

From: [Sunset Advisory Commission](#)
To: [Janet Wood](#); [Brittany Roberson](#)
Subject: FW: Form submission from: Public Input Form for Agencies Under Review (Public/After Publication)
Date: Friday, May 30, 2014 3:06:47 PM

-----Original Message-----

From: sundrupal@capitol.local [<mailto:sundrupal@capitol.local>]
Sent: Friday, May 30, 2014 2:01 PM
To: Sunset Advisory Commission
Subject: Form submission from: Public Input Form for Agencies Under Review (Public/After Publication)

Submitted on Friday, May 30, 2014 - 14:00

Agency: DEPARTMENT STATE HEALTH SERVICES DSHS

First Name: Michelle

Last Name: Bufkin

Title: Accommodations Coordinator, Southern Methodist University

Organization you are affiliated with: Academic Language Therapy Association

Email: mbufkin@smu.edu

City: Dallas

State: Texas

Your Comments About the Staff Report, Including Recommendations Supported or Opposed:

Abolishing licensure for dyslexia therapists and practitioners will do immeasurable harm to families, educators and institutions who rely on licensing standards for professionals they have entrusted to help remediate the language learning difficulties of their students. In my private practice work as a Certified Academic Language Therapist, I routinely hear of the experiences of families who have sought remediation after remediation for their students, only to discover months and sometimes years later, that the techniques and approaches used to supposedly improve the language skills of their students are outdated, ineffective and poorly administered. For the students, critical periods of time are lost as well as their confidence in their learning ability. For parents, financial sacrifices to provide remediation that is unfounded can do irreparable harm to not only family dynamics but also diminish credibility in those professionals' work that is evidence-based and effective.

In the work I do with college students at Southern Methodist University, my standing as a Licensed Dyslexia Therapist is critical when establishing a professional relationship with students and families. The training and experience which lies behind that credential allows me to diffuse any skepticism or unawareness concerning my training and ability to help students in the college setting. As an instructor of teachers seeking this licensure, I gained important perspectives from their experiences in the classroom, seeking to help students with dyslexia but missing critical pieces of training that were filled by the IMSLEC-approved courses they took as part of their training to become Licensed Dyslexia Therapists.

Having been involved in the initial attempts to gain licensure for professionals in the field of dyslexia remediation, I received over 1,000 emails from families in the State of Texas, sharing their stories of time, money and emotion lost on trial-and-error methods for finding help for their children or themselves to learn the critical literacy skills to become

contributing members of society. Licensure was seen by this group of families and educators as an important step in the right direction to protect students and adults and promote high standards in this field. To abolish licensure would throw the field of dyslexia therapy back in to The Dark Ages, in my opinion, and discredit decades of research which prove the highly skilled requirements demanded by licensure are the same ones which effectively remediate written language difficulties across all learning demographics.

The LDT credential behind my name says to the students with whom I work as well as my employer that I cared enough about the learning needs of those entrusted to me to master two years' of past-Masters training specific to dyslexia and then submit my learning to at least 700 hours of clinical practicum teaching, under the supervision of an expert in the field, and then pass a national certifying exam, before I claimed to be qualified to help them.

Public policies should protect the public, especially those members of the public who may not have the benefit of time, knowledge or finances to discriminate between a myriad of options for language remediation. Lowering standards in the field by abolishing licensure is not the answer to creating literate citizens or protecting the public interest. I urge the Commission to maintain licensing standards and continue to make the Licensed Dyslexia Therapist and Practitioner licenses available to those professionals who embrace their work in the field of dyslexia remediation with the focus, rigor and commitment it demands.

Any Alternative or New Recommendations on This Agency: Continue to offer licensure for Licensed Dyslexia Therapists (LDT) and Licensed Dyslexia Practitioners (LDP)

My Comment Will Be Made Public: I agree