

**The Dyslexia Crisis: Critical Analysis of Texas Dyslexia Codes to Propose Policy
Development within the Texas Juvenile Justice System**

Cade Spencer

Georgetown University

Author's Note

As a dyslexic student from Texas myself, my exploration of Texas dyslexia law became a personally and academically empowering and fruitful experience. I sincerely extend my gratitude to the Laidlaw Foundation and the Georgetown Center for Research and Fellowships for the ongoing support to make this research possible. Thank you to my incredible mentor, Dr. Andria Wisler, and our Laidlaw cohort advisor, Colleen Dougherty, for your advice and encouragement.

Any correspondence regarding this deliverable should be sent to cjs371@georgetown.edu

Abstract

This research explored recommendations for areas of policy development for Texas dyslexia codes applicable to the juvenile justice system. Firstly, the researcher conducted a literature review of the Texas Dyslexia handbook, additional documents of the Texas Education Agency, and peer-reviewed articles to identify the key characteristics and priorities of current Texas dyslexia codes. Secondly, the researcher conducted a literature review to identify recommendations for Texas academic codes which could address dyslexia instruction in the juvenile justice system. **As a result, early universal screening, formal evaluation and identification, evidence based instruction and administrative support, and support system development can be identified as four key priorities and characteristics of Texas dyslexia legislation.** Consequently, the researcher recommends further development for compensatory services and support system development policies in the Texas juvenile justice system.

Introduction: The Dyslexia Crisis

The term “dyslexia crisis” refers to a general need and urgent call to support and expand research on dyslexia nationwide. Dyslexia, the most prevalent learning disability, impacts 20 percent of the United States general population (Cassidy, et al. 2021). While strong traditions of dyslexia research do exist, as explored in this research, the field must continue to be expanded alongside evolving frameworks of intersectionality and diversity, equity, and inclusion.

This deliverable specifically seeks to explore, and call for further action in, the study of the prevalence and impact of dyslexia in the criminal justice system. In a study conducted in 2000, 48 percent of individuals in the Texas criminal justice system were estimated to be qualified for a dyslexia diagnosis (Moody et al. 2000). Although little scholarship directly regarding the Texas incarcerated community followed since, a similar study conducted in Louisiana found that 47 percent of incarcerated individuals within two maximum security prisons qualified for a dyslexia diagnosis (2021, 72). As an important note, evaluation methods used to diagnose dyslexia can differ, and yet, the similar numbers demonstrate crucial scholarship on establishing an understanding of dyslexia’s prevalence in the criminal justice system.

To specify the research further, the researcher primarily reviewed literature focused on the Texas Juvenile Justice Department’s (TJJD) dyslexia policy. As all minors in TJJD fall within the age range of 10 to 17 years old, the researcher additionally focused on dyslexia policy within the Texas Education Agency. Through an understanding of the key priorities and characteristics of Texas dyslexia codes for the traditional classroom, key priorities can more effectively be identified and recommended for policy development within the TJJD.

Specific to the juvenile population, Dr. Tony Fabelo and Dr. James Austin of the Texas-based *Justice For All* (JFA) found little notable research on the prevalence of dyslexia in

populations of incarcerated minors (Fabelo, et al. 2004). Through a national lens, the Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention stated that “youth in the juvenile justice system are much more likely to have both identified and undiscovered disabilities” than their peers (Burrell and Warboys, 2000, 1). In fact, the organization estimated that “studies of incarcerated youth reveal that as many as 70 percent suffer from disabling conditions” (2000, 2). Consequently, this deliverable calls for increased research to work towards understanding the prevalence of dyslexia, and other disabilities, amongst juvenile populations. For now, we must act with urgency to innovate policy solutions.

Dyslexia, as a lived experience and research topic, can yield high complexity. However, we must take action to research dyslexia, innovate beneficial student services, and envision a boldly inclusive, supportive, and just world.

Background Context: Why Dyslexia and Why Texas?

The research recognizes the importance of enhanced research for all learning disabilities and their respective policies, especially in connection to the juvenile justice system. For this fellowship, the researcher chose to focus on dyslexia due to its high prevalence in the general population, the developed field of dyslexia policy, the researcher’s personal experience with dyslexia, and their (pronoun?) desire to effectively research within the six week constraint.

For the purposes of this research, Texas has been selected as the state for analysis for two primary reasons:

- (1) Texas has a long, well-defined history of state policy specific to dyslexia. In 1985, Texas House Bill No. 157 became the first state dyslexia policy (Texas State Legislature 2011, 17).

- (2) Texas has continued to pass more than a dozen educational acts specific to dyslexia since 1985 (Texas Education Agency 2018, 97).

Research Question

This research seeks to address the question(s):

- (1) What can be identified as the key characteristics and priorities of Texas dyslexia academic codes?
- (2) How might the findings about these key characteristics and priorities support the formation of dyslexia policy for the Texas juvenile justice system?

Therefore, the deliverable organizes the history of Texas' dyslexia legislation into key priorities and characteristics. This process can enable the researcher to initiate discourse on the possible applications of the development process for dyslexia policy in the Texas education system to the development of dyslexia policy specific to the Texas criminal justice system.

Methodology

The qualitative study, conducted over the six week fellowship period, used the synthesis of existing literature and secondary analysis to address the specific aforementioned research questions.

For the literature review, the study considered ten Texas Education Codes, three applicable federal laws, the portfolio of dyslexia documentation produced by the Texas Education Agency (TEA), and several peer-reviewed articles to enrich insight on Texas dyslexia law. The researcher worked with literature published at the earliest in 2000 to maximize scholarship applicability and focused on literature produced within or about the Texas education

and juvenile justice systems. Keywords employed to locate literature include “Texas dyslexia policy” and “juvenile dyslexia intervention.”

The qualitative elements of the study primarily focused on the identification of the prevalence of dyslexia in Texas incarcerated communities, which speaks largely to the urgency of the study’s subject. The study most closely models a critical policy and discourse analysis. To facilitate this review, the researcher recorded the major themes and characteristics of each policy, article, or document in a specified Google Doc “Research Journal.” The journal system contained three categories: “Important Note,” “Relation of Note to Key Characteristics and Priority,” and “Further Questions.” Employing this system, the researcher effectively mapped connections between the existing literature and the identifiable priorities and characteristics of Texas dyslexia legislation.

In the proposal of these key priorities and characteristics, the researcher employed the scholarship and recommendations of the Texas Education Agency’s *The Dyslexia Handbook (2018 Update): Procedures Concerning Dyslexia and Related Disorders* and the *Texas State Dyslexia Requirements Worksheet*. The study synthesized the literature of these documents with the researcher’s identification of major themes to propose four categories of key priorities and characteristics in dyslexia policy. The researcher conducted a similar process to propose recommendations for two areas of policy development in the Texas Juvenile Justice Department (TJJD).

Key Definitions

The following definitions stand as crucial to the study and the interpretation of the existing literature.

Dyslexia: Although varied definitions of dyslexia exist, the study primarily references the definition outlined in Texas Education Code 38.003 and *The Dyslexia Handbook (2018 Update)*:

Procedures Concerning Dyslexia and Related Disorders:

“‘Dyslexia’ means a disorder of constitutional origin manifested by a difficulty in learning to read, write, or spell, despite conventional instruction, adequate intelligence, and sociocultural opportunity.”

Texas Education Agency (TEA): As per their website, tea.texas.gov, the Texas Education Agency “oversees primary and secondary public education in the state of Texas. It helps deliver education to more than 5 million students.” (Texas Education Agency, 2000).

Texas Education Code (TEC): As defined by the TEA, Texas Education Codes, or TECs, “include all rules passed by the state legislature that apply to most educational institutions supported in whole or part by state tax funds.” (Texas Education Agency, 2000).

Texas Juvenile Justice Department (TJJD): As per their website, tjjd.texas.gov, the Texas Juvenile Justice Department “as the state’s juvenile corrections agency, [promotes] public safety by partnering with youth, families, and communities to provide a safe environment where youth in the agency’s care and custody receive individualized education, treatment, life skills and employment training, and positive role models to facilitate successful community reintegration.” (TJJD, 2000).

Key Priorities and Characteristics: The phrase “key priorities and characteristics” can be understood as the primary themes and practices of the Texas dyslexia policies which influence public action and policy development to significant extents.

Brief History of Texas Dyslexia Policies

To address the need to support students with dyslexia, educational policy has long been relied upon to enforce avenues for early intervention and diagnosis (Cassidy, Reggio, and Shaywitz et al. 2021). For instance, [Texas House Bill No. 157](#) of 1985 was the first state law to require schools to test and treat students with dyslexia. According to the Interim Committee on Dyslexia and Related Disorders, this Texas bill remains the standard for state dyslexia policy today (Texas State Legislature 2011, 5).

Ten Texas Education Codes (TEC) passed since 1985, which address dyslexia specifically, have been identified (Texas Education Agency 2018, 99-103). A Texas Education Code is a piece of state legislation that applies primarily to educational institutions.

- 1) TEC 7.028 (b)
 - a) Establishes limitations on compliance monitoring.
- 2) TEC 21.044
 - a) Establishes expectations for dyslexia educator preparation.
- 3) TEC 21.054
 - a) Establishes requirements for continuing education for dyslexia educators.
- 4) TEC 28.006
 - a) Establishes precedents for reading diagnosis.
- 5) TEC 28.021
 - a) Establishes framework for student advancement with dyslexia.
- 6) TEC 38.003
 - a) Establishes procedures for the screening and treatment of dyslexia and related disorders.

- 7) TEC 38.0031
 - a) Establishes classroom technology plan for students with dyslexia.
- 8) TEC 38.0032
 - a) Establishes procedures for dyslexia training opportunities.
- 9) TEC 42.006
 - a) Establishes procedures for dyslexia records in the Public Education Management System.
- 10) TEC 51.9701
 - a) Establishes procedures for assessment for dyslexia.

Today, 37 states have specific dyslexia policies in statute or code. While each legislation has important distinctions, they share an emphasis on early identification, early intervention, and continued academic support (Cassidy, Reggio, and Shaywitz et al. 2021).

As demonstrated, there is a long history of the creation of educational policy to address dyslexia. Recently, there has been national discourse and action on the application of these policies, and their development processes, to the criminal justice system. For instance, as of 2018, the federal First Step Act now provides guidance for the Bureau of Prisons to screen prisoners for dyslexia and provide support programs (Cassidy, Reggio, and Shaywitz et al. 2021). Because early diagnosis and intervention succeeded in traditional classroom dyslexia intervention, the policy is in the process of innovation to be applied to the criminal justice system.

The primary goal of dyslexia policy in the criminal justice system is to provide beneficial educational services to individuals who have not been previously diagnosed or who have not yet received proper intervention, known as compensatory services (Michaels 2019). Within this

discourse, it is proposed that the recognition and treatment of dyslexia in criminal justice systems could lead to lower rates of recidivism (2019).

Results: Four Key Priorities and Characteristics of Texas Dyslexia Policy

The study synthesized existing literature, primarily referencing the *The Dyslexia Handbook (2018 Update): Procedures Concerning Dyslexia and Related Disorders* and the *Texas State Dyslexia Requirements Worksheet* to propose four categories of key priorities and characteristics of Texas dyslexia policy. The policies primarily apply to the traditional public classroom and thus, largely exclude specifics related to the juvenile justice system. These four identified categories, and their respective policy examples, are as follows:

Early Universal Screening: According to *The Dyslexia Handbook (2018 Update)*, early universal screening demands a “universal measure administered to all students by qualified personnel to determine which students are at risk for dyslexia or reading difficulties and/or a related disorder,” (Texas Education Agency 2018, 17-24). Screening, therefore, serves as a tool to identify students who may qualify for a dyslexia diagnosis without substituting for an official diagnosis. Furthermore, the International Dyslexia Association writes that “screening measures are designed to quickly differentiate students into one of two groups: 1) those who require intervention and 2) those who do not” (2018, 17-24).

“Early Universal Screening” can serve as a key priority and characteristic of Texas dyslexia policy as “screening” stands as a unique category of policy within both the *Texas State Dyslexia Requirements Worksheet* and *The Dyslexia Handbook (2018 Update)*. As these documents produced within the Texas Education Agency speak to priorities in dyslexia

legislation, they serve as important scholarships to support this proposal of early universal screening as a key priority and characteristic.

The terms “screening” and “early universal screening” contain notable distinctions. Early universal screening refers to a specific priority to implement screening practices on a comprehensive scale at an early age. The Texas Education Agency states that “if intervention is not provided before the age of eight, the probability of reading difficulties continuing into high school is 75 percent,” (Texas Education Agency 2018, 18). Furthermore, the Agency declares in *The Dyslexia Handbook (2018 Update)*: the early identification of students with dyslexia along with corresponding early intervention programs for these students will have significant implications for their future academic success,” (2018, 20).

In Texas, the legislative priority of early universal screening manifested in TEC 28.006: Reading Diagnosis and TEC 38.003: Screening and Treatment for Dyslexia. Under TEC 38.003, state law requires screening for dyslexia and related disorders within public schools as determined appropriate by the State Board of Education (Texas Education Agency 2018, 24-26). Under TEC 28.006, public schools must assess the reading development and comprehension levels of all students in kindergarten, first grade, and second grade (2018,24). The program extends to screening in the seventh grade as well based on student performance on the sixth-grade reading assessment (2018, 24). If these assessments identify a student as at risk for a dyslexia diagnosis, the act requires the respective school to notify their parent/guardian (2018, 25). Additional legislative nuances speak to specific assessment tools and assessment techniques adapted for English Language Learners (TEC 29.056) (2018, 31).

Formal Evaluation and Identification: Formal evaluation and identification act as crucial steps in dyslexia intervention following early universal screening. If screening identifies a student as at

risk for dyslexia, evaluation and identification practices can allow for official diagnosis and the ability to access 504 and Individualized Education Plan (IEPs) services (Texas Education Agency 2018, 30). Federally, the processes for formal evaluation remain outlined in the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA) and Section 504 of the Rehabilitation Act (2018, 113).

“Formal Evaluation and Identification” can serve as a key priority and characteristic of current Texas dyslexia legislation as “Procedures for the Evaluation of Identification of Students with Dyslexia” and “Evaluation and Identification” appear as policy specialities within *The Dyslexia Handbook (2018 Update)* and *The Texas State Dyslexia Requirements Worksheet* respectively (Texas Education Agency 2018, 21-39 and 4).

Within Texas legislation, both Texas Education Codes 28.006 and 38.003 provide guidance to the processes of evaluation and identification. Specifically, formal identification of dyslexia must be completed by the “ARD or Section 504 committee of persons knowledgeable about the reading process, dyslexia and dyslexia instruction, the assessments used, and the meaning of the collected data,” (2018, 21-39). TEC 51.9701 additionally establishes procedures for dyslexia assessment, and Texas Administrative Code 74.28(b) establishes practices to ensure these systems of evaluation and identification undergo consistent implementations across all sites (2018, 21-39). In short, this study cannot understate the importance of evaluation and identification processes as it is only through identification that a student can access necessary accommodations and interventions.

Evidence-Based Instruction and Administrative Support: While this key priority and characteristic appears vast, Texas dyslexia legislation specifically describes its services and importance. Contributing to the process established thus far, evidence-based instruction and

administrative support activates once a screened student receives an official dyslexia evaluation and identification. These services provide individualized education services, continued monitoring, and ongoing professional training for educators to ensure students with dyslexia receive beneficial care (2018, 39-59).

The “Critical, Evidence-Based Components of Dyslexia Instruction” sub-section of *The Dyslexia Handbook (2018 Update)* and the “Instruction,” “Required Written Documentation,” and “Teacher Training” sub-sections of the *Texas States Dyslexia Requirements Worksheet* reflect this key priority and characteristics. In Texas legislation, TAC 74.28, TEC 38.003, TEC 38.0032 (B), TAC 89.1011, and TEC 21.054 all provide guidance to evidence-based instruction and administrative support (2018, 39-59). Most notably, TEC 38.0032 requires the implementation of “systematic, explicit, and evidence-based instruction,” (2018, 39). “Evidence based instruction” importantly refers to instruction approved by legislature-accepted research and Section 504 and/or ARD committees, including, but not limited to, the instructional topics of: phonological awareness, sound-symbol association, syllabication, orthography, morphology, syntax, reading comprehension, and reading comprehension,” (2018, 40-41). As *The Dyslexia Handbook (2018 Update)* states, “it is clear from the consensus of scientifically based reading research that the nature of the educational intervention for individuals with reading disabilities and dyslexia is critical,” (2018, 21-22).

Support System Development: The final proposed key priority and characteristic, support system development, refers to a community-centered approach to dyslexia intervention with similarities to social and emotional learning frameworks (2018, 161). Policies within this category apply to the involvement of parents/guardians in a student’s dyslexia intervention, teacher support and training, and attention to students’ social and emotional needs. These

practices continue to grow as evolving intersectional frameworks of diversity, equity, and inclusion enrich understanding of the many impacts on one's educational experience. For instance, within the aforementioned definition of dyslexia, the state of Texas recognizes the need to address "sociocultural opportunity," (2018, 2). When a student participates in dyslexia intervention, the processes must expand beyond the classroom, within one's facilitated support system, to maximize educational benefits.

This key priority and characteristic can be reflected in the "Parent/Guardian Participation" and "Teacher Training" sub-sections of the *Texas State Dyslexia Requirements Worksheet* and the "Environmental and Socio Economic Factors" sub-section of *The Dyslexia Handbook (2018 Update)* (2018, 26-27).

Texas laws applicable to this priority include TEC 28.006, TAC 74.28, 19 TAC 74.28, Senate Bill 2075, 19 TAC 74.28(e): 232.11, and TEC 21.054 (2018, 161-165). Most notably, 19 TAC 74.28(h) requires schools inform "parents/guardians of all services and options available to students eligible under the IDEA and Section 504 acts", and Texas Senate Bill 2075 requires schools make parents/guardians aware of the Texas State Library and Archives Commission program that "provides free access to audiobooks" for the out-of-classroom enrichment of students identified with dyslexia (2018, 24). 19 TAC 74.28(k) further requires schools to provide a dyslexia education program to inform and support parents/guardians of dyslexic students (2018, 24-26). Several pieces of legislation, including TEC 21.054, require schools to provide appropriate ongoing professional development for dyslexia educators (2018, 24). Lastly, TEC 38.0031 provides guidance on the integration of innovative technologies to support students with dyslexia in the classroom (2018, xi).

As *The Dyslexia Handbook (2018 Update)* states, “students with dyslexia may also experience symptoms such as anxiety, anger, depression, lack of motivation, or low self-esteem” due to educational difficulties (2018, 24). Therefore, the handbook proposes that “in such instances, appropriate instructional/ referral services need to be provided to ensure each student’s needs are met... educators and parents should provide students with affirmation and an environment that fosters engagement and success,” (2018, 4). This study proposes that further research and policy within the “support system development” category can and will produce fruitful insight on dyslexia care and intervention through a community-based lense.

Recommendations: Compensatory Services and Support System Development in the TJJD

Within Dr. Tony Fabelo, Dr. James Austin, and Angela Gunter’s April 2004 *Report to the Dyslexia Research Foundation of Texas, Inc.* titled “The Impact of Ignoring Dyslexia and Reading Disabilities in the Criminal Justice System: What We Know and Need to Know,” the researchers propose frameworks to currently understand and further research dyslexia in the juvenile and criminal justice systems. While 2004 is noticeably distant, little Texas scholarship or legislation regarding dyslexia in these systems followed suit. Therefore, this report remains a strong and pioneering scholarship on this topic.

This Laidlaw Fellowship study serves to synthesize current dyslexia policy in Texas through the lenses of key priorities and characteristics and to initiate discourse on the possible priorities of dyslexia policy specific to the juvenile justice system. As aforementioned, scholarship on this very intersection can be reflected in the national First Step Act, which provides guidance for dyslexia screening in the criminal justice system and support for

incarcerated individuals identified with dyslexia in GED obtainment processes (Cassidy, et al. 2021, 2).

The *Report to the Dyslexia Research Foundation of Texas, Inc.* establishes the foundations for our current understanding of dyslexia in the TJJD. Within the *Report*, the researchers identified 43% of TJJD students as in need of special education, compared to 11% to 12% in public schools (Fabelo, et al. 2004). In fact, only 8.3% of students entering TJJD display reading skills at their respective grade levels (2004, viii-xiv). Beyond the broad category of special education, the researchers call for further work to identify the specific prevalence of dyslexia in the Texas criminal justice systems (2004, xiv). However, the researchers can conclude,

“We know from the demographic analysis that there is a high proportion of offenders with reading difficulties in our correctional systems and that reading difficulties are related to high recidivism and to difficulties in advancing in grade level within the educational programs of the correctional agencies or alternative educational programs.”

Responding to the identified need for data on dyslexia prevalence in the TJJD, this study proposes compensatory services as an area of policy research and implementation to prioritize in Texas dyslexia policy development for the juvenile justice system. As defined by the TJJD, compensatory services “help students make up for progress or skills they lost when their special education services were not provided,” (TJJD, 2000). These services, encouraged by current legislation such as the First Step Act, can improve datasets on dyslexia rates in Texas, enable students to receive proper intervention, and encourage further policy. As the *Report* details, “there is evidence that school districts are inconsistent with” Texas screening laws, and TJJD

students attend districts with higher inconsistencies at higher rates (Fabelo, et al. 2004, viii). Therefore, these compensatory services remain vital to the identification, evaluation, and education of students within TJJD.

As the *Report* details, “none of the major educational systems examined in the adult and juvenile correctional systems have specific protocols to identify dyslexia offenders and target them for dyslexia remediation programs,” (Fabelo, et al. 2004. viii-xiv). We must create practices to properly identify the needs of juvenile students, identify and address the gap in implemented policies in the traditional classroom, and encourage dyslexia training programs that transform alarming rates of juvenile students in need of special education and high rates of recidivism. Compensatory services, such as providing late-age screening, processes for evaluation, and early stages of educational training can act as important steps to this transformation.

While traditional classroom policy, as explored above, primarily focuses on the implementation of early universal screening and related processes, compensatory services in the TJJD would need to focus on providing screening and care for youth beyond the early stages. Therefore, traditional classroom policy, which heavily relies on the importance of early intervention, would probably not yield similar or high rates of effectiveness (Fabelo, et al. 2004, xiv). Within this proposition to prioritize compensatory services policy, the researcher recommends that TEC 28.006 (Reading Diagnosis) and the national First Step Act serve as models for the development of these compensatory services (2004, xiv). Within TEC 28.006, which outlines the process to identify students vulnerable for dyslexia diagnosis, the legislation prescribes the steps to take to examine a student in the seventh grade based on their scores on their sixth-grade reading assessment (Texas Education Agency. 2018, 7-21). In short, TEC 28.006 presents a method and need to screen and identify students with dyslexia beyond the

typical early window of primary school. For older youth in the TJJD, this model can serve as beneficial to initiate screening and intervention services.

Additionally, the First Step Act, which applies to the federal criminal justice system, can still provide insight on later-stage screening and action within the TJJD. We must recognize and act upon the necessary responsibility to identify the needs of students who suffer from faults in traditional classroom policy, seeking to address these needs via compensatory services. Responding to a need to care for juvenile youth with an understanding of their unique environment, the researcher also calls for research into policy focused on support system development within these alternate classrooms. Within traditional classrooms, as discussed in the results section above, support system development revolves around the education of and engagement with the parents and/or guardians of students with dyslexia (Texas Education Agency 2018, 99-113). However, the social and emotional, as well as legal, needs of youth within the juvenile justice system can vary significantly from peers of traditional classrooms (Fabelo, et al. 2004, xiv).

As the *Report* addresses, research must be conducted to further explore how “processes and remediation strategies need to account for specific issues impacting minorities, persons in low socioeconomic circumstances, and persons with mental health problems, and alcohol and drug abuse,” (Fabelo, et al. 2004, xiv). Further research into the fields of dyslexia and incarceration must develop within compassionate and appropriate intersectional, social, and emotional frameworks. Through the creation and implementation of compensatory services and comprehensive support system development, administrators can undertake crucial steps to build dyslexia databases, identify the needs of students, and provide long term care to possibly reduce recidivism within the TJJD.

Discussion: Call to Further Dyslexia Research

Through a literature review, this study sought to synthesize current Texas dyslexia policy within categories of key priorities and characteristics. The researcher can propose early universal screening, formal evaluation and identification, evidence based instruction and administrative support, and support system development as possible four such categories. Employing the synthesis of the Texas policy for the traditional classroom, possible policy priorities for the development of dyslexia policy specific to the alternative classrooms of the TJJD can expand from pre-existing foundations. For instance, compensatory services and new policies for support system development can be identified as two facets of dyslexia policy to prioritize when considering the juvenile justice system.

As a key takeaway, the need for dyslexia policy specific to the juvenile justice system remains urgent. These policies, such as compensatory services, can aid educators in providing care to students and long-term support when students lack early-stage training programs. Importantly, research must pursue data on the prevalence of dyslexia and many factors unique to the juvenile justice system in order to best envision transformative policies. As aforementioned, these policies can best serve students when unique environmental and circumstantial variables, such as the development, social, emotional, and legal needs of juvenile youth act as central to policy development.

Limitations of this study include the niche field of prior scholarship speaking to the intersection of dyslexia and the juvenile justice system in Texas. Important scholarship does persist, especially research produced by the TEA, and strong foundations exist for further research to be expanded upon. Furthermore, as this study presents a synthesis of a literature review and proposed policy priorities, the study can be difficult to replicate. The intentions of

this study remain to continue discourse on the dyslexia crisis, add to the literature in Texas on juvenile justice dyslexia policies, and call for continued research into the field.

The *Report* offers effective frameworks to approach future research. As the *Report* proposes, small samples of students with dyslexia can be monitored within TJJD systems for one year to collect data on their “academic progress given the use of present remediation strategies,” (Fabelo, et al. xiv). First and foremost, research must follow to enrich literature estimating the prevalence of dyslexia in juvenile justice systems, the impact of dyslexia on one’s likelihood to spend time within the TJJD, and the most effective means to screen, evaluate, and care for students with dyslexia at later stages. When infused with compassion and appropriate frameworks, this research can pioneer new avenues of dyslexia studies and pioneer new methods to better care for all of our students.

References

- 1) Cassidy, Laura, Kayla Reggio, Bennet A. Shaywitz, and et al. 2021. "Dyslexia in Incarcerated Men and Women: A New Perspective on Reading Disability in the Prison Population." *The Journal of Correctional Education*. 72(2).
- 2) Michaels, Samantha. 2019. "People in Prison Are Way More Likely to Have Dyslexia. The Justice System Sets Them Up to Fail" *Mother Jones* [website], April 30.
<https://www.motherjones.com/crime-justice/2019/04/people-in-prison-are-way-more-likely-to-have-dyslexia-a-the-justice-system-sets-them-up-to-fail/>
- 3) Texas Education Agency. 2021. "The Dyslexia Handbook 2021 Update: Procedures Concerning Dyslexia and Related Disorders." *Texas Education Agency*.
https://tea.texas.gov/sites/default/files/19_0074_0028-1_2021.pdf
- 4) Texas Education Agency. 2018. "The Dyslexia Handbook 2018 Update: Procedures Concerning Dyslexia and Related Disorders." *Texas Education Agency*.
https://tea.texas.gov/sites/default/files/2018-Dyslexia-Handbook_Approved_Accomodated_12_11_2018.pdf
- 5) Moody, K.C., et al. 2000. "Prevalence of dyslexia among Texas prison inmates." *Tex Med*. 96(6): 69-75.
<https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/10876375/>
- 6) The Legislature State of Texas. 2011. "Interim Committee on Dyslexia and Related Disorders." *State of Texas 81st Legislature*. <https://senate.texas.gov/cmtes/81/c804/c804.InterimReport81.pdf>
- 7) Southern Regional Education Board. 2018. "Addressing the Needs of Struggling Young Readers: Dyslexia Policies in SREB States." *Policy Brief*.
https://www.sreb.org/sites/main/files/file-attachments/dyslexia_policies_brief_jan_2018_final_0.pdf?1517338636
- 8) Rata, Elizabeth. 2014. "The Three Stages of Critical Policy Methodology: an example from curriculum analysis." *Policy Futures in Education*. (12). <http://journals.sagepub.com/doi/10.2304/pfie.2014.12.3.347>
- 9) Jie, Ng Ding. 2016. "THF Literature Review: Towards a Framework of Education Policy Analysis." *The HEAD Foundation*.
https://headfoundation.org/wp-content/uploads/2020/11/thf-papers_Towards-a-framework-of-education-policy-analysis.pdf
- 10) Young, Michelle D., and Sarah Diem. 2018. "Doing Critical Policy Analysis in Education Research: An Emerging Paradigm." *Complementary Research Methods for Educational Leadership and Policy Studies*.
https://www.researchgate.net/publication/325908605_Doing_Critical_Policy_Analysis_in_Education_Research_An_Emerging_Paradigm
- 11) Young, Michelle D., and Sarah Diem. 2016. "Critical Approaches to Education Policy Analysis: Moving Beyond Tradition." *Education, Equity, Economy*.
https://books.google.com/books?id=LNWGDQAAOBAJ&printsec=frontcover&source=gbs_ge_summary_r&cad=0#v=onepage&q&f=false
- 12) Texas Education Agency, 2018. "Texas State Dyslexia Requirements Worksheet." *Texas Education Agency*.
https://www.esc19.net/cms/lib/TX01933775/Centricity/Domain/231/Texas_State_Dyslexia_Requirements_Worksheet.pdf
- 13) Fabelo, Tony, James Austin, and Angela Gunter. 2004. "The Impact of Ignoring Dyslexia and Reading Disabilities in the Criminal Justice System: What We Know and Need to Know; Report to the Dyslexia Research Foundation of Texas." *JFA Associates*. (1-67).
https://kipdf.com/the-impact-of-ignoring-dyslexia-and-reading-disabilities-in-the-criminal-justice_5ac9c4391723ddf849c9058d.html
- 14) Burrell, Sue and Loren Warboys. 2000. "Special Education and the Juvenile Justice System." *Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention*. <https://www.ojp.gov/pdffiles1/ojjdp/179359.pdf>

