

DYSLEXIA EVALUATION REPORT FOR STUDENTS WHO ARE BILINGUAL (ENGLISH/SPANISH SPEAKING)

Student: Michael ID#: 0000034 DOB: 09/30/02 Gr: 5
Campus: Someplace ES Date of Assessment: November 17, 2014

REASON FOR REFERRAL: Page 1 and the top section on page 2 of this form **must** be completed by the referring campus **before** sending to dyslexia evaluator. Provide or attach educational background data including but not limited to previous screenings, universal screeners, curriculum-based/progress monitoring, information from classroom teacher(s), parent information, and student information. **remainder of the profile is to be completed by the dyslexia evaluator.**

SPECIFIC REASON FOR REFERRAL:

Michael has a history of struggling with reading and language arts. Records indicate that he has never passed a state assessment in either subject. Classroom grade reports and benchmark assessments also indicate a history of marginal/failing grades in reading/language arts. Michael's benchmark scores place him in the bottom 25% of his grade level. His performance is also lower than other ELL peers in his classroom. Michael is an ESL student who has only received English instruction since Kindergarten. Michael attended school in Missouri in grades K-2 before moving to Texas. He has attended school on a consistent basis at Someplace ES since the 3rd grade. Michael was retained in the 3rd grade at Someplace ES when he did not pass the state assessment in reading. Records indicate that Spanish and English are both spoken in the home although Michael speaks only English at school.

Summary of data points 1-20

Commented [MR1]: Comments in bubbles throughout evaluation will aid the Presenter facilitate tie-in of comments from data story to where they fit in evaluation report.

Summary of data points 15 & 18. Specific scores will be noted later in the report

PREVIOUS SCREENING INFORMATION:

(Include TPRI/Tejas LEE, Istation, STAR Early Literacy scores, benchmarks, state assessment results, if available, etc.)
Istation and DIBELS diagnostic reports place Michael as at-risk in most reading skill areas. His teacher indicates that she accommodates his classroom work by allowing him to retake tests and have extra time to complete his work.

Data point #6

PARENT INFORMATION:

Michael lives with his mother, grandmother, and two siblings. Information from his mother indicates that both English and Spanish are spoken in the home, although Michael primarily speaks English with the family. No family history of learning problems is noted.

TEACHER INFORMATION:

(Include observational data, writing samples, checklists, etc.)
Michael's teacher notes that he works hard and is well behaved in class but that he struggles to keep up with assignments. Michael has not participated in a direct-teach tiered intervention program as his school does not have a consistent RtI framework in place, but his teacher indicates she works with him individually in class and accommodates his reading/writing assignments and tests. Michael also has access to Istation (computer-based) interventions 2x per week for 30 minutes.

RtI is not required for evaluation, but any support that has been offered should be noted. This information comes from data points 12 & 18

THE FOLLOWING FACTORS WERE CONSIDERED AND **EXCLUDED** AS PRIMARY CONTRIBUTORS TO STUDENT'S **WORD READING AND SPELLING DIFFICULTIES** (*The Dyslexia Handbook – Revised 2014: Procedures Concerning Dyslexia and Related Disorders*, pgs. 17, 22, and 69):

- VISION** – Explain: Michael's vision is within normal limits, aided. Records indicate that he does wear his glasses consistently at school. School health report: May 2014
- HEARING** – Explain: Michael's hearing is within normal limits, unaided: school health report May 2014
- HEALTH-RELATED CONCERNS** (e.g., brain injury, disease, or surgery that interferes with learning) – Explain: no specific health concerns are indicated by the parent
- ATTENDANCE** (e.g., frequent change of schools or districts, irregular attendance, and/or frequent tardies, etc.) – Explain: Michael has attended two different schools: K-2 in Missouri and grades 3-5 at Someplace ISD in Texas. No history of significant absences is noted.
- CULTURE/LANGUAGE/EXPERIENTIAL BACKGROUND** – Explain: Records indicate both English and Spanish are spoken in the home. Michael is identified as an English Language Learner and receives content-based ESL support. Michael has only received English instruction since Kindergarten. Current oral language proficiency assessment indicates English is his dominant language.

Data point 17

Data points 8 & 16

It's important to note that specific consideration was given to what language(s) were appropriate for assessment for an ELL student. Reference data points 2-6

EVALUATION SUMMARY AND PROFILE – TO BE COMPLETED BY DYSLEXIA EVALUATOR

CONSIDERATIONS FOR ENGLISH LANGUAGE LEARNERS:

A professional involved in the assessment, interpretation of assessment results, and identification of ELLs with dyslexia needs to have the following training/knowledge:

- Knowledge of first and second language acquisition theory
- Knowledge of the written system of the first language – transparent (Spanish, Italian, German), syllabic (Japanese-kana), Semitic (Arabic, Hebrew), and morphosyllabic (Chinese-Kanji)
- Knowledge of student's literacy skills in native and second language
- Knowledge of how to interpret results from a cross-linguistic perspective
- Knowledge of how to interpret the TELPAS (Texas English Language Proficiency Assessment System)
- Knowledge of how to interpret the results of the student's oral language proficiency in two or more languages in relation to the results of the tests measuring academic achievement and cognitive processes as well as academic data gathered and economic and socioeconomic factors

(*The Dyslexia Handbook – Revised 2014: Procedures Concerning Dyslexia and Related Disorders*, pgs. 19-20)

ASSESS AND EVALUATE LANGUAGE DEVELOPMENT AND PROFICIENCY

Knowledge of a child's language proficiency and language dominance forms the basis of any assessment and guides the appropriate collection of information and data. Language proficiency in both languages **must** be assessed and determined as such information is crucial to the interpretation of any assessment data that is gathered. (Samuel O. Ortiz, Ph.D., St. John's University; Criselda Alvarado, Ph.D. "Best Practices in Assessment of Culturally Linguistic Diverse Students", pg. 6, 10-2006.)

ORAL LANGUAGE PROFICIENCY & DOMINANCE: Testing should be conducted in both languages of the student. Use this information to interpret other test scores. (*The Dyslexia Handbook – Revised 2014: Procedures Concerning Dyslexia and Related Disorders, pg. 20*)

ATTENTION OR MEMORY issues may impact (lower) the **listening comprehension** score; additional data can help substantiate possible difficulties such as teacher observations, parent observations, experiential background, etc. Additional areas for assessment (formal or informal measures) may include vocabulary, syntax, pragmatics, semantics, background knowledge, and inferencing.

AREAS EVALUATED	ASSESSMENT INSTRUMENT	STANDARD SCORE ENGLISH	STANDARD SCORE SPANISH	CALP LEVEL OF PROFICIENCY ENGLISH	CALP LEVEL OF PROFICIENCY SPANISH
LISTENING COMPREHENSION	WJ-III/WMLS-R	92/95	35	3.5	1
ORAL EXPRESSION	WJ-III/WMLS-R	85/88	42	3.5	1
AREAS EVALUATED	ASSESSMENT INSTRUMENT	STANDARD SCORE ENGLISH	STANDARD SCORE SPANISH	CALP LEVEL OF PROFICIENCY ENGLISH	CALP LEVEL OF PROFICIENCY SPANISH
ORAL LANGUAGE* (EXT)	WJ-III/WMLS-R	87/89	31	3.5	1
INFORMAL MEASURES	TELPAS IPT	Listening: Advanced High Speaking: Advanced High		Fluent English Speaker	Negligible Spanish Speaker
ACADEMIC VOCABULARY KNOWLEDGE*	WJ-III/WMLS-R	78/76	51		Negligible Spanish Speaker

*The problems many students face with language proficiency revolve more around their lack of mastery of academic English than their ability to decode single words. (Wong, Fillimore, & Snow, 2000)

Score information obtained from data points 3-5 and formal evaluation results (WJ-III)

RECOMMENDED PRACTICES FOR ASSESSING LANGUAGE PROFICIENCY:

"In general, the child's language performance must be compared to that of other bilingual speakers who have similar cultural and linguistic experience. (i.e., The child should be compared to members of the same cultural group who speak the same language/dialect and who have had similar opportunities to hear and use both languages.)" (Robert L. Rhodes, Salvador Hector Ochoa, and Samuel O. Ortiz, "Assessing Culturally and Linguistically Diverse Students", 2005.)

HOME LANGUAGE SURVEY (DATE): 08/16/2010	LANGUAGE: English/Spanish
PARENT DATA: Michael's mother notes that both English and Spanish are spoken in the home. Michael primarily speaks English both at school and home.	
CONVERSATION SAMPLES observing discourse rules and language use: Michael's teacher rates his conversational proficiency in English as average. LPAC testing completed in May 2014 indicates that Michael is a Fluent English Speaker and Negligible Spanish Speaker. Michael indicates that he speaks mostly English and only "speaks a little Spanish with his grandmother". Based on home and LPAC information, further formal testing of oral language was completed only in English.	
NARRATIVE RETELL TASK: Michael performed well on a narrative retell task in English. His performance was relatively weaker on a task identifying academic vocabulary. Previous testing using the Woodcock Munoz Language Survey (Spanish) showed very limited oral expressive skills in Spanish.	
(ORAL) CLOZE PROCEDURE: Michael's performance on an oral cloze task was within the average range. Overall, his oral language development in English appears adequate at this time. Previous testing using the Woodcock Munoz Language Survey (Spanish) showed very limited comprehension skills in Spanish.	

It's important to note observation and informal data especially for ELLs. Reference data points 3-6 and formal test results (WJ-III & WMLS-R)

ACADEMIC SKILLS – AREAS FOR ASSESSMENT:

The committee (§504 or ARD) **must** first determine whether a student's difficulties in the areas of **word reading and spelling** reflect a pattern of evidence for the primary characteristics of dyslexia with **unexpectedly** low performance for the student's age and educational level in some or all of the following areas (*The Dyslexia Handbook – Revised 2014: Procedures Concerning Dyslexia and Related Disorders, pg. 22*):*

PRIMARY CHARACTERISTICS OF DYSLEXIA	ASSESSMENT INSTRUMENT	COMPOSITE OR SUBTEST*	STANDARD ERROR OF MEASURE ¹	BELOW AVERAGE SS	AVERAGE SS	ABOVE AVERAGE SS
WORD READING – [Reading words in isolation]	E:WJ-III S:	<input type="checkbox"/> Composite <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Subtest	E: S:	E:72 S:	E: S:	E: S:
DECODING UNFAMILIAR WORDS ACCURATELY	E:WJ-III S:	<input type="checkbox"/> Composite <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Subtest	E: S:	E:67 S:	E: S:	E: S:

SPELLING – [An isolated difficulty in spelling would NOT be sufficient to identify dyslexia.]	E:WJ-III S:	<input type="checkbox"/> Composite X Subtest	E: S:	E:71 S:	E: S:	E: S:
LETTER KNOWLEDGE AND LETTER-SOUND CORRESPONDENCE: Informal and/or observational data.	Informal		E: S:	E: S:	E:Average S:	E: S:

Reference formal test results (WJ-III) and data points 14, 15, 18, 19

**Because phonological decoding is easier to master in Spanish than in English, phonological dyslexics are harder to detect. Differences between good readers and the reading disabled become more apparent when pseudo-words or words with low frequency are used. For this reason, pseudo-word reading is the most commonly used task in Spanish to select dyslexic children characterized by difficulties in using the phonological route. (Carmen López-Escribano and Tami Katzir, "Are Phonological Processes Separate from the Processes Underlying Naming Speed in a Shallow Orthography." Journal of Research in Educational Psychology, Vol. 6(3), pg. 646, 2008. [Citing R. Guzmán, "Evaluación de la velocidad lectora de nombrar en las dificultades de aprendizaje de la lectura." Psycotherma, 16, 442-447, 2004 and J. E. Jiménez, "Do the effects of computer-assisted practice differ for children with and without IQ-achievement discrepancy." Journal of Learning Disabilities, Vol. 36, 2003]).*

The main observation is that the difficulties of Spanish dyslexic children are more noticeable when time is measured than when accuracy is measured. In other words, the deficit of the Spanish dyslexic children in terms of reading procedures and phonological processing skills becomes clearer when performance time is considered. (F. Serrano, S. Defior, "Dyslexia Speed Problems in a Transparent Orthography." Annals of Dyslexia, Vol. 58, pg. 90, 2008)

FLUENCY* Slow, inaccurate, or labored oral reading.							
READING FLUENCY - [Rate, Accuracy, and Prosody must be reported separately]	ASSESSMENT INSTRUMENT	WCPM [Rate]	% CORRECT [Accuracy]	STANDARD ERROR OF MEASURE¹	BELOW AVERAGE SS	AVERAGE SS	ABOVE AVERAGE SS
ACCURACY – [Reading words in text with no errors]	E:WJ-III/IStation/DIBELS S:		E:70% S:	E: S:	E:57 S:	E: S:	E: S:
RATE – [Words correct per minute]	E:WJ-III/IStation/DIBELS S:	E:57 wcpm S:		E: S:	E: S:	E: S:	E: S:
OBSERVED PROSODY: [Pitch, tone, volume, emphasis, & rhythm]	E:Informal S:			E: S:	E:Poor S:	E: S:	E: S:
OTHER FLUENCY INDICATORS [specify]: _____ _____	E: S:			E: S:	E: S:	E: S:	E: S:

Reference formal test results (WJ-III) and data points 15&18

*Fluency scores obtained through curriculum-based measures. Rate (words correct per minute), and accuracy level based on percent of words read correctly.

This section would not apply as Spanish reading assessments were not utilized.

"A Spanish-speaking child with a mild-to-moderate difficulty in phonological awareness may acquire word reading skills in Spanish with minimal difficulty, but manifest difficulties in fluency because of the more transparent orthography of Spanish relative to other alphabetic languages, such as English." (R.K. Wagner, D.J. & R.D. Morris, "Identifying English Language Learners with Disabilities: Key Challenges and Possible Approaches." *Learning Disabilities Research & Practice*, Vol. 20, pgs. 6-15, 2005.)

While decoding, word recognition, accuracy, and spelling are important dyslexia indicators in the English orthography, in more transparent orthographies, such as Spanish, it has less influence. Spanish-speaking children usually have more problems related to reading speed and orthographic knowledge. Their main reading problem is slow, laborious decoding of words when task demand increases. (Carmen López-Escribano and Tami Katzir, "Are Phonological Processes Separate from the Processes Underlying Naming Speed in a Shallow Orthography." *Journal of Research in Educational Psychology*, Vol. 6(3), pgs. 641-666, 2008.)

QUALITATIVE DATA – Information from classroom to include curriculum-based monitoring data (e.g., TPRI/Tejas LEE, Istation, etc.); reading and spelling inventories; and independent writing samples.

Formal and informal decoding, spelling and fluency measures indicate that Michael's skills are well below grade level expectations. He struggled to decide both real and unfamiliar words with automaticity and performed poorly on a silent reading fluency test. Istation reports also indicate fluency as an area of significant concern.

*If using subtest scores rather than a composite score, what additional data validates subtest scores?
Benchmark assessment, Istation reports, DIBELS

Data points 15 & 18

Based on professional judgment in reviewing the student's qualitative and quantitative data, the evaluator has included the following assessments: **reading comprehension, mathematics, and written expression.** Measures used may be formal or informal.

(*The Dyslexia Handbook – Revised 2014: Procedures Concerning Dyslexia and Related Disorders*, pgs. 20 – 22.)

SECONDARY CONSEQUENCES	ASSESSMENT INSTRUMENT [If formal, what assessment instrument was utilized?]	COMPOSITE OR SUBTEST*	STANDARD ERROR OF MEASURE ¹	BELOW AVERAGE SS	AVERAGE SS	ABOVE AVERAGE SS
READING COMPREHENSION X Formal X Informal	E:WJ-III/Istation/DIBELS S:	<input type="checkbox"/> Composite <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Subtest	E: S:	E:82 S:	E: S:	E: S:
MATHEMATICS <input type="checkbox"/> Formal X Informal	E:Classroom/state tests S:	<input type="checkbox"/> Composite <input type="checkbox"/> Subtest	E: S:	E: S:	E:Passing S:	E: S:
WRITTEN EXPRESSION [Informal writing samples]	E: S:	<input type="checkbox"/> Composite <input type="checkbox"/> Subtest	E: S:	E:Poor S:	E: S:	E: S:

Formal test results (WJ-III) and data points 14, 15, 18, 20

QUALITATIVE DATA – If providing informal data only, information from classroom should include: informal inventories, progress monitoring data and/or independent work samples.

Formal and informal data indicate reading comprehension as an area of concern. Michael's poor decoding and fluency skills likely impact his comprehension. Classroom and state assessments show passing scores in math. His teacher does note math as an area of relative strength compared to reading and writing. Writing samples show poor composition as well as multiple spelling and punctuation errors.

*If using subtest scores rather than a composite score, what additional data validates subtest scores?
Classroom tests, Istation reports, state assessments

COGNITIVE PROCESSES UNDERLYING ACADEMIC WEAKNESSES – AREAS FOR ASSESSMENT:

Difficulties in **phonological** and **phonemic awareness** are typically seen in students with dyslexia. (The Dyslexia Handbook – Revised 2014: Procedures Concerning Dyslexia and Related Disorders, pg. 20.)

DIFFICULTIES: UNDERLYING CAUSE	ASSESSMENT INSTRUMENT	COMPOSITE OR SUBTEST*	STANDARD ERROR OF MEASURE ¹	BELOW AVERAGE SS	AVERAGE SS	ABOVE AVERAGE SS
PHONOLOGICAL AWARENESS	E:CTOPP S:	X Composite <input type="checkbox"/> Subtest	E: S:	E:81 S:	E: S:	E: S:
RAPID NAMING	E:CTOPP S:	X Composite <input type="checkbox"/> Subtest	E: S:	E:77 S:	E: S:	E: S:

Formal test results:
CTOPP

If phonological awareness is within the average range, consider the following:

- If a composite score is reported, look at the individual subtests that may reflect specific skill deficits reported in the composite score.
- Has the student received intervention that may have normalized the score? If so, it is important to note that because previous effective instruction in phonological/phonemic awareness may remediate phonological skills in isolation. Average phonological awareness scores alone do not rule out dyslexia. Ongoing phonological processing deficits can be exhibited in word reading and/or spelling. (The Dyslexia Handbook – Revised 2014: Procedures Concerning Dyslexia and Related Disorders, pg. 22.)

Developmental dyslexia in Spanish seems to be associated with reading-related cognitive deficits that involve verbal working-memory, naming speed, and impairment in two main phonological skills related to learning to read, phonemic awareness, and phonological short-term memory. (These results lend support to the subgroup of dyslexics who experience the double-deficit phonological impairment plus impairment in naming speed which is the most serious dyslexic subgroup.) (Manuel Soriano and Lana Miranda, "Developmental Dyslexia in a Transparent Orthography: A Study of Spanish Dyslexic Children." Advances in Learning and Behavior Differences, Vol. 23, pg. 95, 2010.)

Letter Knowledge – name and associated sound are key to learning how to read and are not of and by themselves an indicator of dyslexia.

Depending on the nature of the writing system in the student's L1, rapid naming may be a better indicator of underlying cognitive deficits. (Carmen López-Escribano and Tami Katzir, "Are Phonological Processes Separate from the Processes Underlying Naming Speed in a Shallow Orthography." Journal of Research in Educational Psychology, Vol. 6(3), pg. 647, 2008.)

QUALITATIVE DATA – Information from classroom to include: early reading screeners, reading and spelling inventories, and information from teacher(s) and parents.

Composite scores in Phonological Awareness and Rapid Naming from the CTOPP are both in the below average range. Diagnostic reading reports show a history of difficulties with blending and manipulating phonemes.

*If using subtest scores rather than a composite score, what additional data validates subtest scores?
Composite scores were utilized.

UNEXPECTEDNESS – AREAS FOR ASSESSMENT:

Based on the above information and *The Dyslexia Handbook* guidelines, should the committee (§504 or ARD) determine that the student exhibits weaknesses in **word reading and spelling**, the committee **must** then examine the student’s data to determine whether these difficulties are **unexpected** in relation to the student’s other abilities, sociocultural factors, language difference, irregular attendance, or lack of appropriate and effective instruction. *“The student may exhibit strengths in areas such as reading comprehension, listening comprehension, math reasoning or verbal ability yet still have difficulty with reading and spelling. Therefore, it is not one single indicator but a preponderance of data (both informal and formal) that provide the committee with evidence for whether these difficulties are unexpected.”*

(The Dyslexia Handbook – Revised 2014: Procedures Concerning Dyslexia and Related Disorders, pg. 22.)

- | | | |
|--|-------|-----------------------------|
| A. Is the student’s listening comprehension (ability to comprehend what he/she is listening to) age and grade appropriate in either their native or second language (or both)? | X Yes | <input type="checkbox"/> No |
| B. Is the student’s listening comprehension in the absence of print age and grade appropriate in either their native or second language (or both)? | X Yes | <input type="checkbox"/> No |
| C. Is the student’s verbal expression age and grade appropriate in either their native or second language (or both)? | X Yes | <input type="checkbox"/> No |

AREA EVALUATED	ASSESSMENT INSTRUMENT	COMPOSITE OR SUBTEST*	STANDARD ERROR OF MEASURE ¹	BELOW AVERAGE SS	AVERAGE SS	ABOVE AVERAGE SS
ORAL EXPRESSION	E:WJ-III/WMLS-R S:	X Composite <input type="checkbox"/> Subtest	E: S:	E:85/88 S:	E: S:	E: S:
VOCABULARY KNOWLEDGE	E:WJ-III/WMLS-R S:	<input type="checkbox"/> Composite X Subtest	E: S:	E:78/76 S:	E: S:	E: S:

Formal test results:
WJ-III & WMLS-R

QUALITATIVE DATA – Information from informal inventories, teacher(s), parent(s), and student.
Teacher rating scales place Michael’s oral language skills in English in the average range. TELPAS ratings in Listening and Speaking also classify his skills as Advanced. Formal evaluation shows some weaknesses in vocabulary knowledge, but overall Michael’s oral language skills appear adequate in English.

*If using subtest scores rather than a composite score, what additional data validates subtest scores?
Teacher rating, TELPAS, parent information, LPAC

Remember to cite both formal and informal data for oral language especially with ELL students

D. Is the student’s reading comprehension age and grade appropriate in either their native or second language (or both)? Yes No
 E. Is the student’s math reasoning age and grade appropriate in either their native or second language (or both)? Yes No

AREA EVALUATED	ASSESSMENT INSTRUMENT	COMPOSITE OR SUBTEST*	STANDARD ERROR OF MEASURE ¹	BELOW AVERAGE SS	AVERAGE SS	ABOVE AVERAGE SS
READING COMPREHENSION	E:WJ-III S:	<input type="checkbox"/> Composite <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Subtest	E: S:	E:82 S:	E: S:	E: S:
MATH REASONING	E: classroom/state tests S:	<input type="checkbox"/> Composite <input type="checkbox"/> Subtest	E: S:	E: S:	E:Passing S:	E: S:

QUALITATIVE DATA – Information from informal inventories, teacher(s), parent(s), and student.
Reading comprehension is noted as a consistent area of concern on both classroom and state assessments. Math is noted as an area of relative strength.

*If using subtest scores rather than a composite score, what additional data validates subtest scores?
Classroom reports, state assessments, Istation/DIBELS reports

Reading comprehension can be affected by decoding and fluency deficits. It may not always be an area of strength. Reference data points 15, 18, 20 and formal test results: WJ-III

ADDITIONAL ASSESSMENT: Based on professional judgment in reviewing the student’s qualitative and quantitative data, the evaluator has included the following assessments related to word reading and spelling: phonological memory, orthographic processing, verbal working memory, and/or processing speed.

(The Dyslexia Handbook – Revised 2014: Procedures Concerning Dyslexia and Related Disorders, pgs. 20 - 21.)

SECONDARY CONSEQUENCES	ASSESSMENT INSTRUMENT [If formal, what assessment instrument was utilized?]	COMPOSITE OR SUBTEST*	STANDARD ERROR OF MEASURE ¹	BELOW AVERAGE SS	AVERAGE SS	ABOVE AVERAGE SS
PHONOLOGICAL MEMORY X Formal <input type="checkbox"/> Informal	E:CTOPP S:	X Composite <input type="checkbox"/> Subtest	E: S:	E:75 S:	E: S:	E: S:
ORTHOGRAPHIC PROCESSING X Formal X Informal	E:WJ-III, Classroom samples S:	<input type="checkbox"/> Composite X Subtest	E: S:	E:72, 71 S:	E: S:	E: S:
VERBAL WORKING MEMORY <input type="checkbox"/> Formal <input type="checkbox"/> Informal	E: S:	<input type="checkbox"/> Composite <input type="checkbox"/> Subtest	E: S:	E: S:	E: S:	E: S:
PROCESSING SPEED <input type="checkbox"/> Formal <input type="checkbox"/> Informal	E: S:	<input type="checkbox"/> Composite <input type="checkbox"/> Subtest	E: S:	E: S:	E: S:	E: S:

QUALITATIVE DATA – information from informal inventories, teacher(s), parents(s), and student:
Michael’s composite score on phonological memory from the CTOPP was well below average. Formal and informal measures of visual word recognition and spelling are also well below average.

*If using subtest scores rather than a composite score, what additional data validates subtest scores?
Classroom samples, Istation reports/DIBELS

Remember that orthographic processing weaknesses can show up with difficulties in sight word recognition and spelling. Reference formal test results: WJ-III & CTOPP. Also note: data points 15, 18, 19

ASSOCIATED ACADEMIC DIFFICULTIES AND OTHER (CO-OCCURRING) CONDITIONS should be included in the summary and conclusions narrative following this section. <i>(The Dyslexia Handbook – Revised 2014: Procedures Concerning Dyslexia and Related Disorders, pg. 11.)</i>	
<input type="checkbox"/> ATTENTION	Describe: <u>no concerns noted.</u>
<input type="checkbox"/> HANDWRITING	Describe: <u>Michael’s handwriting shows spacing and letter formation issues and is occasionally illegible.</u>
<input type="checkbox"/> FAMILY HISTORY OF READING DIFFICULTIES	Describe: <u>none noted.</u>
<input type="checkbox"/> BEHAVIOR ISSUES	Describe: <u>Teachers and parent describe Michael as well-behaved at school and home.</u>
<input type="checkbox"/> MOTIVATION	Describe: <u>Michael’s teacher indicates that he is a hard-worker in class.</u>
<input type="checkbox"/> SPEECH ISSUES	Describe: <u>none noted.</u>
<input type="checkbox"/> OTHER:	Describe: _____
<input type="checkbox"/> OTHER:	Describe: _____

Data point 19

Data points 12 & 13

Data point 12

SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS NARRATIVE – [attach additional page(s) if necessary]:

Significant decoding, spelling, fluency and reading comprehension weaknesses are noted in both formal and informal assessments. Weaknesses are also indicated in phonological awareness, phonological memory, and rapid naming. Math is noted by school records as a relative strength along with his overall oral language skills in English. While Michael is an English Language Learner and has not had access to native language instruction, he does appear to have had access to ESL instructional support since Kindergarten and his reading and writing skills in English do appear weaker in relation to his oral language skills. All results should be interpreted in light of the student’s cultural, linguistic, and experiential background.

The summary can be a brief review of the student’s strengths and weaknesses and educational history. For ELL students, the impact of culture and language factors also must be considered. Remember the committee makes the recommendation for eligibility.

DYSLEXIA EVALUATION COMPLETED BY:

Ms. Everybody

Signature of Dyslexia Evaluator

¹ **STANDARD ERROR OF MEASURE** - The standard error is the estimated standard deviation or measure of variability in the sampling distribution of a statistic. A low standard error means there is relatively less spread in the sampling distribution. The standard error indicates the likely accuracy of the sample mean as compared with the population mean. The standard error decreases as the sample size increases and approaches the size of the population.