

STUDY OF DYSLEXIA AND OTHER SPECIFIC  
LEARNING DISABILITIES



BULLETIN NO. 85-5

LEGISLATIVE COMMISSION  
OF THE  
LEGISLATIVE COUNSEL BUREAU

STATE OF NEVADA

AUGUST 1984



# TABLE OF CONTENTS

	<u>Page</u>
<u>Assembly Concurrent Resolution 54 (File No. 141, Statutes of Nevada 1983)</u> .....	iii
Report of the Legislative Commission .....	v
Summary of Recommendations .....	vii
Report to the Legislative Commission from the Special Committee to Study Dyslexia and Other Specific Learning Disabilities .....	1
I. Introduction .....	1
II. Findings and Recommendations .....	2
A. Compensatory Education Program .....	2
B. Information Dissemination .....	4
C. Diagnostic and Prescriptive Assistance for Students .....	5
D. Research and Program Development .....	6
E. Financial Support .....	7
F. Training of Certificated Personnel .....	8
III. Selected Bibliography .....	10
IV. Credits .....	12
V. Appendices .....	17
Appendix A Letter, Dated October 11, 1983, Surveying All Nevada School Districts Regarding the Types of Identification Instruments and Methods of Instruction Used for Students with Specific Learning Disabilities .....	19
Appendix B Letter and Questionnaire, Dated February 21, 1984, Surveying All Nevada School Districts Regarding the Frequency of Use of Various Identification Instruments and Methods of Instruction for Students with Specific Learning Disabilities .....	25
Appendix C Suggested Legislation .....	47



ASSEMBLY CONCURRENT RESOLUTION—Creating a special committee to study dyslexia and other specific learning disabilities; and authorizing an expenditure from the legislative fund.

WHEREAS, As many as 20 percent of the pupils in our schools are dyslexic or have specific learning disabilities; and

WHEREAS, Many bright pupils are being turned away from educational opportunities because of their often unidentified inability to learn in the conventional method of instruction; and

WHEREAS, Dyslexia and other specific learning disabilities occur despite exposure of pupils to standard educational opportunity, and in the absence of sensory defects, mental retardation, cultural deprivation, and primary emotional disturbance; and

WHEREAS, The future of our state and nation is at risk because over 10 percent of our adult population is functionally illiterate; and

WHEREAS, Increasing numbers of our high school graduates are unable fully to contribute to society because of their learning disadvantages and functional incompetency; and

WHEREAS, About 75 percent of the offenders in our penal institutions seem to come from the same population which earlier experienced specific learning disabilities; and

WHEREAS, There are ongoing problems of communication as a result of disagreement on the appropriate methods for identifying and teaching children with dyslexia or other specific learning disabilities; and

WHEREAS, A multiplicity of testing instruments and instructional methods is available with records of varying degrees of success and acceptance; and

WHEREAS, There is an urgent need to identify and carry out the most effective methods and programs available for identifying and teaching pupils with dyslexia or specific learning disabilities; now, therefore, be it

*Resolved by the Assembly of the State of Nevada, the Senate concurring,* That: 1. The special committee to study dyslexia and other specific learning disabilities is hereby created.

2. The committee is composed of:

(a) One assemblyman appointed by the speaker of the assembly.

(b) One senator appointed by the majority leader of the senate.

(c) One member representing the Nevada State Education Association.

(d) One member representing the department of education.

(e) One member appointed by the governor to represent the general public.

3. The committee shall select its own chairman.

4. The director of the legislative counsel bureau shall provide the necessary professional staff and a secretary for the committee; and be it further,

*Resolved*, That the study include a review and evaluation of the instruments for testing and the methods of instruction that may be used in programs for pupils in the public schools who have dyslexia or other specific learning disabilities; and be it further

*Resolved*, That the expenditure of money from the legislative fund for the expense of this study, in an amount to be fixed by the legislative commission, is hereby authorized; and be it further

*Resolved*, That the results of the study and recommendations on specific programs to address the needs of pupils in Nevada who have dyslexia or specific learning disabilities be reported to the 63rd session of the legislature.

REPORT OF THE LEGISLATIVE COMMISSION  
TO THE MEMBERS OF THE 63RD SESSION OF THE NEVADA LEGISLATURE:

This report is submitted in compliance with Assembly Concurrent Resolution No. 54 which creates a five-member committee to study dyslexia and other specific learning disabilities. The resolution requires that the study include a review and evaluation of the instruments for testing and the methods of instruction that may be used in programs for pupils in the public schools who have dyslexia or other specific learning disabilities. Appointed to conduct the study were:

Assemblyman Robert G. Craddock, Chairman  
Senator Joe Neal, Vice Chairman  
Ted Sanders, superintendent of public instruction,  
representing the state department of education,  
Carson City  
Marian Conrad, representing the Nevada State  
Education Association, Reno  
Susan Standlee, representing the general public, Reno

The committee has attempted in this report to present its findings and recommendations briefly and concisely. A considerable amount of information was gathered in the course of the study. The data which bear directly upon recommendations are included either in the narrative or appendices. All supporting documents and minutes are on file in the research library of the legislative counsel bureau and are available to any member.

This report is transmitted to the members of the 1985 legislature for consideration and appropriate action.

Respectfully submitted,

Legislative Commission  
Legislative Counsel Bureau  
State of Nevada

Carson City, Nevada  
August 1984

\* \* \* \* \*

LEGISLATIVE COMMISSION

Senator James I. Gibson, Chairman

Senator Thomas J. Hickey	Assemblyman Louis W. Bergevin
Senator Robert E. Robinson	Assemblyman Joseph E. Dini, Jr.
Senator Randolph J. Townsend	Assemblyman John E. Jeffrey
Senator Sue Wagner	Assemblyman Michael O. Malone
	Assemblyman David D. Nicholas
	Assemblyman John M. Vergiels

## SUMMARY OF RECOMMENDATIONS

This summary represents the major conclusions reached by the special committee. These conclusions are based upon (1) suggestions which were made to the committee at public hearings by school administrators, psychologists, teachers and parents; (2) written responses to the committee's surveys of school districts; (3) other correspondence to the members and staff of the committee; and (4) the experience and knowledge of the members of the committee.

The special committee recommends:

### COMPENSATORY EDUCATION PROGRAM

1. The statutes be amended to provide for a compensatory education program for basic skills improvement which includes the following provisions:
  - a. Comprehensive compensatory education programs established by the boards of trustees of local school districts. These programs should provide specifically designed educational activities for all students identified as having, or being at risk of having, problems learning basic educational skills. The programs should be designed to raise the level of educational achievement of these students to that appropriate for children of the same age and grade level or to that level which the students are capable.
  - b. Minimum standards for the operation of compensatory education programs prescribed by the state board of education.
  - c. Funding provided by an annual appropriation from the state general fund.
  - d. Approval by the superintendent of public instruction of local compensatory education programs, regarding the prescribed minimum standards, before distribution of state funds is made to any school district. (BDR 34-238)
2. That an annual appropriation be made from the general fund to the state department of education for state level administration of the compensatory education program, development of a resource center and for

conducting an annual state seminar to disseminate information about effective practices and teaching techniques relating to compensatory education.

#### INFORMATION DISSEMINATION

3. The statutes be amended to establish a resource center within the state department of education to make available pertinent information about dyslexia and other specific learning disabilities. The committee further recommends that a computer network between the resource center and the local libraries and school districts be established. (BDR 34-239)
4. The statutes be amended to require the state department of education to conduct at least one seminar annually concerning the subject of dyslexia and other specific learning disabilities for the benefit of school district personnel and other interested parties. (BDR 34-239)
5. The statutes be amended to require the state department of education to identify the diagnostic instruments and remediation methods for dyslexia and other specific learning disabilities that have been properly validated. The committee further recommends that the state department of education be given the authority to require the use of any of these instruments and methods in the local school districts. (BDR 34-239)

#### DIAGNOSTIC AND PRESCRIPTIVE ASSISTANCE FOR STUDENTS

6. The statutes be amended to require the state department of education to develop a procedure that allows students from one school district to use the diagnostic and prescriptive assistance available in another school district. (BDR 34-238)
7. The statutes be amended to require that students who are facing suspension, expulsion, or exclusion from the public schools be tested to determine whether or not they have dyslexia or other specific learning disabilities. (BDR 34-239)
8. The statutes be amended to require that students who are showing a marked deterioration in their behavior or performance at school be tested to determine whether or not they have dyslexia or other specific learning disabilities. (BDR 34-239)

9. The statutes be amended to reduce the age at which minors may be admitted to special programs as provided in Nevada Revised Statutes 388.490 to 3 years.  
(BDR 34-238)
10. The statutes be amended to require each school district to screen all minors for potential learning problems as they enter the Nevada system of public schools.  
(BDR 34-238)
11. A resolution be adopted by the 1985 session of the Nevada legislature urging an increase in the use of peer tutors in the classroom. (BDR 236)

#### RESEARCH AND PROGRAM DEVELOPMENT

12. That an appropriation be made from the state general fund to the state department of education to undertake a detailed assessment of the needs of students with dyslexia and other specific learning disabilities. The committee further recommends that the research include the development of methods to address those needs.
13. That an annual appropriation be made from the state general fund to the state department of education to make competitive discretionary grants available to the school districts to establish programs that use a simultaneous, multisensory approach for students with dyslexia or other specific learning disabilities.
14. The statutes be amended to require the state department of education to identify or develop model programs that will encourage parents to become more directly involved with the identification and remediation of the learning problems of their children. (BDR 34-238)
15. That the 1985 session of the Nevada legislature adopt a resolution urging the state department of education to undertake research to better match remediation methods to the assessment of dyslexia or other specific learning disabilities. (BDR 234)

#### FINANCIAL SUPPORT

16. That school funding be increased to provide additional staffing to the school districts to diagnose and test for dyslexia and other specific learning disabilities.

17. That an annual appropriation be made from the state general fund to the state department of education to provide categorical funding to the school districts to assist those students with dyslexia and other specific learning disabilities who do not qualify under the special education provisions of the Nevada Revised Statutes.
18. A resolution be enacted urging additional private and public support for programs in the field of dyslexia and other specific learning disabilities at the state universities and other institutions. (BDR 237)
19. Sufficient annual funding be provided to public school education in Nevada to provide for an 18 to 1 pupil/teacher ratio in the regular classrooms in each school district.

#### TRAINING OF CERTIFICATED PERSONNEL

20. The statutes be amended to require that all certificated personnel in the school districts receive inservice training in the field of dyslexia and other learning disabilities with standards established by the state department of education. The committee further recommends that the school term be extended by 10 days to provide for the training of the certificated personnel and that salaries of the certificated personnel be increased to reflect the longer school term. (BDR 34-238)

REPORT TO THE 63RD SESSION OF THE NEVADA LEGISLATURE  
BY THE SPECIAL COMMITTEE TO STUDY DYSLEXIA AND  
OTHER SPECIFIC LEARNING DISABILITIES

I. INTRODUCTION

The 1983 session of the Nevada legislature adopted Assembly Concurrent Resolution No. 54 which creates a special committee to study dyslexia and other specific learning disabilities. The impetus for the resolution came from a growing recognition that up to 20 percent of the pupils in Nevada schools may have specific learning disabilities. Under the current academic curriculum, these students often receive a poor education. Moreover, many high school graduates with specific learning disabilities are unable to fully contribute to society. Others with specific learning disabilities often end up as offenders incarcerated in penal institutions.

The special committee was charged with developing recommendations to address the needs of pupils in Nevada who have dyslexia or other specific learning disabilities. To develop recommendations encompassing a wide range of views or opinions on the subject, the committee was composed of two legislators, a representative of the state department of education, a representative of the Nevada State Education Association, and a representative of the general public appointed by the governor.

The committee held 5 days of meetings:

1. November 7, 1983, in Carson City, Nevada;
2. January 19, 1984, in Las Vegas, Nevada;
3. March 15, 1984, in Carson City, Nevada;
4. March 16, 1984, in Carson City, Nevada; and
5. May 7, 1984, in Carson City, Nevada.

The first meeting was organizational and the last a work session to develop recommendations. At the first meeting, Assemblyman Robert G. Craddock was elected chairman and Senator Joe Neal was elected vice chairman of the committee. The three other days of meetings were devoted to receiving testimony from experts and other persons interested in the subject of specific learning disabilities.

The committee conducted two surveys of the Nevada school districts to obtain information regarding the instruments for testing and the methods of instruction used in programs for pupils in the public schools who may have specific learning disabilities. In addition, the committee solicited and obtained considerable amounts of information from federal, state and private sources active in the field of learning disabilities.

This report is, by design, brief. It is the opinion of the committee that a lengthy document, containing technical jargon and explanations, would serve primarily to belabor the findings and dissuade readership.

## II. FINDINGS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

The following sections of this report represent the committee's recommendations and legislative proposals to address the problems of students with dyslexia or other specific learning disabilities.

### A. COMPENSATORY EDUCATION PROGRAM

Under the requirements of Nevada Revised Statutes 389.015, "Proficiency examination: Requirements; disclosure of questions and answers prohibited," the state board of education has prescribed standard examinations of proficiency in reading, writing and mathematics which are administered by local school districts to students in grades 3, 6, 9 and 11. According to state department of education figures, approximately 15 percent of the third grade students and 18 percent of the sixth grade students in Nevada are not meeting the minimum established standard in one or more areas. Twenty percent of the ninth grade students are not meeting the basic proficiency criteria. Children in grades kindergarten through 2 do not participate in this testing program, yet many give early indications of being "at risk" for later school problems. Special education students are not included in these statistics.

Funding to meet the specialized educational needs of students who are not performing at expected levels or who perform at developmentally different rates is limited to state special education units, federal funds for the handicapped, and special federal money for students under the Chapter 1 program of the Education Consolidation and Improvement Act of 1981. Remedial programs for students who are not handicapped or economically disadvantaged are limited. Therefore, most of the 15 percent to 20 percent of students demonstrating low proficiency are not

receiving formal attention by the public schools to their problems. Many of these students are believed to suffer from dyslexia or other specific learning disabilities.

Subsection 3 of Nevada Revised Statutes 389.015 states that results of a pupil's proficiency examination "must be evaluated to determine what remedial study is appropriate." Remedial activities by the school districts are not clearly mandated nor is funding provided.

The special committee received written and oral testimony that Nevada school districts have access to a wide variety of appropriate assessment instruments and remedial approaches to address the needs of students who have difficulty acquiring basic skills. Educators and parents alike testified, however, to the problems that result from (1) insufficient diagnostic personnel; (2) lack of specialized programs for students who do not meet regulatory criteria for admission into special education programs for the learning disabled or the disadvantaged; (3) teachers who need additional training and assistance to meet the unique and diverse needs of students within their regular classrooms; and (4) the need for early identification and remediation for "at risk" children.

The committee believes that every Nevada student should be guaranteed an equal opportunity to an appropriate education commensurate with his or her individual needs and abilities. Other handicapped students are assured that right through federal and state laws, regulations, and special funding. Students who are "low achievers," or who have individual learning styles and rates that significantly differ from the norm, have not been given, the special committee believes, sufficient opportunity for success in the educational system.

To help rectify these apparent inequalities in Nevada's public school education, the committee recommends:

1. The statutes be amended to provide for a compensatory education program for basic skills improvement which includes the following provisions:
  - a. Comprehensive compensatory education programs established by the boards of trustees of local school districts. These programs should provide specifically designed educational activities for all students identified as having, or being at risk of having, problems learning basic educational skills. The programs should be designed to raise

the level of educational achievement of these students to that appropriate for children of the same age and grade level or to that level which the students are capable.

- b. Minimum standards for the operation of compensatory education programs prescribed by the state board of education.
  - c. Funding provided by an annual appropriation from the state general fund.
  - d. Approval by the superintendent of public instruction of local compensatory education programs, regarding the prescribed minimum standards, before distribution of state funds is made to any school district. (BDR 34-238)
2. That an annual appropriation be made from the general fund to the state department of education for administration of the compensatory education program, development of a resource center and for conducting an annual state seminar to disseminate information about effective practices and teaching techniques relating to compensatory education.

#### B. INFORMATION DISSEMINATION

Presentations by several witnesses and the results of two surveys of the school districts appear to demonstrate an inadequate system of intrastate information dissemination regarding the matter of learning disabilities. The committee feels that school districts, the university system and others should have ready access to the research information, testing instruments and remediation methods available on the subject of learning disabilities.

The committee, therefore, recommends:

- 3. The statutes be amended to establish a resource center within the state department of education to make available pertinent information about dyslexia and other specific learning disabilities. The committee further recommends that a computer network between the resource center and the local libraries and school districts be established. (BDR 34-239)
- 4. The statutes be amended to require the state department of education to conduct at least one seminar annually

concerning the subject of dyslexia and other specific learning disabilities for the benefit of school district personnel and other interested parties. (BDR 34-239)

5. The statutes be amended to require the state department of education to identify the diagnostic instruments and remediation methods for dyslexia and other specific learning disabilities that have been properly validated. The committee further recommends that the state department of education be given the authority to require the use of any of these instruments and methods in the local school districts. (BDR 34-239)

C. DIAGNOSTIC AND PRESCRIPTIVE ASSISTANCE FOR STUDENTS

According to the research reviewed by the committee, attitude and behavior problems in the school setting are often symptomatic of specific learning disabilities. These problems often manifest themselves in unsatisfactory school attendance or disruptive classroom conduct by the students. Certain school administrators have a tendency to place the blame for behavioral problems on these students themselves when, in fact, the students are often "victims" of a school system unable to meet their needs. The committee is concerned that many learning disabled students are being unfairly excluded from the educational and other benefits of the school systems because of the students' behavior "problems."

The committee, therefore, recommends:

6. The statutes be amended to require that students who are facing suspension, expulsion, or exclusion from the public schools be tested to determine whether or not they have dyslexia or other specific learning disabilities. (BDR 34-238)
7. The statutes be amended to require that students who are showing a marked deterioration in their behavior or performance at school be tested to determine whether or not they have dyslexia or other specific learning disabilities. (BDR 34-239)

Most expert witnesses advise that early screening is a key to properly identifying and assisting students who are "at risk" for learning disabilities. In addition, students are better served when parents and schools can take full advantage of the "state of the art" information available to diagnose and remediate students with learning disabilities.

To address these matters within Nevada's public schools, the committee recommends:

8. The statutes be amended to reduce the age at which minors may be admitted to special programs as provided in Nevada Revised Statutes 388.490 to 3 years. (BDR 34-239)
9. The statutes be amended to require each school district to screen all minors for potential learning problems as they enter the Nevada system of public schools. (BDR 34-238)
10. The statutes be amended to require the state department of education to develop a procedure that allows students from one school district to use the diagnostic and prescriptive assistance available in another school district. (BDR 34-238)

The committee heard testimony indicating that there are inadequate resources available for the schools to assist all those students who may have learning difficulties. One low-cost and apparently effective way to help students with learning disabilities is through the use of peer tutors in the classroom. Parents and teachers alike indicated in their presentations to the committee that peer tutors can enhance the education of children with learning disabilities.

The committee, therefore, recommends:

11. A resolution be adopted by the 1985 session of the Nevada legislature urging an increase in the use of peer tutors in the classroom. (BDR 236)

#### D. RESEARCH AND PROGRAM DEVELOPMENT

Information was presented to the committee detailing the innovative research and program development work pertaining to learning disabilities that has been done at the local level. The committee applauds these efforts and strongly supports further initiatives in the school districts. The committee, nevertheless, believes that there must be a more active role for the state in research and program development. All students in Nevada, regardless of their county of residence, must be guaranteed the best educational opportunity possible.

The committee, therefore, recommends:

12. That an appropriation be made from the state general fund to the state department of education to undertake a detailed assessment of the needs of students with dyslexia and other specific learning disabilities. The committee further recommends that the research include the development of methods to address those needs.
13. That an annual appropriation be made from the state general fund to the state department of education to make competitive discretionary grants available to the school districts to establish programs that use a simultaneous, multisensory approach for students with dyslexia or other specific learning disabilities.
14. The statutes be amended to require the state department of education to identify or develop model programs that will encourage parents to become more directly involved with the identification and remediation of the learning problems of their children. (BDR 34-238)
15. That the 1985 session of the Nevada legislature adopt a resolution urging the state department of education to undertake research to better match remediation methods to the assessment of dyslexia or other specific learning disabilities. (BDR 234)

#### E. FINANCIAL SUPPORT

In many instances, proper financing is a key ingredient in improving the quality of public school education. The same holds true in improving the education of students with learning disabilities.

Persons who appeared before the committee identified two primary areas where increased funding could improve the education of children with learning disabilities. At present, several school districts in Nevada have up to 3 months backlog of students waiting to be tested for learning disabilities. Other school districts have inadequate resources to assist students with learning disabilities.

To address both of these problems, the committee recommends:

16. That school funding be increased to provide additional staffing to the school districts to diagnose and test for dyslexia and other specific learning disabilities.
17. That an annual appropriation be made from the state general fund to the state department of education to

**provide categorical funding to the school districts to assist those students with dyslexia and other specific learning disabilities who do not qualify under the special education provisions of the Nevada Revised Statutes.**

The committee determined that public and private support of programs for the learning disabled have been important to universities and other nonprofit organizations. Continuation and enhancement of this support are needed.

The committee, therefore, recommends:

- 18. A resolution be enacted urging additional private and public support for programs in the field of dyslexia and other specific learning disabilities at the state universities and other institutions. (BDR 237)**

Research indicates that the teaching of students with learning disabilities in the regular classroom is ineffective unless the pupil/teacher ratio is reduced to under 18 to 1. A reduction of this magnitude would also help other students and possibly relieve the workload pressure on teachers as well.

The committee, therefore, recommends:

- 19. That sufficient annual funding be provided to public education to enable a reduction to under 18 to 1 of the pupil/teacher ratio in the regular classroom in each school district.**

#### **F. TRAINING OF CERTIFICATED PERSONNEL**

Considerable testimony was provided to the committee indicating that most certificated school personnel are unable to recognize, understand and deal with the problems of students with learning disabilities. The committee feels that additional training on the subject of learning disabilities should be required of all certificated personnel. This training should be offered as an extension of the school year and teachers should be paid accordingly.

The committee, therefore, recommends:

- 20. The statutes be amended to require that all certificated personnel in the school districts receive inservice training in the field of dyslexia and other learning disabilities. The state department of education be required to set the standards for the inservice**

training. The committee further recommends that the school term be extended by 10 days to provide for the training of the certificated personnel. Salaries of the certificated personnel are to be increased to reflect the longer school term. (BDR 34-238)

### III. SELECTED BIBLIOGRAPHY

1. Highland Park Independent School District, Dallas, Texas. Annual Report. Fall 1982.
2. Idaho Department of Education. Identifying Learning Disabled Students in Idaho. July 1982.
3. Iowa Department of Education. Special Education Division. The Identification of Pupils with Learning Disabilities. August 1981.
4. Mainzer, Richard W. The Maryland Learning Disabilities Project--A Status Report to the Maryland State Board of Education on June 29, 1983. Maryland State Department of Education, Division of Special Education. September 1983.
5. Minnesota Department of Education Division of Instruction. Special Education Section. Guideline Handbook for Defining and Serving Students with Specific Learning Disabilities. Draft. Fall 1983.
6. National Joint Committee on Learning Disabilities. Issues in the Delivery of Educational Service to Individuals with Learning Disabilities. Position paper.
7. National Joint Committee on Learning Disabilities. Learning Disabilities: Issues on Definition. Position paper. January 30, 1981.
8. Nevada Department of Education. "Rationale for Early Childhood Special Education," Early Childhood Special Education Manual. (1981) pp. 2-8.
9. Ohio Department of Education. Ohio Guidelines for the Identification of Children with Specific Learning Disabilities (Including Differentiated Referral Procedure). July 1983.
10. Portland Public Schools. Special Education. Manual for Resource Service Model.
11. Salvia, John and James E. Ysseldyke. "Summary and Synthesis," Assessment in Special and Remedial Education. Boston: Houghton-Mifflin, 1978, pp. 456-475.

12. Six, Les, Memorandum to John Vugrin. Addendum to Report of 1982 Proficiency Assessment Results. Chula Vista School District, January 31, 1983.
13. Solorzano, Lucia. "Dyslexia: Help for Victims of a Puzzling Ailment," U.S. News and World Report, November 7, 1983, p. 84.
14. Telzrow, Cathy F. and James L. Williams. LD Discrepancy Formula: A Handbook. Cuyahoga Special Education Service Center, Maple Heights, Ohio, 1982.
15. The Orton Dyslexia Society. "Dyslexia in Perspective," Annals of Dyslexia. Volume XXXIII (1983).
16. U.S. Department of Education. National Diffusion Network. Educational Programs That Work, Far West Laboratory for Research and Development. Ninth Edition (1983).
17. U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. National Advisory Committee on Dyslexia and Related Reading Disorders. Reading Disorders in the United States. August 1969.
18. Utah State Office of Education. Rules and Regulations for Education Programs for the Handicapped. November 20, 1981.

---

Note: This selected bibliography includes the reference sources that were used by the special committee in its interim study. Copies of all of the listed documents are available at the research library of the legislative counsel bureau.

#### IV. CREDITS

The following is a listing of the names of persons who appeared before the committee:

Bendorf, Pat  
Private Citizen  
and  
Trustee  
Clark County School District  
Las Vegas, Nevada

Bily, Rick  
Resource Room Teacher  
Pershing County School District  
Lovelock, Nevada

Budd, Beverly  
School Psychologist  
Washoe County School District  
Reno, Nevada

Conrad, Byron  
Private Citizen  
Reno, Nevada

Dettre, Dr. Judith  
Professor of Education  
Director  
Reading Center and Clinic  
University of Nevada, Las Vegas  
Las Vegas, Nevada

Dorf, Dr. John  
Director  
Special Services  
Douglas County School District  
Minden, Nevada

Gickling, Dr. Edward E.  
Director  
Special Education Program  
University of Nevada, Reno  
Reno, Nevada

Hansen, Nilsine  
Coordinator  
Special Education Services  
Washoe County School District  
Reno, Nevada

Hollingsworth, Dr. Paul  
Director of the Reading and  
Learning Disabilities Center  
and  
Chairman of the Department of  
Curriculum and Instruction  
University of Nevada, Reno  
Reno, Nevada

Johnson, Joaquin G.  
Superintendent  
Nye County School District  
Tonopah, Nevada

Keehn, Muriel  
School Psychologist  
and  
Supervisor of Psychological  
and Health Services  
Carson City School District  
Carson City, Nevada

Kirk, James L.  
Director of Special Services  
Lyon County School District  
and  
President of the Nevada Association  
of School Psychologists  
Yerington, Nevada

Ledbetter, Rabel  
Private Citizen  
Las Vegas, Nevada

Lillimagi, Sue  
Child Development Specialist II  
and  
Supervisor of Treatment  
Special Children's Clinic  
Nevada Division of Health  
Department of Human Resources  
Las Vegas, Nevada

Linderman, Jack F.  
Psychologist  
Nye County School District  
Tonopah, Nevada

Loudon, Kay  
President  
Washoe County School Board  
Reno, Nevada

Martin, Eugene  
Chairperson  
Coalition for Handicapped  
Children's Education  
Las Vegas, Nevada

Miller, Ruth  
Diagnostic/Prescriptive Assistant  
Washoe County School District  
Reno, Nevada

Nicosia, Linda  
Northern Vice Chairman  
Coalition for Handicapped  
Children's Education  
Carson City, Nevada

Samson, Joseph  
Private Citizen  
Carson City, Nevada

Smith, Deborah  
Psychologist II  
Special Children's Clinic  
Nevada Division of Health  
Department of Human Resources  
Las Vegas, Nevada

South, Frank  
Director  
Special Education  
State Department of Education  
Carson City, Nevada

Steele, Judi Kandel  
Director  
Special Student Services  
Department  
Clark County School District  
Las Vegas, Nevada

Sullivan, Mary  
Reading Specialist  
Reed High School  
and  
University of Nevada, Reno  
Reno, Nevada

Tapogna, Debi Langston  
Private Citizen  
Reno, Nevada

Templeton, Dr. Shane  
Language Arts Expert  
University of Nevada, Reno  
Reno, Nevada

Terras, Frances  
Remedial Reading Teacher  
Washoe County School District  
Reno, Nevada

Thomas, Kristin  
Teacher for the Lincoln County  
School District  
and  
President of the Nevada Association  
for Children with Learning Disabilities  
Alamo, Nevada

Van Vactor, Dr. John C.  
Associate Professor  
Special Education  
University of Nevada, Las Vegas  
Las Vegas, Nevada

Webb, Paul G.  
School Psychologist  
Dorothy Siegle Diagnostic Center  
Clark County School District  
Las Vegas, Nevada

Wheat, Laura and Richard  
Private Citizens  
Logandale, Nevada

Worthen, Sue  
Reading Specialist  
Jacks Valley Elementary School  
Minden, Nevada



## V. APPENDICES

	<u>Page</u>
Appendix A - Letter, Dated October 11, 1983, Surveying All Nevada School Districts Regarding the Types of Identification Instruments and Methods of Instruction Used for Students with Specific Learning Disabilities .....	19
Appendix B - Letter and Questionnaire, Dated February 21, 1984, Surveying All Nevada School Districts Regarding Frequency of Use of Various Identification Instruments and Methods of Instruction for Students with Specific Learning Disabilities .....	25
Appendix C - Suggested Legislation .....	47



## APPENDIX A

Letter, Dated October 11, 1983, Surveying All Nevada  
School Districts Regarding the Types of  
Identification Instruments and Methods  
of Instruction Used for Students with  
Specific Learning Disabilities

Because of their volume, the individual responses from the  
17 school districts have not been included in this report.  
They are available at the research library of the legisla-  
tive counsel bureau.



STATE OF NEVADA  
LEGISLATIVE COUNSEL BUREAU  
LEGISLATIVE BUILDING  
CAPITOL COMPLEX  
CARSON CITY, NEVADA 89710

LEGISLATIVE COMMISSION (702) 885-5627  
JAMES I. GIBSON, *Senator, Chairman*  
Arthur J. Palmer, *Director, Secretary*  
INTERIM FINANCE COMMITTEE (702) 885-5640  
ROGER BREMNER, *Assemblyman, Chairman*  
Daniel G. Miles, *Fiscal Analyst*  
Mark W. Stevens, *Fiscal Analyst*



ARTHUR J. PALMER, *Director*  
(702) 885-5627

FRANK W. DAYKIN, *Legislative Counsel* (702) 885-5627  
JOHN R. CROSSLEY, *Legislative Auditor* (702) 885-5622  
DONALD A. RHODES, *Research Director* (702) 885-5637

October 11, 1983

✓

Dear ✓:

I am writing on behalf of Assemblyman Robert G. Craddock and the Special Committee to Study Dyslexia and Other Specific Learning Disabilities (A.C.R. 54).

Under A.C.R. 54 (File No. 141), the committee is directed to review and evaluate the instruments for testing and methods of instruction that may be used in programs for pupils in the public schools who have dyslexia or other specific learning disabilities. A copy of the resolution is enclosed for your consideration.

Assemblyman Craddock, acting committee chairman, requests that you provide the committee with information on your school district's diagnostic and identification instruments and testing procedures regarding dyslexia or other specific learning disabilities (SLD). In addition, he requests that you furnish details of your curriculum and methods of instruction for dyslexia/SLD students.

Since the committee's first meeting is scheduled for November 7, 1983, in Carson City, the committee will need your reply prior to November 4, 1983. Any additional input concerning the interim study would be appreciated. Please send your response to me at the address on this letterhead.

Thank you for your cooperation.

Sincerely,

Donald O. Williams  
Senior Research Analyst

DOW/dr:ltr2  
Enclosure (A.C.R. 54)

Dr. F. Gregory Betts, Superintendent  
Douglas County School District  
P.O. Box 1888  
Minden, Nevada 89423

James Bullock, Superintendent  
Esmeralda County School District  
P.O. Box 546  
Goldfield, Nevada 89013

Orville D. Culley, Superintendent  
Storey County School District  
P.O. Box C  
Virginia City, Nevada 89440

Elmo Dericco, Superintendent  
Churchill County School District  
545 East Richards Street  
Fallon, Nevada 89406

Harry J. Dickson, Superintendent  
Carson City School District  
P.O. Box 603  
Carson City, Nevada 89702

Arlo Funk, Superintendent  
Mineral County School District  
P.O. Box 1547  
Hawthorne, Nevada 89415

Dr. Leon Hensley, Superintendent  
Lander County School District  
P.O. Box 1300  
Battle Mountain, Nevada 89820

Joaquin Johnson, Superintendent  
Nye County School District  
P.O. Box 113  
Tonopah, Nevada 89049

James P. Kiley, Superintendent  
Pershing County School District  
P.O. Box 389  
Lovelock, Nevada 89419

Charles H. Knight, Superintendent  
Elko County School District  
P.O. Box 1012  
Elko, Nevada 89801

Russell McOmber, Superintendent  
White Pine County School District  
P.O. Box 400  
East Ely, Nevada 89315

Dr. Neldon Mathews, Superintendent  
Lincoln County School District  
P.O. Box 118  
Panaca, Nevada 89042

Dr. Marvin Moss, Superintendent  
Washoe County School District  
425 East Ninth Street  
Reno, Nevada 89520

Selway Mulkey, Superintendent  
Eureka County School District  
P.O. Box 249  
Eureka, Nevada 89316

Robert Scott, Superintendent  
Humboldt County School District  
P.O. Box 1070  
Winnemucca, Nevada 89445

Dr. Barton W. Welsh, Superintendent  
Lyon County School District  
25 East Goldfield Avenue  
Yerington, Nevada 89447

Dr. Robert Wentz, Superintendent  
Clark County School District  
2832 East Flamingo Road  
Las Vegas, Nevada 89121

Dr. Robert Whittemore  
3035 Sprout Way  
Sparks, Nevada 89431



## APPENDIX B

Letter and Questionnaire, Dated February 21, 1984,  
Surveying All Nevada School Districts Regarding  
the Frequency of Use of Various Identification  
Instruments and Methods of Instruction for  
Students with Specific Learning  
Disabilities

Because of their volume, the responses have not been included in the report. Individual and grouped responses are available at the research library of the legislative counsel bureau.



STATE OF NEVADA  
LEGISLATIVE COUNSEL BUREAU

LEGISLATIVE BUILDING  
CAPITOL COMPLEX  
CARSON CITY, NEVADA 89710



LEGISLATIVE COMMISSION (702) 885-5627  
JAMES I. GIBSON, *Senator, Chairman*  
Arthur J. Palmer, *Director, Secretary*  
INTERIM FINANCE COMMITTEE (702) 885-5640  
ROGER BREMNER, *Assemblyman, Chairman*  
Daniel G. Miles, *Fiscal Analyst*  
Mark W. Stevens, *Fiscal Analyst*

ARTHUR J. PALMER, *Director*  
(702) 885-5627

FRANK W. DAYKIN, *Legislative Counsel* (702) 885-5627  
JOHN R. CROSSLEY, *Legislative Auditor* (702) 885-5622  
DONALD A. RHODES, *Research Director* (702) 885-5637

February 21, 1984

V

Dear V:

I am writing on behalf of Chairman Robert G. Craddock and the Legislative Commission's Special Committee to Study Dyslexia and Other Specific Learning Disabilities (A.C.R. 54).

On October 11, 1983, the committee had requested information on your school district's diagnostic and identification instruments and methods of instruction regarding dyslexia and other specific learning disabilities. The information we received from your school district and the other Nevada school districts has proven very helpful. The responses also have raised a number of questions by members of the committee. The enclosed survey, which seeks specific testing and remediation information as well as your school district's opinion on certain issues, is designed to answer those questions.

The next meeting of the special committee is scheduled for March 15 and 16, 1984, in Carson City. The committee would appreciate receiving your response by March 8, 1984, so that the information can be reviewed and discussed at the 2-day meeting. If you have any questions regarding the survey, please call me at 885-5637. Please send the completed survey to me at the address on this letterhead.

Thank you for your cooperation.

Sincerely,

Ted Zuend  
Senior Research Analyst

TZ/dr:ltr9  
Enc.

Dr. F. Gregory Betts, Superintendent  
Douglas County School District  
P.O. Box 1888  
Minden, Nevada 89423

James Bullock, Superintendent  
Esmeralda County School District  
P.O. Box 546  
Goldfield, Nevada 89013

Orville D. Culley, Superintendent  
Storey County School District  
P.O. Box C  
Virginia City, Nevada 89440

Elmo Dericco, Superintendent  
Churchill County School District  
545 East Richards Street  
Fallon, Nevada 89406

Harry J. Dickson, Superintendent  
Carson City School District  
P.O. Box 603  
Carson City, Nevada 89702

Arlo Funk, Superintendent  
Mineral County School District  
P.O. Box 1547  
Hawthorne, Nevada 89415

Dr. Leon Hensley, Superintendent  
Lander County School District  
P.O. Box 1300  
Battle Mountain, Nevada 89820

Joaquin Johnson, Superintendent  
Nye County School District  
P.O. Box 113  
Tonopah, Nevada 89049

James P. Kiley, Superintendent  
Pershing County School District  
P.O. Box 389  
Lovelock, Nevada 89419

Charles H. Knight, Superintendent  
Elko County School District  
P.O. Box 1012  
Elko, Nevada 89801

Russell McOmber, Superintendent  
White Pine County School District  
P.O. Box 400  
East Ely, Nevada 89315

Dr. Neldon Mathews, Superintendent  
Lincoln County School District  
P.O. Box 118  
Panaca, Nevada 89042

Dr. Marvin Moss, Superintendent  
Washoe County School District  
425 East Ninth Street  
Reno, Nevada 89520

Selway Mulkey, Superintendent  
Eureka County School District  
P.O. Box 249  
Eureka, Nevada 89316

Robert Scott, Superintendent  
Humboldt County School District  
P.O. Box 1070  
Winnemucca, Nevada 89445

Dr. Barton W. Welsh, Superintendent  
Lyon County School District  
25 East Goldfield Avenue  
Yerington, Nevada 89447

Dr. Robert Wentz, Superintendent  
Clark County School District  
2832 East Flamingo Road  
Las Vegas, Nevada 89121

Dr. Robert Whittemore  
3035 Sprout Way  
Sparks, Nevada 89431

SURVEY OF NEVADA SCHOOL DISTRICTS  
FOR COMMITTEE TO STUDY DYSLEXIA AND  
OTHER SPECIFIC LLARNING DISABILITIES  
\* \* \* \* \*

Name of District \_\_\_\_\_

I Assessment

A. The following list of assessment instruments was compiled from information submitted by Nevada school districts to the Legislative Commission's Special Committee to Study Dyslexia and Other Specific Learning Disabilities. In an attempt to get a clearer picture of how these instruments are used with the population in question, you are asked to review the list and make the following notations:

- Indicate with an X in the appropriate column if the instrument is used in your district to plan instruction for or to assist in identification of students with dyslexia or other learning disabilities.
- Rank the five (5) instruments most frequently used by your district, with 1 representing the most frequently used, 2 representing the next most frequently used and so on. Please rank the tests within each category separately, i.e. 5 for achievement, 5 for intelligence, etc.

Rank Order of Frequency of Use in District (5 per category)	Used to Assist in Identification of Students as Learning Disabled	Used to Plan Instruction	Name of Instrument
_____	_____	_____	1. Individual Achievement Tests
_____	_____	_____	Aloud Oral Reading Sample
_____	_____	_____	Basal Text Placement Tests
_____	_____	_____	Brigance Inventory
_____	_____	_____	Broder Test of Reading-Spelling F
_____	_____	_____	CBS Reading
_____	_____	_____	Classroom Diagnostic Reading Inve
_____	_____	_____	Criterion Test of Basic Skills
_____	_____	_____	Diagnostic Paragraph Test
_____	_____	_____	Diagnostic Spelling Test
_____	_____	_____	Dolch Sight Words Test
_____	_____	_____	Doren Diag. Read. Test/Word Reco
_____	_____	_____	Durrell Analysis of Reading Diff
_____	_____	_____	Durrell Listening-Reading Series
_____	_____	_____	Elementary Reading Placement Tes
_____	_____	_____	Gates-MacGinitie Reading Tests
_____	_____	_____	Gates-McKillop Reading Diagnosti
_____	_____	_____	Gilmore Oral Reading Test
_____	_____	_____	Gray Oral Reading Test

## DISTRICT SURVEY(cont.)

<u>Rank Order of Frequency of Use in District (5 per category)</u>	<u>Used to Assist in Identification of Students as Learning Disabled</u>	<u>Used to Plan Instruction</u>	<u>Name of Instrument</u>
_____	_____	_____	1. <i>Individual Achievement Tests (con</i>
_____	_____	_____	Hollingsworth Diag. Class. Read. Test
_____	_____	_____	Houghton-Mifflin Informal Basal Serie
_____	_____	_____	Individual Reading Placement Inventor
_____	_____	_____	Informal Reading Inventories
_____	_____	_____	Iowa Test of Basic Skills
_____	_____	_____	Kaufman Assessment Battery for Childr
_____	_____	_____	KeyMath Diagnostic Arithmetic Test
_____	_____	_____	Lippincott Placement Tests
_____	_____	_____	Math Management Cluster Tests
_____	_____	_____	Metropolitan Reading Test
_____	_____	_____	Nevada Proficiency Exams
_____	_____	_____	Open Court Basic Reading Series
_____	_____	_____	Otis Lennon School Ability Test
_____	_____	_____	Peabody Individual Achievement Test
_____	_____	_____	Reading Management Cluster Tests
_____	_____	_____	Silent Reading Test
_____	_____	_____	Silveroli Classroom Reading Inventory
_____	_____	_____	Slingerland Screen. Specific Lang. At
_____	_____	_____	Slosson Oral Reading Test
_____	_____	_____	Spache Diagnostic Reading Series
_____	_____	_____	Spadofore Diagnostic Reading Test
_____	_____	_____	SRA Morphographic Spelling Test
_____	_____	_____	Stanford Achievement Test
_____	_____	_____	Stanford Diagnostic Arithmetic Test
_____	_____	_____	Stanford Diagnostic Reading Test
_____	_____	_____	Stanford Early School Achievement Te
_____	_____	_____	Sucher-Allred Reading Placement Inver
_____	_____	_____	Test of Written Language
_____	_____	_____	Test of Written Spelling
_____	_____	_____	University of Nevada, Reno-Spelling
_____	_____	_____	Von Nagle Criterion Reference Test
_____	_____	_____	Wide Range Achievement Test
_____	_____	_____	Woodcock-Johnson Psychoeducational B.

## DISTRICT SURVEY(cont.)

<u>Rank Order of Frequency of Use in District (5 per category)</u>	<u>Used to Assist in Identification of Students as Learning Disabled</u>	<u>Used to Plan Instruction</u>	<u>Name of Instrument</u>
_____	_____	_____	<i>1. Individual Achievement Tests (</i>
_____	_____	_____	Woodcock Reading Mastery Test
_____	_____	_____	Word Attack Inventory
			Word Recognition and Word Analysis
			<i>2. Individual Intelligence Tests</i>
_____	_____	_____	Cattell Culture Fair Intelligence
_____	_____	_____	Columbia Mental Maturity Scale
_____	_____	_____	Escale de Inteligencia Wechsler Pa
_____	_____	_____	Hiskey-Nebraska Test of Learn. Apt
_____	_____	_____	Infant Intelligence Scale, Cattell
_____	_____	_____	Kaufman Assessment Battery for Chi
_____	_____	_____	Leiter International Performance S
_____	_____	_____	Minnesota PreSchool Scale
_____	_____	_____	Nonverbal Intelligence Test
_____	_____	_____	Peabody Picture Vocabulary Test-Re
_____	_____	_____	Pictorial Test of Intelligence
_____	_____	_____	Raven Coloured Matrices
_____	_____	_____	Raven Progressive Matrices (Stand
_____	_____	_____	Slosson Intelligence Test
_____	_____	_____	Stanford-Binet Intelligence Scale
_____	_____	_____	Wechsler Adult Intelligence Scale
_____	_____	_____	Wechsler Intelligence Scale Child.
_____	_____	_____	Wechsler Preschool and Primary Sca
			of Intelligence
			<i>3. Individual Personality Tests</i>
_____	_____	_____	Children's Apperception Test
_____	_____	_____	Children's Personality Questionnai
_____	_____	_____	Goodenough-Harris Drawing Test
_____	_____	_____	Holtzman Inkblot Technique
_____	_____	_____	House-Tree-Person Test
_____	_____	_____	Junior-Senior High Sch. Personalit
_____	_____	_____	Kinetic Family Drawing
_____	_____	_____	Mooney Problem Check Lists

## DISTRICT SURVEY(cont.)

<u>Rank Order of Frequency of Use in District (5 per category)</u>	<u>Used to Assist in Identification of Students as Learning Disabled</u>	<u>Used to Plan Instruction</u>	<u>Name of Instrument</u>
_____	_____	_____	3. <i>Individual Personality Tests (cont</i>
_____	_____	_____	Personal Adjustment Inventory
_____	_____	_____	Rorschach Method of Personality Diag.
_____	_____	_____	Rotter Incomplete Sentence Blanks
_____	_____	_____	Sentence Completion Test
_____	_____	_____	Thematic Apperception Test (TAT)
_____	_____	_____	4. <i>Individual Diagnostics</i>
_____	_____	_____	Auditory Analysis of Word Elements
_____	_____	_____	Auditory Discrimination Test
_____	_____	_____	Auditory-Visual Integration Tests
_____	_____	_____	Bender Visual Motor Gestalt Test
_____	_____	_____	Benton Visual Retention Test
_____	_____	_____	Bruininks-Oseretsky Test of Motor Prof
_____	_____	_____	Clark Motor Scale
_____	_____	_____	Codebreakers Diag. Prescriptive Progra
_____	_____	_____	Denver Developmental Test
_____	_____	_____	Devel. Test of Visual Motor Integratio
_____	_____	_____	Detroit Tests of Learning Aptitude
_____	_____	_____	Differential Aptitude Tests
_____	_____	_____	Early Prevention of School Failure
_____	_____	_____	Family History Report
_____	_____	_____	Frostiq Devel. Test of Visual Percepti
_____	_____	_____	Goldman-Fristoe-Woodcock Aud. Discrim.
_____	_____	_____	Handbook I: A Mainstream Approach-L.D
_____	_____	_____	Hanes Test of Lateral Dominance
_____	_____	_____	Hutt Adaptation of the Bender Gestalt
_____	_____	_____	Illinois Test of Psycholinguistic Abil
_____	_____	_____	Illinois Test of Visual Motor Integrat
_____	_____	_____	Jane Rout Test Visual Auditory Discrim
_____	_____	_____	Jordan Left-Right Reversal Test
_____	_____	_____	LAC Test (Lindamood Auditory Concept.)
_____	_____	_____	Listening Comprehension Test
_____	_____	_____	McCarthy Screening Test

DISTRICT SURVEY(cont.)

<u>Rank Order of Frequency of Use in District (5 per category)</u>	<u>Used to Assist in Identification of Students as Learning Disabled</u>	<u>Used to Plan Instruction</u>	<u>Name of Instrument</u>
_____	_____	_____	<i>4. Individual Diagnostics (cont.</i>
_____	_____	_____	Monroe Visualization Test
_____	_____	_____	Motor Free Visual Perception Test
_____	_____	_____	Preschool Screening Instrument
_____	_____	_____	Purdue Perceptual-Motor Survey
_____	_____	_____	Self Appraisal Inventory
_____	_____	_____	Slosson Drawing Coordination Test
_____	_____	_____	Social Maturity Scale Blind Presc
_____	_____	_____	So. Cal. Batt. Motor Sensory Disf
_____	_____	_____	Test of Motor Coordination
_____	_____	_____	Visual Aural Digit Span Test
_____	_____	_____	Visual Memory of Word Forms
_____	_____	_____	Visual Perception Test
_____	_____	_____	Visual Retention Test
_____	_____	_____	Wepman Auditory Discrimination Te
_____	_____	_____	Winterhaven-Perceptual Copy Forms
_____	_____	_____	Woodcock-Johnson Psychoeducationa
_____	_____	_____	<i>5. Behavior Scales and Surveys</i>
_____	_____	_____	Adaptive Behavior Inventory for C
_____	_____	_____	Adaptive Behavior Scale (AAMD)
_____	_____	_____	Analysis of Coping Style
_____	_____	_____	Behavior Rating Profile
_____	_____	_____	Developmental Profile
_____	_____	_____	Gessell Developmental Kit
_____	_____	_____	McCarthy Scales of Children's Abi
_____	_____	_____	Valett Devel. Survey Basic Learn.
_____	_____	_____	Vineland Social Maturity Scale
_____	_____	_____	Walker Problem Behavior
_____	_____	_____	<i>6. Speech and Language Tests</i>
_____	_____	_____	Assessment of Children's Language
_____	_____	_____	The Bankson Language Screening Te
_____	_____	_____	Bicultural Test of Non-Verbal Rea

## DISTRICT SURVEY(cont.)

<u>Rank Order of Frequency of Use in District (5 per category)</u>	<u>Used to Assist in Identification of Students as Learning Disabled</u>	<u>Used to Plan Instruction</u>	<u>Name of Instrument</u>
_____	_____	_____	6. <i>Speech and Language Tests (cont.)</i>
_____	_____	_____	Birth to Three Diagnostic Inventory
_____	_____	_____	Boehm Test of Basic Concepts
_____	_____	_____	Bryingleson Articulation Test
_____	_____	_____	Carrow Elicited Language Inventory
_____	_____	_____	CELF Screening Tests
_____	_____	_____	Clinical Evaluation of Lang. Function- Communication Screen
_____	_____	_____	Comprehensive Expressive Lang. Invent.
_____	_____	_____	Del Rio Language Screening Test
_____	_____	_____	Denver Auditory Phoneme Sequencing Test
_____	_____	_____	Detroit Test of Learning Aptitude
_____	_____	_____	Developmental Sentence Analysis Test
_____	_____	_____	Dworkin-Cullotta Oral Mechanism Exam
_____	_____	_____	Environmental Pre-language Battery
_____	_____	_____	Expressive One-Word Vocabulary Test
_____	_____	_____	Fisher-Logemann Test of Articulation
_____	_____	_____	Goldman Fristoe Test of Articulation
_____	_____	_____	Goldman Fristoe-Woodcock Test/Aud. Sk
_____	_____	_____	Haws Screening Test/Funct. Artic. Disor
_____	_____	_____	Illinois Test of Psycholinguistic Abi
_____	_____	_____	Joliet 3-Minute Speech/Lang. Screen
_____	_____	_____	Language Development Scale (Meecham)
_____	_____	_____	Language Sampling and Analysis
_____	_____	_____	Lindamood Test of Auditory Concept.
_____	_____	_____	McDonald's Deep Test of Articulation
_____	_____	_____	Multilevel Informal Language Inventory
_____	_____	_____	Northwestern Syntax Screening Test
_____	_____	_____	Oral Language Sentence Imitation Test
_____	_____	_____	Patterned Elicitation Syntax Screening
_____	_____	_____	Peabody Picture Vocabulary Test
_____	_____	_____	Phonological Process Analysis
_____	_____	_____	Photo Articulation Test
_____	_____	_____	Porch Index of Communicative Ability

DISTRICT SURVEY(cont.)

<u>Rank Order of Frequency of Use in District (5 per category)</u>	<u>Used to Assist in Identification of Students as Learning Disabled</u>	<u>Used to Plan Instruction</u>	<u>Name of Instrument</u>
_____	_____	_____	6. <i>Speech and Language Tests (con</i>
_____	_____	_____	Preschool Language Scale
_____	_____	_____	Programed Conditioned Language Tes
_____	_____	_____	Quick Neurological Screening Test
_____	_____	_____	Screening Test of Adolescent Lang
_____	_____	_____	Sequenced Invent. Communication D
_____	_____	_____	Southwestern Spanish Articulation
_____	_____	_____	Templin Darby Articulation Test
_____	_____	_____	Test for Examining Expressive Mor
_____	_____	_____	Test of Adolescent Language
_____	_____	_____	Test of Articulation Performance
_____	_____	_____	Test of Aud. Comp. of Lang. Carre
_____	_____	_____	Test of Early Language Developmer
_____	_____	_____	Test of Oral Language Development
_____	_____	_____	Test of Practical Knowledge
_____	_____	_____	The Token Test
_____	_____	_____	Toronto Tests of Receptive Vocabl
_____	_____	_____	Utah Test of Language Developmen
_____	_____	_____	Vance Evaluation of Language
_____	_____	_____	Verbal Communication Screen
_____	_____	_____	Verbal Language Scale
_____	_____	_____	Visco Child Development Test
_____	_____	_____	Washington Speech and Sound Disc
_____	_____	_____	Weiss Comprehensive Test of Arti
_____	_____	_____	Wepman Test of Auditory Discrimi
_____	_____	_____	The Word Test
_____	_____	_____	Zimmerman Preschool Language Tes

DISTRICT SURVEY(cont.)

B. Opinions about assessment. Please indicate your agreement or disagreement with the following statements and include any comments you wish to add.

Agree	Disagree	1. Some districts have a wider selection of tests available because they have more specialized personnel trained in a wider variety of approaches or perspectives.
_____	_____	
COMMENTS:		
Agree	Disagree	2. It is important to have a wide selection of tests available, because certain tests yield information that other tests won't yield, which may be important to ascertain for a particular child.
_____	_____	
COMMENTS:		
Agree	Disagree	3. The average length of total testing time for Learning Disabled students in this district is between two and four hours.
_____	_____	
COMMENTS:		
Agree	Disagree	4. The total amount of specialist time spent on testing, meetings and report development is between 8 and 12 hours for each child referred.
_____	_____	
COMMENTS:		
Agree	Disagree	5. The wait for testing in this district may be lengthy because of the number of referrals in relationship to the number of available diagnostic personnel.
_____	_____	
COMMENTS:		
Agree	Disagree	6. A good special education teacher can provide appropriate instruction without any assessment data.
_____	_____	
COMMENTS:		
Agree	Disagree	7. All school districts in Nevada should use a standard battery of tests with every child who is suspected of having specific learning disabilities.
_____	_____	
COMMENTS:		
Agree	Disagree	8. The minimum and maximum number of tests given to children suspected of having specific learning disabilities should be specified in regulation
_____	_____	
COMMENTS:		

DISTRICT SURVEY(cont.)

Agree

Disagree

\_\_\_\_\_  
COMMENTS:

9. Persons who administer assessment instruments should be required to participate in periodic training to upgrade their skills and keep abreast of recent developments in the field.

## II Instruction

A. Approaches. Please review the following list of approaches to teaching reading and make the following responses:

- Place an X by any approaches used in your district.
- Star the 10 specific approaches from all the categories which are used most frequently in your district.

Star ten most frequently used	Mark X if used in District	Approaches (see definitions on pp. 16 and 17)
		<i>1. Basic Phonemic Approaches</i>
_____	_____	Psychological Foundations
_____	_____	Method
_____	_____	The Phonovisual Method
_____	_____	Reading with Phonics
_____	_____	Your Child Can Learn to Read
_____	_____	Speech-to-Print Phonics
_____	_____	The Sound Way to Easy Reading
_____	_____	Functional Phonetics
_____	_____	The Landon Phonics Program
_____	_____	Time for Phonics
_____	_____	Phonics We Use
_____	_____	Other Phonemic Systems
		Please list others you use:
_____	_____	_____
_____	_____	_____
		<i>2. Phonemic-Pronunciation Approaches</i>
_____	_____	Breaking the Sound Barrier
_____	_____	Professor Phonics Gives Sound Advice
		Please list others you use:
_____	_____	_____
_____	_____	_____
		<i>3. Phonemics-Reading Approaches</i>
_____	_____	Phonetic Keys to Reading
_____	_____	The Royal Road Readers
_____	_____	Structural Reading Series
		Please list others you use:
_____	_____	_____

# DISTRICT SURVEY(cont.)

Star ten most frequently used	Mark X if used in District	Approaches
		4. <i>Linguistics-Phonemics Approaches</i>
		Let's Read
		Basic Reading
		SRA Basic Reading Series
		The Linguistic Readers
		The Merrill Linguistic Readers
		Programmed Reading
		The Michigan Language Program
		The Miami Linguistic Readers
		The Palo Alto Program
		Please list others you use:
		5. <i>"Total" Languages-Arts Approaches</i>
		The Carden Method
		The Writing Road to Reading
		Open Court Basic Readers
		McQueen Integrated Phonics Method
		The Mott Basic Language Skills Program
		Pro-Reading
		The Wenkart Phonic Readers
		Listen Look Learn
		Please list others you use:
		6. <i>Language-Experience Approaches</i>
		Language Experiences in Reading
		The Chandler Reading Program
		Organic Reading
		Please list others you use:

DISTRICT SURVEY(cont.)

Star ten most frequently used	Mark X if used in District	Approaches
_____	_____	7. <i>One-to-One Symbol Approaches</i>
_____	_____	i/t/a
_____	_____	Unifon
_____	_____	The Laubach Method
_____	_____	Words in Color
_____	_____	Psycholinguistic Color System
_____	_____	Peabody Rebus Reading Program
_____	_____	Other One-to-One Sound-Symbol Approaches
_____	_____	Please list others you use:
_____	_____	_____
_____	_____	_____
_____	_____	8. <i>The Individualized Reading Approach</i>
_____	_____	9. <i>Early-Reading Approaches</i>
_____	_____	The Montessori Method
_____	_____	Getting Ready to Read
_____	_____	A,B,C,Dictation Skills Program
_____	_____	The "Responsive Environments" Approach
_____	_____	Read Along With Me
_____	_____	Play 'N Talk Phonics
_____	_____	How to Teach Your Baby to Read
_____	_____	Distar
_____	_____	Please list others you use:
_____	_____	_____
_____	_____	_____
_____	_____	10. <i>Perceptual-Discrimination Approaches</i>
_____	_____	Barsch Perceptual-Motor Sequences
_____	_____	Dubnoff School Program
_____	_____	Erie County Program
_____	_____	Fairbanks-Robinson Exercises
_____	_____	Frostig
_____	_____	ITPP
_____	_____	KELP

# DISTRICT SURVEY(cont.)

Star ten most frequently used	Mark X if used in District	Approaches
		<i>10. Perceptual-Discrimination Approaches (cont.)</i>
_____	_____	Kephart
_____	_____	Pathway School Eye-Hand Coordination Exercises
_____	_____	Ruth Cheres
_____	_____	Slingerland
_____	_____	Strauss
_____	_____	Winter Haven Program
		Please list others you use:
_____	_____	_____
_____	_____	_____
		<i>11. Other Approaches Not Listed Above</i>
_____	_____	_____
_____	_____	_____
_____	_____	_____
_____	_____	_____

DISTRICT SURVEY(cont.)

B. Opinions about instruction. Please indicate your agreement or disagreement with the following statements and include any comments you wish to add.

Agree	Disagree	1. The number of approaches used in a district will vary with the training and experience of the teachers.
_____	_____	

COMMENTS:

Agree	Disagree	2. It is important to have a wide selection of approaches available to coincide with the individual learning styles and needs of the students involved.
_____	_____	

COMMENTS:

Agree	Disagree	3. The approach used is not as important as the commitment of the teacher and his/her relationship with the student.
_____	_____	

COMMENTS:

Agree	Disagree	4. All school districts in Nevada should use the same instructional approaches and materials for teaching reading and language to dyslexic or learning disabled students.
_____	_____	

COMMENTS:

Agree	Disagree	5. Instruction in this district is provided only for the remediation of identified deficits.
_____	_____	

COMMENTS:

Agree	Disagree	6. Instruction in this district is matched to identified student strengths only.
_____	_____	

COMMENTS:

Agree	Disagree	7. Instruction in this district deals with student strengths as well as deficits.
_____	_____	

COMMENTS:

DISTRICT SURVEY(cont.)

III Recommendations (5 only)

The 1985 Nevada State Legislature needs to provide attention and appropriate funding related to the committee's study in which of the following areas:

Please check

- ☐ Research in effective assessment
- ☐ Research in effective remediation methods
- ☐ Research in matching assessment and remediation
- ☐ Compensatory education programs for students in need of remediation
- ☐ Early identification of handicaps and earlier admission to school program
- ☐ Inservice training in assessment and remediation for regular educators
- ☐ Inservice training in assessment and remediation for special educators
- ☐ Inservice training in assessment and remediation for specialists
- ☐ Reduced teacher-pupil ratios
- ☐ Increased numbers of diagnostic personnel
- ☐ Increased number of special education units
- ☐ Longer school days
- ☐ Longer school year

Comments:

SP/jb  
2/84

## Definitions

The following definitions of the various reading approaches listed are taken from Approaches to Beginning Reading by Robert C. Aukerman, John Wiley & Sons, New York, 1971:

### Basic Phonemic Approaches

"A basic phonemic system is a method of teaching reading in which major and almost exclusive attention is directed toward learning the sounds of vowels and consonants; followed by blending, and the construction of phonemic families or phonograms."

### Phonemic-Pronunciation Approaches

"A phonemic-pronunciation approach to beginning reading is one in which principles of phonemics and rules of pronunciation are presented as aids in helping a child in pronouncing new words."

### Phonemics-Reading Approaches

"A phonemics-reading approach is herein considered as being one in which practice is given first in auditory discrimination of the sounds of the letters separately and in combination, followed by practice in associating individual letter sounds with the printed graphemes, and finally in reading materials that are structured to contain the sounds being studied."

### Linguistics-Phonemics Approaches

"The method which is used is just the opposite of the phonemic-pronunciation rule system. In the latter, the child is given the rule and then he must apply it in deducing the sound of a word. It is a deductive method. In the 'linguistics in reading' method, the procedure is an inductive one, in which the child is presented with pages and pages of reading material which concentrates on one basic sound with its accompanying regular spelling--the 'root' or grapheme ..... In the sample reading material, the am or an sounds are repeated until the child 'gets it.' He does not need a 'rule.'"

### "Total" Language-Arts Approaches

"A group of approaches to beginning reading have been developed to utilize the several aspects of language arts and, consequently, may be classified as 'total' language-arts programs. A definition of a 'total' language-arts approach would reflect the common characteristics of such systems by disclosing that listening, speaking, seeing, writing, spelling, and reading are integrated into a simultaneous and/or sequential process when dealing with our language."

### Language-Experience Approaches

"A few individuals have attempted to develop approaches to beginning reading which would utilize the realistic language of children. There are at least two ways of doing this. One is to write a basal series in which the true speech of children is substituted for the stilted speech of the old basal readers. A second way would be to let the learners write the material themselves by dictating stories in their own speech patterns and with their own vocabulary. In either case, the objective is to provide an approach to reading that is basically a whole word approach, at the same time utilizing the vocabulary and speech patterns of normal children."

### One-to-One Sound-Symbol Approaches

"A one-to-one sound-symbol approach to beginning reading is one in which one symbol has been devised to represent one and only one sound of our language. Inasmuch as there are reported to be some 40 to 45 basic sounds in our spoken language, systems that would be classified as 'sound-symbol' approaches have invented additional symbols of some sort to augment our 26 letter alphabet."

### The Individualized Reading Approach

"Individualized reading is an approach which utilizes the interests of children and permits them to select their own reading materials in keeping with those interests rather than confining them to the devised and restrictive materials of basal readers or any of the other more traditional sequenced materials in reading."

### Early Reading Approaches

"Approaches to beginning reading designed for the very young child."

### Perceptual-Discrimination Approaches

"What may accurately be distinguished as a 'perceptual-discrimination' approach to beginning reading is one which emphasizes auditory and visual perceptual factors of learning. Being psychologically-oriented, a complete perceptual-discrimination approach would utilize several sensory modalities, thus making it possible for the learner to receive reinforcement from tactile and kinesthetic stimuli as well as from auditory and visual stimuli."

## APPENDIX C

### Suggested Legislation

	<u>Page</u>
BDR 34-238..... Establishes program to provide instruction for pupils who lack basic educational skills .....	49
BDR 34-239..... Provides for diagnosis and correction of learning problems of pupils with specific disabilities in learning ...	55
BDR 234..... Urges superintendent of public instruction to determine correlation between methods of diagnosis and correction for pupils who have dyslexia or other specific disabilities in learning .....	59
BDR 236..... Urges school districts to increase use of pupils as tutors in classroom to assist pupils who have disabilities in learning .....	61
BDR 237..... Urges support for organizations and institutions which conduct research in area of dyslexia and other specific disabilities in learning .....	63



SUMMARY--Establishes program to provide instruction for pupils who lack basic educational skills. (BDR 34-238)

FISCAL NOTE: Effect on Local Government: Yes.  
Effect on the State or on Industrial Insurance: Yes.

AN ACT relating to public schools; establishing a program to provide instruction for pupils who lack basic educational skills; increasing the minimum number of days required in a school term; requiring certificated personnel to complete training in the area of specific disabilities in learning; and providing other matters properly relating thereto.

THE PEOPLE OF THE STATE OF NEVADA, REPRESENTED IN SENATE  
AND ASSEMBLY, DO ENACT AS FOLLOWS:

Section 1. Chapter 388 of NRS is hereby amended by adding thereto the provisions set forth as sections 2, 3 and 4 of this act.

Sec. 2. 1. The board of trustees of each school district shall establish a comprehensive program of compensatory education to provide a specifically designed course of instruction for any pupil who is deficient in basic educational skills, within the limitations of legislative appropriations or authorizations.

2. The state board shall prescribe minimum standards for the administration of such a program.

3. The superintendent of public instruction shall not distribute any money to a school district for a program of compensatory education unless that program meets the minimum standards prescribed by the state board for such a program.

Sec. 3. The state board shall establish by regulation a procedure to allow a pupil who has a specific disability in learning, to use the diagnostic and remedial resources available in any school district within the state.

Sec. 4. The superintendent of public instruction shall establish a program to promote the participation of parents in the identification and correction of the specific disabilities of their children in learning.

Sec. 5. NRS 388.090 is hereby amended to read as follows:

388.090 1. Except as otherwise permitted pursuant to subsection 2, boards of trustees of school districts shall provide a minimum of [180] 190 days of free school in the districts under their charge.

2. The superintendent of public instruction may upon application by the board of trustees authorize a reduction of not more than 10 school days in a particular district [for the purpose of establishing] to establish a 12-month [school] program [.] of school.

Sec. 6. NRS 388.440 is hereby amended to read as follows:

388.440 As used in NRS 388.440 to 388.520, inclusive,  
["handicapped"] unless the context otherwise requires:

1. "Handicapped minor" means any person under the age of 18 years who deviates either educationally, academically, physically, socially or emotionally so markedly from normal patterns of growth and development [patterns] that he cannot progress effectively in a regular school program and therefore needs special instruction or special services.

2. "Specific disability in learning" means any disorder in one or more of the basic psychological processes involved in understanding or in using language. The term includes, but is not limited to, such conditions as perceptual handicaps, injury to the brain, minimal dysfunction of the brain, dyslexia and developmental aphasia. The term does not include problems in learning which are primarily the result of:

(a) Visual, aural or motor handicaps;

(b) Mental retardation;

(c) An emotional disturbance; or

(d) An environmental, cultural or economic disadvantage.

Sec. 7. NRS 388.490 is hereby amended to read as follows:

388.490 1. [Except as provided in subsections 2, 3, 4

and 5,] Except as otherwise provided in this section, handicapped minors may be admitted at the age of 5 years to special programs established for such minors, and their enrollment or attendance may be counted for apportionment .  
[purposes.]

2. Aurally handicapped minors may be admitted at any age under 5 to special programs established for such minors, and their enrollment or attendance may be counted for apportionment . [purposes.]

3. Visually handicapped minors may be admitted at any age under 5 to special programs established for such minors, and their enrollment or attendance may be counted for apportionment . [purposes.]

4. Academically talented minors may be admitted at the age of 4 years to special programs established for such minors, and their enrollment or attendance may be counted for apportionment . [purposes.]

5. Mentally retarded minors may be admitted at the age of 3 years to special programs established for such minors, and their enrollment or attendance may be counted for apportionment . [purposes.]

6. Minors with specific disabilities in learning may be

admitted at the age of 3 years to special programs established for such minors, and their enrollment or attendance may be counted for apportionment.

Sec. 8. Chapter 391 of NRS is hereby amended by adding thereto a new section to read as follows:

The superintendent of public instruction shall require all certificated personnel in each school district to complete such training in the area of specific disabilities in learning, as the state board prescribes.

Sec. 9. Chapter 392 of NRS is hereby amended by adding thereto a new section to read as follows:

Each pupil must be tested for specific disabilities in learning upon his initial enrollment in a public school in this state.



SUMMARY--Provides for diagnosis and correction of learning problems of pupils with specific disabilities in learning. (BDR 34-239)

FISCAL NOTE: Effect on Local Government: Yes.  
Effect on the State or on Industrial Insurance: Yes.

AN ACT relating to public schools; authorizing the establishment of a center for the collection and dissemination of information relating to specific disabilities in learning; requiring the testing of pupils for these disabilities before suspension or expulsion from school; authorizing the superintendent of public instruction to require the use of certain diagnostic and remedial methods for these disabilities in school districts; and providing other matters properly relating thereto.

THE PEOPLE OF THE STATE OF NEVADA, REPRESENTED IN SENATE  
AND ASSEMBLY, DO ENACT AS FOLLOWS:

Section 1. Chapter 388 of NRS is hereby amended by adding thereto the provisions set forth as sections 2, 3 and 4 of this act.

Sec. 2. The superintendent of public instruction shall conduct at least one seminar each year relating to specific disabilities in learning for all certificated personnel and any other interested persons.

Sec. 3. The superintendent of public instruction may:

1. Establish a center for the collection and dissemination of information relating to specific disabilities in learning; and

2. Provide for the entry of appropriate information into a computer to make it accessible through terminals located in the center and in public libraries in this state.

Sec. 4. The superintendent of public instruction shall determine the effectiveness of the available diagnostic and remedial methods used in the area of specific disabilities in learning and may require the use of those methods he deems appropriate in school districts in this state.

Sec. 5. NRS 388.440 is hereby amended to read as follows:

388.440 As used in NRS 388.440 to 388.520, inclusive,  
["handicapped] unless the context otherwise requires:

1. "Handicapped minor" means any person under the age of 18 years who deviates either educationally, academically, physically, socially or emotionally so markedly from normal patterns of growth and development [patterns] that he cannot progress effectively in a regular school program and therefore needs special instruction or special services.

2. "Specific disability in learning" means any disorder in one or more of the basic psychological processes involved

in understanding or in using language. The term includes, but is not limited to, such conditions as perceptual handicaps, injury to the brain, minimal dysfunction of the brain, dyslexia and developmental aphasia. The term does not include problems in learning which are primarily the result of:

- (a) Visual, aural or motor handicaps;
- (b) Mental retardation;
- (c) An emotional disturbance; or
- (d) An environmental, cultural or economic disadvantage.

Sec. 6. Chapter 392 of NRS is hereby amended by adding thereto a new section to read as follows:

Each pupil who manifests a marked deterioration in his behavior or academic performance must be tested to determine whether he has a specific disability in learning.

Sec. 7. NRS 392.467 is hereby amended to read as follows:

392.467 1. The board of trustees of a school district may authorize the suspension or expulsion of any pupil from any public school within the school district in accordance with rules and [hearing procedures complying with requirements of] an opportunity for a hearing which afford due process of law.

2. No pupil may be suspended or expelled until he has been [given notice] given:

(a) Notice of the charges against [him, an] him;  
(b) An explanation of the evidence and an opportunity for  
a [hearing,] hearing; and  
(c) A test to determine whether he has a specific disability in learning,  
except that a pupil who poses a continuing danger to persons  
or property or an ongoing threat of disrupting the academic  
process may be removed from the school immediately upon  
being given an explanation of the reasons for his removal,  
and pending proceedings, to be conducted as soon as practi-  
cable after removal, for his suspension or expulsion pursu-  
ant to this section.

3. The provisions of chapter 241 of NRS do not apply to  
any hearing conducted under this section. Such hearings  
[shall] must be closed to the public.

SUMMARY--Urges superintendent of public instruction to determine correlation between methods of diagnosis and correction for pupils who have dyslexia or other specific disabilities in learning. (BDR 234)

CONCURRENT RESOLUTION--Urging the superintendent of public instruction to conduct research to determine whether the methods used to diagnose problems resulting from dyslexia and other specific disabilities in learning correlate with the methods used to correct such problems.

WHEREAS, The amount of available information relating to dyslexia and other specific disabilities in learning is increasing rapidly; and

WHEREAS, The effectiveness of the methods used to diagnose and correct problems resulting from these disabilities in learning is the subject of debate among many educators; and

WHEREAS, Such information is most valuable when effectively applied to correct problems in learning; and

WHEREAS, It is an urgent concern among educators to determine the most effective methods for diagnosing and correcting such problems in learning; now, therefore, be it

RESOLVED BY THE                      OF THE STATE OF NEVADA, THE

CONCURRING, That the legislature urges the superintendent of public instruction to conduct research to determine whether the methods used to diagnose problems resulting

from dyslexia and other specific disabilities in learning correlate with the methods used to correct such problems.

SUMMARY--Urges school districts to increase use of pupils as tutors in classroom to assist pupils who have disabilities in learning. (BDR 236)

CONCURRENT RESOLUTION--Urging school districts to increase the use of pupils as tutors in the classroom to assist pupils who have disabilities in learning.

WHEREAS, Cooperation and encouragement are extremely important in creating an environment in which to learn; and

WHEREAS, Pupils learn better in an environment in which they assume an active role in their education; and

WHEREAS, The resources available to assist pupils who have disabilities in learning are inadequate in many schools in this state; now, therefore, be it

RESOLVED BY THE                      OF THE STATE OF NEVADA, THE

CONCURRING, That the legislature urges the school districts to increase the use of pupils as tutors in the classroom to assist pupils who have disabilities in learning.



SUMMARY--Urges support for organizations and institutions which conduct research in area of dyslexia and other specific disabilities in learning. (BDR 237)

CONCURRENT RESOLUTION--Urging additional public and private support for nonprofit corporations and institutions of higher learning in this state which conduct research and develop programs to assist pupils who have dyslexia or other specific disabilities in learning.

WHEREAS, The need to conduct research in the area of dyslexia and other specific disabilities in learning is important to the citizens of this state; and

WHEREAS, Much of the research in this area is conducted by nonprofit corporations and institutions of higher learning; and

WHEREAS, Pupils who have dyslexia or other specific disabilities in learning are direct beneficiaries of this research; and

WHEREAS, This research is of great value to many educators in this state; now, therefore, be it

RESOLVED BY THE                      OF THE STATE OF NEVADA,  
THE                      CONCURRING, That the legislature urges additional public and private support for nonprofit corporations

and institutions of higher learning in this state which conduct research and develop programs to assist pupils who have dyslexia or other specific disabilities in learning.