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Demographic Data

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Student Name: | Rebecca Doe | Parents/Guardians: | Vella Doe |
| Grade: | 2nd | Address  Phone Number: | 12345 Sage Drive  Downtown, TX 6789  123-456-7890 |
| Date of Birth: | 06/19/2006 | Email Address: | abcd@yahoo.com |
| Age: 11 years 5 months |  | Date of Report: | December 8, 2013 |
| Gender: | Female |  |  |

Reason for Full and Individual Evaluation (FIE)

This Full and Individual Evaluation (FIE) represents a multidisciplinary evaluation conducted by a team of professionals. The purpose of this FIE is to: (a) describe Rebecca’s strengths and weaknesses and present levels of performance/functioning across multiple areas; (b) evaluate for a learning disability condition(s) and educational needs; and (c) make recommendations regarding educational programming.

Background Information

Throughout her school years, Rebecca has experienced occasional academic difficulties due to a speech /language impairment. She received tutoring in reading and mathematics since kindergarten up until now in second grade. Her school success is determined by her efforts to consciously seek assistance from her teacher when needed to complete academic tasks.

Sources of Evaluation Data

Standardized evaluation procedures were followed. Rebecca and her mother were on time for testing. Rebecca was tested by the diagnostician Gloria Chen at request of her mother. The environment was quiet and conducive to an environment appropriate for testing. Lighting and set-up for the test were adequate. During testing, Rebecca was cooperative, focused, friendly, and task driven. She wrote with her right hand and spoke with a slur. However, it was the examiner’s observation that she did not hold the pencil correctly. Every time that she wrote something, she held the pencil with her index and middle finger as she hid her thumb in between her palm and under her pencil. When asked why she held her pencil in that manner, she changed it and held it normally. But frequently, she reverted back to the incorrect position of her fingers in order to hold the pencil. Overall, her attitude towards testing was pleasant and relaxed for the majority of the subtests. She followed directions, established and maintained a good rapport with the examiner to complete the tests. Information regarding Rebecca was collected from a variety of sources.

Table 1. Sources of Evaluation Data

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Sources of Information | Informant/Position | Dates |
| Parent/Student Information | Vella Doe, mother | November 21, 2013 |
| Student Observation/Interview | General Education Teacher-Ms. Care, Diagnostician- Gloria Chen | November 21, 2013 |
| Review of School Records | Diagnostician- Gloria Chen, General Education Teacher-Ms. Care, Nurse-Ms. Hurt, Physical Education Teacher-Ms. Fit, Counselor-Ms. Tap | November 21, 2013 |
| Vision/Hearing Screening | Nurse-Ms. Hurt | November 21, 2013 |
| Wechsler Intelligence Scale for Children-Fourth Edition  (WISC-IV) | Diagnostician- Gloria Chen | December 6, 2013 |
| Wechsler Individual Achievement Test-Third Edition (WIAT-III) | Diagnostician- Gloria Chen | December 2, 2013 |

Review of Educational Records

This evaluation was an initial referral. No previous testing was completed. Based on the findings, it was determined that Rebecca scored within the Average, Low Average, and Borderline range on the intellectual and achievement tests. There appeared to be significant weakness in her *Working Memory Index* (*WMI*=71) which is the ability to temporarily retain information in memory, perform some operation or manipulation with it, and produce a result. In addition, her overall *Full Scale IQ* composite score (89) is in the Low Average range when compared to others at her age level.

Rebecca earned passing grades for courses and was promoted to 2nd grade for the 2013-2014 school year. She attended a private school in grades K through 2nd grade. She shared that reading is her least favorite course. Rebecca indicated that she does not like to read. Rebecca compensates for academic difficulties by attending tutoring with her teacher and asking questions in class. Her mother reported that throughout her school years, Rebecca has experienced academic difficulties due to speech/language impairment. She received tutoring in reading and mathematics until the end of kinder garden and in first grade. Her mother reported that her school success is determined by her efforts to consciously seek assistance from her teacher when needed to complete academic tasks. She received A’s and B’s in first grade. In April 2012, she took the Iowa Tests of Basic Skills and earned a Survey Battery Total grade equivalent of 1.8 on the Level 7 test. This means that her test performance was approximately the same as that of a typical student in first grade at the end of the eighth month. Her overall achievement was in the average range in first grade. In second grade, her mother reported that she is having difficulties with comprehension in reading and science vocabulary. She is still receiving tutoring and takes KUMON math daily to help her with her math facts. Her teacher reported that her grades have dropped from B’s and C’s to D’s in reading and science. Her mother stated that when Rebecca reviews for science tests the day before she does not do well. Only when she gets more time to review with her daughter Rebecca is able to pass with D’s and low C’s. Her teacher reported that Rebecca is struggling in Reading and Science especially with her comprehension and applying what she had learned to new situations. Her teacher reported that Rebecca earns A’s and B’s in math but sometimes struggles when reading word problems. Overall, she stated that Rebecca is hard working and tries her best but she gets discourage when she does not earn A’s or B’s. Her teacher mentioned that she is well behaved and is a very quiet student. Her mother stated that she is very shy and does not make friends easily. She also mentioned that because Rebecca has difficulties pronouncing some sounds, her confidence in herself has taken a toll and therefore she prefers to remain quiet than to talk to others.

##### ***Speech/Language***

Based on the *Wechsler Individual Achievement Test- Third Edition* (*WIAT-III*), Rebecca’s expressive and receptive language is in the Average range. Rebecca’s language proficiency when compared with her same age peers may be regarded in the noted domains as:

Listening Comprehension: Average

Oral Expression: Average

Rebecca was diagnosed with a Speech disorder in April 2012. Rebecca is currently receiving speech services for 30 minutes once a week. Her teacher stated that a Speech therapist is helping her with phonemic awareness as she is not able to pronounce correctly some sounds. Her language functioning was observed during the evaluation and it was determined that she easily engages in informal conversation. Her dominant language is English. She was able to take turns during conversation and remained on topic. All evaluation instruments and procedures were administered in her dominant language.

Physical Information

Physical conditions that may directly affect the student’s ability to profit from the educational process were considered. Rebecca’s vision and hearing appeared to be within normal limits without correction. She did not exhibit any signs of health or medical problems. Currently, she does not take any prescription medication.

She does not appear to have physical conditions that must be considered in the provision of an appropriate education, including physical education. Analysis of the noted evaluations, interviews, and observations indicate this student can function in a regular physical education program including athletics.

Sociological

Sociological data concerning Rebecca’s family and community environment that may influence learning/behavior patterns were considered. Rebecca lives with her biological mother and father. She has one older brother in sixth grade. She also stated that both parents are very involved in her educational performance and have provided numerous supports for her success. Her mother stated that Rebecca and her family have a positive relationship. Based on current data, sociological factors do not appear to adversely affect Rebecca’s learning or behavior patterns to a degree that would impede her learning.

##### **Emotional/Behavioral**

The evaluation of a student’s emotional and behavioral factors consists of identifying those characteristics of behaviors which may impact the student’s learning. During the evaluation, Rebecca was friendly, cooperative, polite, respectful, and independent. Based on observations and parent and student information, serious emotional and behavioral factors do not appear to significantly interfere with her ability to learn.

*Teacher Interviews*

According to Rebecca’s teacher she is hard working and tries her best but she gets discourage when she does not earn A’s or B’s. Her teacher mentioned that Rebecca is well behaved and very quiet student. She reported that her grades have dropped from B’s and C’s to D’s in reading and science. She also stated that Rebecca is struggling in Reading and Science due to poor comprehension. Another area of difficulty mentioned by her teacher is when Rebecca needs to apply what she had learned to new situations. Her teacher reported that Rebecca earned As and Bs but struggles when reading word problems.

Intellectual/Adaptive Behavior

An intelligence test was administered in order to assess Rebecca’s general range of intellectual functioning and to determine current cognitive strengths and weaknesses. The *Wechsler Intelligence Scale for Children-Fourth Edition (WISC-IV)* is an individually administered, comprehensive clinical instrument for assessing intelligence (Wechsler, 2003). The *WISC-IV* provides composite scores that represent intellectual functioning in four specified cognitive domains, as well as a measure of general intellectual functioning.

The four cognitive domains are:

* The *Verbal Comprehension Index (VCI)* – this score is obtained from subtests measuring verbal abilities utilizing reasoning, comprehension, and conceptualization.
* The *Perceptual Reasoning Index (PRI)* – this score is obtained from subtests measuring perceptual reasoning and organization.
* The *Working Memory Index (WMI)* – this score is obtained from subtests measuring attention, concentration, and working memory.
* The *Processing Speed Index (PSI)* – this score is obtained from subtests measuring the speed of mental and graphomotor processing.

The index composite scores are reported as age-correlated standard scores. The composite scores are scaled to a metric with a mean of 100 and a standard deviation of 15. The scaled scores have a mean of 10 and a standard deviation of three.

Rebecca obtained a *Full Scale Intelligence Quotient (FSIQ)* of 89, which ranks her overall ability at the 23th percentile. This means that Rebecca performed as well as or better than 23% and lower than 77% of the remaining peers in the same age group. This score is in the Low Average range of intellectual functioning which indicates a weakness in her overall intelligence. This score is derived from the combined sum of index composite scores for the *VCI, PRI, WMI*, and *PSI*, and is considered to be the score that is most representative of general intellectual functioning. The *PRI, VCI, and PSI* index scoresare in the Average range. Her scores on the index composite scores for *WMI* are in the Borderline range(see Table 2).

Table 2.Wechsler Intelligence Scale for Children- Fourth Edition (WISC-IV) Composite Index Scores Summary

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Scale | Composite  Score | Percentile  Rank | 95%  Confidence  Interval | Qualitative  Description |
| Verbal Comprehension (VCI) | 96 | 39 | 89-103 | Average |
| Perceptual Reasoning (PRI) | 100 | 50 | 92-108 | Average |
| Working Memory (WMI) | 71 | 3 | 66-81 | Borderline |
| Processing Speed (PSI) | 97 | 42 | 90-105 | Average |
| Full Scale (FSIQ) | 89 | 23 | 84-94 | Low Average |

*Composite Index Score Differences*

Composite index score differences were examined to determine significant strengths and weaknesses. The scores are examined for statistical significance of the difference and for the frequency of the difference in the population by *FSIQ* ability level. In other words, are the differences real and are they clinically significant.

When analyzed for discrepancies, three out of six paired index composite scores yielded statistically significant difference. The *VCI*-96 and *WMI*-71 yielded a difference of 25 points; *PRI*-100 and *WMI*-71 yielded a difference of 29 points; *WMI*-71 and *PSI*-97 yielded a negative difference of -26 points. The differences between the paired composite index scores are greater than the critical values for each pair. The base rates (frequency of the difference in the *population by FSIQ ability level ≤90- ≤109)* for the paired index composite scores: *(VCI-WMI, PRI-WMI*, and *WMI-PSI)* are statistically significant because they are lower than 15%. Base rates that are 15% or lower are considered statically significant because the probability of occurrence of the difference in the population is considered low (see Table 3).

Table 3. Wechsler Intelligence Scale for Children- Fourth Edition (WISC-IV) Composite Index Score Differences

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Discrepancy Comparisons | Scaled Score 1 | Scaled Score 2 | Diff. | Critical  Value | Sig.  Diff.  Y/N | Base Rate |
| VCI - PRI | 96 | 100 | -4 | 11.00 | N | 39.8 |
| VCI – WMI | 96 | 71 | 25 | 11.38 | Y | 4.0 |
| VCI – PSI | 96 | 97 | -1 | 12.12 | N | 55.6 |
| PRI – WMI | 100 | 71 | 29 | 11.38 | Y | 3.4 |
| PRI – PSI | 100 | 97 | 3 | 12.12 | N | 38.4 |
| WMI- PSI | 71 | 97 | -26 | 12.46 | Y | 10 |

\*\*NOTE: Statistical Significance (Critical Values) at the .05 level

*Composite Index Score Weaknesses*

The composite index scores were analyzed in depth to determine if there is a *Normative Weakness* (an index below 85), a *Personal Weakness* (an index that is substantially different from the mean), an *Uncommon Personal Weakness* (an index that is substantially different from the mean and occurs less than 10% of the time), or a *High Priority Concern* (an index that is an *Uncommon Personal Weakness* and a *Normative Weakness*). The mean of the 4 index composite scores is 91. The findings indicated that the WMI-71 composite index score met the criteria described for *Normative Weakness* as the *WMI* of 71 is well below 85*.*

*Composite Index Subtest Scaled Score Differences*

The index composite scores for the *VCI, PRI, WMI*, and *PSI* were further analyzed to determine whether the scaled scores on the subtests that constitute each index measure are a *consistent* or *non-consistent* trait. The scaled scores of the index composite scores have a mean of 10 and a standard deviation of three. Discrepancies that are less than five points between the highest and lowest subtest scaled scores within an index are considered *consistent*. This indicates that the intra-index variability among the scaled score range of the subtests for a particular index composite score deems the index composite score as a valid predictor of the student’s skills for the index. Discrepancies that are equal to or greater than five points between the highest and lowest subtest scaled scores within an index are considered *non-consistent*. This indicates that the intra-index variability among the scaled score range of the subtests for a particular index composite score deems the index composite score as not a valid predictor of the student’s skills for the index. In order to verify the consistency between the highest and the lowest subtest scaled scores within the *WMI* index yield to a difference of 4 point indicating that the index is considered consistent.

In addition, the ten individual subtests administered represent 5 of the 7 broad CHC factors (*Comprehension-Knowledge- Gc, Visual-Spatial Thinking-Gv, Fluid Reasoning-Gf, Processing Speed- Gs and Short-Term Memory-Gsm)*.

Rebecca’s composite score of 96 on the *Verbal Comprehension Index* *(VCI)* is ranked in the 39th percentile and is in the Average range of intellectual functioning. This means that she scored as well as or better than 39% and lower than the remaining 61% of peers in her age group. This index is a measure of verbal abilities utilizing reasoning, comprehension, and conceptualization. Rebecca’s ability was assessed using several tasks that identified her skill sets. She was required to define words (*Vocabulary*). The *Vocabulary* subtest measures auditory perception and comprehension, verbal conceptualization, abstract thinking, and verbal expression. This score may indicate good language development, and verbal comprehension. Rebecca scored in the Average range of intellectual functioning on the *Vocabulary subtest*. She was required to draw conceptual similarities between words (*Similarities*). The *Similarities* subtest measures verbal reasoning and concept formation. It also involves auditory comprehension, memory, distinction between nonessential and essential features, and verbal expression. Rebecca scored in the Average range of intellectual functioning on this subtest. This may indicate good verbal comprehension as well as a good ability to see relationships (see Table 4).

She was required to answer questions based on her understanding of general principles and social situations (*Comprehension*). The *Comprehension* subtest measures verbal reasoning and conceptualization, verbal comprehension and expression, the ability to evaluate and use past experience, and the ability to demonstrate practical information. It measures knowledge of conventional standards of behavior, social judgment and maturity, and common sense. Rebecca scored in the Average range of intellectual functioning on this subtest, which illustrates good common sense and the ability to organize knowledge.

The *Similarities*, *Vocabulary*, and *Comprehension* subtests measure *Comprehension*-*Knowledge* (*Gc*) which measures the breadth and depth of a person’s acquired knowledge, the ability to communicate one’s knowledge and ability to reason using previous learned experiences.

Subtest scores for this index are considered *consistent* because the discrepancy between the highest and lowest subtest scaled scores is less than five points. This indicates that the intra-index variability among the scaled score range of the subtests for the *VCI* composite score is a valid predictor of Rebecca’s skills for the index.

Table 4. Wechsler Intelligence Scale for Children- Fourth Edition (WISC-IV) Verbal Comprehension Index (VCI) Subtest Scores Summary

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Subtests | Scaled Score |
| Similarities | 10 |
| Vocabulary | 9 |
| Comprehension | 9 |

The composite score of 100 obtained by Rebecca on the *Perceptual Reasoning Index (PRI)* is in the 39th percentile and is in the Average range of intellectual functioning. This means that Rebecca scored as well as or better than 39% and lower than 61% of the remaining peers in her age group. During the assessment, she seemed to endure and push through testing items regardless of how fatigued she was becoming. This may indicate motivation and persistence to advance through tests, or adversities in her daily life.

The *PRI* is a measure of perceptual reasoning and organization. This score represents Rebecca’s ability to form a group with a common characteristic (*Picture Concepts*). The *Picture Concepts* subtest measures abstract, categorical reasoning ability. Rebecca scored in the Average range of intellectual functioning for this subtest. This subtest required the ability to use logical and abstract thinking, and ability to select appropriate relationships between two objects or concepts. For each picture presented, Rebecca explained the relationship or pattern between each item.

She was required to analyze and synthesize abstract visual stimuli (*Block Design*). The *Block Design* subtest involves the ability to integrate visual and motor processes. The *Block Design* subtest measures *Visual-Spatial Thinking (Gv)* which measures the ability to perceive, analyze, synthesize and think with visual patterns, including the ability to store and recall visual representations.

She was required to use visual information processing and abstract reasoning skills (*Matrix Reasoning*). The Matrix Reasoning subtest measures visual information processing and abstract reasoning skills. It is also relatively culture-fair and language-free and requires no hand manipulation. The *Matrix Reasoning* subtest measures *Fluid Reasoning (Gf)* which measures the ability to reason, form concepts, and solve problems using unfamiliar information or new procedures. Rebecca scored in the Average range of intellectual functioning for this subtest. This may indicate that she worked poorly under time pressure; she may also have difficulty conceptualizing, analyzing and synthesizing information.

Subtest scores for this index are *non*-*consistent* which indicates the intra-index variability among the scaled score range of the subtests for the *PRI* is greater than five points, therefore, the *PRI* composite score is not a valid predictor of Rebecca’s skills for this index.

Table 5. Wechsler Intelligence Scale for Children- Fourth Edition (WISC-IV) Perceptual Reasoning Index (PRI) Subtest Scores Summary

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Subtests | Scaled Score |
| Block Design | 10 |
| Picture Concepts | 7 |
| Matrix Reasoning | 13 |

Rebecca obtained a composite score of 71 on the *Working Memory Index (WMI)* which is in the 3th percentile and is in the Borderline range of intellectual functioning. This means that Rebecca scored as well as or better than 3% and lower than 97% of the remaining peers in her age group. *Working Memory* is a measure of attention, concentration, and the ability to temporarily retain information in memory, perform some operation or manipulation with it, and produce a result. She had a poor ability to receive stimuli, and self-monitor. There is a high correlation between working memory and higher order cognitive processes, as well as being closely related to achievement and learning. The *WMI* is a definite area of weakness for Rebecca. She had difficulty in different areas of short term visual memory. Moreover, her lack of attention, poor mental control, and poor reasoning affected to her performance. She seemed frustrated during this stage of assessment; she squirmed and fidgeted frequently.

Rebecca’s ability for this index was assessed using tasks that required her to repeat a sequence of numbers in the same order as presented by the examiner (*Digit Span Forward*) and in the reverse order (*Digit Span Backward*),and tasks that required her to listen to a sequence of numbers and letters and recall the numbers in ascending order. The *Digit Span* subtest measures auditory short-term memory, sequencing skills, attention, and concentration. *Digit Span* subtests measure *Short-Term Memory (Gsm)* which measures the ability to apprehend and hold information in immediate awareness and then uses it within a few seconds she scored in the Borderline range in intellectual functioning for this subtest. She may have difficulty with auditory short term memory or have a poor rote memory. .

Rebecca was also required to listen to a sequence of numbers and letters and recall the numbers in ascending order and the letters in alphabetical order (*Letter-Number* *Sequencing)*. This subtest measures abilities in sequencing, mental manipulation, attention, short-term auditory memory, visual spatial imaging, and processing speed. During the assessment, Rebecca did not used strategies to aid her in recalling the numbers, letters and their sequences. She appeared frustrated and recalled the sequencing of letters and numbers backwards as supposed to recalling them in sequence. She showed poor ability to sustain attention and concentrate throughout this assessment. However, when comparing the DS and the LNS scaled scores is surprising that she scored a lot better on the LNS than the DS which means that she was capable of scoring higher on the DS and may have not understood the initial directions which contributed to her poor performance on the DS.

Subtest scores for this index are *consistent* because the discrepancy between the highest and lowest subtest scaled scores within the index is equal to five points. This pattern may suggest that short term auditory memory for tasks that require rote memorization and information processing is better developed than short-term auditory memory for tasks that require rote memorization with minimal information processing. This indicates that the intra-index variability among the scaled score range of the subtests for the *WMI* composite score is a valid predictor of Rebecca’s skills for the index.

Table 7.Wechsler Intelligence Scale for Children- Fourth Edition (WISC-IV) Working Memory Index (WMI) Subtest Scores Summary

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Subtests | Scaled Score |
| Digit Span | 3 |
| Letter-Number Sequence | 7 |

Rebecca’s composite score of 97 on the *Processing Speed Index (PSI)* is in the 23th percentile and is in the Average range of intellectual functioning. This means that Rebecca’s scored as well as or better than 23% and lower than 77% of the remaining peers in her age group. The *PSI* is a measure of the ability to quickly and correctly scan, sequence, or discriminate simple visual information.

Working within a specific time limit, she was required to scan a search group and indicate whether one of the symbols in the target group matches *(Symbol Search)*. The *Symbol Search* subtest measures processing speed, short-term visual memory, visual-motor coordination, cognitive flexibility, visual discrimination, psychomotor speed, speed of mental operation, attention, concentration, auditory comprehension, perceptual organization, fluid intelligence, and planning and learning ability. Rebecca scored in the Average range of intellectual functioning on this subtest (see Table 8).

Rebecca’s ability was assessed using tasks that required her/his to copy symbols that are paired with numbers within a specified time limit (*Coding*). The *Coding* subtest measures processing speed, short-term visual memory, learning ability, psychomotor speed, visual perception, visual-motor coordination, visual scanning ability, cognitive flexibility, attention, motivation, sequential processing, and fluid intelligence. Rebecca scored within the Low Average range of intellectual functioning on this subtest. Her low score could have been due to poor scanning abilities and/or poor ability to work under time pressure. Tasks on this subtest required her to focus on many skills at one time to be successful (see Table 8).

The *Symbol Search* and *Coding* subtests measure *Processing Speed (Gs)* which measures the ability to perform automatic cognitive tasks, as an aspect of cognitive efficiency.

.

Subtest scores for this index are *consistent*, which indicates that the intra-index variability among the scaled score range of the subtests for the *PSI* is less than five points therefore, the *PSI* composite score is a valid predictor of Rebecca’s skills for this index.

Table 8. Wechsler Intelligence Scale for Children- Fourth Edition (WISC-IV) Processing Speed Index (PSI) Subtest Scores Summary

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Subtests | Scaled Score |
| Symbol Search | 11 |
| Coding | 8 |

Rebecca’s *WISC-IV Full Scale IQ (FSIQ)* is a valid interpretation of her intellectual ability. Her *FSIQ* of 89 falls within the Low Average range of intellectual ability. Making a comparison of the *FSIQ* to the other index scales (*VCI* (96)-Average; *PRI* (100)-Average; *PSI* (97)- Average; *WMI*- Borderline), the three out of four scales fall within the Average range and the *WMI* (71) falls within the Borderline range. When taking a closer look to the *DS* (3) and the *LNS* (7), subtests that make up the WMI; it is surprising that Rebecca scored a lot better on the LNS (7) than the DS (3) which means that she was capable of scoring higher on the DS and may have not understood the initial directions which contributed to her poor performance on the DS. This means that the *FSIQ* is somewhat affected by the WMI so careful consideration must be given for a valid interpretation of her overall intellectual ability which fall in the Low Average range of intellectual abilities. The latter scores provide indications that Rebecca has the potential to overcome difficulties if she is afforded the opportunity to utilize accommodations and/or recommendations in academic settings.

Adaptive Behavior

Adaptive behavior is the effectiveness with which individuals meet the standards of personal independence and social responsibility expected of individuals of their age and cultural group. Adaptive behavior represents the interaction of personal, cognitive, social, and situational variables.

Rebecca’s adaptive behavior was assessed using informal measures (i.e.: student information and observation of behavior during the individual evaluation, and parent information). Based on this data, Rebecca’s adaptive behavior appears to be within the Average range and consistent with her current intellectual functioning.

Academic/Developmental Performance

Information regarding a student’s level of academic and/or developmental performance may be gathered through data from, but not limited to report cards, state developed assessments, district assessments, teacher reports, information obtained from parents, observations, and the administration of standardized achievement tests. The collection of educational performance data is used to assess Rebecca’s level of acquired knowledge.

*Informal and School Based Academic Testing*

Rebecca is a second grade at Lutheran South. During this school year, her teacher reported that her grades have dropped from B’s and C’s to D’s in reading and science. She attends school regularly. She will attend Lutheran South in 2014-2015.

In April 2012, Rebecca took the Iowa Tests of Basic Skills and earned a Survey Battery Total grade equivalent of 1.8 on the Level 7 test. This means that her test performance was approximately the same as that of a typical student in first grade at the end of the eight month. Her overall achievement was in the average range in first grade (see Table 9).

Table 9. Sources of Previous Academic Data

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Test | Dates |
| Iowa Test of Basic Skills (ITBS) | April 2013 |
|  |  |

*Wechsler Individual Achievement Test-Third Edition (WIAT-III)*

The *Wechsler Individual Achievement Test-Third Edition* (*WIAT-III*) was administered to assess Rebecca’s current levels of academic functioning. The *WIAT-III* is an individually administered, diagnostic achievement test designed for students in grades Prekindergarten (PK) through 12, or ages 4 years 0 months through 19 years 11 months. The test includes 16 subtests designed to measure listening, speaking, reading, writing, and mathematics skills.

*Composite and Subtest Score Interpretations*

Overall, Rebecca’s academic skills are commensurate with her intellectual ability. Based on the findings of the *WIAT-III*, Rebecca’s composite standard scores in six of the seven academic areas are within the Average range. High Average subtest standard scores was identified in one area. The scores are explained in detail below.

The Oral Language Composite is a combination of Listening Comprehension (listen to a word and point to the picture that best illustrates its meaning, and listen to a short narrative and orally answer questions) and Oral Expression, which includes Expressive Vocabulary (measures of speaking vocabulary, and word retrieval), Oral Word Fluency (oral fluency and flexibility of thought processes), and Sentence Repetition (repetition of sentences- oral syntactic knowledge, and short term memory). More specifically, Rebecca was able to comprehend oral directions and answered questions. During the test, she was aware of the questions that she did not get right but she kept trying without much prompting on the examiner’s part.

Rebecca’s score on this cluster is within average limits. She obtained an *Oral Language* standardscore of 109 which is in the 73th, percentile rank. This score is in the Average range of cognitive ability measure. This percentile rank means that Rebecca performed as well as or better than 73 % of students in her norm group and not as well as the remaining 27%. This indicates Average ability when compared to peers in the same grade. She obtained a *Listening Comprehension* standard score of 103 which is in the 58th, percentile rank. This score is in the Average range of cognitive ability measure. This percentile rank means that Rebecca performed as well as or better than 58 % of students in her norm group and not as well as the remaining 42%. Rebecca also obtained an Oral Expressionstandard score of 114 which is in the 82th, percentile rank. This score is in the High Average range of cognitive ability measure. This percentile rank means that Rebecca performed as well as or better than 82 % of students in her norm group and not as well as the remaining 18 %. The *Listening Comprehension* subtest included the component of *Receptive Vocabulary*. Rebecca earned a standard score of 113 on *Receptive Vocabulary*, which is in the Average range. The Average *Receptive Vocabulary* standard score corresponds with the Average *Vocabulary* score on the *WISC-IV*. Rebecca has Average expressive language skills. Therefore, she has good word knowledge as well as verbal skills and language development. This may also indicate a good encouragement of verbal communication in her family and environment (see Tables 10, 11, & 12).

The *Total Reading* composite includes the subtests *Reading Comprehension*, *Word Reading*, *Pseudoword Decoding*, and *Oral Reading Fluency*. These subtests measure untimed reading comprehension of various types of text, including fictional stories, informational text, advertisements, and how-to passages; speed and accuracy of decontextualized word recognition; ability to decode nonsense words; and speed, accuracy, fluency, and prosody of contextual oral reading. Specifically in Reading, the examiner observed that Rebecca was able to answer questions that the answer was stated in the story. However, she had trouble making inferences as she was not able to provide correct responses for questions such as how did Tamiko get to the stars?, Why do people say the moon’s smile is familiar? Also, the examiner noted that during Pseudoword Decoding, Rebecca made only a few attempts to sound out the nonsense word. She mentioned that was a very difficult subtest for her.

Rebecca’s scores on this cluster were somewhat variable. She obtained a Total Reading standard score of 99 which is in the 47th, percentile rank. This score is in the Average range of cognitive ability measure. This percentile rank means that Rebecca performed as well as or better than 47 % of students in her norm group and not as well as the remaining 53 %. She obtained a Reading Comprehension standardscore of 102 which is in the 55th, percentile rank. This score is in the Average range of cognitive ability measure. This percentile rank means that Rebecca performed as well as or better than 55 % of students in her norm group and not as well as the remaining 45%.

The *Basic Reading* composite includes the subtests *Word Reading* and *Pseudoword Decoding*. These subtests measure speed and accuracy of decontextualized word recognition and ability to decode nonsense words. She obtained a Pseudoword Decodingstandard score of 88 which is in the 21th, percentile rank. This score is in the Below Average range of cognitive ability measure. This percentile rank means that Rebecca performed as well as or better than 21 % of students in her norm group and not as well as the remaining 79 %. This score indicates a normative weakness. She obtained a Word Readingstandardscore of 97 which is in the 42nd, percentile rank. This score is in the Average range of cognitive ability measure. This percentile rank means that Rebecca performed as well as or better than 42 % of students in her norm group and not as well as the remaining 58 % (See Tables 10 & 11).

The *Reading Comprehension and Fluency* composite includes the subtests *Reading Comprehension* and *Oral Reading Fluency*. These subtests measure untimed reading comprehension of various types of text, including fictional stories, informational text, advertisements, and how-to passages and speed, accuracy, fluency, and prosody of contextual oral reading. She obtained a *Reading Comprehension* standardscore of 102 which is in the 55th, percentile rank. This score is in the Average range of cognitive ability measure. This percentile rank means that Rebecca performed as well as or better than 55 % of students in her norm group and not as well as the remaining 45%. She obtained an *Oral Reading Fluency* standardscore of 118 which is in the 88th, percentile rank. This score is in the Superior range of cognitive ability measure. This percentile rank means that Rebecca performed as well as or better than 88 % of students in her norm group and not as well as the remaining 12 %. This score indicates a normative strength.

The *Written Language* cluster is a combination of Spelling (spelling a list of words) and *Written Expression* (writing sentences and paragraphs). These subtests measure sentence formulation skills and written syntactic maturity; spontaneous, compositional writing skills within a 10 minute time limit and written spelling of single words. Rebecca is in second grade so; she did not participate in the section of Essay Composition. It was noted by the examiner that Rebecca had the most difficulties during the Sentence Composition subtest. Rebecca stated that she had never had to combine sentences and became very agitated and unsure of herself. The examiner provided a break at this time to calm her down as she refused to proceed with the test. After the break, she resumed to complete the subtest without further interruptions. Although, she had difficulties getting started on this subtest, her performance on Sentence Composition subtest was in the Average range which is typical of students on her grade level. *She scored a* 100 on (*Sentence Composition*)and 98 on (*Spelling*).

The *Mathematics* composite includes the subtests of *Math Problem Solving* and *Numerical Operations*. These subtests measure math problem solving and math calculation. These subtests are designed to inform teacher/hiss about what a student knows or what he or she/he needs to be taught, skill strengths and weaknesses, which skills can be applied at an instructional level and which skills can be applied automatically. Rebecca’s score on this cluster is within average limits. She obtained a *Mathematics* standardscore of 109 which is in the 73th, percentile rank. This percentile rank means that Rebecca performed as well as or better than 73 % of students in her norm group and not as well as the remaining 27%. She obtained a *Numerical Operations* standard score of 110 which is in the 75th, percentile rank. This percentile rank means that Rebecca performed as well as or better than 75 % of students in her norm group and not as well as the remaining 25 %. Rebecca also obtained a *Math Problem Solving* standard score of 105 which is in the 63th, percentile rank. This percentile rank means that Rebecca performed as well as or better than 63 % of students in her norm group and not as well as the remaining 37 %. All standard scores are within the Averag range (see Tables 10 & 11).

The *Math Fluency* composite includes the subtests of *Math Fluency-Addition*, *Math Fluency-Subtraction*, and *Math Fluency-Multiplication*. These subtests measure complex problem solving and the acquisition of higher/his-level mathematics skills. Students are required to correctly answer mathematics problems (addition, subtraction and multiplication facts) within a given time period. Rebecca is in second grade so she was not assessed on Math Fluency- Multiplication. She was able to add and subtract simple digits. It was noted by the examiner that she performed better in addition than subtraction. Rebecca stated that she should have gone faster on addition as she put more effort during the subtraction administration.

Rebecca’s score on this cluster is within average limits. She obtained a *Math Fluency* standard score of 100 which is in the 50th, percentile rank. This score is in the Average range of cognitive ability measure. This percentile rank means that Rebecca performed as well as or better than 50 % of students in her norm group and not as well as the remaining 50%. Rebecca also obtained a *Math Fluency-Addition* standard score of 88 which is in the 21th, percentile rank. This score is in the Low Average range of cognitive ability measure. This percentile rank means that Rebecca performed as well as or better than 21 % of students in her norm group and not as well as the remaining 79 %. She obtained a *Math Fluency-Subtraction* standard score of 111 which is in the 77th, percentile rank. This score is in the High Average range of cognitive ability measure. This percentile rank means that Rebecca performed as well as or better than 77 % of students in her norm group and not as well as the remaining 23 %. See Tables 10 & 11.

There is no significant difference between the composite achievement scores and full scale IQ score. The findings indicate that Rebecca has sufficient ability to be successful in the classroom setting with accommodations for support in the area of attention to tasks.

Table 10. Wechsler Individual Achievement Test-Third Edition (WIAT-III) Composite Score Summary

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Composite | Standard Score | 95%  Confidence Interval | Percentile Rank | Qualitative Description |
| Oral Language | 0109 | 100-118 | 73 | Average |
| Total Reading | 099 | 95-103 | 47 | Average |
| Basic Reading | 92 | 89-95 | 30 | Average |
| Reading Comprehension and Fluency | 112 | 105-119 | 79 | High Average |
| Written Expression | 91 | 82-100 | 27 | Average |
| Mathematics | 109 | 101-117 | 73 | Average |
| Math Fluency | 0100 | 93-107 | 50 | Average |
| Total Achievement | 102 | 98-16 | 55 | Average |

\*\*NOTE: The WIAT–III is a norm-referenced test. It is not aligned with the Texas Essential Knowledge and Skills (TEKS).

Table 11. Wechsler Individual Achievement Test-Third Edition (WIAT-III) Subtest Score Summary

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Subtest | Standard Score | 95%  Confidence Interval | Percentile Rank | Grade Equivalent  (Yrs. &Mos.) | Age Equivalent  (Yrs. &Mos.) |
| Listening Comprehension | 0103 | 91-115 | 58 | 3.0 | 8:2 |
| Reading Comprehension | 102 | 092-112 | 55 | 2.3 | 7:8 |
| Math Problem Solving | 0105 | 095-115 | 63 | 02.41 | 7:81 |
| Sentence Composition | 100 | 091-109 | 50 | 2.2 | 7:6 |
| Word Reading | 097 | 093-101 | 42 | 2.0 | 7:4 |
| Pseudoword Decoding | 88 | 083-93 | 21 | 1.4 | 6:4 |
| Numerical Operations | 110 | 0100-120 | 75 | 2.7 | 7:8 |
| Oral Expression | 114 | 103-125 | 82 | 5.6 | 11:5 |
| Oral Reading Fluency | 0118 | 0110-126 | 88 | 4.0 | 9:4 |
| Spelling | 098 | 091-105 | 45 | 2.1 | 7:4 |
| Math Fluency-Addition | 88 | 77-99 | 21 | 1.5 | 6:8 |
| Math Fluency-Subtraction | 0111 | 0102-120 | 77 | 2.8 | 8:0 |
| Oral Reading\_Accuracy | 096 | 084-108 | 39 | 01.7 | 7:0 |
| Oral Reading Rate | 0116 | 0108-124 | 86 | 004.1 | 11:0 |

\*\*NOTE: The WIAT–III is a norm-referenced test. It is not aligned with the Texas Essential Knowledge and Skills (TEKS).

Table12. Wechsler Individual Achievement Test-Third Edition (WIAT-III) Subtest Component Score Summary

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Subtest Component | Standard Score | Percentile Rank | Qualitative Description |
| Listening Comprehension |  |  |  |
| Receptive Vocabulary | 0113 | 81 | Average |
| Oral Discourse Comprehension | 093 | 32 | Average |
| Sentence Composition |  |  |  |
| Sentence Combining | 106 | 66 | Average |
| Sentence Building | 94 | 34 | Average |
| Oral Expression |  |  |  |
| Expressive Vocabulary | 106 | 66 | Average |
| Oral Word fluency | 134 | 99 | Superior |
| Sentence Repetition | 094 | 34 | Average |

\*\*NOTE: The WIAT–III is a norm-referenced test. It is not aligned with the Texas Essential Knowledge and Skills (TEKS).

Assistive Technology

Rebecca can access the school environment and curriculum without the need for AT services or devices. She communicates clearly and is motorically independent.

Conclusion

During individual achievement testing, Rebecca demonstrated the following academic strengths and weaknesses:

Strengths – Rebecca performed best in the area of Oral Word fluency and Reading Comprehension and Fluency. She is able to use oral language to communicate with others.

Weaknesses – Rebecca exhibited difficulty in Pseudoword Decoding and Math Fluency-Addition, specifically in the areas of decoding nonsense words and simple addition.

Rebeccas’s overall scores indicate that she is performing in the average range of cognitive ability and achievement. When compared to others in her grade level, Rebecca’s standard scores are Average in Oral Language, Total Reading, Basic Reading, Reading Comprehension and Fluency, Written Expression, Mathematics, and Math Fluency. Her standard scores are average (compared to peers in the same grade) in Total Reading and Basic Reading. No significant strengths or weaknesses were found among the scores for a selected set of Rebecca’s achievement areas.

The standard scores for subtests and composites on the WIAT-III which represent the seven areas for identification of a Learning Disability were compared to Rebecca’s *FSIQ* to determine whether a significant difference exists. The findings indicate that significant differences exist in the areas of Oral Expression, Reading Comprehension, and Math Reasoning. However, the achievement standard scores in all areas are above her FSIQ. This means she is functioning above average for her intellectual ability. For overall performance see Table 13. Based on these discrepancies, the Admissions Review and Dismissal Committee will determine the instructional methods and placement that may best fit Rebecca’s educational needs.

Table 13. Wechsler Individual Achievement Test-Third Edition (WIAT-III) and Subtests/Composites Measuring the Seven IDEA Areas

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Required LD Areas | WIAT-III ACH  Subtests/Composites | WIAT-III ACH  Subtests/  Composites STD. Scores | FSIQ | FSIQ /  ACH  Dif. | Sig.  Y/N |
| Oral Expression | Oral Expression | 114 | 89 | -25 | Y |
| Listening Comprehension | Listening Comprehension | 103 | 89 | -14 | N |
| Written Expression | Written Expression | 91 | 89 | -2 | N |
| Basic Reading Skills | Basic Reading | 92 | 89 | -3 | N |
| Reading Comprehension | Reading Comprehension | 112 | 89 | -23 | Y |
| Math Calculation | Math Fluency | 100 | 89 | -11 | N |
| Math Reasoning | Math­-Problem Solving | 105 | 89 | -16 | Y |

Note: STD=Standard Scores; Dif. =Difference; GIA=General Intellectual Ability; Sig. =Significance

Recommendations

This evaluation is considered a valid representation of Rebecca’s current levels of cognitive ability in the areas assessed. The following recommendations are based upon a review of evaluation data to assist Rebecca increase her attention, mental control, and reasoning due to her difficulties during the Digit Span and her FSIQ in the Low Average range as compare to others in the same grade level. Other recommendations are based upon a review of previous evaluation data to assist Rebecca in *Speech* and concerns with her comprehension as the evaluation results did not show deficits in Reading or other areas. These recommendations are intended for the classroom teacher, parent, and student.

Recommendations for the teacher and parents:

* It is the examiner’s recommendation the use of mnemonics when trying to commit information to memory.
* Provide instructions (written and oral) for tasks to be completed in “chunks” short and precise in order to improve comprehension.
* Use of extrinsic rewards is encouraged to keep her motivated to practice difficult tasks. Rebecca gets very nervous when she encounters new tasks.
* Repeat important information often.
* Check for understanding frequently.
* Allow multiple exposures to new material using different instructional techniques.
* Encourage Rebecca to organize class material so that she can easily locate needed information.
* Provide opportunities for Rebecca to interact with her peers in the classroom through cooperative group activities.

Other recommendations for the parents:

* Read to your child daily for at least 15 minutes or have her read to the parent aloud.
* Check for understanding frequently and ask open-ended questions (i.e. why did it happen? How do you know?, etc)
* Praise her efforts and offer rewards to keep her motivated.
* Provide a quiet place conductive to study.
* There are several websites (i.e. www.Starfall.com) that provide free support with phonemic awareness; allow Rebecca to spend 15 minutes reviewing long and short vowels, prefixes, etc.
* Provide opportunities for Rebecca to interact with her peers outside of the classroom through play dates, sleepovers, etc.

Recommendations for Rebecca:

* Ask for help and clarify questions for difficult material.
* Remain calm and breathe when encountering new material.
* Read daily just for fun.
* Review the sounds and use a mirror to see the placement of the tongue.

Assurances

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

The multidisciplinary team assures that the tests and other evaluation materials have been validated for the specific purpose for which they were used.

The multidisciplinary team assures that the tests and other evaluation materials were administered by trained personnel in conformance with the instructions provided by their producers.

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

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 and is sufficiently comprehensive to identify the special education needs and related (supportive) services as a required to assist the child to benefit from special education.

MULTIDISCIPLINARY TEAM

Gloria Chen

Educational Diagnostician

SIGNATURE OF EVALUATOR

\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_
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