

The Institute for Behavior Change, inc.

Steven A. Kossor, Director

Federal EIN: 23-2935316

phone or fax

(610) 383-1432

848 W. King's Hwy.

Coatesville, PA 19320-1714

There are no obstacles, only hurdles of varying heights. None is so great that it can not be overcome, gotten around or gone under. Even mountains disintegrate with time.

EVALUATION REPORT

Initial Referral

Reevaluation

1. DEMOGRAPHICS:

Student Name: *****, *****

Date of Report: **/**/****

School: ***** School

District of Residence: *****

Student Birth Date: **/**/****

Grade: *****

Current Educational Program: Regular Education

Other Demographic Data, As Needed:

Address:

2. REASON(S) FOR REFERRAL:

This evaluation was performed at the request of the administration of the ***** School in order to determine *****'s present intellectual, academic and behavioral strengths, weaknesses and needs. This information was to be used to facilitate making appropriate educational and behavior support recommendations. The reader is referred to teachers' observations, test data and other indices of functioning maintained by the ***** School that were reviewed in the process of completing this evaluation. _____, MS, Program Specialist at The Institute for Behavior Change, administered tests, scored and analyzed protocols and provided preliminary recommendations for this evaluation.

3. EDUCATIONAL LEVELS OF PERFORMANCE AND EDUCATIONAL NEEDS OF THE CHILD:

***** is a student at the ***** School in ***** and is presently in 1st grade. ***** was evaluated to monitor her progress and to determine if Special Education Services are necessary at this time.

4. EVALUATION DATA RESULTS OF DIRECT INTERVENTION-The team will include information on the following areas that impact the student's ability to access the general curriculum:

A. Physical, social or cultural background information relevant to the child's disability and need for special education.

Educational Background Information

***** is currently enrolled in the ***** grade.

Social/Cultural Information

***** resides with her parents, her two older brothers, and her baby brother. During her leisure time she reported that she likes to play with her dolls, do hair, and watch *Spongebob*.

Medical history

No significant medical information was reported for the current assessment.

B. Current classroom-based assessments and observations and observations by teachers and related service providers.

Teacher Input

*****'s teachers did not respond to a teacher questionnaire, however, the staff at wanted to have her evaluated to monitor her progress.

Test Observations

***** is a very personable young girl with a great sense of humor. ***** appeared to be very comfortable with the examiner and talked frequently. ***** would get off topic with her conversations frequently and often needed to be prompted to get back on task. She did, however, have excellent interpersonal skills and was a pleasure to work with.

5. EVALUATIONS AND INFORMATION PROVIDED BY THE PARENTS OF THE CHILD:

A completed Parent Information Questionnaire was not received prior to the completion of this evaluation.

6. IF AN ASSESSMENT IS NOT CONDUCTED UNDER STANDARD CONDITIONS, DESCRIBE THE EXTENT TO WHICH IT VARIED FROM STANDARD CONDITIONS:

The assessment was conducted under standard conditions.

7. SUMMARY OF FINDINGS/INTERPRETATION OF ASSESSMENT RESULTS:

- **Aptitude and achievement levels**

I. INTELLIGENCE TESTING

***** was administered the *Wechsler Intelligence Scale for Children – Fourth Edition* (WISC-IV). The Full Scale IQ (FSIQ) measures *****'s general cognitive ability. *****'s general cognitive ability is within the Low Average range of intellectual functioning, as measured by the FSIQ (84). Her overall thinking and reasoning abilities exceed those of approximately 14% of students her age. However, *****'s unique set of thinking and reasoning abilities make her overall intellectual functioning difficult to summarize by a single score on the Wechsler Intelligence Scale for Children - Fourth Edition (WISC-IV). Her verbal reasoning abilities are much better developed than her nonverbal reasoning abilities. Making sense of complex verbal information and using verbal abilities to solve novel problems are a strength for ***** , while processing complex visual information by forming spatial images of part-whole relationships and/or by manipulating the parts to solve novel problems without using words is a weakness.

The Verbal Comprehension Index (VCI) is designed to measure verbal reasoning and concept formation, on the VCI, *****'s performance on each subtest shows some variability, although it is not especially unusual. The Similarities subtest required her to respond orally to a series of word pairs by explaining how the words of each pair are alike. This subtest examines *****'s ability to abstract meaningful concepts and relationships from verbally presented material (Similarities scaled score = 12). *****'s ability to respond orally to explain how word pairs are alike is in the high end of the average range when compared to her peers. The Vocabulary subtest required ***** to explain the meaning of words presented in isolation. As a direct assessment of word knowledge, the subtest is one indication of *****'s overall verbal comprehension. Performance on this subtest also requires abilities to verbalize meaningful concepts as well as to retrieve information from long-term memory (Vocabulary scaled score = 11). Thus, *****'s ability to explain the meaning of words and verbalize meaningful concepts is average when compared to others her age. The Comprehension subtest required ***** to provide oral solutions to everyday problems and to explain the underlying reasons for certain social rules or concepts. This subtest provides a general measure of verbal reasoning, comprehension of social situations and social judgment as well as her knowledge of conventional standards of social behavior (Comprehension scaled score = 9). *****'s verbal reasoning abilities as measured by the Verbal Comprehension Index are in the Average range and above 55% of her peers (VCI = 102).

The Perceptual Reasoning Index (PRI) is designed to measure fluid reasoning in the perceptual domain with tasks that primarily assess nonverbal fluid reasoning and perceptual organization abilities. *****'s nonverbal reasoning abilities as measured by the PRI are in the Low Average range and above 21% of her peers (PRI = 88). ***** performed comparably on the perceptual reasoning subtests contributing to the PRI, suggesting that her visual-spatial reasoning and perceptual-organizational skills are similarly developed. The Block Design subtest required her to use two-color cubes to construct replicas of two-dimensional, geometric patterns. This subtest assesses ability to mentally organize visual information and *****'s

ability to analyze part-whole relationships when information is presented spatially. Performance on this task also may be influenced by visual-spatial perception and visual perception-fine motor coordination, as well as planning ability (Block Design scaled score = 6). *****'s ability to construct replicas of two-dimensional, geometric patterns and mentally organize visual information was below average when compared to others her age. The Picture Concepts subtest required ***** to select a picture from each of two or three rows of pictures to form a group with common characteristics (Picture Concepts scaled score = 9). *****'s ability to select pictures with common characteristics was average when compared to her same-age peers. The Matrix Reasoning subtest required ***** to identify the missing portion of an incomplete visual matrix from one of five response options (Matrix Reasoning scaled score = 9). Thus, her ability to identify the missing portion of an incomplete matrix was average when compared to her peers.

*****'s ability to sustain attention, concentrate, and exert mental control is in the Borderline range. She performed better than approximately 6% of her peers in this area (Working Memory Index = 77). *****'s short-term memory was assessed by tasks that required her to repeat a series of orally presented number sequences verbatim and in reverse order. A direct assessment of *****'s short-term auditory memory, this subtest requires attention, concentration, and mental control. Performance can also be influenced by the ability to correctly sequence information (Digit Span scaled score = 5). She was also required to listen to a sequence of numbers and letters and repeat the numbers in ascending order, followed by the letters in alphabetical order (Letter-Number Sequencing scaled score = 7). *****'s ability to correctly sequence information and repeat numbers and letters was slightly below that of others her age. The WMI offered a measure of *****'s sustained attention, concentration, encoding, use of rehearsal strategies, auditory processing, short-term memory, and working memory.

The Processing Speed Index (PSI) represents *****'s ability to perform simple, clerical type tasks quickly. The PSI measures perceptual discrimination, speed of mental operations, psychomotor speed, attention, concentration, short-term visual memory, visual motor coordination, and cognitive flexibility. The Coding subtest required her to use a key to associate a series of symbols with a series of shapes and to use a pencil to draw the symbols next to the shapes. A direct test of speed and accuracy, the Coding subtest assesses ability in quickly and correctly scanning and sequencing simple visual information. Performance on this subtest also may be influenced by short-term visual memory, attention, or visual-motor coordination (Coding scaled score = 7). ***** scored slightly below the average of her peers when needing to quickly scan visual information *****'s processing speed was assessed through tasks requiring her to inspect several sets of symbols and indicate if special target symbols appeared in each set. A direct test of speed and accuracy, the subtest assesses scanning speed and sequential tracking of simple visual information. Performance on this subtest also may be influenced by visual discrimination and visual-motor coordination (Symbol Search scaled score = 3). *****'s ability in processing simple or routine visual material without making errors is in the Borderline range when compared to her peers, with a performance better than approximately 4 % of her peers (Processing Speed Index = 73).

INDEX SCORES SUMMARY

Index Factor	Standard Score	Percentile Rank	Range
Verbal Comprehension	102	55	Average
Perceptual Reasoning	88	21	Low Average
Working Memory	77	6	Borderline
Processing Speed	73	4	Borderline
Full Scale IQ	84	14	Low Average

*Mean Standard Score = 100; Standard Deviation = 15

SUBTEST SCORES SUMMARY

Verbal Comprehension Subtests	Scaled Score	Percentile Rank
Similarities	12	75
Vocabulary	11	63
Comprehension	9	37

*Mean Scaled Score = 10; Standard Deviation = 3

Perceptual Reasoning Subtests	Scaled Score	Percentile Rank
Block Design	6	9
Picture Concepts	9	37
Matrix Reasoning	9	37

*Mean Scaled Score = 10; Standard Deviation = 3

Working Memory Subtests	Scaled Score	Percentile Rank
Digit Span	5	5
Letter-Number Sequencing	7	16

*Mean Scaled Score = 10; Standard Deviation = 3

Processing Speed Subtests	Scaled Score	Percentile Rank
Coding	7	16
Symbol Search	3	1

*Mean Scaled Score = 10; Standard Deviation = 3

II. ACHIEVEMENT TESTING

Reading

***** performed in the Low Average range in overall reading skills, as indicated by her standard score on the Reading Composite (83). Her skills in this area exceed that of approximately 13% of students her age. ***** performed comparably on tasks that required her to name alphabet letters, identify and generate letter sounds and rhyming words, and match

and read a series of printed words (Word Reading standard score = 88), match words with pictures, read sentences and paragraphs and answer questions about what was read (Reading Comprehension standard score = 83) and correctly apply phonetic decoding rules when reading a series of nonsense words (Pseudoword Decoding standard score = 86).

Mathematics

In overall mathematics skills ***** performed in the Low Average range, as indicated by her Mathematics Composite standard score (80). Her skills in this area exceed that of approximately 9% of students her age. *****'s performance on tasks that required her to identify and write numbers, count, and solve basic addition and subtraction problems (Numerical Operations standard score = 78) is comparable to her performance on tasks that requires her to understand basic number concepts, including unit and geometric measurement, and solve one-step word problems (Math Reasoning standard score = 86).

Oral Language

***** performed in the Average range in overall language skills, as indicated by her standard score on the Oral Language Composite (104). Her skills in this area exceed those of approximately 61% of students her age. ***** performed comparably on tasks that required her to identify the picture that best represents an orally presented descriptor or generate a word that matches the picture (Listening Comprehension standard score = 103) and repeat sentences, generate words within a category, describe scenes, and give directions (Oral Expression standard score = 106).

Written Language

In overall written language skills, ***** performed in the Low Average range, as indicated by her Written Language Composite standard score (81). Her achievement in this area is better than of approximately 10% of students her age. *****'s performance on tasks that required her to write the alphabet from memory, generate words within a category, generate sentences to describe visual cues, and combine sentences (Written Expression standard score = 87) is comparable to her performance on tasks that required her to write one's name and print letters that correspond to sounds and words (Spelling standard score = 78).

COMPOSITE SCORES SUMMARY

Subject Area	Standard Score	Percentile Rank
Reading	83	13
Mathematics	80	9
Written Language	81	10
Oral Language	104	61
Total Composite	84	14

*Mean Standard Score = 100; Standard Deviation = 15

SUBTEST SCORES SUMMARY

Subtest	Standard Score	Percentile Rank	Grade Equivalent
Word Reading	88	21	K:8
Reading Comprehension	83	13	<1:0
Pseudoword Decoding	86	18	PreK5:0
Numerical Operations	78	7	K:2
Math Reasoning	86	18	K:6
Spelling	78	7	K:3
Written Expression	87	19	K:4
Listening Comprehension	103	58	1:8
Oral Expression	106	66	2:0

*Mean Standard Score = 100; Standard Deviation = 15

Educational Strengths:

- Demonstrated effective reasoning with verbal and nonverbal forms of communication
- Displayed average ability to explain the meaning of words and an average store of word knowledge (e.g., Vocabulary)
- Exhibited strong abstract and concrete reasoning abilities and concept formation (e.g., Vocabulary, Similarities)
- Displayed effective visual perception and discrimination (e.g., Picture Concepts, Matrix Reasoning)
- Good skills with expressive language and oral expression
- Good communication skills and a polite young girl

Educational Needs:

- Difficulty with working memory tasks, especially holding orally presented information in mind and working with details to produce a correct answer
- Displayed difficulty with tasks requiring multi-step directions
- Poor word decoding skills
- Difficulty with reading words and reading comprehension
- Displayed skills in math slightly below grade level
- Difficulty with spelling common words
- Needs improvement with writing words and sentences
- Has great difficulty with staying on task and often needs redirection, especially with verbal expression

Summary

***** is a ***** -year-old student who completed the WISC-IV and the WIAT-II. Her overall cognitive ability, as evaluated by the WISC-IV, cannot easily be summarized because her verbal reasoning abilities are much better developed than her nonverbal reasoning abilities. *****'s reasoning abilities on verbal tasks are generally in the Average range (VCI = 102), while her nonverbal reasoning abilities are significantly lower and in the Low Average range (PRI = 88).

On the WISC-IV, ***** achieved her best performance among the verbal reasoning tasks on the Vocabulary and Similarities subtests. The Vocabulary subtest required ***** to explain the

meaning of words presented in isolation. As a direct assessment of word knowledge, the subtest is one indication of her overall verbal comprehension. Performance on this subtest also requires abilities to verbalize meaningful concepts as well as to retrieve information from long-term memory (Vocabulary scaled score = 11). On the Similarities subtest ***** was required to respond orally to a series of word pairs by explaining how the words of each pair are alike. This subtest examines her ability to abstract meaningful concepts and relationships from verbally presented material (Similarities scaled score = 12).

On the WIAT-II, ***** scored significantly better in oral language. Her Oral Language Composite score (104) is much higher than anticipated for a child with her general cognitive ability. The difference is significant, suggesting that this is an area of considerable strength for *****. She performed particularly well on tasks involving Oral Expression. This significant difference indicates a specific strength in tasks that required her to repeat sentences, generate words within a category, describe scenes, and give directions.

***** often has difficulty remaining on tasks when asked questions. She frequently got off topic and needed to be redirected to remain on the subject at hand. Once redirected, ***** immediately got back on target, but would soon get off topic again and need redirection. Although ***** has good verbal skills, she does require frequent redirection to discuss only relevant information. This behavior may be having an effect on *****'s school work and classroom behavior.

- **Involvement in and progress in the general education curriculum**

See text above.

- **Relevant functional and developmental evaluation (ecological evaluation, if appropriate)**

See text above.

- **Vocational Technical Education Assessment Results (when appropriate) N/A**

- **Interests, Preferences, Aptitudes (for transition planning) N/A**

- **Functional Behavioral Assessment Results (if appropriate) N/A**

For a child suspected of having a specific learning disability, the documentation of the team's determination of eligibility must include a statement of: 1) whether the child has a specific learning disability; 2) the basis for making the determination; 3) the relevant behavior noted during the observation of the child; 4) the relationship of that behavior to the child's academic functioning; 5) the educationally relevant medical findings, if any; 6) whether there is a severe discrepancy between achievement and ability that is not correctable without special education and related services; and 7) the determination of the team concerning the effects of environmental, cultural, or economic disadvantage.

8. CONCLUSIONS

 X Student is a child with a disability. Disability category: Learning Disability

(If appropriate) Secondary Disability category: _____

Student is in need of specially designed instruction

OR

Student is not a child with a disability, or is a child with a disability but does not need specially designed instruction.

Recommendations regarding special education and related services needed to enable the child to meet goals and to participate as appropriate in the general curriculum:

1. The results of the present assessment suggested that ***** was eligible for Learning Support services in the area of **Reading, Mathematics, and Writing**.
2. ***** should be given opportunities for repeated practice of new skills.
3. ***** would benefit from developing her ability to use problem solving strategies such as self-correction, verbal mediation, process of elimination, utilizing context clues, etc.
4. ***** should receive instruction in a phonetic approach to reading in conjunction with the development of her sight vocabulary.
5. ***** would benefit from reading interventions such as:
 - Paired Reading
 - Repeated Reading
 - Listening Passage Preview
 - Assisted Reading Practice
6. ***** would benefit from reading comprehension interventions such as:
 - Practice answering who, what, when, where, and how questions
 - Opportunities to preview comprehension questions
 - Story mapping
 - Developing prior knowledge
 - Activating prior knowledge
7. ***** would benefit from interventions in the area of written expression including:
 - Utilization of graphic organizers
 - Grammar instruction
 - Punctuation instruction
 - Practice developing topic sentences and supporting sentences
 - Organization of written work (i.e. beginning, middle, and end)

-
8. ***** would benefit from intervention in the following areas of mathematics reasoning:
- Time telling
 - Measurement
 - Money concepts
 - Word problems
 - Using graphs and charts
9. ***** would benefit from intervention in the following areas of numerical operations:
- Addition (single digit, of multiple numbers, multiple digit without carrying, and multiple digit with carrying)
 - Subtraction (single digit, of multiple numbers, multiple digit without borrowing, and multiple digit with borrowing)
10. ***** should receive accommodations regarding assessments, such as questions read, extended time, etc.
11. ***** should be encouraged to read high interest, reading level appropriate reading material or books at home and at school.
12. The team should consider the composition of a contingency contract to help ***** to remain on task.
13. The team should consider the scheduling of regular team meetings to monitor *****'s progress.

Examiner's signatures appear on attached page.

***** Date
Program Specialist
The Institute for Behavior Change

Reviewed and Approved by: _____
Steven Kossor Date
Licensed Psychologist – PS-003680-L
Certified School Psychologist
Executive Director, The Institute for Behavior Change

EVALUATION REPORT – SIGNATURES (Only applicable for evaluating children with specific learning disabilities.)

Directions to Team Members: Check YES if you agree with this report; check NO if you do not agree. If you do not agree, please write the reason for disagreement, and it will be attached to the report. (When evaluating children suspected of having a specific learning disability, the evaluation team must include at least one person qualified to conduct individual diagnostic examinations of children, such as a school psychologist, speech-language pathologist, or remedial reading teacher.)

YES	NO	SIGNATURE	TITLE
_____	_____	_____	_____
_____	_____	_____	_____
_____	_____	_____	_____
_____	_____	_____	_____
_____	_____	_____	_____
_____	_____	_____	_____
_____	_____	_____	_____
_____	_____	_____	_____
_____	_____	_____	_____

List name of person copies were given to:

- Parent
- Teacher
- Principal/CAO
- Other