School Logo and Address

Name of Examiner
Phone of Examiner
Email of Examiner

PSYCHOEDUCATIONAL EVALUATION

Confidential

Name: Student	**Date of Birth: January 10, 1996**
Date of Testing: 10--2009	**Chronological Age: 13.9 years**
Examiner:	**Sex: Female**
Grade: 7	**School:**

WISC IV SCORES SUMMARY

WISC-IV COMPOSITE	Composite Score	Percentile Rank	95% Confidence Interval	Qualitative Description
Verbal Comprehension	121	92	113-127	Superior
Perceptual Reasoning	127	96	117-132	Superior
Working Memory	99	47	91-107	Average
Processing Speed	103	58	94-112	Average
Full Scale (FSIQ)	119	90	113-123	High Average
General Abilities Score (GAS)	128	97	121-133	Superior

Verbal Comprehension Subtest Scores Summary		**Perceptual Reasoning Subtest Scores Summary**	
Subtests	Scaled Score	Subtests	Scaled Score
Similarities	15	Block Design	12
Vocabulary	10	Picture Concepts	16
Comprehension	16	Matrix Reasoning	15
(Information)		(Picture Completion)	
(Word Reasoning)			

Working Memory Scores Summary		**Processing Speed Subtest Scores Summary**	
Subtests	Scaled Score	Subtests	Scaled Score
Digit Span	7	Coding	9
Letter-Number Sequencing	13	Symbol Search	12
(Arithmetic)		(Cancellation)	

PIAT-R SCORES SUMMARY

Subtest	**Standard Score**	**95% Confidence Intervals**	**Percentile Rank**	**Qualitative Description**
General Information	114	108-120	82	High Average
Reading Recognition	102	96-108	55	Average
Reading Comprehension	92	85-99	30	Average
Total Reading	96	91-101	39	Average

Mathematics	114	108-120	82	High Average
Spelling	80	72-88	9	Low Average
Total Test	100	90-110	50	Average

WRMT-R/NU Form G SCORES SUMMARY

Subtest	Standard Score	90% Confidence Intervals	Percentile Rank	Qualitative Description
Visual-Auditory Learning	60	56-65	<1	Extremely Low
Letter-identification	79	70-88	20	Well Below Average
Word Identification	92	88-95	38	Average
Word Attack	105	98-113	57	Average
Word Comprehension	95	90-100	43	Average
Passage Comprehension	93	88-98	40	Average
Cluster				
Readiness	73	68-78	10	Well Below Average
Basic Skills	97	94-99	45	Average
Reading Comprehension	93	91-96	41	Average
Total Reading -FS	95	93-97	43	Average

CTOPP SCORES SUMMARY

Composite	Standard Score	Percentile Rank	Qualitative Description
Phonological Awareness	80	9	Below Average
Phonological Memory	91	27	Average
Rapid Naming	73	3	Well Below Average

Gray Oral Reading Tests-4th Ed. Form A SCORES SUMMARY

Subtest	GORT-4 Quotients	Standard Score	Percentile Rank	Qualitative Description
Rate		5	5	Extremely Low
Accuracy		6	9	Extremely Low
Fluency		3	1	Extremely Low
Comprehension		8	25	Average
Oral Reading Quotient	73			Well Below Average

ORAL AND WRITTEN LANGUAGE SCALES SCORES SUMMARY

Subtest	Standard Score	Confidence Interval	Percentile Rank	Qualitative Description
Listening Comprehension	106	95-117	66	Average

TOWL-3 SCORES SUMMARY

Subtest	Quotient	Standard Scores	Percentile Rank	Qualitative Description
Contextual Conventions		9	37	Average
Contextual Language		8	25	Average

Story Construction		7	16	Low Average
Spontaneous Writing	87		19	Low Average

EVALUATION PROCEDURES:

Student's primary language, racial, and ethnic background were considered prior to selection and interpretation of evaluation procedures and measures. All assessment procedures measure a limited sample of a person's total repertoire. The selected measures should only be interpreted within the limits of their measured validity. The following procedures were components of the evaluation:

Interview and Observation of Student
Developmental Checklist
All Kinds of Minds "Attuning a Student" Checklists
Wechsler Intelligence Scale For Children 4th Edition (WISC-IV)
Peabody Individual Achievement Test-Revised/Normative Update (PIAT-R/NU)
Woodcock Reading Mastery Tests-Revised/Normative Update (WRMT-R/NU)
Comprehensive Test of Phonological Processing (CTOPP)
Oral and Written Language Scales (OWLS) Listening Comprehension Subtest
Test of Written Language, 3rd Edition (TOWL-3) Spontaneous Writing Subtests
Gray Oral Reading Test 4th Edition (GORT-4)

Reason for Referral
Student was referred by his teacher because has been struggling with all reading and writing assignments across his classes and in-class interventions have not been effective.

Home:
Student lives at home with his mother, father, and two sisters. Student is the youngest of the three siblings. He lives in a three bedroom home in a gated community at [redacted], [redacted] This living arrangement has been in effect since August, 2009. Mother and father are both highly educated. His father has an engineering degree and his mother has a bachelor's degree in art.

Language:

Student's primary language is English which he has been exposed to since birth. The language spoken in Student's home is primarily English, however Spanish, is also spoken "frequently." It was observed that his speech was clear and intelligible. His verbal responses were generally complete, grammatically correct sentences.

Development:

Student's birth was a "normal full-term" birth. His mother reports that he was "unsettled as [an] infant, as compared to his two older sisters." The following developmental milestones were achieved within the range of normal expectations:

Sitting alone	Crawling
Standing Alone	Walking Alone
Using Toilet When Awake	Staying Dry at Night: Occasionally bed wet

Student is right handed.

Sensory/Motor Status:

Student's latest hearing screening was conducted in 2009; his latest vision screening in 2003. His mother reports that the results were normal.

Medical/Psychiatric/Neurological Status:

Student was hospitalized in 2003 with a kidney infection. Mother reports no major medical or psychiatric concerns

Medication/Substance Abuse:

According to Student's mother, Student has taken "natural supplements, e.g., Omegas, DHA, CoQ10, GABA, Acidophilous" He is not currently taking any medication." There is no history of substance abuse.

Family History

There is a family history of left-handedness (maternal grandmother), trouble learning to read (father and student), giftedness, and creativity (student's sisters).

Educational History

Student was cared for as an infant by his mother and grandmother, both of whom spoke English and Spanish equally. Student attended a Montessori preschool beginning at age 3.5. The educational philosophy was a combination of academics, practical life, and socialization skills.

Student began kindergarten at [redacted] School in [redacted]. He attended from kindergarten to grade two where he repeated second grade. He attended [redacted] School in [redacted] from third through sixth grade.

While at the [redacted] School Student's principal "noticed that Student was falling behind for his age group. According to his mother, Student still finds spelling difficult and can "be easily distractable." Student is not "fond of identifying the names of states on a blank map." His academic difficulties at this time include spelling, composition, decoding language, reading, comprehension and staying focused.

Student "enjoys math" and is a "talented artist." According to his mother Student can be "diligent and perseverant" and is "not afraid to be challenged." He is finding school a challenge now, however, and struggles to find a niche.

According to Student's mother his social life is progressing "better more recently" as he has begun to make friends in his new school. He has "always been a very social child" and "sometimes this is distracting to his studies." As when he was younger, socializing appears to be "one of his greatest skills" and he is described as "confident and equipped with a good sense of humor." He is popular amongst his peers and has always been "well-liked by his teachers."

Behavioral Observations

Student presented as a friendly, attractive, cooperative, 13 year-old-boy. He was neatly groomed and appropriately attired. He approached each task with persistence and was engaged in each activity throughout the testing experience. While he was confident when he knew the answers, he was cautious and slow when not sure. He took one break within each 3 hour testing session. Rapport was easy to establish and maintain.

During testing, Student had no apparent sensory or motor problems. He easily talked about his likes and was alert to person, place and time. His oral expression was adequate. His eye contact was appropriate. His motor proficiency was adequate. He used her right hand on paper and pencil tasks.

When providing verbal responses, his sentences were complete. He used adequate vocabulary choices to express himself. Student was oriented to the task and displayed appropriate attention, concentration and effort. There were no behavioral indications of significant distractibility, hyperactivity or impulsivity.

Validity Statement

Student's performance during formal testing did not appear to be adversely affected by failure or frustration. He did not require any adaptations or modifications to the standardized procedures. He did not require an excessive amount of reinforcement and praise. HISOverall, the results of the present testing and evaluation procedures appear to be valid for the purpose of addressing the reason for referral.

COGNITIVE ASSESSMENT:
Description and Interpretation of WISC–IV Results

Student was administered ten subtests of the Wechsler Intelligence Scale for Children-Fourth Edition (WISC-IV) from which his composite index scores are derived. The Full Scale IQ (FSIQ) is derived from a combination of ten subtest scores and is considered the most representative estimate of global intellectual functioning. Student's general cognitive ability is within the *above average* range of intellectual functioning as measured by the FSIQ (FSIQ = 119; 95% confidence interval =115-125), however there were significant differences (at the .05 level) among the four Indexes that make up this composite; therefore the FSIQ score cannot be considered a valid representation of his overall cognitive ability. In this case, it is appropriate to use the VCI and PRI scores (http://alpha.fdu.edu/psychology/using_the_dwi_or_gia.htm) to create a General Ability Score (GAI) The GAI score is derived from the subtests that comprise the Verbal Comprehension Index and the Perceptual Reasoning Index. Student's GAI score is in the *superior* range (GAI= 128, 95% confidence level = 121-133)

Student's verbal reasoning abilities as measured by the Verbal Comprehension Index are in the *superior* range (VCI = 121; 95% confidence interval = 113-127). The Verbal Comprehension Index is designed to measure verbally acquired knowledge, reasoning, and concept formation. Student's performances on the subtests that contribute to the VCI were variable, ranging from *average* to *superior* indicating that his abilities in this area are unevenly developed. He achieved his best performance among the verbal reasoning tasks on the Comprehension subtest (Scaled Score = 16). The Comprehension Subtest is designed to measure common sense, social judgment and a sense of social conventionality. His score on this subtest reflects a significantly more well-developed ability relative to his other abilities. Student's verbal comprehension abilities are a significant strength relative to his working memory and processing speed abilities.

Student's nonverbal reasoning abilities as measured by the Perceptual Reasoning Index are in the *superior* range (PRI = 127; 95% confidence interval = 117-132). The Perceptual Reasoning Index is designed to measure nonverbal concept formation, visual perception and organization, simultaneous processing, learning, and the ability to separate figure and ground in visual stimuli. Student's performances on the subtests that contribute to the PRI ranged from *average* to *superior* indicating that his abilities in this area are unevenly developed. Student achieved his best performance among the nonverbal reasoning subtests on the Picture Concepts subtest (Scaled Score = 16). The Picture Concepts Subtest is designed to measure abstract categorical reasoning based on perceptual recognition processes. Student's perceptual reasoning abilities are a significant strength relative to his processing speed and working memory abilities.

Student's working memory abilities as measured by the Working Memory Index are in the *average* range (WMI =99; 95% confidence interval = 91-107). The Working Memory Index is designed to measure working memory, short–term auditory memory, encoding ability, the ability to use rehearsal strategies and auditory processing skills, and the ability to shift mental operations on auditory symbolic material. Student's performances on the subtests that compose the working memory index ranged from *average* to *below average* indicating that his abilities in this area are unevenly developed. A comparison of the two subtests reveals that his short–term auditory memory for tasks that require rote memorization AND

information processing is significantly better developed than his short-term auditory memory for tasks that require only minimal information processing. In addition, Student's scores on the subtest designed to measure short-term auditory memory and attention requiring only minimal information processing indicate that his abilities in this area are significantly less well developed than his other abilities.

Student's speed of processing abilities as measured by the Processing Speed Index is in the *average* range (PS=103 95% confidence interval = 94-112). The Processing Speed Index is designed to measure perceptual discrimination, speed of mental operations, psychomotor speed, attention, concentration, short-term visual memory, visual-motor coordination, and cognitive flexibility.

His performances on the subtests that compose the Processing Speed Index were all within the *average* range. Student's scores on the subtest that measures the ability to learn an unfamiliar task that involves speed and accuracy of visual-motor coordination, speed of mental operation, attentional skills, visual acuity, visual scanning and tracking, and cognitive flexibility indicate that his abilities in this area are significantly less well developed than his other abilities. This subtest measures the ability to learn combinations of shapes and symbols and the ability to make associations quickly and accurately and can be characterized as a task involving the discrimination and memory of visual pattern symbols.

ACHIEVEMENT ASSESSMENT
Description and Interpretation of PIAT-R/NU Academic Scores

Student completed the Peabody Individual Achievement Test-Revised/Normative Update to assess his current level of functioning in specific academic areas. The report, generated from the PIAT-R/NU ASSIST software is summarized here.

General Information:

The General Information subtest measures mastery of the general body of knowledge taught in school, including information from science, social studies, and fine arts. On this measure of general encyclopedic knowledge, Student performed in the *above average* range (Standard Score = 114 95% confidence interval = 108-120).

Reading:

The reading subtests include the reading recognition subtest which measures the ability to recognize sounds associated with printed letters and the ability to read words aloud, and the reading comprehension subtest which measures the ability to understand the meaning of written material.

On the reading recognition subtest, Student performed in the *average* range (standard score = 102; 95% confidence interval = 96-108).

On the reading comprehension subtest, Student performed in the *average* range (standard score =92; 95% confidence interval = 85-99).

Student's overall performance is summarized by the Total Reading composite score. She performed in the *average* range (standard score = 96; 95% confidence interval = 91-101).

Mathematics:

The mathematics subtest measures the ability to understand mathematical concepts and procedures to perform calculations, and to solve problems. Student's performance was *above average* (standard score =114; 95% confidence interval =108-120)

Spelling:

This subtest measures the ability to recognize letters from their names or sounds and to recognize the standard spelling of words. Student's performance on this subtest was *low average* (standard score = 80; 95% confidence interval = 72-88).

Total Test:

The total test composite score is a measure of the overall level of achievement on the five subtests listed above. Student's overall performance was *average* (standard score = 91; 95% confidence interval = 88-94)

Strengths and Weaknesses:

Student's strongest performance was on the general information subtest with a standard achievement score of 114. His weakest performance was on the spelling subtest with a standard score of 80. His general information subtest score revealed a significant strength in relationship to his other achievement scores.

Ability-Achievement Discrepancy Analysis:

Student recently obtained a GAI standard score of 128 on the WISC-IV. Based on this score, his actual total reading achievement score of 91 is significantly lower than the expected achievement score of 119. The percent of the population with the same size discrepancy or greater is 2.

Description and Interpretation of WRMT-R/NU Results

The Woodcock Reading Mastery Tests-Revised, Normative update is a comprehensive battery of tests measuring important aspects of reading ability. It consists of six tests that measure several important aspects of reading. The Visual-Auditory subtest measures the ability to learn new vocabulary. The Letter Identification subtest measures the ability to identify letters of the alphabet when they are presented in many forms. The Word Identification subtest measures the ability to read words that may be unfamiliar out loud. The Word Attack subtest measures the ability to analyze the form and sound of unknown words in order to pronounce them. The Word Comprehension subtest measures a how your child understands antonyms, synonyms and analogies. The Comprehension Subtest measures the ability to read and comprehend a short passage. The WRMT-R/NU ASSIST was used to score the results.

Three cluster scores were derived from the six subtests. They included the Readiness cluster, measuring the skills useful for beginning reading, the Basic Skills cluster, measuring basic reading skills, and the Reading Comprehension cluster, measuring how well one understands what is being read.

The Readiness Cluster measures skills useful for beginning reading such as visual-auditory learning and letter identification. Student performed in the *well below average* range (Standard Score = 73; 90% confidence interval = 68-78), scoring in the *extremely low range* (Standard Score = 60, 90% confidence interval = 56-65) on the subtest designed to measure visual-auditory learning ability.

The Basic Skills Cluster measures basic reading skills. Student performed in the *average* range (Standard Score = 97; 90% confidence interval = 94=99) in the Basic Skills Cluster.

The Reading Comprehension Cluster measures how well an individual understands what he or she reads. Student performed in the *average* range (Standard Score =93; 90% confidence interval = 93-97) in the Reading Comprehension Cluster.

The Total Reading-Full Scale Cluster measures overall reading ability and consists of the Word Identification, Word Attack, Word Comprehension, and Passage Comprehensions tests. Student performed in the *average* range (standard score = 95; 90% confidence interval = 93-97) on the Total Reading FS cluster.

His lowest attained score (Standard Score = 60; 90% confidence interval = 56-65) was on the visual-auditory learning subtest; his highest was on the word attack skills subtest (Standard Score = 105; 90% confidence interval = 98-113).

There was a significant discrepancy in Student's expected total reading score of 119 based on a recently administered WISC-IV GAI of 128, and his actual score of 95. The percent of the population with this size discrepancy is 1.

Description and Interpretation of OWLS Results

The Oral and Written Language Scales are designed to measure (a) receptive oral language, which is the understanding of spoken language (b) expressive oral language, which is the understanding and use of spoken language, and (c) the use of the conventions of written language. It is comprised of three subtests that collapse into two composites.

The Listening Comprehension Scale assesses the ability to comprehend words and phrases, grammar, and higher order language such as logic and humor. Student's performance on this scale was in the *average* range (Standard Score =106; 90% confidence interval = 95 - 117).

Description and Interpretation of the GORT-4 Results

The Gray Oral Reading Tests, 4th ed., (GORT-4) assesses oral reading rate, accuracy, fluency, and comprehension. A combination of all scores results in an Oral Reading Quotient, providing an overall index of the student's ability to read orally.

Student's scores respectively, were in the *extremely low* range (scaled score 5; 5th percentile) for the subtest measuring **Reading Rate** (the amount of time taken by a student to read a story), the *extremely low* range (scaled score 6; 9th percentile) for the subtest measuring **Accuracy** (the student's ability to pronounce each word in the story correctly) and in the *extremely low* range (scaled score 3; 1st percentile) for the subtest measuring **Fluency** (the student's rate and accuracy scores combined). He performed in the *average* range (scaled score 8; 25th percentile) in the **Comprehension** subtest, a test to measure understanding.

The combination of all scores resulted in an overall **Reading Quotient** in the *well below average* range (standard score 73; 2nd percentile).

Description and Interpretation of TOWL-3 Results

The Test of Written Language, 3rd. Ed., measures the student's written communication skills as elicited by a picture stimulus. To assess his spontaneous writing ability, Student was administered the three subtests of the Test of Written Language 3rd Ed. Student's Spontaneous Writing Quotient was in the *low average* range (Quotient = 87). His score for the subtest measuring knowledge and use of contextual conventions was in the *average* range (standard score = 9; 37th percentile). His score measuring contextual language was in the *average* range (standard score = 8; 25th percentile). His score for story construction was in the *below average* range (standard score = 7; 11th percentile) He did not include any coordinating conjunctions other than "and," he did not name any of the objects in the picture and his vocabulary selection was sparse and immature. His story had an ordinary beginning, did not refer to a specific event occurring before or after the picture, and the plot was meager with predictable story action and an abrupt ending. He took the entire 15 minutes allotted and was only able to complete eleven lines of prose.

PROCESSING ASSESSMENT

Description and Interpretation of CTOPP Results

Student was administered the six core subtests of the Comprehensive Test of Phonological Processing (CTOPP) to assess phonological awareness, phonological memory, and rapid memory. Phonological processing refers to the ability to use the sound elements that comprise oral language to process written and oral language. These core subtests collapse into three composites, Phonological Awareness, Phonological Memory, and Rapid Naming. An individual such as Student with deficits in both rapid automatic naming and phonological awareness is at greater risk of reading problems compared to an individual with deficits in only one of the two areas.

Phonological Awareness:

Phonological Awareness refers to the individual's awareness of and access to phonemes, the individual sound units that make up spoken words. Student's composite performance on the two core subtests that contribute to the phonological awareness composite is within the *low average* range (standard score =80). A weakness in phonological processing is a hallmark of dyslexia.

Phonological Memory:

Phonological Memory refers to coding information phonologically for temporary storage in working or short-term memory. Student's performance on the subtests that contribute to the Phonological Memory Composite is within the *average* range (standard score = 91).

Rapid Automatic Naming:

Rapid Automatic Naming evaluates the student's ability to quickly and efficiently retrieve phonological information stored in long-term memory. Student's performance on the subtests that contribute to the Rapid Automatic Naming Composite is within the *extremely low* range (standard score = 73). The abilities measured by this set of sub-tests include efficient retrieval from long-term or permanent memory and executing a series of operations quickly and efficiently. A deficit in this area suggests Student may have problems with reading fluency.

SUMMARY

Student is a friendly and cooperative 13 year-old boy who was evaluated using a developmental checklist the WISC-IV, the PIAT-R/NU, the CTOPP, the TOWL-3, the GORT-4, and the listening comprehension protocol for the OWLS. Student was referred by his teacher because of ongoing challenges in all course requiring reading and writing.

The capability or potential to succeed in school-related tasks was assessed by use of the Weschler Intelligence Scale for Children, Fourth Edition (WISC-IV). The overall profile is that of a student who has an *above average* to *superior* aptitude for learning, with a significant strength in perceptual reasoning and verbal comprehension relative to his speed of processing and his auditory working memory. He has significant strengths in (a) his understanding of what is called "common sense," his social judgment and sense of social conventionality, and (b) his ability to reason using abstract categories based on perceptual recognition processes.

Student's phonological processing abilities were assessed by the use of the Comprehensive Test of Phonological Processing (CTOPP). His ability to rapidly name familiar symbols such as letters and numbers is *well below average.* Student scored in the 3rd percentile compared to his same-age peers.He also scored in the *below average* range in his ability to

Student's current academic functioning was assessed by use of the Peabody Individual Achievement Test-Revised (PIAT-R), the Test of Written Language, Third Edition (TOWL-3), the Gray Oral Reading Test (GORT-4) and the listening portion of the Oral and Written Language Scales (OWLS).

His scores in the entire area of language arts are not commensurate with his abilities scores. His spelling achievement score was in the *below average* range; his basic reading skills and ability to accurately and quickly read orally fall in the *well below average* ranges, and his contextual writing scores are also in the *below average* range with spelling mistakes such as ""yestorday" for yesterday, "theator" for theater, "whatching" for watching, and "movei" for movie. These outcomes are in spite of abilities scores in the superior range in his verbal and perceptual abilities, a supportive home environment, consistent school attendance and Tier One Interventions provided by an experienced team of educators.

The above scores along with Student's *extremely low* scores in visual-auditory learning, placing his in the below 1% when compared to his same age peers in this category, and his *well below average* scores in rapid digit naming reveal the benchmarks for a learning disability known as dyslexia.

RECOMMENDATIONS BASED ON TESTS AND OTHER INFORMATION DESCRIBED IN THIS REPORT

1. The following additional accommodations may help with Student's school requirements include the following:

2. The following i**nterventions** are recommended

3. **Additional suggestions** include the following:

Student's family and teachers are encouraged to support him in developing her strengths and interests. Emotional support is also encouraged through the use of positive feedback in recognition of both effort and progress.

Thank you for allowing me to participate in his evaluation.

Signed _____
Name of Examiner
Educational Psychologist