Eligibility Determination Team Report

Small Town Municipal School District
512 First Street
Small Town, N.M. 88352
(575) 585-6514

CONFIDENTIAL
This report contains confidential information and is the property of the local education agency.

SECTION I

Child's Name: Marcie Daniels	Date of Birth: 4/9/11
Gender: Female	Age at Evaluation: 6:7
School: Small Town Elementary	Grade: 1st
Parent/Guardian: Jeff Daniels	Parent/Guardian: Sally Shaw
Address: PO Box 1702	Address: Small Town, New Mexico 88316
Primary Phone: (575) 802-3939	Primary Phone:
Alternate Phone:	Alternate Phone:
Home Language: English	English Language Proficiency (if applicable):
Child's Preferred Language: English	Language of Instruction: English
Ethnicity: Caucasian	
Referral Date (for initial evaluation only):	Consent Date: 2/20/18
Evaluation Complete Date: 4/20/18	Report Finalization Date: 4/24/18
EDT Meeting Date: 5/5/18	Reevaluation Due Date: 4/20/21

SECTION II

The purpose of this multidisciplinary evaluation was to answer several questions related to the child's educational needs, including:

1. Whether the child has or continues to have a disability
2. The child's educational needs
3. The child's present levels of academic achievement and related developmental needs
4. If the child needs or continues to need special education and related services and/or
5. If the child is already receiving special education services, whether any additions or modifications to the special education and related services are needed to meet the measurable annual goals set out in the IEP and to participate, as appropriate, in the general education curriculum

This report will answer questions related to the child's educational needs, present levels of academic achievement and related developmental needs, and, as appropriate, necessary additions or modifications to the child's educational program (questions #2, #3, and #5). In addition, the report will provide information to support the child's team in completing the NM TEAM Eligibility Determination Worksheets

(December, 2017) that will answer the questions related to the presence of a disability and the need for special education and related services (#1 and #4).

This child was referred for a comprehensive evaluation due to a suspected disability **and** one or more of the following:

Yes No	The school and/or parent reports that the child is having difficulty **being involved in and making progress in the general education curriculum or developmentally appropriate activities.** (see pages 38-39 in NM TEAM, December 2017)
	If yes, provide detailed explanation: Due to difficulty meeting grade one expectations, an evaluation was recommended to determine whether Marcie is eligible for and in need of additional support.
Yes **No**	The school and/or parent reports that the child is having difficulty **participating in extracurricular and other non-academic activities.** (see pages 39-40 in NM TEAM, December 2017)
	If yes, provide detailed explanation:
Yes No	The school and/or parent reports that the child is having difficulty **being educated and participating with other children with and without disabilities.** (see pages 40-41 in NM TEAM, December 2017)
	If yes, provide detailed explanation: Currently, Marcie is demonstrating behaviors such as tantruming, frustration, and shutting down that are impacting her ability to consistently participate in the educational setting.

SECTION III

REVIEW OF CHILD'S HISTORY			
Evaluation Area	**Data Sources**	**Evaluator(s)**	**Date(s)**
Developmental history	Jeff Daniels, Father		2/20/18
Educational history	Cumulative File	Skye Blue, Educational Diagnostician	3/11/8
Medical history (e.g., current diagnosis, if any) ● Vision screening ● Hearing screening	Jeff Daniels, Father Penny Timothy, School Nurse Penny Timothy, School Nurse		2/20/18 9/20/17 10/11/17
Family history	Jeff Daniels, Father		2/20/18
Social history	Jeff Daniels, Father, and Camila Atencio, General Education Teacher		2/20/18
Review of Individual Academic Achievement Performance		Skye Blue, Educational Diagnostician	3/11/18

OBSERVATIONS Observations			
Evaluation Area	**Data Sources**	**Evaluator(s)**	**Date(s)**
Daily Classroom Performance	General Education Teacher	Mrs. Camila Atencio	2/25/18
Math	Math Interventionist	Ms. Oz	2/7/18
Reading	Educational Diagnostician	Skye Blue	3/11/18

FORMAL AND INFORMAL DATA			
Sensory Processing and/or Motor			
Evaluation Area	**Data Sources**	**Evaluator(s)**	**Date(s)**
Visual perception skills	Motor-Free Visual Perception Test, 3rd Ed.	Carmen Miranda, Occupational Therapist	3/13/18
Fine motor	Wide Range Assessment Visual Motor Abilities	Carmen Miranda, Occupational Therapist	3/13/18
Speech, Language, and/or Communication			
Speech and/or language abilities	● Oral & Written Language Scales, 2nd Edition ● The Expressive One-Word Picture Vocabulary Test ● Arizona Articulation Proficiency Scale, 3rd Edition ● Informal: Speech Sample	Lucie Lou, Speech and Language Pathologist	3/14/18
Behavior and/or Social-Emotional			
Social/emotional skills	Social Skills Improvement System (SSIS)	Martha Bird	4/20/18
Academic and/or Pre-academic Achievement			
Academic achievement	● Kaufman Assessment Test of Educational Achievement, 3rd Edition (KTEA-3) ● Woodcock-Johnson 4 Tests of Achievement (WJ-IV)	Skye Blue, Educational Diagnostician	4/4/18 4/5/18

Cognitive Abilities			
Cognitive/intellectual	● Kaufman Assessment Battery for Children, 2nd Edition ● Kaufman test of Educational Achievement, 3rd Edition	Skye Blue, Educational Diagnostician	4/7/18
Other Cognitive Evaluations			
Cognitive processing	Comprehensive Test of Phonological Processing, 2nd Edition	Skye Blue, Educational Diagnostician	4/7/18

SECTION IV

COMPREHENSIVE REVIEW OF MARCIE'S HISTORY

Developmental history
Ms. Shaw received prenatal care by a physician during her pregnancy. Marcie was carried full term and no complications were evident at birth. Though Marcie met motor milestones (e.g., sitting, walking) as expected, she was late speaking.

Educational history (include attendance, grade, district/state assessments, etc.)
Marcie did not attend preschool before she was enrolled at Small Town Elementary School as a kindergarten student. Documentation of performance provided within her cumulative file shows some consistent understanding of concepts with some skills identified as inconsistent.

Examples of areas meeting expectations include writes all lowercase letters, gives a number from 1-20/counts out that many objects, blends and segments words, and decodes simple phonics words. Some skills falling below expectancy include writes all uppercase letters, writes numbers 1-20, recognizes all lower/uppercase letters, recognizes and produces rhyming words, and reads common high frequency words. The classroom teacher noted that Marcie "gets confused between letter names and letter sounds". In addition, within Marcie's Student Assistance Team (SAT) file and the teacher report, there is report of crying out of frustration, shutting down, one-on-one support needed, and difficulty "retaining newly learned letter sounds or letter formations in writing".

Currently, due to Marcie's challenges, the following interventions are provided to assist progress: reading intervention three times weekly for 30 minutes with Ms. Pena, math intervention two times weekly with Ms. Oz, reduced assignments (e.g., 5 spelling words instead of 10), extended time for work completion, reteaching in small group, and work corrected one-on-one with Mrs. Atencio.

Medical history (e.g., current diagnoses, if any)
Marcie passed vision (9/20/17) hearing (10/11/17) screenings conducted by the school nurse, Penny Timothy. In general, Marcie's health is excellent. The sole condition requiring medical intervention was a dog bite at age three, which required stitches in her left calf.

Family history
Marcie lives with her biological father and five sisters: 14-year-old Missy, 12-year-old Maggie, 10-year-old Miller, 8-year-old Molly, and 3-year-old Macie. Ms. Shaw was incarcerated shortly after Macie was born.

She has recently been released on parole. She visits the children on a weekly basis, however, she is not living in the home.

English is the sole language spoken in the home. While home and when allowed, Marcie enjoys barbies, playing with friends, and computer games.

Social history
Mr. Daniels describes Marcie as a kind child and very helpful with her little sister. Marcie likes attending school to interact with friends, play at recess, and attend field trips. Within the school setting, Mrs. Camila Atencio presents as a very sweet, kind, and loving young girl.

Review of individual academic achievement performance

Attendance: Thus far this school year, Marcie missed a single day of school.

Grades: Semester One of 2017-18
Language Arts: 79% C
Reading: 79% C
Spelling: 78% C
Math: 84% B
Science: 90% A
Social Studies: 90% A
Homework: 56% F
Note: Her grades reflect support and modifications.

District and State Assessments

- *Istation* (December 2017)
    - Overall Reading: 21st percentile (Marcie scored better than or equal to 21% of students who took this test in December.)
        - Grade Equivalency: K.7 (Performing as an average kindergarten student who took this test in March.)
        - Tier: 3 (Performing seriously below grade level and in need of intensive intervention.)
    - Letter Knowledge: 38th percentile
    - Phonemic Awareness: 62nd percentile
    - Alphabetic Decoding: 24th percentile
    - Comprehension: 7th percentile
    - Vocabulary: 19th percentile
    - Spelling: 19th percentile

SECTION V

OBSERVATIONS DURING FORMAL ASSESSMENT

1) Skye Blue, Educational Diagnostician

- Marcie presented as a reserved child. In general, she only spoke when asked a question.
- She often smiled when complimented or when given a bag of fruit snack.
- Though Marcie was presented with some challenging tasks, she remained cooperative and seemed to put forth her best effort.
- At times, mispronunciations of words made understanding Marcie difficult.
- On occasion, she moved her upper body back and forth while seated and would clench her fists. This action seemed to occur when tasks became challenging.

2) Carmen Miranda, Occupational Therapist

- Marcie came willingly with the examiner.
- She had a good sustained attention during the evaluation.
- She was very quiet but worked very hard.
- She completed all task which were requested of her.

3) Lucie Lou, Speech and Language Pathologist

- Marcie attended to the task for brief periods and offered responses but rocked in her seat.
- She was very verbal throughout the tests giving information about the toys she brought or her pets at home. However, she was difficult to understand.
- When asked questions, she was able to answer with appropriate topic of conversation.

SECTION VI

VALIDITY OF ASSESSMENT RESULTS

Based on the following profile, Marcie's evaluation results should be considered reasonable estimates of her current abilities.

- Marcie is identified as a Caucasian individual speaking English alone.
- Because Marcie speaks only English, formal assessments were administered in English.
- Marcie is a child whose family relates to mainstream American culture.
- Marcie is not exhibiting vision, hearing, or motor challenges.
- Standard administration of assessments were followed.
- Marcie demonstrated appropriate attention and effort during assessments.

SECTION VII

USE OF STANDARDIZED ASSESSMENTS AND DEFINITIONS OF OBTAINED SCORES

Standardized assessments are designed to provide a very specific type of information. They are designed to demonstrate how a child performs under highly controlled conditions in order to allow for comparison with other children of the same age.

Several eligibility categories require the consideration of eligibility criteria that are based upon formulas related to data thresholds. The PED cautions that the implementation of these formulas must always be guided by professional judgment. The criteria offered are simply one piece of information that must be considered within the context of the entire body of evidence collected by the evaluation team.

Terms and Concepts

- **Scaled Score** is a type of score with a mean (average) of 10 and a standard deviation of 3. The average range is from 7 to 13.
- **standard Score (SS)** is a type of score with a mean of 100 and one standard deviation of 15. Normal or average scores range from 85 to 115.
- **T-Score** is a type of score with a mean of 50 and a standard deviation of 10. Scores between 40 and 60 are considered average.
- **Percentile (%ile) Rank** gives the rank of a student within the normative sample (i.e., the population sample used to determine test norms). For example, a percentile rank of 70 indicates that the student's score is equal to or greater than 70 out of 100 students in the normative sample.
- **Standard Error of Measurement (SEM)** is used to calculate the range or confidence interval within which the true score should fall. The child's score plus and minus 1 SEM represents the score range in which the EDT could be 68% confident that the child's "true" score would fall.

- **Confidence Interval (CI)** indicates the range in which a child's "true" score is likely to fall. It provides a way to predict a child's estimated true performance based on his or her actual obtained score. CIs are typically reported in ranges that represent 90% or 95% confidence.
- **Age Equivalent** reflects performance in terms of the age level in the norming sample at which the average score is the same as the child's score. (Note: Due to the significant limitations of AE scores and the ease with which they are misunderstood, these scores should not typically be reported in comprehensive evaluation reports and should not be used as part of the eligibility determination process. However, in rare cases (i.e., under the eligibility category of Developmental Delay when standard scores aren't available), it may be necessary to report age equivalent scores. In this case, it is the evaluator's responsibility to ensure that the scores are presented in conjunction with more valid and meaningful scores.)

SECTION VIII

INTERPRETATION OF MARCIE'S ASSESSMENT RESULTS BY EDT

Observations

General Education Teacher

On 2/25/18, Mrs. Camila Atencio, Marcie's 1st grade teacher, shared the following observations:

- She seems to lack self confidence.
- In regard to academic skills, she is strongest in mathematics. For example, she can add/subtract and follow along during math lessons.
    - She has difficulty writing numbers in the correct order and using the right formation.
    - She reverses most of her numbers even with the aid of a number chart in front of her.
    - She struggles with independent work during assessments when she is required to remember how to set up word problems appropriately.
- Marcie can read most decodable words including words with blends.
    - She struggles with words that use the following letters: *b, d, p, q, f,* and *th*. She is encouraged to use her alphabet chart, but she does not always check it. She concentrates on reading for accuracy and does not generally read for comprehension. She also has difficulty listening to stories and comprehending the meaning and details of those stories.
- The act of physical writing seems difficult for Marcie.
- Because Marcie does not know her letters well enough, writing sentences is difficult.
- Marcie has difficulty listening to dictated sentences within a whole group setting and then writing them down without support. She can do it with one-on-one support with many prompts and reminders.
- She needs prompts to add capital letters and punctuation. She is unable, at this time, to generate her own ideas.
- If required to work independently, Marcie struggles and then becomes frustrated. She will shut down and refuse to complete her work.
- As a result of Marcie's academic challenges, she requires one-on-one support in all subject areas.
- She is significantly behind her same-grade peers.

Analysis of work samples reveals the following:

- difficulty remembering how to formulate letters and numbers (e.g., *b, d f, e, c, p, j, z; 9, 7, 5)*
- letters transposed (e.g., *two* written as *tow; the* spelled *het*)
- omission of letters (e.g., *next* written as *es*)
- messy handwriting
- inconsistency identifying words describing pictures (e.g., When shown a jet and five possible answers to complete "I see a big _____," Marcie wrote *jet*. However, when shown jet and given *jam, job, jet*, Marcie wrote *job*.

- With help, Marcie's spelling grades improve.

Math Interventionist
On 2/7/18, Ms. Oz, the math interventionist, described Marcie as a happy child; she smiles often. She is quiet and difficult to understand (at times). When working with manipulatives, Marcie does fairly well. Much of her independent work requires corrections, which are led by Ms. Oz.

Educational Diagnostician
Skye Blue, Educational Diagnostician, conducted a classroom observation on 3/11/18. Fifteen students were present in class. At the beginning of the observation, Mrs. Camila Atencio prompted Marcie to read aloud to her for the purpose of assessing reading fluency. The following strengths and challenges were shown:

- Marcie successfully read *is, a, mess, can, we, fix,* and *plan*. (*Can, fix*, and *plan* required sounding out/decoding).
- Challenging words included *big, kid, not, have, good*, and *play*.
    - When reading *big*, Marcie identified */b/* as */d/*; thus, Mrs. Atencio asked Marcie to retrieve her alphabet strip. Together they identified B/b and its corresponding sound */b/*. Marcie then identified the word correctly. When reading *kid*, Marcie gave the sound */b/* for */d/*. With the ABC strip, together A, B, C, D and the sound */d/* were named. Marcie then spoke */k/ /i/ /d/*, followed by *kid*, and finally */s/* was added to identify *kids*.
    - Marcie attempted to decode *have*; thus, support was required from Mrs. Atencio as the word is not a decodable word but a sight word.
- In general, reading a title and four short sentences required much effort.

The second part of the observation included a whole group lesson: review of spelling words, letter sounds, and high frequency words.

- Because Marcie was the only student sitting with his body positioned in the correct position, she was applauded by Mrs. Atencio.
- While reviewing spelling words, Marcie was asked, "What sound do letters *cl* make?" A long pause caused Mrs. Atencio to provide */cl/*.
- Mrs. Atencio then asked Marcie to use the word *club* in a sentence. Marcie stated, "I'm in the ice club." Mrs. Atencio asked, "Like I'm in the ice skating club?" Marcie nodded to indicate yes.

Sensory Processing and/or Motor

Assessments administered by Carmen Miranda, Occupational Therapist, 3/13/18.

Assessment Tool 1: *Wide Range Assessment of Visual Motor Abilities* (WRAVMA)

The WRAVMA assesses three areas using three tests. These three areas have been selected because of their relevance to school-related activities. Difficulty performing visual-motor tasks, such as copying from the chalkboard, drawing, or handwriting, most logically can be linked to either fine motor deficits, spatial deficits, and / or to an "integration" deficit when motor and spatial "systems" are combined. The WRAVMA is an efficient and economical measurement battery, which allows the examiner to effectively assess three important aspects of visual-motor functioning in children and adolescents: The Drawing Test measures integrated visual-motor ability: The Matching Test measures visual-spatial ability and the Pegboard Test measures fine motor ability. While each WRAVMA test can be used individually, all three tests can be efficiently administered, yielding a comparison of a child's integrated visual-motor ability with the skill areas of visual-spatial and fine motor abilities. The WRAVMA is appropriate for ages 3-17 years. All WRAVMA standard scores adhere to traditional psychometric properties, with a mean of 100 and a standard deviation of 15.

	Standard Score	Percentile Rank
DRAWING Visual-Motor	109	73rd
MATCHING Visual-Spatial	79	8th
PEGBOARD Fine Motor	94	34th
VMA Composite	91	27th

Based on this assessment Marcie scored an overall motor composite of 91 in the 27th percentile. Marcie's area of strength was in visual motor with a standard score of 109 and her weakest score was in visual spatial with a standard score of 79. Marcie worked well from left to right and stabilized her work with the non dominant hand. She demonstrates a right hand dominance and uses a nice tripod grasp during the writing task. She had good sustained attention and was not fidgety during the assessment. During Marcie's writing samples she had a difficult time with sizing, improper formation, and reversals. Other observations from reviewing Marcie's work indicate that she has good line adherence and spacing between letters. She performed better on worksheets that were not to visually overstimulating and that had nice organized working space.

Assessment 2: *Motor-Free Visual Perception Test, 3rd Edition*

The MVPT-3 is a motor free visual perception test designed to assess visual perceptual skills without a motor response. The visual perceptual skills which are assessed are spatial relationships, visual discrimination, figure-ground, visual closure, and visual memory. The MVPT-3 is an individually administered test. It is standardized from ages 4 to 94 years of the age. The MVPT-3 is scored using standard scores, which have median of 100 and a standard deviation of 15.

Comparison to Same-aged Peers:

Standard Score	99
Percentile Rank	47th

Based on this assessment Marcie scored a standard score of 99 placing her in the 47th percentile when compared to other children her age which is well within the average range.

Speech, Language, and/or Communication

The communication portion of this evaluation was conducted on 3/14/18 by Lucie Lou, Speech-Language Pathologist.

DEFINITIONS
Receptive Language refers to a student's current responses to sound and the language spoken to her, or around her, and her ability to decode/comprehend the intended meaning of these messages, including following through with appropriate, desired responses. Receptive language is sometimes referred to as Auditory Comprehension.

Expressive Language refers to the student's current oral language production, the ability to encode messages and the necessary motor skills that are required to communicate that message. This definition includes speech and any non-verbal behaviors which are also used to communicate meaning.

Assessment 1: *Oral and Written Language Scales-2nd Edition* (OWLS-2)—*Listening Comprehension and Oral Expression Scales*

The Listening Comprehension and Oral Expression sections of the OWLS-2 were administered to assess various aspects of receptive and expressive language. The Listening Comprehension Scale is designed to measure Marcie's understanding of spoken language and requires her to listen to a selection and then choose from a group of four drawings the correct picture that represents the selection that was read.

The Oral Expression Scale is designed to measure the understanding and use of spoken language and uses a variety of response formats, including sentence completion with a word or phrase, providing a response to a given situation, sentence combination, and sentence formulation. The expressive portion allows for a certain amount of individualization of responses, as long as there is no deviation from the targeted structures. The standard scores are based on a mean of 100 and a standard deviation of 15.

Marcie's presently obtained scores are as follows:

Subtest/Composite	**Standard Score**	**Percentile**	**Range**
Listening Comprehension	112	79	Average
Oral Expression	100	50	Average
Oral Composite	**105**	**63**	**Average**

Interpretation of OWLS-2 results:
Results of this test indicated that Marcie's receptive and expressive language skills are in the average range. Her overall language abilities were also in the average range.

On the Listening Comprehension Scale, Marcie demonstrated relative strength in her ability to identify identifying lexical/semantic (e.g., vocabulary) and syntactic (e.g., grammar) components of language in test stimuli. Her weakness lied in her comparative difficulty identifying supralinguistic (e.g., humor and inferences) components of language.

On the Oral Expression Scale, Marcie demonstrated relative strengths in her ability to use syntactic and supralinguistic components of language in test stimuli. Her weaknesses lied in her comparative difficulty using lexical/semantic and pragmatic (i.e., social language) components of language.

Assessment 2: *Receptive and Expressive One-Word Picture Vocabulary Test, 4th Edition*

The Expressive One-Word Picture Vocabulary Test (EOWPVT-4) and Receptive One-Word Picture Vocabulary Test (ROWPVT-4) are individually administered, norm-referenced assessments of an individual's ability to name objects, actions, and concepts when presented with color illustrations and match a spoken word to an image of an object, action, or concept. On the expressive portion, illustrations of objects, actions, or concepts are presented to the examinee, who then names, with one word, what is depicted on the test plate. On the receptive portion, a word is spoken by the examiner and the examinee indicates (by pointing or verbal response) which of four illustrations matches the word. The standard scores are based on a mean of 100 and a standard deviation of 15.
Marcie's presently obtained scores are as follows:

Test	**Standard Score**	**Percentile**	**Range**
EOWPVT-4	107	68	Average

ROWPVT-4	116	86	Above average

Interpretation of ROWPVT-4 results:
Results of this test indicated that Marcie's expressive and receptive one-word vocabulary skills are in the average to above average range.

Assessment 3: *Arizona Articulation Proficiency Scale—3rd Edition (AAPS-3)*
The AAPS-3 was administered to determine Marcie's articulation abilities at the word level. It is designed to provide a useful assessment measure of articulatory proficiency in children and adults. The standard scores are based on a mean of 100 and a standard deviation of 15.

Marcie's presently obtained scores are as follows:

Standard Score	**Percentile**	**Impairment Rating**
73	4	Moderate

Marcie demonstrated the following errors during the administration of this test: substitutions of /n/ for/k/, /d/ for /g/, /n/ for /ng/, /d/ for /j/, /t/ for /sh/, /y/ for /l/, /w/ for /l/, /t/ for /k/, /w/ for /r/, /d/ for /ch/, /k/ for /ch/, /f/ for /th/, /n/ for /s/, /t/ for /s/, and /d/ for /th/. She omitted all of blend sounds in /s/, /l/, and /r/ blends. She also distorted her vocalic /r/. Results of this test indicated that Marcie's articulation abilities are in the moderately impaired range at the single word level, which is categorized by test authors as "speech is intelligible with careful listening."

Assessment 4: *Goldman Fristoe Test of Articulation, 2nd Edition* (GFTA-2)
The GFTA-2 is a systematic means of assessing an individual's articulation of the consonant sounds in standard American English. It samples both spontaneous and imitative sound production, including single words and conversational speech. The standard scores are based on a mean of 100 and a standard deviation of 15.

Marcie's presently obtained scores are as follows:

Standard Score	**Percentile**
43	<1

Marcie demonstrated the following errors during the administration of this test: substitutions of initial, medial, and final /k/, /sh/, /ch/, /l/, /r/, ,/j/, and /th/, medial /f/, /ng/, and /th/, medial and final /s/ and /z/. She substituted /w/ in almost all of her blends.

Informal Speech Sample:
An informal speech sample was obtained during the evaluation process. Marcie demonstrates a significant amount of articulation errors in conversation. These errors have a severe impact on listener comprehension. Marcie's speech in conversation was understood approximately 70% of the time by an familiar listener.

Communication Strengths:
- Marcie enjoys communicating and has a great personality
- Receptive language skills were in the average range
- Expressive language skills were in the average range

Communication Challenges:

- Articulation is significantly impaired
- Demonstrated many phonological processes
- Will get frustrated when her speech is not understood

Behavior and/or Social-Emotional

Administered by Martha Bird, School Social Worker

Assessment Tool: *The Social Skills Improvement System* is an integrated system designed to facilitate the identification and classification of prosocial and problem behaviors and to aid in the design of intervention plans. The SSIS Rating Scales provides a broad assessment of a student's social behaviors, behaviors that can affect teacher/student relations, peer acceptance, and academic performance.

This report is based on results of the Teacher Form rating.

Social Skills Scale
The Social Skills scale of the SSIS Rating Scales comprises a broad array of prosocial behaviors. Social skills are defined as socially acceptable learned behaviors used to promote positive interactions while simultaneously discouraging negative interactions. Sharing, helping, initiating relationships, and controlling one's temper are all examples of social skills that are commonly valued in society. While few children exhibit a high level of prosocial skills all the time, low scores on this scale may indicate a need for intervention.

Skill	Standard Score	Behavior Level
Social Skills	**78**	**Below Average**

Marcie's Social Skills scale standard score based on Mrs. Atencio rating is 73, with a 95% confidence interval range of 68 - 78 and a percentile rank of 4. Marcie's standard score on this scale falls in the Below Average behavior level.

The SSIS Rating Scales organize prosocial behaviors into seven areas or subscales: Communication, Cooperation, Assertion, Responsibility, Empathy, Engagement, and Self-Control. For these Social Skills subscales, the raw score is described using one of three behavior levels: Below Average, Average, and Above Average. A Below Average behavior level on any Social Skills subscale indicates that the individual may need direct instruction to improve her/his skills.

Communication
The Communication subscale includes behaviors such as: making eye contact when talking, and saying "please" and "thank you." Marcie's Communication score falls in the Average range.

Cooperation
The Cooperation subscale includes behaviors such as: following rules, and completing tasks without bothering others. Marcie's score resulted in a rating that falls within the Below Average behavior level.

Assertion
The Assertion subscale includes behaviors such as: asks for help when needed, and says when there's a problem. The Assertion rating and falls in the Below Average behavior level.

Responsibility

The Responsibility subscale includes behaviors such as: respects the property of others, and is well-behaved when unsupervised. Marcie's Responsibility score falls in the Below Average range.

Empathy
The Empathy subscale includes behaviors such as: tries to comfort others, and feels bad when others are sad. Empathy rating results fall in the Average range.

Engagement
The Engagement subscale includes behaviors such as: invites others to join in activities, makes friends easily, and introduces herself to others. Marcie's Engagement score falls in the Average range.

Self-Control
The Self-Control subscale includes behaviors such as: stays calm when teased, and uses appropriate behavior when upset. Self-Control rating falls in the Below Average behavior level.

Problem Behaviors Scale
The SSIS Rating Scales Problem Behaviors scale comprises a broad array of behaviors, some relatively mild and more commonly exhibited by youth (e.g., acts without thinking, fidgets, has difficulty waiting for a turn) and some infrequently observed and more severe (e.g., bullies others, talks back to adults, withdraws from others, performs non-functional behaviors or rituals). All of these behaviors can interfere with an individual's social skill development. While all children demonstrate some problem behaviors from time to time, a high score on this scale indicates that the child is exhibiting more problems more consistently.

Marcie's Problem Behaviors scale standard score rating is 130, with a 95% confidence interval range of 124 - 136 and a percentile rank of 95. Marcie's standard score on this scale falls in the Well Above Average behavior level.

The SSIS Rating Scales organize problem behaviors into five subscales: Externalizing, Bullying, Hyperactivity/Inattention, Internalizing, and Autism Spectrum. Scores are described using three behavior levels: Below Average, Average, and Above Average. Problem Behavior subscale scores that fall in the Above Average behavior level indicate that the individual exhibits more problem behaviors than his peers and that intervention designed to reduce such behaviors may be warranted.

Externalizing
The Externalizing subscale includes behaviors such as: disobeys rules, fights with others, and has temper tantrums. Externalizing rating falls in the Above Average range.

Bullying
The Bullying subscale includes behaviors such as: does things to make people scared, and keeps others out of social circles. Marcie's Bullying score falls in the Average range.

Hyperactivity/Inattention
The Hyperactivity/Inattention subscale includes behaviors such as: acts without thinking, has temper tantrums, and is inattentive. The Hyperactivity/Inattention rating falls in the Average range.

Internalizing
The Internalizing subscale includes behaviors such as: withdraws from others, acts sad, and has low energy. The Internalizing rating falls in the Above Average range.

Academic and Pre-Academic Achievement

Assessment Tool 1: The *Kaufman Test of Educational Achievement, Third Edition* (KTEA-3) is an individually administered assessment measure of academic achievement for grades pre-kindergarten through 12, or ages 4 through 25.

Administered by Skye Blue, Educational Diagnostician, on 4/4/18.

Assessment Tool 2: The *Woodcock-Johnson IV Tests of Achievement* is an individually administered norm-referenced test used to assess reading, mathematics, written language, and academic knowledge.

Administered by Skye Blue, Educational Diagnostician, on 4/5/18.

Cluster/Subtest	**Standard Score**	**Percentile**	**90% CI**	**Descriptive Category**
KTEA-3: Decoding	**Age (A): 81 Grade (G): 79**	**A: 10 G: 8**	**A: 78-84 G: 76-82**	**A/G: Below Average**
Letter & Word Recognition	A: 81 G: 76	A: 10 G: 5	A: 79-83 G: 73-79	A/G: Below Average
Nonsense Word Decoding	A/G: 85	A/G: 16	A: 81-89 G: 80-90	A: Average (low)
KTEA-3: Reading Fluency	**N/A**	**--**	**--**	**--**
Silent Reading Fluency	A: 77 G: 75	A: 6 G: 5	A: 63-91 G: 61-89	A/G: Below Average
Word Recognition Fluency	A: 75 G: 74	A: 5 G: 4	A: 67-83 G: 65-83	A/G: Below Average
Decoding Fluency	NA	--	--	--
KTEA-3: Reading Understanding	**A: 87 G: 79**	**A: 19 G: 8**	**A: 82-92 G: 74-84**	**A: Average (low) G: Below Average**
Reading Comprehension	A: 89 G: 80	A: 23 G: 9	A: 82-96 G: 72-88	A: Average (low) G: Below Average
Reading Vocabulary	A: 90 G: 85	A: 25 G: 16	A: 84-96 G: 79-91	A: Average G: Average (low)

KTEA-3: Decoding is intended to measure the most basic aspects of reading (i.e., letter/word recognition, decoding). Letter & Word Recognition (LWR) and Nonsense Word Decoding (NWD) comprise the index. LWR required Marcie to identify letters and pronounce regular and irregular words. Regular words are defined as those that can be read correctly by applying phonological decoding principles. Irregular words can only be read if the child is familiar with the word. When compared to others of the same age (81) and grade (76), Marcie earned below average scores. NWD prompted Marcie to read nonsense words (e.g., *vip*) by transforming printed letters and letter patterns into sounds and then integrating those sounds into a pronunciation that follows the rules of standard American English. Same-age and grade comparisons resulted in a just average (85-115) standard score of 85 (16th percentile). Taken as a whole, Marcie's decoding skills fall <u>below average</u> as shown by standard scores of 81 (age) and 79 (grade). The corresponding percentile rankings suggest that 90-92% of peers included within the norming sample showed stronger abilities.

KTEA-3: Reading Fluency typically includes three subtests, Silent Reading Fluency (SRF), Word Recognition Fluency (WRF), and Decoding Fluency (DF). However, administration of DF, which requires reading two lists of nonsense words within a specified time limit, is intended for students in grades 3-12+. As such, this subtest was not administered to Marcie and an index score not attainable. Her performance on SRF (77, 75) and WRF (75, 74) resulted in below average standard scores, when compared to same-age or grade peers. SRF measures a child's ability to read simple sentences and mark yes or no to indicate whether the statement is true or false under time constraints. Because Marcie was unable to successfully complete four practice items, the entire subtest was not administered but a raw score of zero assigned, per test instrument directions. WRF required Marcie to read a list of words in two 15-seconds trials.

KTEA-3: Reading Understanding includes Reading Comprehension (RC) and Reading Vocabulary (RV). The first subtest requires matching a word with the corresponding picture and reading simple instructions and performing the action. Then, the most challenging items require reading passages and answering comprehension questions. The second subtest requires pointing to one of three words with a similar meaning as the target word, which is followed by the more difficult task of reading a sentence and selecting the word that has a similar meaning as the identified word. Depending upon the norming group, Marcie's overall performance falls in either the below average (79, 8th percentile) or low average (87, 19th percentile) range. Similarly, RC results fall either below average (80) or low average (89). The outcome of RV reveals low average (85) to average (90) results.

Analysis of Reading Development
Strengths:

- Listening to various letter sounds and pointing to corresponding letters
- Understanding letters represent sounds
- Using clues (e.g., pictures) to help with word identification
    - This strategy appeared to be used during RC and RV, resulting in higher standard scores.

Challenges:

- Consistently…
    - recalling sounds to letters shown
        - Rather than saying */t/*, Marcie gave the letter name to T.
    - applying letter-sound knowledge to work out or decode words
        - Examples of errors: */b/* given to T*; /b/* for D
    - attending to beginning, medial and final sounds
        - Marcie read *at* as *it.*
        - She read *hen* as *hot*.
- Reading basic sight words
    - Marcie attempted to apply her knowledge of phonics to decode, for example, *be*.
        - She incorrectly identified B as */d/* and applied short e (e.g., b*e*d).
- Reading short, simple sentences

Cluster/Subtest	**Standard Score**	**Percentile**	**90% CI**	**Descriptive Category**
KTEA-3: Written Language	**Age (A): 82** **Grade (G): 72**	**A: 12** **G: 3**	**A: 77-87** **G: 67-77**	**A/G: Below Average**
Written Expression	A: 86 G: 75	A: 18 G: 5	A: 78-94 G: 67-83	A: Average (low) G: Below Average
Spelling	A: 79 G: 71	A: 8 G: 3	A: 74-84 G: 66-76	A/G: Below Average

KTEA-3: Written Language is a measurement of an individual's ability to formulate written responses to a variety of demands and spell words accurately. The cluster includes Written Expression (WE) and Spelling. WE required Marcie to write letters, copy words, write sentences from dictation, add capitalization/punctuation, complete or combine sentences, and write an essay. When compared to same-age peers, Marcie earned a low average WE score of 86 (18th percentile). Differently, a same-grade comparison resulted in a standard score of 75 (5th percentile) and below average categorization. Regardless of the comparison, the outcome of Spelling (79, 71), which required Marcie to spell words from dictation, suggests below average skill. Overall, written language composite scores fall in the below average range: The same-age comparison resulted in a standard score of 82 (12th percentile). Based on the outcome of same-grade norming participants, Marcie's written language development earned a score of 72 and 3rd percentile ranking.

Analysis of Writing Skills:
Strengths:

- Knowledge messages can be communicated through writing
- Understanding spacing is required between words
- Improved handwriting shown when copying
- Correct spelling of some basic sight words (e.g., *I, me*, *you*, *so*)

Challenges:

- Directionality
    - Marcie wrote *d* as the beginning sound of *ball*.
    - Marcie inconsistently formulated various letters. For example, at times, she wrote *a, p*, *s*, *F,* and *G* backward.
    - She wrote *Daniels* with *r* and *c* written backward.
- Applying punctuation
    - When asked to place the correct mark at the end of a sentence, Marcie wrote a backward *s* instead of a period.
- Spelling errors include...
    - vowel substitution (e.g., *pet* written as *pat; see* spelled *si*)
    - omission of *th* (/th/), *ar* (/ar/), vowel-consonant-e (e.g., *h<u>o</u>m<u>e</u>*)
    - letters transposed (e.g., *<u>st</u>op* written as *s<u>ot</u>o*; Daniels written *dan<u>ei</u>s<u>l</u>*)
- Poor spelling impacts readability
    - *What* spelled *wto*
    - *Be quiet* written as *by wii it* and *bwi it*
    - *go in i wbile*

Additional Information:

- Based on the inconsistency of Marcie's formation of various letters, she does not apply a set of rules or directions to assist her with letter writing.
- During the essay portion or retell of the story presented in Written Expression, Marcie began copying two sentences from the provided booklet rather than writing her own thoughts.

Cluster/Subtest	**Standard Score**	**Percentile**	**90% CI**	**Descriptive Category**
KTEA-3: Mathematics	**Age (A): 93 Grade (G): 86**	**A: 32 G: 18**	**A: 89-97 G: 81-91**	**A: Average G: Average (low)**
Math Concepts & Applications	A: 91 G: 86	A: 27 G: 18	A: 86-96 G: 80-92	A: Average G: Average (low)

Math Computation	A: 97 G: 91	A: 42 G: 27	A: 92-102 G: 85-97	A/G: Average
WJ-4: Math Calculation Skills	**A/G: 95**	**A: 37 G: 36**	**A: 89-101 G:89-100**	**A/G: Average**
Calculation	A/G: 95	A: 38 G: 37	A: 91-100 G: 90-99	A/G: Average
Math Facts Fluency	A: 96 G: 95	A: 40 G: 38	A: 86-107 G: 85-106	A/G: Average
WJ-4 Math Problem Solving	**A/G: 96**	**A/G: 40**	**A: 90-103 G: 90-102**	**A/G: Average**
Applied Problems	A/G: 93	A: 32 G: 33	A: 85-102 G: 86-101	A/G: Average
Number Matrices	A/G: 100	A: 51 G: 49	A: 90-111 G: 91-109	A/G: Average

KTEA-3: Math Composite includes Math Concepts & Applications (MCA) and Math Computation (MC). The first subtest measured Marcie's ability to apply math concepts to solve problems. She showed low average to average skill in this area, earning MCA standard scores of 86 (grade) 91 (age). The second subtest assessed Marcie's knowledge and application of basic math operations. When compared to same-age (97) and grade (91) peers, Marcie earned average scores. With age comparison subtest scores of 91 and 97, the math composite resulted in standard score of 93 (32nd percentile), which falls in the average range. When compared to grade 1.3 participants, Marcie's math skills (86, 18th percentile) are defined as low average.

Because the KTEA-3 does not provide separate cluster scores for math calculation skills and math problem solving, the WJ-4 was administered.

WJ-4 Math Calculation Skills is a cluster intended to measure computational skills and automaticity with basic math facts. Marcie's total standard score of 95 (age/grade) falls in the average and is representative of her performance on the core tasks included in the cluster. She earned average scores solving a variety of calculations (Calculation, 95) and recalling basic facts under a time constraint (Math Facts Fluency: 96, 95). Thus, Marcie's math calculation skills are estimated as equal to or greater than 37% (grade) or 36% (age) of her peers.

Math Problem Solving measures mathematical knowledge and reasoning through two subtests, Applied Problems (AP) and Number Matrices (NM). Marcie's performance on these tasks is similar. She displayed average skill analyzing and solving practical math problems, earning an AP score of 93 (32nd or 33rd percentile). Then, she earned a standard score of 100 (49th or 51st percentile) looking at a matrix of numbers, figuring out the pattern, and then providing the missing number. Thus, her math problem solving skills are defined as average (96, 40th percentile), when compared to either same-age or grade peers.

Analysis of Mathematics Knowledge and Application
Strengths:

- Applying one-to-one correspondence (e.g., * * = 2)
- Orally providing the missing number in simple patterns (e.g., 13, 14, 15, ___)
- Naming teen numbers (e.g., What number is this [15]?)
- Using picture clues to complete a partially written number sentence (2+ __=__)

- Solving most basic story problems presented with and w/out visual support (e.g., There were six puppies. Two went off to play. How many stayed behind?)

Challenges:
- Identifying the number before a specified number (e.g., What number comes just before 33?)
- Placing double-digit numbers in sequential order (e.g., 45, 62, 78, 83)
- Looking at an analog clock and telling time to the hour/half hour
- Writing specified two-digit numbers
    - When asked to write *15*, Marcie wrote *27*.
- Consistently adding/subtracting basic facts
    - Though Marcie correctly solved 1-0=1 when completing Math Computation, she answered 0 when solving the problem presented during Calculation.
    - Though Marcie correctly solved 18 Math Facts Fluency problems within a 3-minute period, she incorrectly answered 21 problems (e.g., 5-4=0; 8-1=0).

Additional Information:
- Marcie wrote several numbers backward (e.g., 6, 5, 7, 4)
- At times, she manipulated her fingers to help solve problems.

Cognitive Abilities

Assessment Tool: *Kaufman Assessment Battery for Children, Second Edition* (KABC-II)
The KABC-II is an individually administered measure of the processing and cognitive abilities of children and adolescents ages 3 through 18.

Administered by Skye Blue, Educational Diagnostician, on 4/7/18.

Scale/Subtest	**Standard Score**	**Subtest Score**	**Percentile**	**90% CI**	**Descriptive Category**
Intelligence: Fluid-Crystallized Index	**90**		**25**	**86-94**	**Average**
Cognitive Processing: Learning	**89**		**23**	**82-96**	**Average (low)**
Atlantis		10	50		Average
Rebus		6	9		Below Average
Knowledge	**96**		**39**	**88-104**	**Average**
Expressive Vocabulary		10	50		Average
Riddles		8	25		Average
Sequential	**80**		**9**	**74-88**	**Below Average**
Number Recall		6	9		Below Average
Word Order		7	16		Average (low)
Simultaneous	**101**		**53**	**95-107**	**Average**
Conceptual Thinking		11	63		Average

Rover		9	37		Average
Triangles		9	37		Average
Pattern Reasoning		12	75		Average

Intelligence:

The Fluid Crystallized Index (FCI) is a measure of an individual's general cognitive ability. The index reflects the functioning of attention and concentration, processing, coding and storing of incoming information. Marcie earned a FCI score of 90, which identifies her global intellectual functioning as average and equal to or greater 25% of same-age peers. The 90% confidence interval suggests that her true score most likely falls within the range of 86 to 94.

Cognitive Processing:

Learning is defined as the ability to store information in long-term memory and retrieve that information fluently and efficiently. Marcie earned a standard score of 89 (23rd percentile), which is defined as low average (90% CI: 82-96). With that said, her performance on the subtests included in the standard score revealed discrepant abilities. That is, she showed average skill observing a picture while listening to the examiner give the item a nonsense name and then pointing to the correct picture when the name was again presented. Her Atlantis scaled score of 10 is estimated as equal to or greater than 50% of same-age peers. Differently, she showed below average skill learning a word or concept associated with particular drawings and then reading a phrase or sentence composed of the drawings. Her Rebus (6) score suggests that 91% of same-age norming participants showed stronger skill.

Knowledge measures the breadth and depth of knowledge acquired from one's culture. Marcie earned a standard score of 96, which falls within the average range and is ranked at the 39th percentile (90% CI: 88-104). This score is representative of her performance on the two subtests comprising the construct: Expressive Vocabulary required Marcie to look at pictures and provide the verbal label. She earned an average scaled score of 10 (50th percentile). Her average Riddles (8) score suggests that her ability to listen to several characteristics of a verbal concept and then name the concept is equal to or greater than 25% of same-age peers.

Sequential is identified as the ability to apprehend and hold information in immediate awareness briefly and then use that information within a few seconds. The index is composed of two subtests, Number Recall (NR) and Word Order (WO). NR required Marcie to repeat orally presented number sequences. She earned a below average scaled score of 6 (9th percentile). She demonstrated low average skill touching a series of pictures in the same sequence as named by the examiner as shown by his WO scaled score of 7 (16th percentile). Thus, overall, Marcie earned a sequential index standard score of 80, which is ranked at the 9th percentile and falls below average (90% CI: 74-88).

Examples of Academic Tasks Impacted by Poor Working Memory:

- Trouble following directions
- Easily distracted or attentional issues
- Hesitant to answer questions presented to the whole group
- Difficulty solving mental math problems
- Difficulty getting started on tasks

Simultaneous (Visual Processing)
The construct of simultaneous processing is measured by Conceptual Thinking (CT), Rover, Triangles, and Pattern Reasoning (PR). These subtests provide insight into an individual's ability to perceive, store, manipulate, and think with visual patterns. Marcie was presented with problems that included visual

stimuli (often complex) and required some type of spatial manipulation and nonverbal reasoning to solve correctly. Her index standard score of 101 (53rd percentile, 90% CI: 95-107) indicates average visual processing and is representative of his subtest scores:

- Her ability to point to the picture that does not go with the others around it (CT, 11) is estimated as equal to or greater than 63 out of 100 same-age peers.
- Marcie earned scaled scores of 9 (37th percentile) moving a toy dog on a grid with obstacles to find the quickest path to the bone (Rover) and assembling several foam triangles to match a picture (Triangles).
- Of all subtests administered, Marcie's strongest scaled score of 12 (75th percentile) was a result of her success determining the design needed to complete a series.

Other Cognitive Abilities

Assessment Tool 1: The *Kaufman Test of Educational Achievement, Third Edition* (KTEA-3) is an individually administered assessment measure of academic achievement for grades pre-kindergarten through 12, or ages 4 through 25.

Administered by Skye Blue, Educational Diagnostician, on 4/7/18.

Composite/Subtest	Standard Score	Percentile	90% CI	Descriptive Category
Phonological Processing	**Age (A): 74 Grade (G): 68**	**A: 4 G: 2**	**A: 69-79 G: 62-74**	**A: Below Average G: Low**
Orthographic Processing	**A/G: NA**	**--**	**--**	**--**
Spelling	A: 79 G: 71	A: 8 G: 3	A: 74-84 G: 66-76	A/G: Below Average
Letter Naming Facility	A/G: NA	--	--	--
Word Recognition Fluency	A: 75 G: 74	A: 5 G: 4	A: 67-83 G: 65-83	A/G: Below Average

Phonological Processing measures the ability to manipulate the sounds within a word. Of the five phonological processing tasks, Marcie demonstrated the most success blending sounds. This task required her to listen to sounds provided by the examiner (e.g., */s/ /a/ /t/)* and then put the sounds together to make a word (e.g., *sa*t). She correctly responded to 8 out of 10 items. Segmenting, sound matching, and deleting sounds resulted in a few correct responses. Segmenting tasks include those such as answering, "What sounds do you hear in the word *pot*?" (*/p/ /o/ /t/*). Sound Matching required Marcie to identify, for example, "Which word begins with the same sound as *pig*?" (*bed*, *sand*,). Deleting sounds prompted Marcie to identify, for instance, the word that would be left (e.g., *at*) if the */b/* sound were taken away from *bat*? The area of greatest difficulty was rhyming. Though Marcie accurately responded to the example item, which required her to look at pictures while listening to the examiner identify the name of each object (e.g., *hog, hill, dog*) and then point to or name the one item that does not rhyme (e.g., *hill*), she incorrectly answered the next three rhyming tasks. Whether comparing Marcie's phonological processing to same-age (74, 4th percentile) or same-grade (68, 2nd percentile) peers, results suggest that this area is challenging as shown by categorizations of below average or low.

Academic Implications:
A weakness in phonological processing may result in literacy learning difficulties such as difficulty decoding words.

Orthographic Processing is defined as an individual's awareness of how print works and how it looks --- the visual representation of language (i.e., letters and letter patterns that are used to represent the word in print). The index is comprised of Spelling, which measured Marcie's ability to spell words from dictation; Letter Naming Facility (LNF), an assessment of the ability to name a combination of letters as quickly as possible; and Word Recognition Fluency (WRF), measuring one's skill reading a list of words as quickly as possible during 15-second trials. Because Marcie was unable to identify the letters presented within the LNF practice items, the subtest and subsequent Orthographic Processing cluster score were unattainable. Difficulty was shown identifying S as its name (S) rather than its corresponding sound (/s/). And, Marcie named D as B. Results of Spelling (79, 71) and WRF (75, 74) fall below average, based on age and grade comparisons.

Assessment Tool 2: The *Comprehensive Test of Phonological Processing, 2nd Edition* (CTOPP-2) is a norm-referenced test that measures three phonological processing abilities involved in learning to read and write: phonological awareness, phonological memory, and rapid naming. It is appropriate for use with individuals between the ages of 4-0 and 24-11.

Administered by Skye Blue, Educational Diagnostician, on 3/7/18.

Composite/Subtest	Standard Score	Scaled Score	Percentile	SEM	Descriptive Category
Phonological Memory	**73**		**3**	**67-79**	**Below Average**
Memory for Digits		4	2		Below Average
Nonword Repetition		7	16		Average (low)
Rapid Symbolic Naming	**NA**	**--**	**--**	**--**	**--**
Rapid Digit Naming		8	25		Average
Rapid Letter Naming		NA	--	--	--
Rapid Non-Symbolic Naming	**NA**	**--**	**--**	**--**	**--**
Rapid Color Naming		NA	--	--	--
Rapid Object Naming		8	25		Average

Phonological Memory is defined as the ability to code information phonologically for temporary storage in working or short-term memory. The index includes Memory for Digits (MD) and Nonword Repetition (NR). MD required Marcie to recall strings of numbers. She earned a below average scaled score of 4, which is ranked at the 2nd percentile. Her ability to repeat made-up words (e.g., *mibgus*) resulted in a low average score of 7 and 16th percentile ranking. Overall, Marcie earned a phonological memory standard score of 73 (3rd percentile), which falls within the below average range.

Academic Implications:

- Students with poor phonological memory may experience difficulty decoding words that are not within their speaking vocabulary. For example, a student may have difficulty remembering the sounds spoken at the beginning of the word as they attend to the ending sounds.
- Comprehension may be compromised if the words within a sentence are not recalled in the appropriate sequence (e.g., "The cat chased the mouse" differs from "the mouse chased the cat.")

- A deficit in this cognitive processing area can impact an individual's listening comprehension for complex sentences and ability to learn new oral vocabulary.

Rapid Symbolic Naming is a measurement of the ability to retrieve phonological information from long-term memory and execute a sequence of operations quickly and repeatedly. The cluster includes the core tasks of Rapid Digit Naming and Rapid Letter Naming (RLN). Similar to KTEA-3 Letter Naming Facility (LNF), RLN was administered to determine Marcie's ability to quickly name letters. However, the subtest was not completed in its entirety as she again named S as /s/, during the practice items. In addition, Marcie switched from naming the letters to giving the sound (e.g., K: /k/). Thus, a subtest score and subsequent cluster score could not be calculated. Marcie was able to complete Rapid Digit Naming, earning an average scaled score of 8, indicating that her ability to rapidly recall digits is equal to or greater than 25 out of 100 same-age peers.

Because Rapid Letter Naming was not completed, the Non-Rapid Symbolic Naming subtests or portions of the subtests were administered in an attempt to gather a rapid naming cluster standard score. However, during the Rapid Color Naming sample items, Marcie identified yellow as green. Thus, subtest administration was discontinued. She successfully responded to Rapid Object Naming practice items and showed average skill naming a series of objects as shown by a score of 8 (25th percentile).

SECTION IX

INTEGRATION AND TRIANGULATION OF ASSESSMENT INFORMATION

In general, similarities are evident amongst all data sources. For example, observations and standardized test results identify articulation as an area in need of intervention as mispronunciations have a significant impact on listener comprehension. Social skills assessment results reveal strength in areas such as empathy but challenges with self-control. These are consistent with the classroom teacher's report of a kind, loving child experiencing difficulty when experiencing frustration.

Differences are shown between standardized assessment listening comprehension (i.e., average to above average standard scores) results and the classroom teacher's observation (i.e., difficulty listening to stories and comprehending the meaning and details of those stories). With the OWL-2 and ROWVPT-4 assessment format in mind, Marcie seems to respond with a higher degree of success when when comprehension questions were accompanied by visual cues.

SECTION X

DETERMINANT FACTOR ANALYSIS

When determining if a child has a disability according to IDEA and NMAC, EDTs must consider what factor(s) are the **primary** reason for the child's educational difficulties. Some of the possible reasons for educational difficulties may include limited English proficiency, lack of appropriate instruction, and/or the presence of a disability. To be determined to be eligible for special education and related services, a child's educational difficulties must be **primarily** the result of a disability, even though other factors may be present and contributing to the difficulties.

Though family challenges such incarceration and limited parental involvement may contribute to Marcie's daily performance, the data within this evaluation suggest other factors (e.g., cognitive processing) may be considered the primary cause of her present academic difficulties.

SECTION XI

ELIGIBILITY CATEGORIES OF DISABILITY CONSIDERED BY THE ELIGIBILITY DETERMINATION TEAM

NOTE: The Eligibility Determination Team (a group of qualified professionals and the parent of the child) must determine whether the child is eligible for and in need of special education and related services. This involves the team answering two questions: (1) does the child have a disability, as defined by IDEA and NMAC and (2) as a result of that disability, does the child require specially designed instruction. It is important to recognize that this second question is only addressed if the EDT determines that the child has a disability.

In order to answer the first question: "Does the child have a disability, as defined by IDEA and NMAC," the EDT is considering the eligibility criteria under one or more eligibility categories of disability. These criteria are outlined in NM TEAM and include data from a variety of sources, including formal assessments (e.g., test scores), informal assessments (e.g., work samples), observations, interviews, and more. EDTs must look at all of those different sources of information to come to an eligibility determination decision and can't rely solely on one source of information. For example, even if one of the eligibility category criteria indicate a specific test score, the EDT must recognize that those test scores are simply one piece of information and cannot be used as "gatekeepers" for eligibility determination decisions (see NM TEAM, 2017, pg. 22).

For each category under consideration, the following information is provided below: (1) the definition of the eligibility category, (2) a description of the criteria relevant to that category, and (3) interpretation of the evaluation data with supporting documentation and data examples.

It is important to recognize that this report provides information to inform eligibility determination decisions, but the EDT (which includes a group of qualified professionals and the parent of the child) makes and documents the final determination of eligibility for special education and related services.

The particular eligibility categories being considered in Marcie's case are as follows:

1) Specific Learning Disability

Specific Learning Disability is defined as a disorder in one or more of the basic psychological processes involved in the understanding or in using language, spoken or written, which may manifest itself in an inability to think, speak, read, write, spell, or to perform mathematical calculations. This disability includes such conditions as perceptual disabilities, brain injury, minimal brain dysfunction, dyslexia, and developmental aphasia. Specific Learning Disabled does not include children who have learning problems which are primarily the result of visual, hearing, or motor disabilities, of intellectual disability, of emotional disturbance, or of environmental, cultural, or economic disadvantage.

SLD is a disability rooted in a neurological processing deficit (e.g., auditory processing, memory, processing speed, phonological processing, visual/perceptual processing, etc.) and results in significant academic underachievement following sustained, high-quality, scientific, research based instruction and intervention. SLD may be manifested in the following areas:

- Basic reading skills
- Reading fluency skills
- Reading comprehension skills
- Written expression
- Mathematics calculation
- Mathematics problem solving
- Oral expression
- Listening comprehension

Eligibility Determination Criteria:
Dual Discrepancy Model: Required for grades K through 3

Factor 1: The child does not achieve adequately for age or to meet grade level standards.
Using multiple data sources, does the child demonstrate a pattern of performance that indicates she does not achieve adequately for her age or has not met State-approved grade-level standards (a) consistent with at least one of the specified SLD areas and (b) documented by data such as:

1a: 1.5 standard deviation difference between the child's achievement scores and that of her same age or grade peers; and/or

1b: percentile ranks at or below the 6th percentile (e.g., DIBELS and other curriculum based measures -- CBMs, short-cycle assessments, standard based assessments, etc.)

SLD Area	**1.5 SD**	**Percentile Ranking: Age**	**Percentile Ranking: Grade**	**Criteria Met?**
Reading *Istation:* Overall Reading	N/A	N/A	21st percentile	No
Basic Reading Skills *Istation:* Alphabetic Decoding KTEA-3: Decoding		N/A 10th SEM +/-1.97 = 79 or 8th percentile	24th %ile 8th w/ SEM 76 or 5th percentile	No No, Yes
Reading Fluency *Istation:* Text Fluency KTEA-3: Reading Fluency Subtests		N/A 6th, 5th percentile	N/A 5th, 4th percentile	N/A Yes, Yes
Reading Comprehension *Isation:* Comprehension		N/A	7th %ile	Yes (-1 = 6th %ile)
KTEA-3: Reading Understanding		19th percentile	8th w/ SEM (+/- 3.43) 75 or 5th %ile	No, Yes
Written Expression KTEA-3: Written Language	N/A	12th percentile	3rd percentile	No, Yes
Mathematics KTEA-3: Math Composite	N/A	32nd percentile	18th percentile	No
Math Calculation Skills WJ-4:		37th %ile	36th %ile	No
Math Problem Solving WJ-4:		40th percentile	40th percentile	No

N/A: Data unavailable

Factor 1a Results: At the present time, data required to determine whether Factor 1a is met are not available.

Factor 1b Results: Considering percentile rankings and standard error of measurement related to age and grade comparisons, Marcie does not achieve adequately for her age or grade in the area of ***reading fluency***. That is, each of Marcie's reading fluency assessment results include performance at or below

the 6th percentile, *meeting* Factor 1 criteria. Because measurements of basic reading skills, reading comprehension, and written expression do not consistently fall below the 6th percentile, criteria in these areas do not appear to be met. In regard to mathematics, Marcie's percentile rankings do not meet criteria.

Factor 2: The child does not make sufficient progress and/or has a pattern of strengths and weaknesses.

2a: The child's frequent (at least bi-weekly, but ideally weekly or semi-weekly) progress-monitoring assessment data demonstrate a difference of 1.5 standard deviations or more between her progress monitoring growth and that of the rate of improvement of same grade peers; and/or

2b: The child demonstrates a highly consistent pattern of strengths and weaknesses (in performance, achievement, and/or cognitive abilities relative to age or State-approved grade level standards) as evidenced by the triangulation of multiple data points from a variety of sources using the process outlined in the NM TEAM (2017)

Area	***Strength (S), Weakness (W), or Neither (N)**
Progress Monitoring:	Data unavailable
School Administered Screenings/Assessments: Reading: *Istation* Writing: Math:	 (W) Below expectation = intensive intervention required Data unavailable Data unavailable
Norm-referenced tests: Intelligence: KABC-2: FCI Cognitive Processing Examples: KABC-2: Simultaneous KTEA-3: Phonological Processing Reading KTEA-3: Decoding KTEA-3: Reading Fluency KTEA-3: Reading Understanding Written Language KTEA-3: Written Language Math KTEA-3: Math WJ-4: Math Calculation Skills WJ-4: Math Problem Solving	 (N) 25th percentile (N) 53rd percentile (W) 4th percentile (W) 5th-8th percentile (W) 4th, 5th percentile (W) 5th-8th percentile (W) 3rd percentile (N) 18th percentile (N) 36th percentile (N) 40th percentile
Curriculum Assessments: Language Arts *Reading* *Spelling* Math	 (N) 76% *(S) 82%* *(N) 78% (modified list)* (S) 81%

Grades: Reading Language Arts Math Homework	 (N) 79% (N) 79% (S) 84% (W) 56%
Teacher Report:	(W) Marcie is significantly behind her same-grade peers in all academic areas. (N) With that said, Mrs. Atencio describes math as Marcie's strongest academic area.
Observations: Academic and Functional	(S) When given the opportunity to use manipulatives, Marcie is often successful completing math problems, as observed by Ms. Oz. (W) During the administration of norm-referenced tests, Marcie showed great difficulty identifying words. (W) Per Mrs. Atencio, because Marcie does not know her letter well enough, writing sentences is difficult. (W) Mr. Daniels identifies his daughter as behind in reading, writing, and mathematics. (S) Marcie responds well to support from adults. (W) When required to work independently, Marcie often becomes frustrated.
Cumulative Record Review	(W) Per Marcie's end-of-year kindergarten report card, several literacy and math concepts/skills had not yet been mastered. And,she continues to demonstrate difficulty with some of those skills.

**Strength, Weakness criteria described on page 243 of NM TEAM.*

Factor 2a Results: At the present time, data required to determine whether Factor 2a is met are not available.

Factor 2b Results: Marcie's *Istation* report indicates that she is performing as a kindergarten student who took the test in March, suggesting that intensive intervention is needed. Then, based on norm-referenced assessment results, Marcie's word identification and fluency skills fall below average when compared to same-age and grade peers. This information is consistent with parent and teacher report as well as historical documentation reported within Marcie's cumulative file. At the present time, in regard to mathematics, data are inconsistent. For example, though Marcie may not be demonstrating grade-appropriate skills on a daily basis within the classroom, her father describes Marcie as behind. Based on Marcie's current profile, the Eligibility Determination Team (EDT) may consider *Factor 2 criteria as met*, due to the consistent pattern of weakness shown in Marcie's reading development along with identification of strengths and average (neither) functioning.

Consideration of Dyslexia:
The state of New Mexico defines dyslexia as "a condition of neurological origin that is characterized by difficulty with accurate or fluent word recognition and by poor spelling and decoding abilities, which characteristics typically result from a deficit in the phonological component of language that is often unexpected in relation to other cognitive abilities and the provision of effective classroom instruction and may result in problems in reading comprehension and reduced reading experience that may impede the growth of vocabulary and background knowledge."

Dyslexic Profile:
Based on Marcie's demonstration of the following characteristics, she may be considered a student with dyslexia:

Birth through Preschool

- Late learning to talk
    - Mr. Daniels described Marcie as speaking her first words and sentences later than expected.
- Difficulty pronouncing words
    - As shown by a recent speech evaluation, articulation remains problematic.
- Difficulty learning names of colors or common objects
    - During the sample items of Rapid Color Naming, Marcie misidentified yellow as green.

Kindergarten and Into 1st Grade

Literacy:

- Difficulty remembering letter names and/or letter shapes
    - Per Marcie's kindergarten report card, at the end of the year, recognizing all lowercase/uppercase letters remained below expectation.
- Difficulty learning letter sounds
    - The kindergarten teacher reported confusion shown between letter names and letter sounds. This challenge remains, per various observations.
- Difficulty spelling last name
    - At the present time, Marcie shows inconsistency writing *Daniels* (e.g., *daneisl*).
- Difficulty hearing and manipulating sounds in words
    - Marcie's kindergarten teacher identified rhyming as a skill not yet meeting expectations. And, current KTEA-3 results reveal continued challenges in this area, as well as others (e.g., sound matching)
- Difficulty identifying basic sight words
    - Marcie's kindergarten report card identified reading common high frequency words as falling below expectation. During current assessment administration, she attempted to decode some high frequency words (e.g., *be*, *have*).
- Reversing letters (e.g., *b/d*; *b-p*; *m/w*; *n/u*) or the order of letters when reading
    - Marcie shows significant difficulty identifying *b* and *d* and applying the corresponding sound.
- Slow, labored, inaccurate reading of single words in isolation (when there is no story line or picture to provide clues)
    - Marcie's KTEA-3 reading fluency subtest scores fall below average, when compared to others of the same-age or grade. Word identification improved when a picture accompanied the reading task, as shown by Marcie's KTEA-3 Reading understanding scores.
- Makes frequent errors
    - Some mistakes reported during KTEA-3 reading activities include reading *at* as *it* and *hen* as *hot*.
- Many spelling mistakes (e.g., reversals, transposition)
    - Marcie's KTEA-3 written responses include many misspelled words, making it difficult to read his message.

Mathematics:

- Many calculation errors/ difficulty memorizing math facts
    - Though Marcie earned average computation scores, analysis of her responses shows many errors.
- Reversing numbers
    - Marcie continues to write numbers backward (e.g., 5, 9, 6).

Fine/Gross Motor Skills:

- Difficulty forming letters correctly (e.g., forms letters with unusual beginning and/or ending points).

- Marcie writes several letters backward and is inconsistent applying a start point to various letters.

Social and Self-Awareness:
- Per Mrs. Atencio report, Marcie lacks self-confidence.

Significant Strengths:
- Marcie is described by many adults as kind and loving.

Eligibility Recommendation: Based on all data, Marcie appears to be a student meeting specific learning disability criteria (reading fluency) with dyslexia the underlying cause of her literacy challenges.

2) Speech and Language Impairment
A speech or language impairment means a communication disorder, such as stuttering, impaired articulation, a language impairment, or a voice impairment that adversely affects a child's educational performance. (34 CFR Sec. 300.8(c)(11))

Eligibility Recommendation: Current data suggest Marcie may be eligible as a student with speech and language impairment: articulation.

Section XII

EDUCATIONAL NEEDS AND PRESENT LEVELS OF ACADEMIC ACHIEVEMENT AND RELATED DEVELOPMENTAL NEEDS

Based on this comprehensive, multidisciplinary evaluation, the Eligibility Determination Team has identified the following areas of educational need, including both academic and functional performance:

Child's Areas of Strength	Child's Areas of Need
● Kindness ● Understanding letters represent sounds ● Knowledge messages can be communicated through writing ● Following along during math lessons ● Adding/subtracting basic facts ● Use of math manipulatives ● Line adherence and spacing between letters ● Expressive language skills	● Self confidence ● Sustaining effort when frustrated ● Consistently recalling letter sounds ● Reading fluently ● Letter formation ● Spelling ● Writing sentences (e.g., dictated, generating ideas) ● Articulation

RECOMMENDATIONS

Cognitive Processing
- *Ready, Set, Remember: Short-Term Auditory Memory Activities* recommends the following:
  - Use short, simple sentences in logical ordering, using pauses to allow processing time.
  - Include visual supports during instruction.
  - Use comprehension checks to determine if key instructions have been understood.
  - If repetition of directions, instructions, etc., is requested, give them *shorter* and *slower*.
  - Consider that increased anxiety, diminishes listening ability.

Academic Achievement
Reading
In general, ...

- provide Marcie with explicit, intense, and specifically focused reading lessons (e.g., *Orton-Gillingham*).
- do not require Marcie to read aloud to the entire class.
- use progress charts or visuals that show Marcie's gains. Construct the charts or visuals in such a way that small gains reveal progress.

Phonological Awareness

- Provide opportunities to practice sound matching, segmenting, rhyming, and deleting. For example, …
    - the following segmenting activity (refer to Yopp, M., 1992) is presented to the tune of "*If You're Happy and You Know It, Clap Your Hands*."
        - Encourage Marcie to choose a picture card (e.g., *cat, sun, bell, book, plane*). Then, together sing…
            - If you think you know this word, shout it out!
            - If you think you know this word, shout it out!
            - If you think you know this word,
            - Then tell me what you've heard,
            - If you think you know this word, shout it out!
        - After singing, Marcie says the segmented word such as /k/ /a/ /t/ and the others students provide the blended word *cat*.
    - While reading a book such as *Llama Llama Red Pajama*, encourage Marcie to identify the rhyming words. In addition, ask her to add another word to the two identified within the text.
    - Encourage Marcie to draw a picture of a rhyming sentence such as "Dad is glad," or "A frog sat on the log." Talk about the rhyming words and how they sound alike. Have her think of other words that rhyme and make up her own sentence using new rhyming words.

Letter/Word Identification

- Use manipulatives to help teach letter/sound relationships. These can include counters, sound boxes, and magnetic letters.
- Use reading material with pictures and predictable reading in order to help Marcie master word attack skills.
- Use chants or songs to enhance spelling and recognition of basic sight words.
- To minimize reversals, provide Marcie with cue cards to keep at her desk. For example, a picture of a bat and ball represents *b*; a drum and drumstick show *d*.

Fluency

- Provide short, frequent periods of fluency practice. For example, have Marcie read phrases and/or passages 3 or 4 times.
- Provide Marcie with reading material at her independent reading level.

Letter Formation

- Keep in mind, according to research, letter practice that involves tactile (touch) and proprioceptive (muscle resistance, vibration) sensory input allows the brain to process and remember the motor patterns based on information directly from the skin and muscles. This is especially important for children with dyslexia, since they typically struggle with auditory and/or visual processing and really benefit from hands on, whole body learning when it comes to letters and language.

        - Allow opportunities to engage in multisensory writing (e.g., salt tray writing, shaving cream, finger paint, etc.)
- When Marcie experiences difficulty writing a simple word (e.g., *sat*), after she has identified the letter making a specific sound (e.g., */s/: s*), provide her with 2-3 letters to choose from with the correct letter (e.g., *s*) included. Once Marcie has pointed to the correct letter, encourage her to copy/write the letter.
- Continue to provide Marcie with an alphabet strip for visual support and/or individual letters with reminders of the starting point for correct letter formation.

Directionality

- Incorporate activities to promote awareness of left and right.
    - Sing and dance to "The Hokey Pokey" to practice left and right. For children who are having a difficult time, tie a ribbon around their right wrists and right legs to aid in choosing the correct side to "put it in and shake it all about."
    - Organize a scavenger hunt and have every clue include directional words. You can have Marcie hunt for items in the classroom or outside. Use clues such as, “walk to your right to find these little things that have fallen from the tree.”
    - Teach and reinforce print conventions through discussing print directionality (print is written and read from left to right).
    - At the present time, encourage Marcie to use her finger to sweep from left to right when reading or after she has written a single word or line of text.

Mathematics

- Provide Marcie with additional practice…
    - writing numbers
    - sequencing double-digit numbers
    - naming numbers before and after assigned numbers
    - telling time to the hour
    - solving basic facts
- Read story problems aloud to Marcie.
- Provide Marcie with manipulatives and visual supports (e.g., pictures, number lines).
- Encourage Marcie to use a number strip as a reference for correct number formation.
- Teach Marcie letter formation rhymes/songs to be repeated when writing numbers.

Fine Motor

- Promote writing skills through an educational curriculum such as (Ex, Handwriting Without Tears.) that contains numerous strategies for writing, (starting points. Reversals, letter formation etc.)
- Make sure Marcie has adequate space for writing on worksheets and they are not visually overstimulating.
- Try various style writing paper to see which one Marcie performs the most consistently on while writing.
- Decrease the number of repetitions and promote good proper formation of letters and then identify the best ones circling to reinforce visually and motor memory.
- Try a padded surface such as a spiral or notepad to give kinesthetic writing feedback.
- Consider a slanted work surface to increase proper positioning which increases wrist extension and distal control while writing
- Try various medium point pens with various grips to give writing feedback.
- Also consider trying the opposite a mechanical pencil to decrease writing pressure and increase the flow of writing.
- Use highlighting to help with spacing and sizing of letters, numbers, and words. Teach Marcie to do this for herself.

- Sit Marcie square to the board when copying from the board to alleviate any additional steps while writing and copying from the board.
- Play games that teach spatial awareness and body awareness such (Ex. top to bottom and left to right) to establish good motor patterns for reading and writing.

Speech

- Model correct speech when errors are made and ask student to repeat the word correctly each time there is an error to promote new muscle memory.
- Provide feedback for correct speech sounds (bring your tongue to your teeth, lip back).
- Provide opportunities for verbal presentation or speaking and encourage correct production of sounds.
- When possible, allow usage of verbal and visual cues/prompts in all tasks.

Sociological

- Use positive reinforcement to maintain the desired social behaviors.
- Utilize Marcie as a model within the classroom when appropriate behavior is being displayed.
- Using behavior techniques would help Marcie practice and perform the desired social behaviors.
- Use behavior techniques to reduce interfering behavior.

EVALUATION TEAM SIGNATURES

_____
Speech Language Pathologist

_____
Occupational Therapist

_____
School Social Worker

_____
Educational Diagnostician

_____
General Education Teacher