

Case Study: Michael

FALL SEMESTER

1. Michael is a twelve-year-old, 5th-grade student at SOMEPLACE elementary in SOMEPLACE ISD.
2. Michael is identified as an English language learner and is placed in a content-based ESL classroom.
3. LPAC records indicate that Michael is limited-to-fluent in English (CALP 3-4) and negligible in Spanish (CALP 1). The LPAC requested updated formal oral language assessment within the last calendar year (Spring 2014) due to his ongoing academic concerns. Results showed that his English proficiency was significantly higher than his Spanish proficiency.
4. As Michael has only received English instruction and has negligible proficiency in Spanish, formal assessment of academic skill areas was completed in English.
5. TELPAS results:
 Composite: Intermediate Listening: Advanced High Speaking: Advanced High
 Reading: Intermediate Writing: Beginning
6. Michael lives with his mother, grandmother, and two siblings. Michael’s mother speaks English and Spanish, and his siblings speak English. Michael’s grandmother speaks Spanish. Michael indicates he is most comfortable speaking in English and “only speaks a little Spanish with his grandmother.” No family history of learning problems is noted.
7. Michael’s school is a Title I campus, and he qualifies for free and reduced lunch.
8. Michael previously attended school for kindergarten, 1st, and 2nd grades in Missouri, where he was also placed in an ESL classroom.
9. Michael was retained in the 3rd grade at SOMEPLACE elementary when he did not pass the state standardized assessment in reading.
10. Michael has never passed state assessments in either reading or writing. He did pass the math assessment in 4th grade.

Commented [KM1]: Noting both age and grade level provides an immediate indication of the student’s history. Is 12 years old age appropriate for most 5th graders? Comment #9 will confirm that Michael was retained in 3rd grade.

Commented [KM2]: Evaluators will need to understand the difference between ELL programs. Bilingual and ESL have very different instructional models. Remember what you learned in Day 3 also about the impact that language instruction has on student achievement.

Commented [KM3]: It’s important to note LPAC information for ELL students. Collaboration with the LPAC is required for decision-making when the student is an ELL. The LPAC also provides valuable information about the student’s oral language history, current proficiency levels and language of instruction. In Michael’s case, formal oral language testing through the LPAC has already established that his Spanish proficiency is extremely low (level 1). That combined with history as an ESL student (no access to native language instruction) will help inform the decision to assess him in English.

Commented [KM4]: Make sure to cite TELPAS results, since they will assist interpreting oral language scores. Keep in mind that only the Reading score is based on an objective measure (assessment). All other TELPAS scores are based on holistic observation. This is why relying on TELPAS results alone for oral language information may not give you a complete picture of the student’s language proficiency in English. In Michael’s case, recent formal language testing in English and Spanish had been completed. Otherwise, similar testing should be completed as part of the evaluation process.

Commented [KM5]: Parent information is important for interpreting oral language scores also. Note that the grandmother is the primary Spanish speaker in the home.

Commented [KM6]: What impact does socio-economic status have on language development and academic achievement? This information typically comes from PEIMS and/or the student’s cumulative folder.

Commented [KM7]: It’s important to note when a student was retained but also why. Also note if there has been any history of academic success as well. Previous educational history, including out-of-state, should all be documented as part of the initial data gathering process.

11. Michael is currently passing his classes but with marginal (70s) grades in reading/ language arts. His teacher notes that she is accommodating his assignments with extra time and the opportunity to retake **tests**.
12. Michael's teacher notes that he is very well-behaved and that he works hard, but he struggles to keep up with **assignments**. No behavior concerns at home are noted by the parent.
13. During the testing sessions, Michael was polite and cooperative. He persisted on tasks that were clearly difficult for him and did not complain or attempt to avoid challenging **items**.
14. Current reading benchmarks place him in the bottom 25% of his grade **level**. Approximately 30% of Michael's classmates are also classified as English language learners. His performance is lower than all ELL peers in his class.
15. Individually administered oral reading fluency measures (DIBELS Next) show that his accuracy is <80%. His rate is 57 wcpm. DIBELS Next benchmark goals for rate are 130+ wcpm (EOY-5th grade). Michael's DIBELS (DAZE-comprehension) score was 14, which is below benchmark. His prosody is observed to be poor, with multiple hesitations and self-corrects **noted**. Informal assessment indicates that he has 100% accuracy with letter-sound knowledge.
16. Michael has a history of good attendance, and only one disciplinary incident is noted in the past.
17. School records from May 2014 indicate that Michael's vision is not within normal limits, but he wears glasses consistently. His vision is within normal limits when corrected. Michael's hearing is within normal **limits**. No significant history of physical or medical concerns are noted by his mother.
18. Michael's school does not have a consistent intervention process in place although he does participate in software-based reading intervention (Istation) two times per week for 30 minutes each session. Diagnostic reports from Istation appear to corroborate DIBELS reports (<80% accuracy and approximately 60 wcpm rate) and indicate that he is well below benchmark levels in all reading skill **areas** including decoding, fluency, comprehension.

Commented [KM8]: Just because a student has passing grades doesn't rule out a referral for dyslexia. In many cases teachers may be providing accommodations to support students with core content instruction. Accommodations should be documented as part of the initial data gathering process.

Commented [KM9]: Note attendance and behavioral history as both can impact academic achievement. This information should be included as part of the initial data gathering process.

Commented [KM10]: Michael's history shows us that he has been struggling for a long time, so the impact of motivation and behavior should also be considered. In Michael's case despite his difficulty with grade level reading and writing assignments he continued to put forth his best effort. What does this tell you about the social emotional side of Michael?

Commented [KM11]: Remember ELL students should be compared to other ELLs. Studies have shown that students who come from campuses with larger percentages of ELL students are less likely to be over-identified for disabilities. In fact, in many cases schools with higher proportions of ELL students may actually under-identify their students with disabilities.

Commented [KM12]: Note comparison to grade level expectations/norms. The norms for DIBELS Next were included in the referral information for Michael. This comparative information is critical for understanding not only if the student is below expectations for age/grade level, but how severe the deficits are.

Commented [KM13]: Lack of educational opportunity (school attendance) as well as hearing and vision are exclusionary factors that must be ruled out as the primary cause of the academic difficulties. This documentation usually comes from the school nurse and should be included as part of the initial data gathering process.

Commented [KM14]: Participation in an RtI process is not a requirement for dyslexia evaluation. Regardless, there should be some diagnostic information collected as part of the initial data gathering process. Having corroborating information from more than one source is also important-no single source of data should be used for decision-making

19. Classroom spelling samples show evidence of poor phonics development and poor retention of common spelling patterns (orthographic memory). Poor retention of sight words is also noted by teachers. Michael's handwriting shows spacing and letter formation deficits and is occasionally illegible.

Commented [KM15]: Classroom work samples play an important role in confirming or questioning the results of standardized assessment.

20. Michael's classroom teachers in 3rd, 4th, and 5th grades have all noted the provision of in-classroom, one-on-one support for reading and writing, as well as accommodations for assignments. Teachers do note that Michael performs much better on math word problems when they read the questions to him.

Commented [KM16]: Math is often used as a potential area of unexpectedness. Information collected can be either formal or informal, or a combination of the two.

LPAC Testing (Spring 2014)

All scores indicated are Standard Scores with a Mean of 100 and Standard Deviation of 15. Scores of 90-110 are within the average range of performance.

Commented [KM17]: Standard scores will be included under each skill area on the report template. Results of the Woodcock-Munoz Language Survey-Revised (WMLS-R) were obtained from the LPAC.

Woodcock-Munoz Language Survey-Revised
English
Oral Expression- 88
Listening Comprehension- 95
Extended Oral Language- 89
(Picture) Vocabulary- 76

Woodcock-Munoz Language Survey-Revised
Spanish
Oral Expression-42
Listening Comprehension- 35
Extended Oral Language- 31
(Picture)Vocabulary- 51

Standardized Testing (Fall 2014)

All scores indicated are Standard Scores with a Mean of 100 and Standard Deviation of 15. Scores of 90-110 are within the average range of performance.

Phonological Awareness (CTOPP)= 81

Rapid Naming Facility (CTOPP)= 77

Phonological Memory (CTOPP)= 75

Letter Word ID (WJ-III)= 72

Passage Comprehension (WJ-III)=82

Word Attack (WJ-III)= 67

Reading Fluency (WJ-III)= 57

Spelling (WJ-III)= 71

Listening Comprehension (WJ-III)=92

(Academic) Picture Vocabulary-78

Oral Expression (WJ-III)= 85

Oral Language (Extended-WJ-III)= 87

Commented [KM18]: Standard scores will be included under each skill area on the report template. Both the CTOPP (Comprehensive Test of Phonological Processing) and WJ-III (Woodcock-Johnson Tests of Achievement-Third Edition) were utilized in conjunction with informal data gathered for Step 1 of the evaluation process.

SAMPLE