



Full and Individual Evaluation

Date of Report: 7-1-2008
Student Name: Amy Reeves
Campus: St. Thomas Elem.
DOB: 4-19-1999
Grade: 2

The multidisciplinary team that collects or reviews evaluation data in connection with the determination of a student's eligibility must include an appropriately certified or licensed practitioner with experience and training in the area of the disability.

Information for this evaluation has been provided by the following individuals:

Diagnostician:

Speech Therapist:

Reason for Referral:

Initial: The purpose of this evaluation is to determine if the student has a speech, language, or learning deficit and/or physical, mental, emotional condition that requires specialized instruction through special education services in order to be successful in an educational setting.

Assessment Observations:

Amy accompanied the examiner willingly to the testing session and cooperated fully. Her effort on this assessment appeared to be good. Amy was friendly during the testing session. She was generally able to maintain concentration with little redirection and attended well to the testing materials. Amy responded at an average rate to questions asked by the examiner. She seemed to enjoy the one-on-one attention of the testing situation. Rapport was thought to have been established and maintained. Amy completed each task with good effort on the part of the examinee. In the opinion of this examiner, these test results represent a valid estimate of her current cognitive and academic achievement levels.

Section A: Language

Language Proficiency:

Students Dominant Language: English

Students Level of Proficiency:

	<u>Receptive</u>	<u>Expressive</u>
Above Average		
Average	x	
Below Average		x

LPAC Information:

The student is not limited English proficient

LPAC Recommendations: N/A

Student expresses herself best: Orally

Based on the assessment of the student’s language abilities, the remainder of the assessment was conducted in: English

No Testing modifications were needed to address the students language needs.

Communication Evaluation:

Source of data:

Assessment: Comprehensive Assessment of Spoken Language (CASL)

Description: This Is a norm-referenced oral language assessment battery for children and young adults age 3 through 21 years. It assesses lexical, semantic, syntactic, supralinguistic, and pragmatic skills.

Assessment Date: 7/31/2007

Assessment Components	Language	Standard Score	Percentile
Core Composite	English	81	10
Expressive	English	81	10
Receptive	English	84	14

Results and Interpretations:

Test results indicate that Amy lacks proficiency in the oral language processing systems of oral expression and word retrieval. Auditory comprehension, while below normal limits was found to be commensurate with cognitive ability.

Assessment: Test of Language Development - Primary -3 (TOLD-P; 3)

Description: An individually administered test that evaluates a students overall language abilities for students aged 4.0 to 8.11. It measures fundamental linguistic concepts, including listening, speaking, semantics and syntax as well as their ability to understand and use vocabulary words.

Assessment Date: 6/20/2007

Assessment Components	Language	Percentile	Scaled Scores	Quotient
Listening	English	73		109
Organizational Language	English	9		67
Phonemic Analysis	English	25	8	
Picture Vocabulary	English	91	14	
Relational Vocabulary	English	9	5	
Semantics (SeQ)	English	50		100
Speaking (SpQ)	English	27		91
Spoken Language (SLQ)	English	23		89
Syntax (SyQ)	English	45		98
Word Discrimination	English	50	10	

Results and Interpretations:

The TOLD-P: 3 includes spoken language, listening, organization, speaking, semantics, and syntax. The supplemental subtests are designed to measure phonological abilities. This allows the examiner to differentiate between speech competence and language competence.

Composite Quotients:

131-165 -Very Superior

121-130 - Superior

116-120-Above Average

85-115-Average

80-84 - Below Average

70-79 - Poor

35-69- Very Poor

Picture Vocabulary- measures the extent to which a student understands the meanings

associated with spoken language by prompting the student to point to the picture that best represents the meaning of the word spoken by the examiner. (semantic)

Relational Vocabulary - an associative task that measures a child's ability to understand and orally express the relationships between two words by understanding the meaning of a set of spoken words, recognizing their semantic category, and expressing their relationship. I.E.: How are a dog and a cat alike? (semantic)

Oral Vocabulary - measures a child's ability to give oral definitions to common words that are spoken by the examiner by giving the definition of the prompt word. I.E.: What is a home? (semantic)

Grammatical Understanding - measures the child's ability to comprehend the meaning of sentences by selecting from three pictures the one that best represents the stimulus sentence supplied by the examiner. (syntactic)

Sentence Imitation - measures the child's ability to produce correct sentences by imitating sentences presented by the examiner. (syntactic)

Grammatical Completion - measures the student's ability to recognize, understand, and use common morphological forms of language by supplying the missing word of a given sentence. (syntactic)

Supplemental subtest:

Word Discrimination - measures the student's ability to recognize the differences in significant speech sounds by having the student judge pairs of words, spoken by the examiner, as same or different (phonology)

Phonemic Analysis - measures a student's competence with the phonological system of the English language through auditory processing skills by segmenting words into smaller phonemic units. This skill is highly correlated with reading abilities. (phonology)

Word Articulation - measures the student's ability to produce speech sounds required in the English language by naming the pictures that are presented by the examiner.

Amy exhibited a significant discrepancy in relational vocabulary and organizational language.

Assessment: The Word Test Elementary Revised

Description: Assesses expressive vocabulary and semantics through associations, synonyms, semantic absurdities, antonyms, definitions and multiple definitions for children aged 7-0 to 11-11 years of age. It is designed to assess a student's ability to categorize and define words; use verbal reasoning; and choose appropriate words to measure the students command & semantic attributes.

Assessment Date: 6/28/2007

Assessment Components	Language	Percentile	Standard Score
Antonyms	English	17	86
Associations	English	4	75
Definitions	English	26	90
Multiple Definitions	English	45	99
Semantic Absurdities	English	14	82
Synonyms	English	33	95
Total Score	English	15	85

Results/Interpretations:

Amy scored in the average range of development in synonyms (95); definitions (90); and multiple definitions (99). She scored in the low to low average range for antonyms (75), semantic absurdities (84). Amy's score of 75 (low range) in associations indicates that she has significant difficulty categorizing words and explaining why they belong "together". The inability to do this indicates that Amy does not have adequate use of semantics and the vocabulary needed to complete the task. Lack of language reasoning skills, as measured on "The Listening Test" may also play a role in her difficulties with associating words.

Assessment: The Listening Test

Description: The Listening Test is a diagnostic tool that evaluates listening skills in elementary students. Each task assesses the strengths and weakness of listening skills in main Idea, details, concepts, reasoning, and story comprehension,

Assessment Date: 6/28/2007

Assessment Components	Language	Raw Scores	- Percentiles	Standard Scores
Concepts	English	8	17	85
Details	English	8	23	89
Main Idea	English	8	20	88
Reasoning	English	5	2	69
Story Comprehension	English	10	25	95
Total	English	39	10	84

Result/Interpretations:

Amy's scores indicate average ability in story comprehension (95). While she scored in the low average range in concepts (85), main idea (88), and details (89): these scores are within one standard deviation of the mean. This indicates that while these are relative weakness for Amy, they are not in need of formal intervention. Amy scored in the "very low" range in the area of reasoning (69). This score indicates that Amy is working more than two standard deviations from the mean and is significantly deficit in critical listening skills, prioritizing what she hears, identifying relationships and similarities, and drawing conclusions.

Assessment: Clinical Evaluation of Language Fundamentals- 4th Edition (CELF-4)

Description: An individually administered test that assesses both expressive and receptive skills in ages 5 thru 21 yrs.

Assessment Date: 6/28/2007

Assessment Components	Language	Standard Scores	Scaled Score	Percentiles
Concepts & Following Directions	English		2	
Core language Index	English	67		1
Expressive Language Index	English	67		1
Formulated Sentences	English		4	
Recalling Sentences	English		5	
Receptive Language Index	English	86		18
Word Structure	English		5	

Results/Interpretation:

The CELF-4 is designed to pinpoint a student's strengths and weaknesses in the area of language so that educationally relevant recommendations can be made. The difference between Amy's expressive language (67) score and receptive language (86) score is considered to be statistically significant. Additionally, her overall core language score is more than two standard deviations from the mean. These scores are indicative of a significant language deficit that may be affecting her educational performance.

Summary:

Amy exhibited significant discrepancies in her language skills. She scored in the average range of development in listening comprehension: low average in oral vocabulary; and very poor in organizational language. Further assessment completed by the Speech Pathologist indicates that Amy lacks proficiency in the area of oral expression. She demonstrates difficulty explaining auditory associations and semantic absurdities. Amy also exhibited difficulty with problem solving skills. These weaknesses may be identified in the classroom but Amy's difficulty understanding/retaining written and oral directions, and difficulty associating instructions from one task to the next. She does meet the criteria as speech impaired as specified by TEA. The ARD committee will determine eligibility for services.

Section B: Physical

Vision: Results of the vision screening completed by the school nurse indicates 20/20 vision in both eyes without the use of glasses.

Hearing: Results of the pure bell tone sweep test administered by the school nurse indicated hearing within gross normal limits in both ears.

Relevant Health Concerns:

Parent information indicates no identified health issues. REED information indicates that Amy missed 21 days of school during the 06-07 school year due to various illnesses unrelated to OHI eligibility.

Source of Data:

Assessment: Beery Buktenica Developmental Test of Visual Motor Integration (VMI)

Description: The Beery Buktenies Developmental Test of Visual Motor Integration (VMI) is administered to identify, through early screening, significant difficulties that some children have in integrating, or coordinating, the visual perceptual and motor abilities. The VMI identifies difficulties that children may have with integrating or coordination their visual perceptual and motor (finger/hand movement) abilities.

Standard score interpretation is as follows:

133-160 – Very High

118-132 - High

83-117 - Average

66-82 - Low

40-67 - Very Low

Amy's score of (90) indicates average abilities in the area of visual motor integration.

Section C: Emotional/Behavioral

Emotional/Behavioral concerns were measured informally through parent and teacher information submitted through the referral process and test observations.

Amy did not manifest any behaviors during the assessment sessions that would be indicative of an emotional or behavioral disorder that would affect her educational progress. Amy's mother indicated that at home, she has many friends her own age. She is a happy, well adjusted child who loves helping others. No behavior deficits were noted from the parent information.

Based on the Academic and Social Profile completed by the classroom teacher, Amy is cooperative and well behaved. Teacher indicates that Amy is socially age-appropriate. She makes and keeps friends at school and works cooperatively with peers. Amy shows

pleasure with good work and initiates activities independently. She generally demonstrates an even, usually happy disposition.

Section D: Sociological

Amy resides in Dallas and lives with her parents and sister. Mrs. Reeves' reported that Amy gets along with peers well and goes to bed at an average time for a child of her age. Parent reports no major changes in the family. She attends St. Thomas Elementary school.

No cultural or lifestyle factors that would influence the student's educational progress were evident in the parent profile or school records.

While student records did indicate no lack of previous educational opportunities, she did miss 21 days of the 06-07 school year due to various illnesses.

Section E: Cognitive

Source of Data:

Assessment: Cross Battery Assessment

Description: Cross battery assessment incorporates the Cattell-Horn-Carroll (CHC) theory in the process of analysis. The process of using subtests from various instruments allows the opportunity to gather the appropriate information needed to make educational placement decisions.

Assessment Components	Test	Standard Score	Scaled Scores	Percentiles
Full Scale	WISC-IV	98		
Crystallized Knowledge (Gc)	CHC	100		
Verbal Comprehension	WISC-IV	99		
Similarities (VL)	WISC-IV		9	
Verbal Comprehension (VL)	WJ III		11	
Comprehension (KO)	WISC-IV		10	
Fluid Reasoning (Gf)	CHC	95		
Perceptual Reasoning	WISC-IV	96		
Arithmetic (RQ)	WISC-IV	95	9	
Matrix (I)	WISC-IV	95	9	
Working Memory (Gsm)	CHC			
Working Memory	WISC-IV	99		
Digit Span (MS)	WISC-IV	115	13	
Letter-Number Sequencing (MW)	WISC-IV	85	7	
Arithmetic (MW)	WISC-IV	95	9	
Visual Processing (Gv)	CHC	111		
Picture Completion (CF)	WISC-IV	110	12	
Picture Recognition (MV)	W-J III	118		88
Block Design (SR)	WISC-IV	105	11	
Processing Speed (Gs)	CHC	98		
Processing Speed	WISC-IV	97		
Coding (R9)	WISC-IV	95	9	
Symbol Search (P)	WISC-IV	100	10	
Auditory Processing (Ga)	CHC	99		
Auditory Processing	W-J Cog III	98		44
Auditory Attention (US/U3)	W-J Cog III	102		55
Sound Blending (PC:S)	W-J Cog III	96		40
Long Term Retrieval (Glr)	CHC	89		

Long Term Retrieval	W-J Cog III	93		32
Visual-Auditory Learning (MA)	W-J Cog III	85		16
Retrieval Fluency (FI)	W-J Cog III	117		87
Assessment Components	Test	Standard Score	Scaled Scores	Percentiles
Rapid Picture Naming (NA)	W-J Cog III	92		30
Delayed Recall: Memory for Naming (MA)	W-J Cog III	76		6

Results/Interpretations:

The WISC-IV is a standardized: norm referenced intelligence test for children ages 6-0 to 16-11. The WISC-IV provides composite scores that represent intellectual functioning in specified cognitive domains (Verbal Comprehension Index, Perceptual Reasoning Index, Working Memory Index, and Processing Speed Index) as well as providing a composite score that represents a child’s general intellectual ability (Full Scale IQ). In addition to the above mentioned scores, the WISC-IV can be used to yield information on both the broad and narrow abilities that make up intellectual functioning. Measuring five of the seven broad abilities, the WISC-IV can be utilized to assess crystallized knowledge, fluid reasoning, visual processing, short term memory, and processing speed.

Scores fall into the following classifications:

- 130 and above—Very Superior
- 120-129 - Superior
- 116-119 - High Average
- 85-115 - Average
- 80-84 - Low Average
- 70-79 - Borderline
- 69 and below— Intellectually Deficient

Subtest Scale Scores:

- 12 or more - Above Average
- 8-11 – Average
- 7 or less - Below Average

Percentiles

- 75-100 - Above Average
- 25-74 - Average
- 24 or less - Below Average

DISCUSSION:

Amy’s intellectual functioning appears to be within the average range as measured by the WISC-IV. Overall comparison of total verbal comprehension, perceptual reasoning, working memory and processing speed index scores suggest there is not a significant difference between index score totals.

The verbal comprehension index score is dependent on the child’s accumulated experience, and usually requires an automatic response with what is already known. This scale involves auditory verbal input and vocal verbal output.

The perceptual reasoning index score is more dependent on the child's immediate problem-solving ability and requires the child to meet new situations, apply past experiences, and use previously acquired skills to respond to a new set of demands. This scale involves visual nonverbal input, some verbal input, and motor nonverbal output.

The working memory index score is a measure of a child's ability to hold information in short term memory sufficiently long enough for it to be processed.

The perceptual speed index is a measure of a child's ability to perceive visual information quickly and accurately.

Individual subtest scores are expressed in terms of scaled scores having a mean of ten and a standard deviation of three.

Crystallized Knowledge (Gc) - The breadth and depth of knowledge including verbal communication and information. Reasoning, when using previously learned procedures is also included.

VL - Lexical Knowledge: Extent of vocabulary that can be understood in terms of correct word meaning.

LD - Language Development: The general development, or the understanding of words, sentences, and paragraphs (not required for reading) in spoken native language skills

KO - General Knowledge: Range of general knowledge.

LS - Listening Ability: Ability to listen and comprehend oral communication

Amy's crystallized knowledge appears to be within the average range of intellectual functioning. Subtests involved in measuring this are:

Similarities (VL)

Comprehension (KO)

A brief description of these subtests is as follows:

SIMILARITIES: measures the ability to think and reason associatively and logically at the concrete and abstract levels. A child is asked to compare two unlike concepts and choose like characteristics or qualities with a verbal response.

COMPREHENSION: measures the ability to make judgments about social situations, practical knowledge, reasoning, and logical solutions. The child is asked to explain the reasons certain things are done which involve conventional standards.

Fluid Reasoning (Gf) - The ability to use and engage in various mental operations when faced with a relatively novel task that cannot be performed automatically.

RG - General Sequential Reasoning: The ability to start with stated rules, premises, or conditions, and to engage in one or more steps to reach a solution to a novel problem.

I - Induction: The ability to discover the underlying characteristic problem (i.e. rule, concept, process, trend, class membership) that governs a problem or set of materials.

RQ – Qualitative Reasoning: Ability to start with stated rules, premises or conditions and to engage in one or more steps to reach a solution to a problem

Amy's fluid reasoning as described through the perceptual reasoning ability index appears to be within the average range of intellectual functioning. Subtests involved in measuring this are:

Arithmetic (RQ)

Matrix Reasoning (I)

A brief description of these tests is as follows:

MATRIX REASONING: Provides a reliable measure of visual information processing and abstract reasoning skills. The child is shown a matrix with a missing part, and asked to choose the correct part from a selection at the bottom of the page.

ARITHMETIC: Measures mental manipulation, concentration, attention, short and long-term memory, numerical reasoning ability and mental alertness. In this test, the child is required to listen to an arithmetic problem, and then solve it without pencil and paper within a given time limit.

Visual Processing (Gv) - The ability to use spatial orientation, the ability to analyze and synthesize visual stimuli, and the ability to hold and manipulate mental images.

Vz – Visualization: The ability to mentally manipulate objects or visual patterns and to see, in the mind's eye, " how they would appear under altered conditions.

SR – Spatial Relations: Ability to perceive and manipulate visual patterns or to maintain orientation with respect to objects in space.

MV - Visual Memory: Ability to form and store a mental representation or image of a visual stimulus and then recognize or recall it later.

SS - Spatial Scanning: The ability to survey a spatial field or pattern accurately and identify a path through the visual field or pattern.

CF – Flexibility of Closure: Ability to identify a visual figure or pattern embedded in a complex visual array, when knowing in advance what the pattern is.

CS – Closure Speed: Ability to quickly combine disconnected, vague, or partially obscured visual stimuli or patterns into a meaningful whole, without knowing in advance what the pattern is.

Amy's visual processing appears to be within the average range of intellectual functioning. Subtests involved in measuring this are:

Picture Completion (CF)
Block Design (SR)

PICTURE COMPLETION: measures visual perception and organization, concentration, and visual recognition of essential details of objects.

BLOCK DESIGN: measures the ability to arrange small colored blocks to copy a geometric design, visual alertness, and visual perception. Visual analysis and synthesis are utilized.

Short Term Memory (Gsm) - The ability to hold information in immediate awareness and then use it within a few seconds. Also related to working memory.

MS - Memory Span: The ability to attend to and immediately recall temporally ordered elements in the correct order after a single presentation

MW - Working Memory: The ability to hold information in mind for a short time while performing some operation upon it.

Amy's short term memory is within the average range. Subtests involved in measuring this cognitive process are as follows:

Digit Span (MS)
Letter-Number Sequencing (MW)
Arithmetic (MW)

Amy did exhibit a significant difference between letter-number sequencing (MW) -7 and digit span (MS) - 13. Further assessment in the area of short-term memory (Gsm), with arithmetic (MW) indicates average (9) performance. Analysis of these scores indicates there is no processing deficit in short term memory. It does suggest, however, that Amy has the ability to comprehend and recite a given stimulus, but has some difficulty when asked to mentally manipulate (rearrange) the stimulus before responding.

A description of the subtests used is as follows:

DIGIT SPAN: This test is composed of two parts: digit span forward and digit span backward. Digit span forward requires the child to repeat numbers in the same order as read aloud by the examiner. Digit span backward requires the child to repeat the numbers in the reverse order when presented by the examiner. This subtest is designed as a measure of short-term auditory memory, sequencing skills, attention and concentration.

LETTER-NUMBER SEQUENCING: Measures sequencing, mental manipulation, attention, short term memory, visuospatial imaging and processing speed. In this test a

series of numbers and letters are read to the child. The child is required to rearrange the characters by numerical and alphabetic order,

ARITHMETIC: Measures mental manipulation, concentration, attention, short and long-term memory, numerical reasoning ability and mental alertness. In this test, the child is required to listen to an arithmetic problem, and then solve it without pencil and paper within a given time limit.

PROCESSING SPEED (Gs) - The ability to use speed and efficiency in performing automatic or very simple cognitive tasks.

P - Perceptual Speed: The ability to search for and compare rapidly visual symbols presented side by side or separated in a visual field.

N – Number Facility: Ability to rapidly and accurately manipulate and deal with numbers, from elementary skills of counting and recognizing numbers to advanced skills of adding, subtracting, multiplying, and dividing.

R9 – Rate – of- Test- Taking: Ability to rapidly perform tests that are relatively easy or that require very simple decisions.

RE – Speed of Reasoning: Speed of fluency in performing tasks in a limited time.

Amy's processing speed is within the average range. Subtests involved in measuring this cognitive process are:

Coding (R9)

Symbol Search (P)

A description of the subtests used is as follows:

CODING: Measures processing speed, short-term memory, learning ability, visual perception, visual-motor coordination, visual scanning ability, cognitive flexibility, attention and motivation. Using a key, the child draws each symbol in its corresponding shape or box within a specified time limit.

SYMBOL SEARCH: This test involves short-term memory, processing speed, visual-motor coordination, cognitive flexibility and visual discrimination. The child scans a search group and indicates whether or not the target symbol matches any of the symbols in the search group within a time limit.

The **Woodcock-Johnson Test of Cognitive Abilities III** is an individually administered instrument used to evaluate the intelligence of children ages of 5 years through 19 years of age. The test is based on the Cattell-Horn-Carroll theory of intelligence yielding information on the seven broad abilities and associated narrow abilities that make up cognitive functioning. The W-J Cog. III may be used independently or in a cross-battery approach, along with other IQ assessments, to determine a student's strengths, weakness, and the extent of the impairment.

Score ranges are as follows:

131 and above - Very Superior
121-130-Superior
116-120-High Average
85-115 -Average
80-84- Low Average
70-79- Very Low

The sections of this test that are listed in the table were used to supplement the WISC-IV in an effort to determine cognitive functioning in all broad areas of intellectual functioning. Long Term Retrieval (Glr) and Auditory Process (Ga) were measured with the following subtests.

Long-Term Retrieval (Glr) - is the ability to store information efficiently and retrieve it later through association. Narrow abilities (skills that are needed to be proficient in this area of cognitive ability) under Long Term Retrieval are:

MA - Associative Memory: The ability to recall one part of a previously learned but unrelated pair of items when the other part is presented. (i.e. Paired associative learning)

FI - Ideational Fluency: The ability to produce a series of ideas, words, or phrases related to a specific condition or object, rapidly.

NA - Naming Facility: The ability to produce names for concepts rapidly.

MM - Meaningful Memory: The ability to recall a set of items where there is a meaningful relation between items or the items comprise a meaningful story or connected discourse.

M6 – Free Recall Memory: Ability to recall as many unrelated items as possible, in any order, after a large collection of items is presented.

FF – Figural Fluency: Ability to rapidly draw several examples of elaboration when given a starting visual stimulus.

The subtest used in this assessment to measure Long-Term Retrieval were:

Visual-Auditory Learning (MA) - 85
Retrieval Fluency (FI, NA) – 117
Rapid Picture Naming (NA) - 92
Delayed Recall; Visual-Auditory Learning (MA) -76

Due to the significant difference in scores between Visual- Auditory Learning and Retrieval Fluency; Delayed Recall and Rapid Picture Naming were administered. While the scores that represent associative memory are considered in the low average range of development, with Delayed Recall representing a normative weakness, the overall score for Glr (89) is within one standard deviation from the mean, which indicates Amy does not have a normative weakness in Long Term Retrieval. It is worth noting, that

associative memory is a relative weakness for Amy and may hinder her educational progress.

A description of these subtests are as follows:

Visual-Auditory Learning - Delayed is a test that can be used to provide additional information about long term retrieval, specifically aspects of associative and meaningful memory.

Visual- Auditory Learning is a test of long term storage and retrieval. This “thinking” ability test requires the subject to learn, store and retrieve a series of visual-auditory associations. The subject uses associative and meaningful memory skills to learn and recall rebuses, then read sentences and paragraphs written using the rebuses.

Retrieval Fluency is a test that measures an aspect of long term retrieval, by measuring the fluency of retrieval from stored knowledge.

Rapid Picture Naming is a test of cognitive fluency that provides additional information about processing speed.

Auditory Processing (Ga) measures the ability to discriminate, analyze, and synthesize auditory stimuli. This score is also related to phonological awareness. Narrow abilities (skills that are needed to be proficient in this area of cognitive ability) under Auditory Processing are:

UR - Resistance to Auditory Stimulus: The ability to understand speech that has been distorted or masked in one or more ways.

PC:A - Phonetic Coding Analysis: Ability to process speech sounds, as identifying, isolating, and analyzing sounds.

PC: S Phonetic Coding – Synthesis: Ability to process speech sounds, as identifying, isolating, and blending or synthesizing sounds

UL – Sound Localization: Ability to localize sounds heard in space.

US/U3 – Speech/General sound Discrimination: Ability to detect differences in speech sounds under conditions of little distraction or distortion.

Subtests used to measure this cognitive process are:

Sound Blending (PC: 5)

Auditory Attention (USIU3. UR)

Amy’s scores indicate average functioning in the areas of Auditory Processing.

A description of these subtests are as follows:

Sound Blending is an auditory processing test. This test of phonetic coding measures skill in synthesizing language sounds. The subject listens to a series of syllables and then is required to blend the sounds into a word.

Auditory Attention measures an aspect of speech-sound discrimination - the ability to overcome the effects of auditory distortion or masking to understand oral language. (Ga)

Adaptive behavior was assessed using informal measures.

Sources of Data

Assessment: Parent Questionnaire

Description: An informal social history made up of a series of questions related to the family unit, which gives information related to the student's development and functioning within the family setting.

Assessment Date: 5/8/2007

Results and Interpretations:

Data drawn from the Informal evaluation of emotional/behavioral and social factors reveals that Amy appears to meet the standards of personal independence and social responsibility of her age and cultural group, both in and away from school.

Summary:

A cross battery approach was used in this assessment to ensure that all areas of cognitive functioning were assessed. Incorporating the Cattell-Horn-Carroll (CHC) theory and cross-battery process of analysis, the examiner was able to gather the most appropriate information available to estimate the student's range of functioning in both the broad and narrow abilities associated with academic achievement. The WISC-IV and portions of the W-J III Cognitive were used in this process.

Amy is performing in the average range in the broad abilities of Crystallized Knowledge (Gc), Fluid Reasoning (Gf), Short-Term Memory (Gsm), Visual Processing (Gv), Auditory Processing (Ga), and Processing Speed (Ps). She is performing in the low average range in the broad ability of Long-Term Retrieval (Glr). She exhibits a weakness in the narrow ability of Associative Memory. This weakness indicates Amy may have difficulty with paired-associative learning (the ability to recall one part of a previously learned but unrelated pair of items when the other part is presented). This is a relative weakness for Amy, but is not indicative of a specific learning disability. Strengths for Amy within this ability include Naming Facility (the ability to rapidly produce names for concepts) and Ideational Fluency (the ability to rapidly produce a series of ideas, words, or phrases related to a specific condition or object). An overall examination of cognitive ability does not indicate a processing deficit in any of the seven areas of cognitive processes associated with academic achievement.

Section F: Achievement

Source of Data:

Assessment: Cross Battery Assessment

Description: Cross battery assessment incorporates the Cattell-Horn-Carroll (CHC) theory in the process of analysis. The process of using subtest from various instruments allows the opportunity to gather the appropriate information needed to make educational placement decisions.

Assessment Components	Test	Standard Score	Scaled Score	Percentile
Comprehension	GRST	92 (SRite)		
Written Expression	W-J III	96 (SRite)		
Math Calculations	W-J III	104 (SRite)		
Math Reasoning	W-J III	103 (SRite)		
Word Reading	WIAT	95 (SRite)		
Pseudo word Decoding	WIAT	89		23
Spelling	WIAT	100		50
Accuracy	GORT	7 (SRite)		
Fluency	GORT	12 (SRite)		
Overall Reading Ability	GORT	100		
Rate	GORT	8		
Blending Words	C-TOPP	7 (SRite)		
Elision	C-TOPP	7(SRite)		
Phonological Awareness	C-TOPP	82 (SRite)		
Phonological Memory	C-TOPP	64		
Rapid Digit Naming	C-TOPP	10 (SRite)		
Rapid Letter Naming	C-TOPP	12 (SRite)		

Results/Interpretations:

The **Gray's Silent Reading Test** is designed for individuals ages 7-25 years, and measures an individual's silent reading comprehension ability. The GSRT results may be used to identify individuals who are working significantly below their peers to determine areas of relative strengths and weakness in reading comprehension. The GRST yields raw scores, grade equivalents, age equivalents, percentiles, and a silent reading quotient. This test evaluates reading comprehension by requiring students to read a series of paragraphs and answer questions about their content. Amy's score of (92) indicates that her comprehension skills are in the average range of development when compared to children her age.

The **Woodcock-Johnson Test of Achievement III** is set of individually administered tests for students ages two and up, which measures academic achievement in reading, mathematics, written language and knowledge. Scores for the Woodcock-Johnson Test of Achievement are reported by standard scores and fall in the following classifications:

131 and above-Very Superior
121-130 - Superior
116-120 - High Average
85- 115 - Average
80-84 - Low Average
70-79 - Low
69 and below-Very Low

The following subtests were used to assess written language and math.

Written Expression

Test 8: Writing Fluency

Writing fluency measures skill in formulating and writing simple sentences quickly. Each sentence must relate to a given stimulus picture in the Subject Response Booklet and include a given set of three words. This test has a 7-minute time limit.

Test 11: Writing Samples

Writing Samples measures skills in writing responses to a variety of demands. The person must produce written sentences that are evaluated with respect to the quality of expression. Item difficulty increases by increasing passage length, level of vocabulary, grammatical complexities, and level of concept abstraction. The individual is not penalized for errors in basic writing skills, such as spelling or punctuation.

Math Calculations

Test 5: Calculations

Calculation is a test of math achievement measuring the ability to perform mathematical computations. The initial items in calculation require the individual to write single numbers. The remaining items require the person to perform addition, subtraction, multiplication, division and combinations of these basic operations, as well as some geometric, trigonometric, logarithmic, and calculus operations. The calculations involve negative numbers, percents, decimals, fractions, and whole numbers. Because the calculations are presented in a traditional problem format in the subject response booklet, the person is not required to make any decisions about what operations to use or what data to include.

Test 6: Math Fluency

Math Fluency measures the ability to solve simple addition, subtraction, and multiplication facts quickly. The person is presented a series of simple problems in the subject response booklet. This test has a 3-minute time limit.

Math Reasoning

Test 10: Applied Problems

Applied Problems requires the person to analyze and solve math problems. To solve the problems, the person must listen to the problem, recognize the procedure to be followed, and then perform relatively simple calculations. Because many of the problems include extraneous information, the individual must decide not only the appropriate mathematical operations to use but also which numbers to include in the calculations. Item difficulty increases with complex calculations.

Test 18: Quantitative Concepts

Quantitative Concepts measures knowledge of mathematical concepts, symbols, and vocabulary. This test consists of two subtests: Concepts and Number Series. In the first subtest, the initial items require counting and identifying numbers, shapes, and sequences. The remaining items require knowledge of mathematical terms and formula. The subject does not perform any paper-and-pencil calculations. In the second subtest, the task requires the person to look at a series of numbers, figure out the pattern, and then provide the missing number in the series.

Amy's overall scores in math and written language are in the average range of development when compared to children her age.

The **Wechsler Individual Achievement Test, 2nd Edition, (WIAT-II)** is a comprehensive, individually administered test for assessing the achievement of children, adolescents, college students, and adults who are in grades Pre-K through 16 or who are 4-85 years of age. The WIAT-II is a revision of the WIAT, 1992, and retains the basic domains of Reading, Writing, Math and Oral Language; however the depth of each related subtest was increased and updated to reflect new curriculum standards. The WIAT-II can be utilized comprehensively or to test only in an area of need.

Scores for the WIAT Test of Achievement II are reported by standard scores and fall in the following classification:

131 and above - Very Superior

121-130- Superior

116-120- High Average

85-115 Average

80-84 - Low Average

70-79 - Low

69 and below - Very Low

The following subtests were administered to supplement the assessment from Scottish Rite Hospital.

Word Reading assesses early reading and word recognition and decoding skills. Tasks include the ability to identify letters of the alphabet, identify and generate rhyming

words, identify beginning and ending sounds of words, blend sounds into words, and match sounds with letters and letter blends. Words are also read aloud from a word list.

Pseudoword Decoding evaluates the ability to apply phonetic decoding skills. The nonsense words that are read by the student are designed to be representative of the phonetic structure of words in the English language.

Spelling evaluates the ability to spell dictated letters, letter blends, and words. When spelling homonyms, the student is required to use context clues from the dictated sentences to spell the appropriate word.

Although Amy struggles with grade level reading prompts, her scores reflect average abilities in reading and spelling.

The **Gray Oral Reading Tests, Fourth Edition (GORT-4)** measure growth in oral reading and aides in the diagnosis of oral reading difficulties in children 6-18 years of age. Five scores give you information on student's oral reading skills in terms of:

Rate - the amount of time taken by a student to read a story.

Accuracy - the student's ability to pronounce each word in the story correctly.

Fluency - the student's rate and accuracy scores combined.

Comprehension - the appropriateness of the student's responses to questions about the content of each story read.

Overall Reading Ability - a combination of a student's fluency (i.e: Rate and Accuracy) and comprehension scores.

Amy's overall oral reading score (100) is in the average range when compared to children her age. Fluency is in the high average range of development while accuracy is in the low average range. This difference in scores may be attributed to Amy's difficulties with decoding with grade level reading prompts.

The **Comprehensive Test of Phonological Processing (CTOPP)** assesses phonological awareness, phonological memory, and rapid naming in children 5 to 24-11 years of age. The CTOPP may be used to identify individuals who are significantly below their peers in important phonological abilities, and to determine strengths and weaknesses among developed phonological processes. The test contains the following subtests: Elision, Blending Words, Sound Matching, Memory for Digits, Non-word Repetition, Rapid Color Naming, Rapid Digit Naming, Rapid Letter Naming, Rapid Object Naming, Blending Non-words, Phoneme Reversal, Segmenting Words, and Segmenting Non-words. Composite scores used in this evaluation include:

The **Phonological Awareness Quotient (PAQ)** measures an individual's awareness and access to the phonological structure of oral language.

The **Phonological Memory Quotient (PMQ)** measures the examinee's ability to code

information phonologically for temporary storage in working or short-term memory.

Scores indicate that, Amy exhibits a normative weakness in Phonological Awareness and Phonological Memory indicating difficulty in her ability to access the phonological structure of oral language and to code information phonologically.

Summary:

While overall achievement scores reported in Reading-Writing Ability - Writing (Grw-W) -100, Quantitative Reasoning (Gq,) - 104, and Reading-Writing Ability - Reading (Grw-R) -89, and all supplemental achievement tests are in the average range of development; it is worth noting the following observations that may be affecting Amy's educational progress.

Amy's overall oral reading (100) is in the average range when compared to children her age. Informal pre-reading measures as reported by Scottish Rite, indicate that Amy has the ability to recite the alphabet, name upper and lower case letters, identify consonant sounds, write the alphabet and form letters correctly. She was also able to identify 4 of 5 vowel sounds. Informal assessment by her tutor this summer indicates that Amy can read text at a 2nd grade level by using sight vocabulary and reading from context.

When measuring pseudoword decoding, Amy scored in the low average range of development but did achieve within a standard deviation of the mean. This indicates that while this is a relative weakness for Amy, it is not considered a normative weakness that would support SLD identification. It is worth noting that while reading the nonsense prompts, she regularly reversed letters such as d/b and d/p. Additionally, Amy substituted i/h; r/h; and r/l in words that have blends in the initial position of words.

When evaluating spelling, Amy scored in the average range of development for both this examiner and in the Scottish Rite report. It is worth noting that the words she did miss were ones that require knowledge of the rules for reading and spelling. For example, Amy consistently missed words with patterns such as cvc-silent e; Irregular bends such as (gh); and words with double vowels such as "easier" and "guess".

Amy's word reading scores indicates that she is working in the average range of achievement when compared to children her age, but it is worth noting that she struggles with words that have irregular patterns such as double vowel and blends that possess a silent consonant or form a single consonant sound. It is also worth noting that when given the Decoding Skills Test administered by Scottish Rite, which measures a child's ability to use letter-sound associations, vowel and consonant patterns and syllables to decode real or nonsense words, she scored inadequate' on both single and multiple syllable words.

Amy's score of (82) in the area of phonological awareness on the CTOPP is more than one standard deviation from the mean, which indicates a normative deficit in the ability to understand the sound structure of spoken words. Amy's phonological memory score of

(64), which measures the student's ability to code information phonologically for temporary storage in working or short-term memory, further supports the belief that weak phonological skills are hampering her progress in reading. This weakness may be the core of her decoding difficulties. Strengths in this area include rapid naming of digits and letters.

Amy's scores on the GORT-4 indicate low average abilities with rate and accuracy. The above mentioned relative weakness in reading may be causing low average performance in accuracy and rate. Improving phonological awareness and memory skills should help her with rate and accuracy. Her score of (12) in fluency indicates a high average ability in this area of reading.

Section G: Assistive Technology:

Amy is able to ambulate independently and does not need adaptations or accommodations other than that available to other students in general or special education classes. She does not need classroom adaptations in order to benefit from her education program. While her expressive skills are below average she does not require assistive or augmentative devices in order to communicate. It has been recommended in this report that the ARD committee consider speech therapy to remediate weaknesses in expressive language.

Amy does not require the use of hearing or vision aids and/or devices in order to benefit from class instruction. She is able to participate in activities to build or enhance skills in the areas of physical education, recreation and leisure. Amy can manage routine self-care and activities of daily living without modification, adaptations, or assistive devices.

Based on information gathered through observations, screenings, and teacher/parent information, Amy does not require assistive technology devices or services to benefit from her education program. Referral for additional assessment is not required at this time.

Section H: Summary and Conclusions:

This student demonstrates significant educational/developmental deficits in the areas of:

Language

As outlined by IDEA, State Regulations and cross battery analysis procedures, students are found to have a learning disability when:

1. an identified processing deficit that is normatively significant, in an otherwise normal profile within their cognitive abilities is present;
2. an achievement deficit that can be tied to the identified processing deficit in any of the following areas of academic achievement: basic reading, reading comprehension;

reading fluency; math reasoning, numerical operations, oral expression, listening comprehension and/or written expression;

3. all exclusionary factors that may be impeding the student's academic progress are ruled out;
4. student has had benefit of RTI (response to intervention) and has failed to make significant gains in his/her achievement.
5. **and**, the suspected disability results in significant/substantial failure or limitations in daily life functions (educational need for service).

Amy presents with average abilities in all areas of cognitive ability. While a relative weakness (Assoc. Memory) was identified in the area of Long Term Retrieval, a processing deficit has not been identified. Academic test results indicate that Amy is working in the average range of all assessed areas. A relative weakness with phonological awareness and memory were identified within the area of basic reading, however, her overall reading ability is in the average range. Additionally, exclusionary factors due to numerous absences (illnesses) during the intervention process (Tier 2) in regular education could not be ruled out as a contributor to her lack of progress within this intervention. Due to the lack of a processing deficit in an otherwise normal profile and overall average achievement in all academic areas assessed; Amy does not meet the SBOE regulations for Specific Learning Disability. Using the simple difference method of determination of Language deficits; she does qualify as a Speech Impaired student.

Educational Recommendations:

Amy's remediation plan to strengthen the identified relative weaknesses within her achievement should include:

1. Exercises to improve relational vocabulary and organizational language.
2. Exercises to improve awareness and access to the phonological structures of language.
3. Exercises to improve Amy's ability to code/decode information phonologically.
4. Exercises to improve overall decoding and spelling skills.

Exercises may include:

1. Ask the student to help make lists of small categories which fit inside larger categories. (e.g. flowers, trees, and bushes are all categories which can be included in the plant category)
2. Have student play analogy games involving multiple choice possibilities.

3. After making a grocery list, have student divide the items up into food groups to “help” you find them more easily in the store.

4. Have the student correspond sound with a physical object such as colored tiles or their fingers. Have the student hold up a tile or finger for each sound in the word identifying each sound as she goes. This can be played as a car game as well - Choose a word from a passing sign and identify the different sounds as you say the word. To take it to the next level, you may want to carry a dry erase board so the student can write the word. (choose words with the same ending)

5. Have student repeat nonsense words as they heard it, using their fingers to identify each sound. Help the student to recognize each sound that is vocalized by repeating and modeling as needed.

6. To improve Amy’s ability to read and spell words that do not follow normal spelling rules, make sure that she knows the spelling rules rather than just memorizing the spelling words for a test. You may want to give her a “tip” sheet that is laminated and taped to her desk or can be used as a book mark. Have her refer to the list of rules when trying to read or spell a word until these rules are committed to memory. (e.g. (i) before (e) except after (c), etc.)

7. List each spelling rule and have the student give examples of words under each rule.

8. To help with letter reversals, make certain the student has a number line and alphabet strip on her desk for quick reference. If only b/d are involved, have the student keep a card with the word bed for quick reference.

9. Required student to proof all work highlighting any reversed letters/numbers. Reinforce all self corrections.

Accommodations that the regular ed. teacher may want to consider to address Amy’s relative weakness with associative memory (MA) include:

1. Insure that Amy generalizes directions when needed by asking her to repeat which assignments have the same set of directions. (e.g. Worksheets, 3 & 5 are due on Tuesday.)

2. Do not assume that because she did one assignment correctly, she will know to do the next assignment the same way.

3. Allow Amy to have a reduced spelling list that supports and helps strengthen the above mentioned skill families.

4. Remember that associative memory task will be difficult but not impossible for Amy. Continue to “stretch” this ability for improvement. Be aware that she may have difficulty with activities that involve paired-associative learning.

Conclusion:

Based on information contained in this FIE, related disability reports, and/or the statement of recommendations and assurances, this student appears to meet criteria for the disability(ies) below:

Condition: Speech Impairment

Discussion:

THE ARD COMMITTEE WILL MAKE THE FINAL DECISION REGARDING ELIGIBILITY ACCORDING TO IDEA AND COMMISSIONER'S REGULATIONS. TEST RESULTS INDICATE THAT AMY DOES MEET THE CURRENT COMMISSIONER'S CRITERIA FOR SPEECH IMPAIRMENT. RECOMMENDATIONS ARE FOR CONTINUED MAINSTREAM REGULAR EDUCATION INSTRUCTION WITH SPEECH SERVICES AND INTERVENTIONS FOR DECODING SKILLS.

ASSURANCES:

The multidisciplinary team assures that tests, or evaluation materials, used for the purposed evaluation, were selected and administered so as not to be racially or culturally discriminatory.

Any standardized tests have been validated for the specific purpose for which they were used.

Any standardized tests were administered by trained personnel in accordance with any instructions provided by the producer of the test.

More than one procedure was used for determining whether a student has a disability and for determining an appropriate educational program for the student.

Tests were selected and administered so as to best ensure that if a test was administered to a child with impaired sensory, manual, or speaking skills, the test results accurately reflect the students aptitude or achievement level or other factors the test purport to measure, rather than reflecting the student's impaired sensory, manual, or speaking skills (unless those skills are the factors that the test purport to measure).

Technically sound instruments were used to assess the relative contribution of cognitive and behavioral factors, in addition to physical or developmental factors.

The evaluation provides relevant information that directly assists persons in determining the educational needs of the child.

Materials and procedures used to assess a student with limited English proficiency were selected and administered to ensure that they measure the extent to which the student has a disability and needs special education, rather than measuring the students English language skills.

Information has been drawn from a variety of sources including aptitude and achievement tests, parent input, teacher recommendations, physical condition, social or cultural background, and adaptive behavior.

I have reviewed this report and it reflects my professional conclusions.

<u>Multidisciplinary Team</u>	<u>Position</u>	<u>Agree</u>	<u>Disagree*</u>

Specific Learning Disability
Eligibility Report

Name: Amy Reeves
Date of Birth:
Date of Report: 7/01/2008

Professional Evaluators: General education teacher; person trained/certified in the area of learning disabilities, and assessment specialist.

Standardized Intelligence and Achievement Scores: Based on the Full and Individual Evaluation (FIE), Part I - Determination of Disability and Educational Need:
The student's performance on the standardized intelligence test Indicates that his/her assessed intellectual ability is above the mentally retarded range.

The student has been administered standardized achievement tests in areas in which she/he has had appropriate learning experiences.

Does the student's intellectual ability indicate a processing deficit in an otherwise normal profile? Documentation of Decision:

All areas of intellectual ability assessed are within the average range of development No processing deficit has been identified.

Do the student's scores indicate a normative weakness in one or more areas of achievement? If so, how is it related to the identified processing deficit?

Documentation of Decision:

Student's overall achievement in reading, writing, and math are within normal limits. Amy does exhibit a normative weakness in organizational language, vocabulary. Relative weaknesses were identified in the areas of phonological awareness, and phonological memory.

Do exclusionary factors exist that affect the student's educational progress?

Documentation of Decision (Include RTI, Attendance, etc.):

Student does not exhibit negative emotional/attention behaviors. Teacher reports good behavior, positive, enthusiastic learner. Amy was absent 21 days of the 06-07 school year due to various illnesses.

RTI:

TIER 1: Student has been instructed in the TEKS based curriculum adopted by “school district” that addresses the 5 areas of reading, math, and written language.

TIER 2: District dyslexic program - spring semester

Frequency - Information not available

Fidelity- Student missed 17 days of school the spring semester, and teacher was reportedly out sick frequently.

Progress - Teacher reported that Amy began the intervention with good progress then regressed.

TIER 3: Summer Tutoring - Take Flight (Scottish Rite dyslexic program)

Frequency- 2x/week

Fidelity - unknown

Progress - tutoring reported significant progress

CLASSROOM OBSERVATION OF STUDENT’S BEHAVIOR-

Observer reports Amy begins tasks promptly. attends to task most of the time; and follows oral and written directions. When off task she was easily redirected. She interacts well with peers and teachers. When given oral directions, she required specific attention to begin, but remained focused once started.

NAME OF OBSERVER

POSITION

DATE

EDUCATIONALLY REVANT MEDICAL FINDINGS (if any):

No educationally relevant medical findings that may be affecting the student’s educational performance were identified.

EFFECTS OF ENVIRONMENTAL, CULTURAL OR ECONOMIC DISADVANTAGE:

No cultural, environmental, or economic disadvantages that may be affecting the student’s educational progress were identified.

IMPLICATIONS:

yes no n/a Based on the data presented in this report, the multidisciplinary evaluation team has determined that the identified processing deficit and associated achievement deficit exist to the degree that the student cannot be adequately served in general classes without the provision of special services other than those provided under the compensatory education programs. The identified deficits are not correctable without special education and related services.

Additional implications of the processing and academic deficit for the educational process (If any):
No deficits identified.

yes no n/a Based on the Full and Individual Evaluation and data presented in this report, the multidisciplinary evaluation team assures that the following have been ruled out as the primary cause of the severe discrepancy visual, hearing, or motor impairment; mental retardation; emotional disturbance; or environmental, cultural, or economic disadvantage.

yes no n/a Based on the Response to Intervention (RTI) data that accompanies this report, the student has had adequate access to RTI to support determination of a specific learning disability.

yes no Based on the data presented in this report, the student appears to meet the criteria for a specific learning disability.

SIGNATURE OF GEN. ED. TEACHER

Position

agree disagree

SIGNATURE OF PERSON TRAINED/CERTIFIED
IN THE AREA OF LEARNING DISABILITIES

Position

agree disagree

SIGNATURE OF EVALUATION SPECIALIST
MULTIDISCIPLINARY TEAM MEMBER

Position

agree disagree