



The Dyslexia Services (DS) Department's mission is to assist students with dyslexia in the achievement of independent literacy skills by providing service and support to students, their parents, and school personnel through identification, instruction, and community awareness. **The department employed** Evaluators for early identification of students with dyslexia and Dyslexia Interventionists (DIs) to provide specialized campus-based programming services to those students across the district. Interventionists also offered training to support parents and campus staff. **The 2024-25 budget** for the department was \$5,839,882 from the district general operating funds.

Key Findings

Implementation

- In 2024-25, students with dyslexia made up 5.6% of the student population. Of students with dyslexia, 56% were male, 70% were classified as SPED, and 47% as EB.
- Sixty-six percent of students with dyslexia participated in an intervention program, 90% of whom used the Wilson program.
- In 2024-25, dyslexia services were carried out by a team of 185 Interventionists (including 25 Leads) and 19 Evaluators.

Stakeholder Feedback

- A survey was emailed to Dyslexia Interventionists and Evaluators, with a 52% overall response rate.
- While a large majority of staff agreed that they understood policies and procedures and had adequate resources and support, a smaller majority felt they had adequate time for planning and preparation. Comments suggested that new duties like case management, ARD meetings, and documentation negatively impacted direct student services.
- Most staff had caseloads of 16-40 students, with over a quarter reporting that half or more of their students were considered "struggling". While programming services were seen as effective, favorable responses were lower for implementation fidelity, scheduling, and one-on-one instruction.
- Suggestions for improvement included delegating case management, enhancing guidance and training, and ensuring adequate staffing to ensure a focus on direct student services.

Student Outcomes

Word Identification Spelling Test (WIST)

- Grades 6-12 increased their average FLAI standard score by 6.8 points. (Goal not met.)
- Average SSK standard scores for grades 6-12 increased by 20.4 points. (Goal met.) Overall, this represents a 33% increase from BOY to EOY. Average scores for grades 2-5 increased by 27% overall.
- From BOY to EOY, the proportion of elementary students with "average or above" FLAI standard scores increased by nearly 3.5 times; at the secondary level the proportion more than doubled, increasing by 163%.
- From BOY to EOY, the proportion of elementary students with "average or above" SSK standard scores nearly quadrupled, while at the secondary level the proportion more than quadrupled.

i-Ready: Reading Language Arts

- From BOY to EOY, the proportion of K-5 students with dyslexia On Grade Level or Above was nearly 5 times higher, outpacing K-5 students in the district overall, which increased 1.5 times.
- From BOY to EOY, the proportion of grade 6-8 students with dyslexia On Grade Level or Above doubled, outpacing the district's overall increase for grades 6-8, which was 40%.
- Compared to the district as a whole, students with dyslexia outperformed their peers: 71% met or nearly met (i.e., achieved at least 75% of) their typical growth targets, while nearly half met or nearly met their stretch growth target.
- Nearly 80% of K-5 students and 60% of grade 6-8 students with dyslexia who were two or more grade levels behind at BOY (nearly 75% of K-5 and 85% of grade 6-8 students with dyslexia), gained at least one grade level by EOY.
- Among K-5 students with dyslexia taking the i-Ready in Spanish, 32% fewer scored on-grade-level at EOY compared to BOY.

State of Texas Assessments of Academic Readiness (STAAR)

- The percentage of students with dyslexia at all performance standards on STAAR/EOC reading tests was lower than the district.
- From 2024 to 2025, students with dyslexia in grades 3-8 and English I showed increases across all performance standards, with only two exceptions remaining flat (grade four at Approaches+ and grade six at Masters).
- A greater proportion of students with dyslexia in grade 6 and grade 8 achieved accelerated progress compared to the district.



Recommendations

Improve Data Collection for Actionable Insights.

The Dyslexia Services department should implement a more robust system for collecting and managing student data. The current data collection process does not allow the linking of student activities (e.g., specific interventions, dosage, and duration) with their academic outcomes. To address this, the Dyslexia Services department should **establish a centralized data system** by collaborating with the district's EdTech team to create an efficient, user-friendly platform for tracking student services. This system should capture key information, including students served, programs used, and frequency of services. The new system should **prioritize data quality and efficiency** to ensure data is accurate, reliable, and easy for staff to enter. Given dyslexia staff feedback about being overextended, the process should be streamlined to avoid adding to their workload. Having a centralized data system and improved data collection will allow the department to **track student progress over multiple years** and examine the **impact of dyslexia interventions** on student outcomes over time.

Focus on Strategic Planning and Goal Setting.

The collective impact of HB 3928, the transition to an intensity of service funding model, changes to the DS organizational structure, and closer collaboration with the SPED department, provide an opportunity to **envision new SMART program goals**. Taking a strategic, data-driven approach to the goal-setting process would begin with re-examining roles, responsibilities, and the service delivery process, taking into account the constraints of staffing, time, and budget. New goals and objectives should **include those related to implementation**, including service scheduling, intervention dosage, duration, and progress. **Outcome related goals and objectives** can include the *i-Ready* and *STAAR/EOCs*, to align with district level goals and progress measures, while acknowledging the *WIST* as the most proximal indicator and direct measure of program success. Outcome goals should **utilize 2024-25 data as a baseline**, again with consideration given to implementation constraints. Having goals and objectives for each facet of the intervention model will allow for better evaluation and more specific, actionable feedback for program administrators.