

Dyslexia Pilot Project

Implementation and Outcomes
2012-13, 2013-14, and 2014-15

Julie Morrison Tai Collins Renee Hawkins
University of Cincinnati

Presentation at the Spring Conference of the
Ohio School Psychologists Association, 2016



Agenda

- I. Goal and Core Components of the DPP
- II. Overall Evaluation Findings
- III. Lessons Learned by District
- IV. Conclusions and Recommendations



The primary goal of the
Dyslexia Pilot Project was to
evaluate the effectiveness of early
screening and reading assistance
programs for children at risk for
reading failure including those
students exhibiting risk factors
associated with dyslexia.



Core Components of the Dyslexia Pilot Project

- I. Technically adequate standardized curriculum-based assessments for the purposes of screening**
- II. Technically adequate standardized curriculum-based assessments for the purposes of intervention planning**




- III. Assessment data used to determine students' specific reading deficits in order to provide evidence-based intervention matched to the students' specific needs**


- IV. Technically adequate standardized curriculum-based assessments for the purposes of progress monitoring**




- V. Professional development provided to K-2 teachers to implement core evidence-based reading instruction, multi-sensory structured language instruction, and specific reading intervention programs at each tier.**










Six Districts Participated


4 Small, Rural Districts
1 Large, Urban District
1 Suburban

*Two other districts were not renewed
in the Pilot after Year 1*





**Overall Evaluation Findings for
the Three-Year Project**




**Among the six districts participating in
the Dyslexia Pilot Project ...**

**100% of the school districts choose
technically adequate standardized CBM
assessments for the purposes of
screening, intervention planning, and
progress monitoring in Years 1-2.**

- 5 selected DIBELS Next
- 1 selected DIBELS, 6th Edition

📍 One school district discontinued its use of
CBM assessments in Year 3.



Matching students to interventions and instructional supports based on need

Year 1

The districts varied widely in their capacity to match students to instructional supports and interventions of sufficient intensity.



Progress Monitoring Schedule

Tier of Support	Frequency of Progress Monitoring
Universal Supports Tier 1	Three or four times a year
Targeted Intervention Tier 2	Once or twice a month
Intensive Intervention Tier 3	Weekly or twice a week

Vary the Schedule According to the Intensity of the Intervention



Matching Students to Tier of Support Based on Need

Tier of Support	Defining the Tier
Universal Supports Tier 1	Core instruction with instructional supports
Targeted Intervention Tier 2	30 min, 3-5 days/week 5-8 students
Intensive Intervention Tier 3	45-120 min, 5 days/week 1-3 students



Matching students to interventions and instructional supports based on need

Year 2

Improvements were noted among all of the districts.



Matching students to interventions and instructional supports based on need

Year 3

Five of the six districts sustained their capacity for matching students to intervention based on need (using CBM assessments) in Year 3.



Overall Evaluation Finding #1

The five districts that fully implemented the Dyslexia Pilot Project demonstrated an increased capacity to meet students needs as evidenced by increases in the percentage of students “At or Above” benchmark and decreases in the percentage of students “Well Below” benchmark.




Overall Evaluation Finding #2

Full implementation of the Dyslexia Pilot Project contributed to a measurable reduction of reading failure risk that precluded the need for more intensive and costly individualized Tier III interventions.

Cost savings (in teacher time) varied by district given differences in the effectiveness of Tier II interventions and teacher salaries.



The components required for successful implementation of the Dyslexia Pilot Project reflect what we know about Implementation Research.



© Fixsen & Blase, 2008



Lessons Learned from the Large Urban

Competency

- High quality, comprehensive, embedded professional learning opportunities through a partnership with the a professional development provider and a local university.
- Professional development focused on Orton-Gillingham Multisensory Reading (Practicum I & II) and Response to Intervention.




Lessons Learned from the Large Urban

Organization

- DIBELS Next decision-support data system
- Highly effective coordination provided by intervention specialist and school psychologists

Leadership


- Project Director from the professional development provider partnered with building principals with district leadership support.



Lessons Learned from the Small Rural #1

Competency

- Focused and sustained professional learning opportunities through a partnership with Step By Step Learning.
- Professional development consisted of modeling and coaching in data analysis and instructional planning.




Lessons Learned from the Small Rural #1

Organization

- DIBELS Next decision-support data system
- Highly effective coordination provided by district administrators.

Leadership


- Superintendent and district administrator were directly engaged in implementing the Project (e.g., staffing and scheduling interventions)



Lessons Learned from the Small Rural #2

Competency

- Focused and sustained professional learning opportunities through a partnership with Step By Step Learning.
- Professional development consisted of modeling and coaching in data analysis and instructional planning.




Lessons Learned from the Small Rural #2

Organization

- DIBELS Next decision-support data system
- Highly effective coordination provided by a team of district administrators and external partners.

Leadership

- The superintendent other administrators were directly involved in leading the implementation of the Project.



Lessons Learned from the Small Rural #3

Competency

- 30 hours of professional development in multi-sensory structured language instruction (i.e., Reading Orton-Gillingham, Lindamood Bell)
- Embedded classroom-based modeling and coaching from the school's Reading Specialist.
- Professional development included DIBELS Next – Train the Trainer (Year 3).



Lessons Learned from the Small Rural #3

Organization

- DIBELS Next decision-support data system
- Highly effective coordination provided by Project's team, which included the principal, intervention specialists, and reading specialists.

Leadership

- The principal was directly involved in driving the implementation of the Project.



Lessons Learned from Small Rural #4

Competency

- High quality, embedded professional learning opportunities through a partnership with a local university. Professional development over all three years included direct training, modeling in the classroom, and coaching in phonics-based, multisensory techniques.



Lessons Learned from Small Rural #4

Organization

- DIBELS Next decision-support data system
- Responsibility for coordination changed hands in first two years with staff turnover. Effective coordination emerged in Year 3.

Leadership

- Beginning in Year 3, the new principal was directly engaged in providing leadership support for the Project.



Lessons Learned from the Suburban

Competency

- A minimum of two days of training in Orton-Gillingham Multisensory Reading
- Training in Lindamood Phoneme Sequencing (LiPS) over three days
- Two days of training on Lindamood Bell Visualizing and Verbalizing
- One-day session on Handwriting without Tears
- One-day session on Strategies Supporting Comprehension and Expression



Lessons Learned from the Suburban

Organization

- Previous version of DIBELS (DIBELS 6th Edition) used in Year 1 and 2, but discontinued in Year 3.
- Grant proposal developed by primary level teachers who selected the professional development sessions.
- Coordination provided by an over-burdened special education district administrator in Year 1 & 2, who left the district after Year 2.



Lessons Learned from the Suburban

Leadership

- District and building administrators were not involved in the implementation of the Project.
- District administration did not support the use of CBM assessments throughout the three-year Project.



Conclusions and Recommendations

- I. Among the participating school districts, exemplary practices have emerged in meeting the needs of students at risk of reading failure.
- II. Building a proactive, tiered system of support requires systemic change to ameliorating student risk and providing teacher professional learning opportunities (competency), organizational capacity, and leadership.



Contact Information

Julie Morrison, Ph.D.

E-mail: Julie.Morrison@uc.edu

Tai Collins, Ph.D.

E-mail: Tai.Collins@uc.edu

Renee Hawkins, Ph.D.

E-mail: Renee.Hawkins@uc.edu

University of Cincinnati
College of Education, Criminal Justice, & Human Services
School Psychology Program