are looking to hire teachers. This could also be shared with high school counselors who are guiding students toward programs for teacher training. Stephanie Edgren volunteered to reach out to Maryam Rod Szabo, Department Administrative Consultant for educator quality, to see if she would share the dyslexia guidance/website at IACTE. She also noted that the National Council for Teacher Quality (NCTQ) also rates programs on the five pillars and rates textbooks for higher education. Perhaps the Dyslexia Board could use this as a starting point. They noted that with higher education leverage is with IHE consumers.
 - ii. The Data Mining committee proposes they conduct 2 surveys in alternating years. Tammy Wilgenbusch and Ben Walizer have access to survey delivery systems.
 1. General literacy instruction. The IRRC has done this in the past and would like to do it again.
 2. Educators regarding dyslexia. This would start with the items used for the Dyslexia Task Force survey and would be used to determine if there has been growth in teacher knowledge of dyslexia, particularly for K-8 educators. Specifically it would focus on dyslexia knowledge, classroom and teaching practices, and preservice and inservice training.

6. Adjourn

- a. The board adjourned at 2:30.