

Speech & Language Evaluation Template for Performance Pathways:

1. REASON(S) FOR REFERRAL:

Xxx was referred for a speech and language evaluation by her kindergarten teacher, Ms. Xxx. Initial reports indicate Xxx has frequent difficulty with intelligibility of utterances with familiar and unfamiliar listeners. Xxx also received preschool speech therapy and IEP transition was not followed through, evaluation was requested because of this.

2. SOURCES OF EVALUATION DATA– In interpreting evaluation data, the school must draw upon a variety of data sources, including those listed below, and carefully consider the information obtained. Document the information obtained from the sources below.

A. Evaluations and information provided by the parent of the student (or documentation of LEA's attempts to obtain parental input):

Xxx's mother, Catherine Xxx indicated that Xxx does well academically with strengths in writing and spelling words, however displays difficulty with sounds when rate of speech increases.

B. Observations – Include teacher observations and observations by related services providers, when appropriate:

Xxx's kindergarten teacher identified concerns in October, 2013 and requested a speech/language screening be conducted. Results of that screening showed that Xxx demonstrated difficulty with /g,v,k/ in initial and final position (e.g., dame for game) at the word level, as well as in conversation. Academically, Xxx works hard on her literacy skills and is making slow progress. She is reading at a B level which is slightly below average for this point in the kindergarten year. She attempts to write developmentally, however confuses sounds and writes letters that she reverses in her speech. In terms of math, Xxx is demonstrating basic skills in counting, number identification and money, and proficient skills in geometry, measurement, data and probability. Her speech is noted to be difficult to understand at times and her teacher notes that other teachers and professionals who interact with Xxx frequently ask her to repeat herself. .

C. Recommendations by teachers:

Ms. Xxx stated that Xxx's speech is 50% unintelligible and is sometimes distracting. Her speech is interfering with her social, emotional, and academic functioning. Given these factors, as well as her performance on the speech/language screening conducted in October, 2013, it was recommended that Xxx be evaluated for a speech/language disability. Her current teacher is supportive of these recommendations.

D. The student's physical condition (include health, vision, hearing); social or cultural background; and adaptive behavior relevant to the student's suspected disability and potential need for special education:

ENTER INPUT HERE: check with nurse Trudy Faux (stop in or email) to determine if student has passed vision screening and if there are any other health concerns. Check with our TA to

find out results of hearing screening. Also review parent information forms to see if anything additional was shared.

E. Assessments – Include, when appropriate, current classroom based assessments; aptitude and achievement tests; local and/or state assessments; behavioral assessments; vocational technical education assessment results; interests, preferences, aptitudes (for secondary transition); etc.:

Benchmark Comparison: Central Columbia Elementary School

Outcome Measure	Year	Grade	Fall	Winter	Spring	Level of Skill	Instructional Recommendation
Letter Naming Fluency (LNF)	2013-2014	K	4	36		Average	Continue Current Program
Letter Sound Fluency (LSF)	2013-2014	K		17		Below Average	Further Assess and Consider Individualizing Program
Phoneme Segmentation Fluency (PSF)							

SPEECH/LANGUAGE INPUT:

XxxAnn Xxx Evaluation Report

Graduate Student Clinician: Maria Hodapp, B.A

Date of Report: 3/12/2014

Clinical Supervisor: Sharon M. Xxx, M.A., CCC-SLP

Diagnostic Evaluation of Articulation and Phonology (DEAP) Evaluation Report

The Diagnostic Evaluation of Articulation and Phonology (DEAP) was administered in order to assess Xxx’s Articulation abilities. The DEAP is designed to provide diagnoses of speech disorders.

The following table represents Xxx’s DEAP scores with performance analysis below

DEAP	Scaled Score	Percentile Rank
Articulation Assessment	3	1

Below is a brief summary of Xxx’s performance:

Articulation Assessment: The articulation assessment samples the child’s production of 40 English phonemes. The child is asked to identify pictures containing 24 consonants in the initial and final position at the word level, as well as 16 vowels. Xxx scored in the mild-moderate articulation severity range. Xxx produced consistent errors with /g/, /k/, /th/, /l/, and /ng/ in both initial and final position. Errors with the /k/ phoneme were made in both initial and final position

(e.g., kar and sock). The /k/ phoneme was also produced in error in presence of a consonant blend (i.e., crab). She produced /th/ in error in initial and final position (i.e., thumb, teeth). The phoneme /g/ was also produced in error in both initial and final position (e.g., girl and pig). Omission of these phonemes was noted in the final position. Xxx was also demonstrating fronting of the phonemes she produced in error (e.g., car-> dar). When tested Xxx was stimutable for these sounds in the phoneme stimulability assessment.

Results of the DEAP indicate Xxx scored with a mild to moderate severity for speech production abilities. She achieved a percentile rank of 1, which is below average for her age, and 3SD from the average. This means that Xxx performed at the same level or better than 1% of students her age. The phonemes /g/ and /k/, according to Sanders Sound Acquisition Chart (1972), are developed by 90% of children at age four. The phonemes /l/ and /ng/ are developed, according to this research, by age six. Xxx would benefit from speech therapy to correct these errors in order to increase her speech intelligibility and help her speech become developmentally appropriate.

The DEAP indicated errors at the word level, however, these errors were noted during informal assessment of XxxAnn’s speech during conversation. These errors severely impacted her intelligibility and multiple requests for clarification were made. XxxAnn seemed to demonstrate frustration. She also demonstrated awareness of her errors throughout conversation stating several times throughout the evaluation “my speech isn’t very good”.

CELF-5 Evaluation Report

The Clinical Evaluation of Language Fundamentals-Fourth Edition (CELF-5) was administered in order to assess Xxx's expressive and receptive language abilities. The CELF-5 is designed to evaluate a broad range of language skills for students ages 5-21.

The following table represents Xxx's CELF scores with performance analysis below:

Subtest	Scaled Score	Percentile Rank
Sentence Comprehension	14	91
Word Structure	11	63
Recalling Sentences	12	84
Formulating Sentences	13	75

Below is a brief summary of each subtest and Xxx’s performance:

Sentence Comprehension: The Sentence Comprehension subtest assessed Xxx’s ability to interpret spoken sentences of increasing length and complexity and select the pictures that illustrate referential meaning of the sentences. Xxx scored within normal limits on this subtest. She demonstrated one error selecting the picture when the sentence included a verb phrase (i.e., the boy will feed the cat).

Word Structure: The Word Structure subtest assessed Xxx’s ability to apply morphological rules to mark inflection, derivations and comparison as well as to select and use appropriate pronouns. Xxx scored within normal limits on this subtest. She demonstrated difficulty with comparatives and superlatives responding with “smaller” when the target was “bigger”. Xxx also demonstrated difficulty with possessive and subjective pronoun usage, providing the incorrect

pronoun. She displayed difficulty with regular past tense, future tense, and irregular plural forms (i.e., “mouses” for mice, and “childs” for children).

Recalling Sentences: This subtest evaluated Xxx’s ability to listen to spoken sentences and repeat them without changing word meaning or sentence structure. Xxx scored within normal limits on this subtest. She displayed increased difficulty with active declaratives with relative causes; these items constituted almost half of her major errors. An example for this concept can be observed in Xxx’s response of “The coach give a trophy” instead of the target stimulus response, “The coach gave the trophy to the team that won the track meet on Saturday”. Other errors were observed in items containing active declaratives with relative clauses, subordinate clauses, and coordination. One error with passive declarative with coordination was observed during this task.

Formulated Sentences: The Formulated Sentences subtest assessed Xxx’s ability to formulate grammatical sentences using given words and contextual constraints. Xxx scored within normal limits on this subtest. She demonstrated increased difficulty with adjectives (i.e, best) subordinate conjunctions (e.g., before, because and unless), and adverbs (e.g., before).

CORE LANGUAGE: Standard score of 117.
Percentile rank of 87.

The Core Language Index score was derived through the use of the following subtests: Sentence Comprehension, Word Structure, Recalling Sentences, and Formulated Sentences. The Core Language score measures the general language ability of a student and is used to determine the presence or absence of a language disorder. Xxx’s combined score falls within +1.5 standard deviations from the mean, which is **above** average for her age. Xxx displays overall normal language abilities according to this result. Xxx is performing at the 87% rank, which means that Xxx is performing the same as or better than 87% of her peers.

Overall, results of the CELF-5 indicate that Xxx displays above average language abilities. All index scores fell within normal limits. Individual subtests indicate Xxx displays the most difficulty with word structure, mainly relating to correct use of grammar. Increased support in these areas may be beneficial. Xxx’s language abilities greatly surpass her performance on the articulation assessment (DEAP). Articulation abilities negatively impacted her performance on this assessment and supports information supplied from her kindergarten teacher. Some examples identified from testing included misarticulations of testing stimuli which resulted in her inability to earn full credit. For example, given the target sentence “was the van followed by the ambulance” Xxx produced the utterance “was the *ban* followed by the ambulance”. Xxx’s observations from Ms. Xxx state that Xxx is misunderstood when speaking with classmates and other teachers. Therapy is warranted to correct these errors and increase Xxx’s success with communication in both academic and social areas.

These errors will not only be shown in her intelligibility but will impact Xxx’s success with language and literacy in the future. Ms. Xxx stated that Xxx is reading at a B level and often confuses letter sounds in words when blending and reading sounds. She also stated “reading

problems are due to articulation problems". These errors have also been noted during KLL sessions from the clinician. A probe was conducted during a KLL session to target the phonemes /g/ and /k/ in all positions at the sentence level. Xxx demonstrated inconsistent errors with these phonemes throughout the probe, and intelligibility of her utterances was negatively impacted because of this. Observation of /th/ and /l/ in all positions at the sentence level was also noted during this probe, and Xxx demonstrated difficulty producing these sounds correctly as well. Her understanding of sounds and the ability to blend sounds appropriately, phonological awareness, will greatly impact her success with language and literacy in the future. Xxx is also noted as not speaking during social situations because of her awareness of her articulation errors. Therapy would increase her academic and social functioning in these areas.

GENERAL OBSERVATIONS

Xxx was pleasant and energetic and was attentive throughout each task. Xxx required a few redirections but worked hard throughout the evaluation. Rapport was developed via casual conversation at the beginning of each session and had been developed through previous KLL sessions. Xxx showed interest in coloring pictures for family members during breaks throughout the evaluation. Xxx scored within normal limits on each subtest; demonstrating her ability to utilize language abilities across all language areas.

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

(including if the assessment was given in the student's native language or other mode of communication):

N/A

4. DETERMINING FACTORS – A student must not be found to be eligible for special education and related services if the determining factor for the student's disability is any of those listed below. Respond Yes or No to, and provide evidence for, each determining factor below.

Yes No Lack of appropriate instruction in reading, including the essential components of reading

instruction. Provide evidence:

STUDENT has been instructed in the research based balanced literacy program, which contains all of the essential components of successful reading instruction, and adherence to Pennsylvania reading standards since his/her initial enrollment at CCSD (kindergarten year XXXX). The program is taught by highly qualified teachers. Learning Focused Schools' (LFS) strategies are integrated throughout the reading curriculum, which incorporates best teaching practices (e.g., graphic organizers, activating background knowledge, identifying essential main ideas/concepts,

etc.). {In addition, STUDENT received Title I reading specialist assistance during her kindergarten, first and second grade years. Currently, she works with the reading specialist for approximately 15 minutes a day. In addition, Brooke receives speech and language services that target her phonological awareness skills, comprehension and vocabulary knowledge for 35 thirty minute sessions across the IEP cycle}. ** this info may/may not be applicable, check with supervisor....

Yes No Lack of appropriate instruction in math. Provide evidence:

(Student's name) math instruction has been provided by highly qualified teachers who have been trained in a research-based Everyday Math program utilizing Learning Focused Schools' (LFS) strategies (e.g., graphic organizers, activating background knowledge, utilizing essential questions or main ideas, etc.), and adhering to Pennsylvania's standards.

Yes No Limited English proficiency. Provide evidence:
English is Xxx's native language.

5. SUMMARY OF FINDINGS/INTERPRETATION OF EVALUATION RESULTS –

Considering all available evaluation data, record the team's analyses of the student's functioning levels.

A. PRESENT LEVELS OF ACADEMIC ACHIEVEMENT – Describe the student's present levels, strengths, and the resulting academic needs, when appropriate. Include communicative status, motor abilities, and transition needs as appropriate. For students with limited English proficiency (LEP), include current level(s) of English language proficiency in reading, writing, speaking and understanding/listening:

ENTER INPUT HERE- summarize information from teacher

Xxx's kindergarten teacher, Ms. Xxx, suggested that she receive a speech and language evaluation. She stated that Xxx is reading at a B level which is slightly below average. Ms. Xxx also stated that many teachers have asked Xxx to repeat what she said, because of difficulty understanding her speech

B. PRESENT LEVELS OF FUNCTIONAL PERFORMANCE – Describe the student's present levels, strengths, and the resulting functional and developmental needs, when appropriate: Xxx demonstrates strengths in writing and understanding within her classroom. Some areas that may need to be further developed are reading ability and articulation of sounds, and blending sounds. During a speech and language screen conducted in the fall of 2013 XxxAnn demonstrated difficulty producing the phonemes /g/ /k/ and /v/. She had errors in both initial and final position with these sounds (e.g., game-> dame, pig-> pid). XxxAnn also produced the ending -nt sound in error, as well as ending -er sound. A glottal stop was also noted in conversation.

C. BEHAVIORAL INFORMATION – Include social and emotional status and behavioral strengths and needs, when appropriate:

Xxx was very pleasant throughout each evaluation session. She worked hard, although she needed a few redirections to the task. She was aware of her speech production errors and would attempt to correct her speech when misunderstood.

6. CONCLUSIONS – Determination of Eligibility and Educational Needs Complete A or B or C.

A. The student does not have a disability and therefore is NOT ELIGIBLE for special education.

B. The student has a disability but does not need specially designed instruction, and therefore is NOT ELIGIBLE FOR for special education.

C. The student has a disability AND is in need of specially designed instruction, and therefore IS ELIGIBLE for special education.

Disability Category: Primary disability category: N/A

Secondary disability category(s), if any: N/A

2. Recommendations for consideration by the IEP team to enable the student to participate as appropriate in

the general education curriculum (including special considerations the IEP team must consider before developing the IEP, measurable annual goals, specially designed instruction, and supplementary aids and services):

Based on the results of the Diagnostic Evaluation of Articulation and Phonology and The Clinical Evaluation of Language Fundamentals – Fifth Edition, it is recommended that Xxx receive speech and language service at Central Columbia Elementary School. Overall, Xxx scored average in regards to language, however scored with a mild to moderate articulation disorder. Based on the previous assessments, it is recommended that Xxx work on her production of the following phonemes: /g/, /k/, /th/ and /v/ in both initial and final position to increase her speech intelligibility with familiar and unfamiliar listeners. It is also recommended to help Xxx acquire developmentally appropriate phonemes in increase her social, emotional and academic success. Goals that should be targeted:

1. Xxx will improve overall intelligibility by articulating STOPS /g, k,/ in all positions at the isolation, syllable and word level with 80% accuracy in three therapy sessions (1.6).
2. Xxx will improve overall intelligibility by articulating FRICATIVES /th, v,/ in all positions at the isolation, syllable and word level with 80% accuracy in three therapy sessions (1.6).
3. Xxx will improve overall intelligibility by articulating /l/ in all positions at the isolation, syllable and word level with 80% accuracy in three therapy sessions (1.6).

