**Houston Baptist University Testing Course**

7015 Fondren

Houston, Texas 77040

**FULL AND INDIVIDUAL EVALUATION**

**Demographic Data**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Student Name: | John Doe | Parents/Guardians: | Mr. and Ms. Doe |
| Grade: | Employed | Address  Phone Number: | 11935 Bogey Way, Houston TX 77089  713-376-4849 |
| Date of Birth: | 12-10-1973 | Email Address: | gloriadelgado070@yahoo.com |
| Age: | 39 years old | Date of Report: | 6/19/13 |
| Gender: | Male |  |  |

**Reason for Individual Academic Assessment**

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 John’s strengths and weaknesses and present levels of performance/functioning across multiple areas; (b) determine his disability condition(s) and educational needs; and (c) make recommendations regarding programming.

**Sources of Evaluation Data**

Standardized evaluation procedures were followed. John was tested by Ms. Chen. The environment was quiet and conducive to an environment appropriate for testing. During testing, John was extremely cooperative, focused, friendly, and task driven. His attitude toward testing was pleasant. He followed directions quickly, established and maintained a good rapport with the examiner and showed high levels motivation to complete the tests. Information regarding John was collected from a variety of reliable sources which included the examinee.

***Table 1*.** Sources of Evaluation Data

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Sources of Information** | **Informant/Position** | **Dates** |
| Parent | Mr. and Mrs. Doe | 06/10/2013 |
| Student Observation/Interview | John Doe | 06/11/2013 |
| Vision/Hearing Screening | Nurse- Ms. Price | 06/10/2013 |
| Woodcock-Johnson Tests of Cognitive Abilities-Third Edition (WJ III Cognitive) | Selected clusters from the Woodcock-Johnson Test of Cognitive Abilities-Third Edition (WJ III Cognitive), was administered over a 2 hour session. | 06/19/2013 |
| Woodcock-Johnson Tests of Achievement-Third Edition (WJ III Achievement) | Test of Achievement (WJ III ACH) was administered. Testing was completed over a 1½ hour session. | 06/15/2013 |

**Review of Educational Records**

No previous evaluations have been conducted for John Doe. He earned all of his high school credits for courses and graduated 12th grade in 1993. He attended public school from PK-3rd. He attended private school in grades 4-12th. He attended Louisiana University and graduated with honors with a Bachelor of Science in Mechanical Engineering in 1998. He has been employed with Chevron since 1998.

##### Speech/Language

Evaluation of Jonh’s language consisted of informal and formal assessments of language proficiency in both the receptive and expressive domains. John’s language proficiency on the *Woodcock-Johnson III Tests of Achievement Assessment - Third Edition* (*WJ III ACH*) when compared with same age peers may be regarded in the noted domains as:

Listening Comprehension: Average

Oral Expression: Average

John expresses himself best in oral speech. Language functioning was observed during the evaluation and it was determined that he easily engages in informal conversation. He has intelligible speech and is able to make his needs known to others. His dominant language is English. John was able to follow instructions for testing and engaged in appropriate conversation. He was able to take turns during conversation and remained on topic. All evaluation instruments and procedures were administered in his dominant language.

**Physical Information**

Physical conditions that may directly affect the individual’s ability to profit from the educational process were considered. John’s vision and hearing appeared to be within normal limits without correction. He did not exhibit any signs of health or medical problems. Currently, he is not taking any prescribed medication, only over the counter Allegra for common allergies.

He 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 individual can function in regular physical education activities.

**Sociological**

Sociological data concerning John’s family and community environment that may influence learning/behavior patterns were considered. He lives with his wife and two children. Both parents are still alive and he has one older brother, and one younger brother, and a younger sister. John and his family appear to have a positive relationship. Based on current data, sociological factors do not appear to adversely affect John’s learning and behavior patterns to a degree that would impede his learning.

**Emotional/Behavioral**

The evaluation of an individual’s emotional and behavioral factors consists of identifying those characteristics of behaviors which may impact the individual’s learning. During the evaluation, John was friendly, cooperative, polite, respectful, and independent. Based on observations and information provided by the individual, serious emotional and behavioral factors do not appear to significantly interfere with his ability to learn.

**Intellectual/Adaptive Behavior**

An intelligence test was administered in order to assess John’s general range of intellectual functioning and to determine current cognitive strengths and weaknesses. The *Woodcock-Johnson III Test of Cognitive Abilities (WJ III COG)* is a battery of carefully engineered tests for measuring cognitive abilities and related aspects of cognitive functioning. In all, 31 tests are contained in the standard battery, an extended battery, and the diagnostic supplement. Some WJ III COG tests are appropriate for individuals as young as 24 months, and all of the tests can be used with individuals from 5 to 95 years of age. Various tests from the WJ II COG are combined into clusters for interpretive purposes. Most of the scores generated through the administration of the third edition of the Woodcock-Johnson Test of Cognitive (WJ-III COG) reveal that John’s overall intellectual ability is in the Average and High Average range of standard scores.

The WJ III COG provides a General Intellectual Ability score (GIA) and three cognitive performance clusters (Verbal Ability-Standard Scale, Thinking Ability-Standard Scale and Cognitive Efficiency-Standard Scale). The cluster scores are reported as age-correlated standard scores. The cluster scores are scaled to a metric with a mean of 100 and a standard deviation of 15.

* The *General Intellectual Ability (GIA) –* is a score that represents the first principal component, or single g factor, accounting for the most variance in overall performance on the tests that comprise the scale. The General Intellectual Ability, or g, score will often be the best single-score predictor of various global criteria such as overall school achievement or other life outcomes that have some relationship to cognitive ability.
* The *Verbal Ability-Standard Scale* – is a measure of language development that includes the comprehension of individual words and the comprehension of relationships between words.
* The *Thinking Ability-Standard Scale* – is a sampling of the different thinking processes that may be invoked when information in short-term memory cannot be processed automatically.
* The *Cognitive Efficiency-Standard Scale* – is the capacity of the cognitive system to process information automatically.

John obtained a *General Intellectual Ability (GIA)* standard score of 107 which is in the 67th percentile. This means that John performed as well as or better than 67% of the individuals in this norm group and not as well as the remaining 33% of individuals. This score is in the Average range of intellectual functioning. This score is derived from the combined sum of cluster scores for the *GIA, Verbal Ability-Standard Scale, Thinking Ability-Standard Scale*, and *Cognitive Efficiency-Standard Scale*, and is considered to be the score that is most representative of general intellectual functioning. His cluster scores for *Verbal Ability-Standard Scale, Thinking Ability-Standard Scale*, and *Cognitive Efficiency-Standard Scale* are also in the Average and High Average range (see Table 2).

For the *Verbal Ability-Standard Scale* test measure, John obtained a standard score of 99 which falls in the 15th percentile rank. John performed as well or better than 15% and lower than 85% of the remaining individuals in his norm group. The difference between John’s actual standard score of 99 and the predicted standard score of 109 indicates that there is no statically significant difference. This means that the standard score of 99 is a valid indication of his performance on this measure.

On the *Thinking Ability-Standard Scale* test, John obtained a standard score of 106 which is in the 43th percentile rank which is in the Low Average range. This means that John performed as well as or better than 43% and lower than the remaining 57% of the individuals in his norm group. The difference between the actual score of 106 and the predicted score of 107 indicates that there is no significant difference. This means the standard score of 106 is a valid indication of his performance on this measure.

On the *Cognitive Efficiency-Standard Scale* test, John obtained a standard score of 118 which is in the 93th percentile rank which is in the Average range. This means that Jane performed as well as or better than 93% and lower than the remaining 7% of the individuals in his norm group. The difference between the actual score of 118 and the predicted score of 102 indicates that there is no significant difference. This means the standard score of 118 is within the same range of students in his norm group.

**Table 2.**Woodcock-Johnson Cognitive Abilities Assessment – Third Edition Cluster Scores Summary

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Cluster | Standard  Score | PR | Actual Score | Predicted Score | Score Diff. | SD | Sig at + or – 1.50 Y/N. | Qualitative  Description |
| General Intellectual Ability (GIA) | 107 | 67 |  |  |  |  |  | Average |
| Verbal Ability-  Standard Scale | 99 | 15 | 99 | 109 | -10 | -1.03 | N | Average |
| Thinking Ability-Standard Scale | 106 | 43 | 106 | 107 | -1 | -0.17 | N | Average |
| Cognitive Efficiency-Standard Scale | 118 | 93 | 118 | 102 | 16 | 1.47 | N | High Average |

Note: SD= Standard Deviation; PR=Percentile Rank

***Broad Clusters and Subtest Score Interpretations***

In the *WJ III COG*, the broad ability clusters were designed to provide breadth among the different narrow abilities within each broad *CHC* factor. Each component test was designed to contribute a different aspect to the broad ability. The *Woodcock-Johnson Tests Cognitive Abilities- Third Edition*contains 20 tests, each measuring a different aspect of cognitive ability.  The tests combine to form clusters for interpretive purposes.  John was administered nine (9) tests which represent 7 broad CHC factors (list factors) to obtain her cognitive ability scores. No significant weaknesses or strengths for John were prominent.

***Comprehension-Knowledge*** *(Gc)* 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. The test of *Verbal Comprehension* measures *Comprehension-Knowledge (Gc).* *Verbal Comprehension* measures an individual’s acquired knowledge. On the *Verbal Comprehension* test, John standard scored 99 which is in the Average range of intellectual functioning. This score is in the 15th percentile rank. This means that John performed as well as or better than 15% of students in his norm group and not as well as the remaining 85%. John’s age equivalent for this measure is above 30 years old.

The *Verbal Comprehension* test includes four (4) subtests: *Picture Vocabulary, Synonyms, Antonyms, and Verbal Analogies*. Each subtest measures a different aspect of language development in spoken English language, such as knowledge of vocabulary or ability to reason. *Picture Vocabulary* measures aspects of word knowledge and requires the examinee to identify pictures of familiar and unfamiliar objects; *Synonyms* measures aspects of vocabulary knowledge and requires the examinee to complete tasks providing a similar word; *Antonyms* measures the counterpart of vocabulary knowledge and requires the examinee to provide an opposite word; and *Verbal Analogies* measures reasoning using word knowledge which requires the examinee to listen to three words of an analogy and provide a fourth word.

***Long-term Retrieval*** *(Glr)* measures the ability to store information and retrieve it later. The *Visual-Auditory* test measures *Long-Term Retrieval*. The *Visual-Auditory* test measures associative and meaningful memory. The examinee learns and recalls rebuses (pictographic representations of words) that begins as phrases and then sentences that increase in length and complexity. On the *Visual-Auditory* test, John’s standard score of 79 which is in the Low Average range of intellectual functioning. This score is in the 8th percentile rank. This means that on visual auditory tasks, John performed as well as or better than 8% of students in his norm group and not as well as the remaining 92%. John’s age equivalent for this measure is 5 years, 6 months.

Visual Auditory Learning measures associative memory or paired-associative learning. Associative memory is defined as a sub-process that combines information from two types of properties and compares the information with stored representations. The initial task requires associating the visual rebus symbol with a verbal label. The controlled-learning format of this test uses directed spotlight attention, the mental attention-focusing process that prepares the subject to encode the stimulus. The retrieval phase requires the subject to match a rebus with its stored representation; this process is called identification. When the rebus is identified, the subject has access to the name associated with the stored representation.

***Visual-Spatial Thinking*** *(Gv)* measures the ability to perceive, analyze, synthesize and think with visual patterns, including the ability to store and recall visual representations. *Spatial Relations* is a measure of *Visual-Spatial Thinking*. This cluster includes one subtest: *Spatial Relations* (the ability to use visualization in thinking) and required him to identify two or three pieces that form a complete targeted shape. On the *Spatial Relations* test, John standard scored 127 which is in the Superior range of intellectual functioning. This score is in the 96th percentile rank. This means that John performed as well as or better than 96% of individuals in his norm group and not as well as the remaining 4%. John’s age equivalent for this measure is above 25 years old.

The ***Spatial Relations*** test measures the ability to use visualization (the ability to apprehend spatial forms or shapes, often by rotating or manipulating them in the imagination). Through the process of visual-feature detection, puzzle pieces are matched to components of the target shape held in immediate awareness.

***Auditory Processing*** *(Ga)* measures the ability to analyze, synthesize, and discriminate auditory stimuli, including the ability to process and discriminate speech sounds that may be presented under distorted conditions. *Sound Blending* and *Incomplete Words* subtests measure *Auditory Processing*. *Incomplete Words* like *Sound Blending* measures the CHC narrow ability of phonetic coding. From a cognitive neuroscience perspective, both *Sound Blending* and *Incomplete Words* can be considered measures of phonetic processing, or the extraction of specifically linguistic features such as placement and articulation of consonants. However, unlike *Sound Blending*, *Incomplete Words* is not a blending task. In *Incomplete Words* a stored representation of a word must be activated from an incomplete set of phonological features that are extracted from the acoustic signal.

The ***Sound Blending*** test measures the ability to produce language sounds. The examinee listens to a series of syllables and phonemes (sounds) and asked to blend the sounds into a word. *Sound Blending* measures the narrow ability of phonetic coding (i.e. phonological awareness, or the ability to code phonetic information in immediate awareness). From a cognitive neuroscience perspective, *Sound Blending* involves acoustic-phonetic processing, which is the ability to analyze acoustic waveforms in terms of phonological elements, blend or synthesize the waveform elements, match the blended sequence to stored lexical entries, and unambiguously identify the component phonemes in the waveform as a complete word through the lexical activation process. For the *Sound Blending* test, John standard scored 90 which is in the Average range of intellectual functioning. This score is in the 26th percentile rank. This means that Jane performed as well as or better than 26% of individuals in his norm group and not as well as the remaining 74%. John’s age equivalent for this measure is 10 years, 7 months. *Incomplete Words* measures auditory analysis and auditory closure and requires the examinee to hear a word from an audio recording that is missing one or more phonemes and identify by completing the word. For the *Incomplete Words* test, John standard scored 96 which is in the Average range of intellectual functioning. This score is in the 40th percentile rank. This means that John performed as well as or better than 40% of individuals in his norm group and not as well as the remaining 60%. This means the standard score of 96 is a valid indication of his performance on this measure.

***Fluid Reasoning*** *(Gf)* measures the ability to reason, form concepts, and solve problems using unfamiliar information or new procedures. *Concept Formation* is a test that measures *Fluid Reasoning*. *Concept Formation* involves categorical reasoning based on principles of inductive logic and an aspect of executive processing – flexibility in thinking when required to shift one’s mental set frequently. This test requires the individual to examine a stimulus set and then formulate a rule that applies to the item(s). *Concept Formation*, a measure of induction, or inference, requires rule application and frequent switching from one rule to another. The *Concept Formation* test is a controlled, cognitive processing task. The principle contribution of the test is that it allows for measurement of an explicit inductive reasoning task – the *education* of relations.

On the *Concept Formation* test, John standard scored 124 which is in the Superior range of intellectual functioning. This score is in the 94th percentile rank. This means that John performed as well as or better than 94% and not as well as the remaining 6%. John’s age equivalent for this measure is 18 years, 8 months.

***Processing Speed*** *(Gs)* measures the ability to perform automatic cognitive tasks, as an aspect of cognitive efficiency. *Visual Matching* is a test that measures *Processing Speed*. *Visual Matching* is a test measuring cognitive efficiency which is the speed at which an individual can make visual symbol discriminations.

John was administered the second version, *Visual Matching 2*, since he functions at or above the level of an average 5-year old. He was required to locate and circle two identical numbers in a row of six within a 3-minute time limit. The items became more difficult as they progressed from single-digit numbers to triple-digit numbers. On the *Visual Matching 2* test, John standard scored 118 which is in the High Average range of intellectual functioning. This score is in the 88th percentile rank. This means that John performed as well as or better than 88% of individuals in his norm group and not as well as the remaining 12%. John’s age equivalent for this measure is above 23 years old.

***Short-Term Memory*** *(Gsm)* measures the ability to apprehend and hold information in immediate awareness and then use it within a few seconds. *Numbers Reversed* and *Auditory Working Memory* both are measurements of *Short-Term Memory*.

The first test administered, *Numbers Reversed*, measures short-term memory span, and requires the individual to hold a span of numbers in immediate memory while performing a mental operation on it by reciting the numbers in reverse order. On *Numbers Reverse* test, John standard scored 114 which is in the High Average range of intellectual functioning. This score is in the 82nd percentile rank. This means that John performed as well as or better than 82% of students in his norm group and not as well as the remaining 18%. John’s age equivalent for this measure is above 26 years old.

The second test, *Auditory Working Memory*, measures short-term auditory memory span and working memory or divided attention. The examinee listens to a series of digits and words, attempts to reorder the information repeating the objects first and then the numbers in sequential order. On *Auditory Working Memory* test, John standard scored 100 which is in the Average range of intellectual functioning. This score is in the 50th percentile rank. This means that John performed as well as or better than 50% of individuals in his norm group and not as well as the remaining 50%. John’s age equivalent for this measure is 16 years, 4 months.

**Table 3.** Woodcock-Johnson Cognitive Abilities Assessment – Third Edition Cluster Subtest Scores Summary

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Cluster | Standard  Score | PR | AE | Qualitative  Description |
| Verbal Comprehension | 099 | 48 | >30 | Average |
| Visual-Auditory Learning | 079 | 08 | 6- 5 | Low Average |
| Spatial Relations | 127 | 96 | >25 | Superior |
| Sound Blending | 090 | 26 | 10- 7 | Average |
| Concept Formation | 124 | 94 | 18- 8 | Superior |
| Visual Matching 2 | 118 | 88 | >23 | High Average |
| Numbers Reversed | 114 | 82 | >26 | High Average |
| Incomplete Words | 096 | 40 | 20 | Average |
| Auditory Working Memory | 100 | 50 | 7- 2 | Average |

Note: SD= Standard Deviation; PR=Percentile Rank; AE= Age Equivalent

**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 (Sattler, 2002).

John’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, John’s adaptive behavior appears to be within the Average and High Average and Superior range and consistent with his current intellectual functioning.

**Academic/Developmental Performance**

Information regarding an individual’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 John’s level of acquired knowledge.

***Woodcock-Johnson Test of Achievement Assessment-Third Edition (WJC III ACH)***

The *Woodcock-Johnson Test of Achievement Assessment-Third Edition (WJC III ACH)* is administered to determine and describe an individual’s present status of academic strengths and weaknesses. The test results help determine how certain factors are affecting related aspects of development. The WJ III ACH provides a more in depth evaluation after individual has failed a screening procedure or to substantiate the results of other tests or prior evaluations. The WJ III ACH has 22 tests organized into five areas/clusters: oral language, reading, written language, mathematics and academic knowledge, and can be administered to individuals as young as 2-years to 95-years and older.

***Cluster and Subtest Score Interpretations***

Overall, John’s academic skills are commensurate with his intellectual ability. Based on the findings of the WJ III ACH, John’s cluster standard scores in all academic areas are within Average, High Average, or Superior range. This suggests the individual has special strengths in mathematics and may provide insights about the student’s learning styles and learning abilities and disabilities. The scores are explained in detail below.

***Oral Language*** is related to success in reading, math and written language and the skills are measured in five oral language tests ranging from lower-level abilities to higher-level abilities. It is a measure of an individual’s expressive (speaking) and receptive language (listening). On the *Oral Language* test, John standard scored 105 which is in the Average range of intellectual functioning. This score is in the 64th percentile rank. This means that John performed as well as or better than 64% and not as well as the remaining 36% of individuals in his norm group. John’s age equivalent for this measure is above 21 years old.

***Oral Expression*** measures linguistic competency and vocabulary knowledge. Jane was administered *Story Recall* which measured aspects of oral language including language development and meaningful memory. The task required her to recall increasingly complex stories that are presented through an audio recording. After listening to the passage, Jane was asked to recall as many details of the story she could remember. On the *Oral Expression* test, John standard scored 105 which is in the Average range of intellectual functioning. This score is in the 62th percentile rank. This means that Jane performed as well as or better than 62% and not as well as the remaining 38% of students in his norm group. John’s age equivalent for this measure is above 20 years old.

***Listening Comprehension*** measures an individual’s listening ability and verbal comprehension. The test administered was *Understanding Directions*, and it measures Oral Language. The examinee listened to a sequence of audio-recorded instructions and then followed the directions by pointing to various objects in a colored picture. The items gradually increased in linguistic complexity as the number of tasks to perform increased. On the *Listening Comprehension* test, John standard scored 105 which is in the Average range of intellectual functioning. This score is in the 62th percentile rank. This means that John performed as well as or better than 62% and not as well as the remaining 38% of individuals in his norm group. John’s age equivalent for this measure is above 21 years old.

***Written Expression*** is a measure of written and fluent expressive skills. Two subtests were administered; the first test was *Writing Fluency*. This test measures skills in formulating and writing sample sentences quickly. Each student must relate to a given stimulus picture and include a given set of three words. On the *Writing Fluency* test, John standard scored 121 which is in the Superior range of intellectual functioning. This score is in the 92th percentile rank. This means that John performed as well as or better than 92% and not as well as the remaining 8% of individuals in his norm group. John’s age equivalent for this measure is above 21 years old. The second test, *Writing Samples*, measures skill in writing responses to a variety of demands. The individual must produce written sentences that are evaluated with respect to quality of expression. Item difficulty increases by increasing passage length, level of vocabulary, grammar complexities and level of abstraction. The individual is not penalized for errors in basic writing skills. On the *Writing Samples*, John standard scored 130 which is in the Superior range of intellectual functioning. This score is in the 98th percentile rank. This means that John performed as well as or better than 98% and not as well as the remaining 2% of individuals in his norm group. John’s age equivalent for this measure is above 30 years old.

***Basic Reading Skills*** measures sight vocabulary, phonics and structural analysis. *Letter-Word Identification* was administered and measures the subject’s word identification skills. The initial items require the individual to identify letters that appear in large type and the remaining items require correct pronunciation. The individual is not required to know the meaning of any words. The items become more increasingly difficult as the selected words appear less and less frequently in written English. On the *Basic Reading Skills*, John standard scored 97 which is in the Average range of intellectual functioning. This score is in the 41th percentile rank. This means that John performed as well as or better than 41% and not as well as the remaining 59% of individuals in his norm group. John’s age equivalent for this measure is 19 years old.

***Reading Comprehension*** provides a broad view of an individual’s reading comprehension skills or understanding what they read. *Passage Comprehension* measures comprehension in a context of connected discourse. The items required the person to point to the picture represented by a phrase. The remaining items required the person to read a short passage and identify the missing key word that makes sense in the context of the passage. The items become more increasingly difficult by removing pictorial stimuli and by increasing passage length, level of vocabulary, and complexity of syntactic and semantic cues. On the *Reading Comprehension*, John standard scored 98 which is in the Average range of intellectual functioning. This score is in the 44th percentile rank. This means that John performed as well as or better than 44% and not as well as the remaining 56% of individuals in his norm group. John’s age equivalent for this measure is 21 years old.

***Math Calculation Skills*** measure computational skills and automaticity with basic math facts and provides a measure of basic mathematical skills. Two subtests were administered: *Calculation and Math Fluency*. For *Calculation*, measures the ability to perform mathematical computations. The examinee performed addition and subtraction operations. The second subtest, *Math Fluency*, measures his ability to solve simple addition and subtraction facts quickly. The person is presented a series of arithmetic problems and has a 3-minute time limit. On the *Math Calculation*, John standard scored 125 which is in the Superior range of intellectual functioning. This score is in the 95th percentile rank. This means that John performed as well as or better than 95% and not as well as the remaining 5% of individuals in his norm group. John’s age equivalent for this measure is above 23 years old.

***Math Reasoning*** measures mathematical knowledge and reasoning including problem solving, analysis and vocabulary. John was administered the *Applied Problems* subtest which required her to analyze and solve math problems. To solve the problems, he was required to listen to the problem, recognize the procedure to follow and perform relatively simple calculations. The examinee must decide not only which appropriate mathematical operation to use but also which numbers to include in the calculation. Item difficulty increases with complex calculations. On the *Math Reasoning*, John standard scored 137 which is in the Very Superior range of intellectual functioning. This score is in the 99th percentile rank. This means that John performed as well as or better than 99% and not as well as the remaining 1% of students in his norm group. John’s age equivalent for this measure is above 30 years old.

**Table 4.** Woodcock-Johnson III Test of Achievement Assessment (WJ III ACH)-Third Edition Cluster Score Summary

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Cluster | Standard Score | Age Equivalent | Percentile Rank | Qualitative Description |
| Oral Language (Std) | 105 | >21 | 64 | Average |
| Oral Expression | 105 | >20 | 62 | Average |
| Listening Comprehension | 105 | >21 | 62 | Low Average |
| Written Expression | 121 | >21 | 92 | Superior |
| Basic Reading Skills | 97 | 10-6 | 41 | Average |
| Reading Comprehension | 98 | 21 | 44 | Average |
| Math Calculation Skills | 125 | >23 | 95 | Superior |
| Math Reasoning | 137 | >30 | 99 | Very Superior |

Note: SD= Standard Deviation; PR=Percentile Rank; AE= Age Equivalent

A summary of the John’s overall performance for theWoodcock-Johnson III Tests of Achievement (WJ III ACH)-Third Edition Subtest Scores can be found on Table 5. Below a detailed explanation about the subtests tested on the *WJ III ACH* and the results in terms of percentile rank, standard scores, and age equivalent.

***Letter Word Identification*** requires the individual to read isolated letters and words orally. It is a measure of reading decoding (sight recognition), including reading readiness skills. The items are presented in a list rather than in context. It is not necessary to know the meaning of words. On the *Letter Word Identification*, John standard scored 97 which is in the Average range of intellectual functioning. This score is in the 41th percentile rank. This means that John performed as well as or better than 41% and not as well as the remaining 59% of individuals in his norm group. John’s age equivalent for this measure is 19 years old.

***Story Recall*** requires the examinee to listen to a story and then recall the elements of that story. Both receptive and expressive language skills are required to perform this story-telling task. Story Recall measures linguistic competency, listening comprehension, meaningful memory, and language development. On the *Story Recall*, John standard scored 105 which is in the Average range of intellectual functioning. This score is in the 62th percentile rank. This means that John performed as well as or better than 62% and not as well as the remaining 38% of individuals in his norm group. John’s age equivalent for this measure is above 20 years old.

***Understanding Directions*** requires the examinee to listen to a sequence of audio-recorded instructions and then follow the directions by pointing to various objects in a colored picture. This test measures listening ability and language development, both aspects of comprehension-knowledge. On the *Understanding Directions*, John standard scored 105 which is in the Average range of intellectual functioning. This score is in the 62th percentile rank. This means that John performed as well as or better than 62% and not as well as the remaining 38% of individuals in his norm group. John’s age equivalent for this measure is above 21years old.

The ***Calculation*** Test requires the examinee to perform a variety of calculations ranging from simple addition to more advance operations. ***Calculation*** measures the ability to perform mathematical computations that are fundamental to more complex math reasoning and problem solving. Fluency with *Calculation* is fundamental to more complex math. On the *Calculation*, John standard scored 125 which is in the Superior range of intellectual functioning. This score is in the 95th percentile rank. This means that John performed as well as or better than 95% and not as well as the remaining 5% of individuals in his norm group. John’s age equivalent for this measure is above 23years old.

***Math Fluency*** requires the examinee to solve simple addition, subtraction, and multiplication facts quickly. Low performance on this test may result from limited basic math skills, lack of automaticity, limited attention, or slow processing speed. On the *Math Fluency*, John standard scored 118 which is in the High Average range of intellectual functioning. This score is in the 88th percentile rank. This means that John performed as well as or better than 88% and not as well as the remaining 12% of individuals in his norm group. John’s age equivalent for this measure is above 25years old.

***Spelling*** requires the examinee to produce, in writing, single letters or words in response to oral prompts. Several factors that may influence performance include handwriting, fine-motor skills, phonological coding, and orthographic coding. This test measures prewriting skills and spelling. On the *Spelling*, John standard scored 98 which is in the Average range of intellectual functioning. This score is in the 44th percentile rank. This means that John performed as well as or better than 44% and not as well as the remaining 56% of individuals in his norm group. John’s age equivalent for this measure is 23 years old.

***Writing Fluency*** requires the examinee to produce, in writing, legible, simple sentences with acceptable English syntax. Low performance on this test may result from limited concentration, poor motor control, limited spelling or reading skills, limited processing speed, or may result from a response style that interferes with performance. On the *Writing Fluency*, John standard scored 121 which is in the Superior range of intellectual functioning. This score is in the 92th percentile rank. This means that John performed as well as or better than 92% and not as well as the remaining 8% of individuals in his norm group. John’s age equivalent for this measure is above 21years old.

***Passage Comprehension*** requires the examinee to read a passage silently, comprehend the information, and provide a missing word. It is a measure of reading comprehension and lexical knowledge. This modified cloze task requires the ability to use syntactic and semantic clues in comprehending contextual information. On the *Passage Comprehension*, John standard scored 98 which is in the Average range of intellectual functioning. This score is in the 44th percentile rank. This means that John performed as well as or better than 44% and not as well as the remaining 56% of individuals in his norm group. John’s age equivalent for this measure is 21years old.

***Applied Problems*** requires the examinee to analyze and solve practical math problems. It is a measure of quantitative reasoning, math achievement, and math knowledge. Because no reading is required, low performance will likely be related to limits in mathematical knowledge. On the *Applied Problems*, John standard scored 137 which is in the Average range of intellectual functioning. This score is in the 99th percentile rank. This means that John performed as well as or better than 99% and not as well as the remaining 1% of individuals in his norm group. John’s age equivalent for this measure is above 30 years old.

***Writing Samples***, measures skill in writing responses to a variety of demands. The individual must produce written sentences that are evaluated with respect to quality of expression. Item difficulty increases by increasing passage length, level of vocabulary, grammar complexities and level of abstraction. The individual is not penalized for errors in basic writing skills. On the *Writing Samples*, John standard scored 130 which is in the Average range of intellectual functioning. This score is in the 98th percentile rank. This means that John performed as well as or better than 98% and not as well as the remaining 2% of individuals in his norm group. John’s age equivalent for this measure is above 30 years old.

The ***Handwriting*** test can be used to analyze six elements that affect handwriting quality: slant, spacing, size, horizontal alignment, letter formation, and line quality. This evaluation aids in recommending instructional procedures. On *Handwriting*, John standard scored 116 which is in the Average range of intellectual functioning. This score is in the 85th percentile rank. This means that John performed as well as or better than 85% and not as well as the remaining 15% of individuals in his norm group. John’s age equivalent for this measure is above 22 years old.

**Table 5.** Woodcock-Johnson III Test of Achievement Assessment (WJ III ACH)-Third Edition Cluster Score Summary

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Subtest | Standard Score | Percentile Rank | Age Equivalent | Quality Description |
| Letter-Word Identification | 97 | 41 | 19 | Average |
| Reading Fluency | 101 | 62 | >20 | Average |
| Story Recall | 105 | 62 | >20 | Average |
| Understanding Directions | 105 | 62 | >21 | Average |
| Calculation | 125 | 95 | >23 | Superior |
| Math Fluency | 118 | 88 | >25 | High Average |
| Spelling | 98 | 45 | >23 | Average |
| Writing Fluency | 121 | 92 | >21 | Superior |
| Passage Comprehension | 98 | 44 | >21 | Average |
| Applied Problems | 137 | 99 | >30 | Very Superior |
| Writing Samples | 130 | 98 | >30 | Superior |
| Handwriting | 116 | 85 | >22 | High Average |

**Assistive Technology**

John can access the work environment without the need for AT services or devices. He communicates clearly and is not motor dependent.

**Transition**

Transition services are not pertinent to John due to being over the transition age of 16.

**Conclusion**

John’s overall intellectual ability, as measured by the *WJ III GIA (Std)*, is in the average range of standard scores. John’s verbal ability (acquired knowledge and language comprehension) is in the average range of standard scores when compared to others at his age level. His thinking ability (intentional cognitive processing) is in the average range. His cognitive efficiency (automatic cognitive processing) is in the High Average range. No significant strengths or weaknesses were found among the scores for a selected set of John’s cognitive abilities.

John’s phonemic awareness is significantly lower than would be predicted by his general intellectual ability. John’s oral language skills are average when compared to the range of scores obtained by others at his age level. John’s overall level of achievement is High Average. John’s ability to apply academic skills is within the Superior range. His fluency with academic tasks is within the High Average range. His academic skills are within the average range.

When compared to others at his age level, John’s standard scores are very superior in broad mathematics and brief mathematics. His math calculation skills and written expression scores are in the Superior range; his broad written language and brief writing scores are in the High Average range. His standard scores are Average (compared to age peers) in broad reading and brief reading. When scores for a selected set of achievement areas were compared, John demonstrated a significant strength in broad mathematics. He demonstrated a significant weakness in broad reading.

To help determine if any ability/achievement discrepancies exist, comparisons were made between his cognitive achievement scores. Significant discrepancies were found between John’s intellectual ability and his measure in broad mathematics. However, the achievement standard scores in all areas are above his GIA, so no instructional modifications are necessary at this time. Based on a mix of cognitive tasks associated with performance in each area, John is performing at or above predicted levels in reading, mathematics, written language, and oral language.

**Table 6.** Woodcock-Johnson Tests of Achievement – Third Edition and Clusters Measuring the Seven IDEA Areas

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Required LD Areas | WJIII ACH  Subtests | STD. Scores | GIA | GIA/  ACH  Dif. | Sig.  Y/N |
| Oral Expression | Story Recall | 105 | 107 | 2 | N |
| Listening Comprehension | Understanding Directions | 105 | 107 | 2 | N |
| Written Expression | Writing Sample | 121 | 107 | -14 | N |
| Writing Fluency |  |  |  |  |
| Basic Reading Skills | Letter-Word Identification | 97 | 107 | 10 | N |
| Reading Comprehension | Passage Comprehension | 105 | 107 | 2 | N |
| Math Calculation | Calculation | 125 | 107 | -18 | Y |
| Math Fluency | 118 | 107 | -11 | N |
| Math Reasoning | Applied Problems | 137 | 107 | -30 | Y |

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

# Recommendations

This evaluation is considered a valid representation of John’s current levels of functioning in the areas assessed. The following recommendations are based upon a review of evaluation data to assist John in *Broad Reading*. These recommendations are intended for the work environment.

* Read on a routine basis and highlight important information
* When lecturing, present ideas in an organized and logical sequence.
* Keep notes as simple as possible and group related information.
* Make an outline and take notes while reading.
* Clarify information as needed

**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.
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