Reason for Referral:
Age: 11  
Grade: 6  
School: St. Somnolent School.  
Family: mother, stepfather, two sisters (19 and 17) brother 24 (not living at home)  
Language spoken: English  

Referred by: the principal of St. Somnolent  
Reason: poor attention and academic difficulty in all subjects.

Most Significant Factors in Family, School or Social History:
Pregnancy: normal  
Labor: lasted 15 hours  
Delivery: umbilical cord wrapped around neck; mother told he did not have difficulty breathing  

Developmental milestones: Sat up - 6 mo. Crawled - 8 mo. Walked 13 mo. First words - 15 mo. Two words together - 24 mo. Complete sentences - 3 yrs. (normal)  
Infancy and toddler stages: no problems, normal development  

School history:  
Kg - 3rd grade in public school in another state  
Family moved to Chicago at end of 3rd grade.  
One year public school in Chicago; mother dissatisfied with progress  
Now starting second year at St. Somnolent.  

Testing: Special Ed. evaluation - second grade  
Reason: reading problems.  
Decision: "remain in the regular classroom; no additional services."  
Records from that evaluation: not available  

Current school report: daydreams in class; cannot complete class work. After being given an assignment he has no idea what the teacher has said.  

General Health and Illness:  
General health: good.  
Childhood diseases: several mild ear infections during infancy; chicken pox at age 8  
Illness: none, does not take any medication.
Vision history: Has had glasses for 2 years; does not like to wear them.
Hearing history: passed school screening

Mother reports lapses in attention: vacant stare for a few seconds, mildly disoriented, little recollection of what was just said.
Same phenomenon reported by classroom teacher. Observed during testing as well.
School officials suggested: lapses could be of neurological origin.
Testing scheduled: mother has arranged for neurological exam including EEG which will be completed soon.

Current Vision Assessment:
Vision: wears glasses - did not bring them to any session (he forgot) despite repeated requests.
Vision tested without glasses.
Results: did not pass acuity items for distance. All other results OK.

Current Hearing Assessment:
Hearing: assessment was normal, no problems

Behavior During Testing:
Mike was friendly, likeable, easygoing. General behavior: cooperative.
Rapport with examiner: good, warmed up easily, talkative
Motivation: worked hard, rarely wanted to take a break
Self-concept: fairly good even though he knows he does not do well in school
Testing was very frustrating: never refused a task, tried hard; handles by avoiding, stalling.

Approach to Task(s):
Attention span: Low average if task was within his ability; quite distractible if things were hard.
Had several short lapses of attention. Wanted to know what the noises were outside the testing room.

Approach to difficult tasks: on difficult tasks he would hold his head, slump in his chair, wrinkle his forehead, and stare at the wall. Often said "Oh my" "Hmmm" "Oh my goodness" "Oh my God" etc. During oral reading he would repeat words, cough, look around. (Stalling, gaining sympathy?)

Involvement in testing: active. Tried to listen carefully and follow directions, even though he was sometimes distracted, or had lapses of attention. Frequently asked for repetitions.
Spontaneous memory strategies: subvocal rehearsal, writing in the air
Response rate: generally slow. Inordinately slow on reading and writing tasks.
Response preference: oral or pointing response.
Slow response and distractibility effected scores on timed tests.

Overall:
Wants to please, tries hard, frustrated by all the things he can't do, deals with this by gaining sympathy, avoiding the task.
Social/Emotional
Mother reports:
Has had a difficult time adjusting to his new stepfather.
Considerable sibling rivalry with 17 year old sister; very difficult relationship since birth.
Good relationships with rest family.
To escape the difficult relations he daydreams a lot; talks about how wonderful his real father is; how much better things would be if he were with him.

Teachers report:
Has many friends at school, realizes the importance of friendship, works hard at being a good friend. Wants to please adults, teachers.
Attention is adequate for listening in some situations, but Mike often appears to have little idea what was said to him. Teacher has noted short lapses of attention. Daydreams, but no overt behavior problems.

Clinician reports:
Easygoing, friendly social manner. Very talkative about friends at school. Liked to talk about life in an abstract and surprisingly mature manner. Tries to gain sympathy by convincing clinician how hard the task is; avoidance; easily distracted

Integration:
Teachers have identified lapses of attention, daydreaming as a problem: What would you predict will happen as academic demands increase?
**MENTAL ABILITY:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Test</th>
<th>Score</th>
<th>Interpretation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Slossen (SIT-R)</td>
<td>40%ile</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TONI</td>
<td>55%ile</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Columbia</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WJR Cognitive Scale</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Broad Cognitive Ability</td>
<td>38%ile</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Reasoning Subtests:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Analysis/Synthesis</td>
<td>63%ile</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Concept Formation</td>
<td>59%ile</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Analogies</td>
<td>20%ile</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Notes**

Notes on WJ-R reasoning subtests: Analysis/Synthesis and Concept Formation are nonverbal reasoning tests. Analogies is verbal reasoning test - score was the lowest score on entire test.

Did best on tests of nonverbal reasoning. Results on both tests of nonverbal reasoning (WJ-R and TONI) are consistent.

Did least well (although still within the average range) on tests requiring word knowledge such as naming pictures, finishing analogies, and giving antonyms and synonyms. Results on both tests verbal reasoning (WJ-R and Slossen) are consistent: missed vocabulary items and analogies on both tests.

**Integration:**

Is mental ability adequate for grade level achievement? What will be the impact of somewhat weak vocabulary? Remember all scores are still within average range.
RECEPTIVE LANGUAGE:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Auditory Discrimination:</th>
<th>Score:</th>
<th>Interpretation:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>TOLD - P Word Discrim.</td>
<td>___%ile</td>
<td>______________________</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>✓ Wepman</td>
<td>___%ile</td>
<td>___ see notes below ______________________</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LAS</td>
<td>___%ile</td>
<td>______________________</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>___%ile</td>
<td>______________________</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes:
Wepman: 2 errors: clothe/clove  sheaf/sheath . Seemed more distracted as test went on. Errors were probably due to attention problems - passed these items when readministered during a later testing session.

Receptive Vocabulary:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Score:</th>
<th>Interpretation:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>TOLD-P Picture Voc.</td>
<td>___%ile</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>✓ PPVT-R</td>
<td>14_%ile</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes:
PPVT
Correct: pasting, bark, arch, bolt, carpenter, blazing
Did not know: tambourine, reel, spatula, pyramid, dissecting, citrus, slumbering, peninsula, barricade, abrasive, spherical

Comprehension in Context:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Score:</th>
<th>Interpretation:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>✓ WIAT List. Comp.</td>
<td>23_%ile</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LAS</td>
<td>___%ile</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>___%ile</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes:
WIAT - Listening Comprehension: there was no clear pattern of errors. Mike missed some easy items and succeeded on some very difficulty ones. (Weak oral vocabulary? Lapses of attention?)
Related Observations on Comprehension Based on Interaction During Testing:

Comprehension of Questions: no problems

Comprehension of Directions: some lapses of attention

Comprehension of Conversation: no problems

Notes:

No problems in comprehension of questions, directions (except for lapses of attention) or conversation.

Additional Receptive Vocabulary:  

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Test</th>
<th>Score</th>
<th>Interpretation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>TOLD-P Picture Voc.</td>
<td>%ile</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Durrell List. Vocab.</td>
<td>5th grade</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOAL List. Vocab.</td>
<td>%ile</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes:
Durrell 5th grade level
Correct: colossal, decade, currency, luminous, saunter, articulate, glamorous.
Did not know: azure, magenta, millennium, herbaceous, rapture, deciduous, marsupial, precipitation, irrigate.

Integration:
How can you explain the contrast in PPVT and Durrell scores? Durrell requires only general knowledge of the word: the child only has to place a word within a category such as time words or color words. PPVT requires much more specific knowledge of the attributes of a word.

Receptive Syntax:  

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Test</th>
<th>Score</th>
<th>Interpretation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>TOLD-P Gram. Unders.</td>
<td>%ile</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOLD-I Gram. Unders.</td>
<td>50%ile</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOAL List. Grammar</td>
<td>%ile</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes:
Syntax was tested because of weak vocabulary and listening comprehension, but no apparent problems.
Auditory Memory: | Score: | Interpretation: |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>WJR Numbers Rev.</td>
<td>50th %ile</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DTLA-2 Oral Dir.</td>
<td>29th %ile</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WJR Memory for Sent.</td>
<td>41st %ile</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOLD-P Sent. Imitation</td>
<td>%ile</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WJR Memory for Words</td>
<td>61st %ile</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>%ile</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes:
All scores are in the average range, but the scores for digits and unrelated words (just lists or strings of unrelated information) are a little better than the scores for memory for sentences and directions (these are more related, contextual, and longer).

Integration:
What happens as the amount to be remembered and level of complexity increases? (Why? Attention problems?)

Overall Receptive Language:
Range of scores: average to low average
Weakest area: vocabulary, (just slightly below average)
Academic language vs. everyday conversation: academic language is more difficult; most difficulty when he needs to be specific or precise.

Integration:
Listening comprehension may be affected by attention and vocabulary weaknesses, especially as the amount to remember increases.
What academic areas might be affected?
EXPRESSIVE LANGUAGE:

Exp.Vocabulary and Retrieval: Score: Interpretation:

WJR Picture Vocab.  _15_%ile

TOLD-P Oral Vocab. ___%ile

TOAL Speaking Vocab. ___%ile

WJR Oral Vocab. ___%ile

WJR Antonyms/Synonyms_23_%ile

Notes:
WJ - Picture Vocabulary errors: theater, vise, pendulum, yoke, loom, candelabra, gondola

WJ - Antonyms/Synonyms: rarely guessed, said "ummmmm" or "I don't know." Often didn't know the word stated by the examiner, so couldn't give a synonym or antonym.

Integration:
Check the WJ-R Picture Vocabulary score (expressive) with the PPVT score (receptive). Are these scores consistent? What does that tell you about the relationship between the words he understands and the words he can use?

Check the WJ-R Picture Vocabulary score with the WJ-R Antonyms/Synonyms score. Does vocabulary knowledge effect ability to give antonyms and synonyms?

Formulation: Interpretation:

Language Samples (Narr. v. Expos.)

LAS

WIAT Oral Expression _20_%ile

Notes:
WIAT - Oral expression:
Gave few details when describing a picture. Descriptions sprinkled with "let's see" "you know" "uhhh" as he tried to think of the appropriate word or expression.
When giving directions from a map: omitted one step. When asked for clarification: would hit his forehead, say "Oh my goodness" and start all over again. Reports that he always knows what he wants to say but that "it just goes away sometimes." After a little coaching, [done informally after standardized administration] final set of directions was logical and detailed.
Informal language sample: Narration: movie about THE NINJA TURTLES:
Started very slowly, with many starts and stops and lots of "uhhh" "hmmm" "well, uh" "I don't
know" "what am I saying?" "wait a minute" oh my goodness" "you know" "ooooh" "let's see" etc.
Story line: minimal but sequence OK, few details, little precision.
Excerpt: Uhhh, you know the turtles, they live in the sewers, and this one turtle, well uhhh,
Raphael, he uh, wait a minute...he uh, he got captured and the others had to rescue him.

Ordinary conversation: Enjoys philosophizing about life.
Mature ideas when speaking about how one should act and why some people act the way they
do.
Tends to go off on tangents
Sometimes does not follow through on ideas.
Example: when talking about himself the following ideas all were mentioned in about 2 or 3
minutes with little to connect them: where he was born; difficulties in packing possessions when
moving, so a sports car was left behind; the neighborhood he used to live in; the kids at school
call him Lenny, but he doesn't know why; having lunch in the catholic church every day; he
doesn't know what religion he is but his parents were married in a church.

Pragmatics:                                                                                           Interpretation:
__ ✔ Language Samples (Narr. v. Expos.)                                                                                          _____________________________
__                                                                                                                                         _____________________________

Notes:
Conversation abilities: fair.
Taking turns in a dialogue: OK
Listener and speaker: OK
New topics: OK but topics were occasionally not appropriate to the conversation, because he
could not remember what he wanted to say.
Staying on topic: problems here, gets distracted, goes off on tangents
Pronouns: sometimes did not have clear referents.
Point of view of listener: Occasionally assumed the listener had as much knowledge of the
situation as he did. (still fairly typical of 11 year old)
Expressive Syntax: | Score: | Interpretation: |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>____ TOLD-P Gram. Compl. ____%ile</td>
<td>____________________________</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>✓</strong> TOLD-I Word Ordering <em>28</em>%ile</td>
<td>____________________________</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>✓</strong> TOLD-I Sent. Combining_24_%ile</td>
<td>____________________________</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>____ TOAL Speaking Grammar___%ile</td>
<td>____________________________</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>____Language Samples (Narr. v. Expos.)</td>
<td>____________________________</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>____WIAT Oral Expression ____%ile</td>
<td>____________________________</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes:
TOLD-I Sentence Combining: asked for repetitions. (Attention? Stalling tactic?)
Language Sample: no obvious grammar problems. Adequate grammar in normal conversation

Integration:
Compare TOLD-I Word Order and Sentence Combining scores (expressive) with TOLD-I Listening Grammar score (receptive). Are these consistent? How do you explain the lower scores on the expressive tasks? TOLD-I: expressive tasks require conscious manipulation of language [more like what is required in school], also more precision. So...although he comprehends grammar, he has more difficulty using grammar rules consciously and precisely.

Articulation: | Interpretation: |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>____TOLD-P Word Arctic. ____%ile</td>
<td>____________________________</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>✓</strong> Language Samples</td>
<td>____________________________</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>____LAS</td>
<td>____________________________</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>____Slingerland Echolalia</td>
<td>____________________________</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes:
no problems noted

Overall Expressive Language

Expressive language = low average; although still in average range, not an area of strength
Weakest area: oral expression requiring precision and careful organization, also vocabulary
Use of language to communicate: fair (language not always clear)
Integration:
Is weakness in receptive vocabulary reflected in expressive language? Where might a weakness in oral expression show up academically?

SELECTED PROCESSING ABILITIES:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Auditory Analysis/Synthesis:</th>
<th>Score:</th>
<th>Interpretation:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>✔ GFW Sound Analysis</td>
<td>33%ile</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>✔ LAC</td>
<td>80/100</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>✔ WJR Sound Blending</td>
<td>55%ile</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes:
LAC Category I errors: discriminating f/s/th and k/t. Was very distracted on this test. Attention?
GFW sound analysis errors: mainly vowels in the middle position. May be due to attention problems - passed these items when readministered on a different day.

LAC Category II errors: could not do last three items - mainly involving manipulation of 4 sounds.
Overall on the LAC (Category I and II): 80 out of 100 points - somewhat low for an 11 year old. Recommended minimum score for a child in the 6th grade is 93. However, somewhat low score may be due to attention problems during Category I

Auditory-Visual Association: Score: Interpretation:

✔ WJ Auditory/Visual Learning 50%ile ________________________________

Notes:
WJ Aud/V is Learning: adequate auditory memory - could make auditory/visual associations
Visual Discrimination:  Score:  Interpretation:

✓ WJR Visual Matching  _39_%ile  ________________________________

✓ WJR Cross Out  _46_%ile  ________________________________

✓ MVPT  _52_%ile  ________________________________

Notes:
WJ - R Cross Out: worked faster here than on other timed tests, but still a bit slow. Sometimes distracted.

MVPT: no errors:

Visual Memory:  Interpretation:

✓ Durrell Vis. Mem. Prim.  _many errors  ________________________________

✓ Durrell Vis. Mem. Int.  none correct  ________________________________

✓ DTLA-2 Let. Seq.  _>1_%ile  ________________________________

✓ MVPT  ________________________________

✓ DTLA-2 Object Seq.  _10_%ile  ________________________________

✓ DTLA-2 Memory for Designs  _8_%ile  ________________________________

Notes:
Durrell Visual Memory (Primary and Intermediate) - made many errors on primary level test. Got none correct on Intermediate level. Was frustrated, but kept trying. Eventually, the Intermediate subtest was discontinued because he could not remember what the words looked like to write them down.

DTLA - Letter sequences: many errors. Could remember groups of 2 and 3 letters; when strings got longer he could still only remember 2 or 3. Said he could not see letters in his mind. Very frustrated but kept trying.

DTLA - Object Sequences: many errors. Tried verbal rehearsal. Said he could not picture the in his mind.

DTLA - Memory for Designs: Test description: Child is asked to look at a series of increasingly complex designs and reproduce them from memory. Could reproduce general
overall form, difficulty remembering details (Note: this test does not appear in the report/disk. You must add it right after Object Sequences). Got distracted, stalled.

**Visual Spatial Abilities:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Test</th>
<th>Interpretation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>✓ WJR Spatial Relations</td>
<td>20th %ile</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MVPT</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VMI</td>
<td>43rd %ile</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Notes:**
Timed test - he was accurate but slow

**Visual-Motor Integration:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Test</th>
<th>Interpretation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>✓ VMI</td>
<td>43rd %ile</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Handwriting Sample</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Notes:**
VMI - could reproduce overall design. Performance was much better than on the DTLA because the figure was there to copy (no visual memory involved)

Handwriting was legible

**Overall:**
Auditory processing: not strong but adequate.

**Integration:**
Are lower scores on auditory discrimination tests related to attention lapses? How will visual memory problems interfere with reading? spelling?
### ACHIEVEMENT:

#### READING:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Decoding: Single Words</th>
<th>Score</th>
<th>Interpretation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>✓ WIAT Basic Reading</td>
<td>24%ile</td>
<td>__________________________</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>✓ QRI Word Lists</td>
<td>4th grade</td>
<td>__________________________</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>%ile</td>
<td>__________________________</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Notes:

- WIAT basic reading errors: professional/provisional, departure/departer, cauliflower/clorifower, valid/viled, jeopardize/jeparlaze urgent/arguent, balmy/lammy, occasionally/acousonally

- QRI oral reading errors on 4th grade list: weather/weeter, precious/present, conquer/conkew, fought/fight. Errors on 5th grade list (which was too difficult for him): heaven/heev, managed/man-a-ged threatened/tret, creature/creter, tomb/tohm-buh.

- QRI Oral miscues indicate that most errors result in nonsense words or real words that do not make sense in the context of the passage - will reduce comprehension of what is read

- QRI comprehension: Had difficulty with both literal and inferential questions in both narrative and expository passages

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Phonics:</th>
<th>Score</th>
<th>Interpretation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>✓ Durrell</td>
<td></td>
<td>__________________________</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>✓ El Paso Phonics Survey</td>
<td></td>
<td>__________________________</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>✓ Northwestern Informal</td>
<td></td>
<td>__________________________</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>✓ QRI</td>
<td></td>
<td>__________________________</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Notes:

- El Paso Phonics -
  - Knows all single consonant sounds, blends, digraphs
  - Does not know vowel combinations: au, aw, ou, oa, ea, ei.
  - Short vowels: performance inconsistent, not stable
Uses phonics almost exclusively to decode
Mastery of phonics not complete (especially vowels).
Consistent with QRI errors. Makes many errors on vowel sounds

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sight Words:</th>
<th>Score:</th>
<th>Interpretation:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>✓ Fryer Dolch-Informal 2nd grade</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>✓ QRI</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes:
Fryer-Dolch Informal Sight Word List
Level: approximately second grade
Strategy: sounds them out
Errors: night/nit knee/knee knife/k-nif hadn't/hand

Analysis of QRI word lists indicate similar errors.

Integration:
Why is he having such trouble with sight words? Check processing abilities!

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Structural Analysis:</th>
<th>Score:</th>
<th>Interpretation:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SDRT</td>
<td>__%ile</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>✓ QRI</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes:
Syllabication/structural analysis measured informally
Does not use
Does not know what a root or prefix is.
Does not consciously look for syllable boundaries.
Simply sounds out letters as best he can.

Integration:
Why doesn’t he know structural analysis? Can this be explained by processing problems?
What do you know about his school history? Could this be a factor?
Context Cues:  Score:  Interpretation:

☑️ Gray Oral  □ 10%ile  ____________________________

☑️ WIAT Reading Comp.  □ 14%ile  ____________________________

☑️ QRI Passages  □  ____________________________

□  □%ile  ____________________________

Notes:
Does not appear to use context cues to decode.
Gray Oral - accuracy score = 10%ile. Indicates inability to use context cues
Sometimes makes semantic and syntactic errors; the resulting "words" are frequently not real words
Instead, tries to analyze/sound out each word, slow, laborious, coughs, long pauses, repeats words, looks around, slumps in chair, says "Oh me" etc.

Observed similar results on QRI.

Integration:
Why does he have problems with use of semantic context cues? What do you know about vocabulary? Over all language abilities?

Overall Decoding:

Integration:
Strategies: uses phonics almost exclusively. Relative strengths: auditory analysis and synthesis. Relies on sounding out, but phonics mastery not complete

Recap why he has problems with sight words, structural analysis, sight words. Problems: visual memory, possible lack of instruction. Result: difficulty developing sight vocabulary, can't remember what word looks like; does not have good strategy for decoding multisyllable words Oral language is not a strength; does not use the language context to help decode.

Compare oral reading of single words to oral reading of passages: does much worse reading orally in context. Problem: Decoding so many unknown words has cumulative effect. Results: Decoding problems interfere with meaning. Oral reading rate: excessively slow (sounding out is laborious). Does not self-correct. Little attention to punctuation or expression.
Comp of Single Words:  Score:  Interpretation:

_ __ TOAL Reading Vocab.  __17_%ile  ____________________________
_✓ WRMT Word Comp.  ___%ile  ____________________________

Notes:
WRMT-Word Comprehension: could only complete a few analogies because he couldn’t decode the words. Was distracted; asked for many repetitions.

Integration:
Problems that effect comprehension
Decoding
Oral vocabulary
Will problems comprehending single words interfere with comprehension in context?

Comp in Context:  Score:  Interpretation:

_✓ Gray Oral - Rdg. Comp. __ 8_%ile  ____________________________
_✓ QRI Oral Passage Comp. ___  ____________________________
_✓ WJ-R Passage Comp.  __23_%ile  ____________________________
_✓ WIAT Reading Comp.  __14_%ile  ____________________________
_✓ QRI Silent Pass. Comp. ___  ____________________________
_ __ TOAL Reading Grammar ___%ile  ____________________________

Notes:
Gray Oral - able to answer only a few comprehension questions. Oral reading comprehension severely effected by difficulty decoding many words.

QRI Oral Passage Comprehension: Similar results

QRI Silent Passage Comprehension- Similar results; had difficulty with both literal and inferential questions in both narrative and expository passages
Overall Reading Comprehension:
Integration:
Compare oral and silent comprehension: decoding problems interfere with both oral and silent comp. Silent is a little better; can go faster, skips what he can't decode, gets an overall sense of the passage.

Compare short to long passages: longer are harder; cumulative effect of poor decoding (FYI only: The W-J Passage Comprehension subtest requires filling in a missing word in a sentence or very short passage. The WIAT, Gray Oral, and QRI-comprehension all require comprehension of a paragraph or more of text.)

Problems that effect comprehension:
Decoding
Oral and reading vocabulary
Attention
Decoding and Comprehension both poor, needs instruction in both

WRITTEN LANGUAGE

Notes:
Handedness: right handed
Pencil grip: relaxed
Prefers: cursive
Handwriting: adequate; no problems noted.

Spelling: Score: Interpretation:
✓ PIAT (Recognition) >1%ile
✓ WIAT (Dictated) 15%ile
✓ Writing Sample (Spontaneous)

Notes:
WIAT errors: night/nit, reach/rech, nature/nachur, explain/esplan, kitchen/kichin, advice/avise, purchase/purjus, brief/bref, success/sucses, reasonable/resnabl, imaginary/emaganary, occupy/oqupie, character/chariter, official/afishl, commission/comishn, beneficial/benafishl, recognize/reciniz, familiar/fumiler

Spontaneous spelling in informal writing sample: Only uses words he thinks he can spell (no multisyllable words) which limits productivity
Spells entirely phonetically
Sample of spontaneous spelling: "I wundr wat the futur is going to look like. I wundr wat the year to thousnd is going to be like. And I think the futur is going to be like the spaseage, the cars are going to be spase ships fling in the air and the food is going to be like a hole bunch of butins that you press. And pens are going to be like, you think in your mind about the anser and the pen will do the riting."

PIAT: very frustrated, guessed on most items, picked most phonetic spelling
Note: this test (although it is multiple choice) requires visual memory of the correct spelling.

Integration:
Compare WIAT (ability to recognize correct spelling) to PIAT (ability to recall the correct spelling.) Which is better? Why? On recall test he can spell the phonetically regular words.

What processing problem is having such a major impact on spelling? What is relation of spelling to decoding? Will he have difficulty proofreading? Why?

Composition:
Score: __________________________
Interpretation: __________________________

WIAT Written Expression: 14%ile ____________________________________
Ideas/Development: 1
Organization/Unity: 1
Vocabulary: 1
Sentence Complexity: 2
Grammar/Usage: 3
Punctuation/Caps: 2

Language Sample (Narrative) ____________________________________

Language Sample (Expository) ____________________________________

TOAL Writing Vocab. ___%ile ____________________________________

TOAL Writing Gram. ___%ile _______________________________

Notes:
WIAT:
Ideas/Development: [1 out of 4 points] the theme is imaginative; did not develop ideas descriptively, gave a few elaborative examples

Organization/Unity/Coherence: [1 out of 4 points] tends to go off on tangent (as in oral language).

Vocabulary: [1 out of 4 points] limited by spelling; production was painfully slow and laborious

Grammar/Usage: [3 out of 4 points] Generally adequate, no serious errors. Limited by spelling; tended to write simple sentences that didn't require complex grammar.

Punctuation/Capitalization: [2 out of 4 points] somewhat erratic, appears not to attend consistently to punctuation while writing.

Informal writing sample: narrative about the space age; did not ask for help on spelling; story very short; similar in quality to WIAT

Overall Written Language Integration:
How do Mike’s attention, oral language, and spelling problems affect written language? Look at the first WIAT 3 scores. Why are idea development, coherence, and vocabulary low? Go back to your sections on receptive and expressive language. What do you know about his creativity and quality of his ideas? What do you know about oral language that explains these poor written language scores? What do you know about his attention?

Look at the Sentence Complexity score. Why is this score relatively low? What do you know about Mike’s oral language? What do you know about his spelling?

What might explain the poor score in punctuation? What do you know about his attention? How does this relate to proofreading?

MATHEMATICS
Score: Interpretaion:
Basic Concepts:
__✔️ Key Math-R __39_%ile ________________________________
__✔️ WJR Quant. Concepts __43_%ile ________________________________

Notes:
W-J Numeration: good knowledge of numeration concepts, including place value
Math Symbols: adequate
Geometric Concepts: generally adequate but did not know names for hexagon, octagon
Fractions: little concept of fractions beyond ½, 1/4

Integration:
Given that knowledge of math concepts is well within average range, how can you explain the fact that he didn’t know the names for hexagon and octagon? What do you know about his
receptive language abilities that is relevant here? How can you explain his lack of knowledge of fraction concepts? If there are no processing problems that can explain it, is there anything in his educational background?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Computation/Operations:</th>
<th>Score:</th>
<th>Interpretation:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>✓ WIAT Numerical Oper.</td>
<td>37%ile</td>
<td>__________________________</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>✓ Key Math-R</td>
<td>30%ile</td>
<td>__________________________</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WRAT</td>
<td></td>
<td>__________________________</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes:
WIAT - Knows essentials of computation facts and algorithms
Problems: cannot compute problems containing fractions

Key Math-R same observations. Has difficulty when computation problems contain fractions.

Integration:
How can you explain his adequate knowledge of math facts and algorithms? How could he have memorized the math tables without good visual memory? Go back to section on behavior during testing.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Applications:</th>
<th>Score:</th>
<th>Interpretation:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>✓ WIAT Math Reasoning</td>
<td>35%ile</td>
<td>__________________________</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>✓ Key Math</td>
<td>31%ile</td>
<td>__________________________</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes:
Math reasoning:
WIAT - Math Reasoning Test consists of story problems. Very good except on problems involving fractions. Sometimes computation errors interfere with correct answer (attention?)

Key Math - Missing elements subtest - scored 100% correct (child is asked to identify the missing information needed to solve the problem)

Applied math skills:
Key Math - Money, Time, Measurement:
Had basic facility with money and time
Could not do measurement problems involving fractions
Overall math:
Math = relative strength but still within the average range

Integration:
Do his math scores fit well with what you know about his overall IQ, his reasoning ability? How do you explain the specific lack of knowledge of fractions? Has he had difficulty learning any other aspect of math? Is there any evidence of processing problems interfering with math?

Summary and Diagnosis

(Below is a bare minimum outline of the diagnosis: you should go back and read through the entire report to flesh out this section; )

Average achievement: math, handwriting, decoding lists of single words
Underachieving: reading (decoding in context, reading comprehension) spelling, written language

Diagnosis: LD
Significant processing problems: attention, visual memory.

Processing problems interfere with: decoding, spelling
Decoding problems subsequently interfere with reading comprehension
Weak oral language plus spelling problems interfere with written language

Strengths: Strong social skills with peers and teachers, easygoing, friendly manner. Good reasoning skills, able to solve problems. Persistent, tries hard, wants to please.