# LAKE TRAVIS INDEPENDENT SCHOOL DISTRICT 3322 RANCH ROAD 620 SOUTH

**AUSTIN, TX 78738**

## 512-533-6000

**Full and Individual Evaluation Report CONFIDENTIAL**

DEMOGRAPHIC DATA SCHOOL RELATED DATA

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Student Name | Alexander Hernandez | School/Home Campus | LTE |
| Student ID Number | 117634 | Grade | 4 |
| Date of Birth | 03/21/2014 | Age | 9;7 |
| Gender | Male | Medicaid Number |  |
| Parents/Guardians | Elvira Huerta  Cesar Hernandez |  |  |
| Address | 1809 Quanah Parker Trl Austin, TX  78734 |  |  |
| Telephone | 512-825-7929 | Date of Report | 10/27/2023 |

# REASON FOR REFERRAL

Alexander was referred for an initial evaluation to determine whether a disability condition is present and the need for special education services. The areas of concern are stuttering and articulation.

# SOURCES OF EVALUATION DATA

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Sources of Information** | **Informant/Position** | **Dates** |
| Review of Educational Records | Weronika Monaco/Bilingual Speech Language Pathologist | 10/19/2023 |
| Home Language Survey | Elvira Huerta/Parent | 07/19/2023 |
| Medical Information | Justine Rosser/School Nurse | 10/19/2023 |
| Parent Information/Interview | Elvira Huerta/Parent | 10/19/2023 |
| Student Observation | Weronika Monaco/Bilingual Speech Language Pathologist | 10/19/2023 |
| Teacher Information/Interview | Ingrid Martinez Salamanca/Classroom Teacher | 10/18/2023 |
| Campus Consideration for Assistive Technology | Campus Assistive Technology Team | 10/24/2023 |
| Goldman-Fristoe Test of Articulation –  Third Edition Spanish | Weronika Monaco/Bilingual Speech  Language Pathologist | 10/19/2023 |
| Clinical Evaluations of Language Functioning – 5th Edition (CELF-5) Screener | Weronika Monaco/Bilingual Speech Language Pathologist | 10/24/2023 |
| Stuttering Severity Instrument-4 | Weronika Monaco/Bilingual Speech  Language Pathologist | 10/27/2023 |
| Language Sample | Weronika Monaco/Bilingual Speech Language Pathologist | 10/27/2023 |

Standardized evaluation procedures were followed when evaluating Alexander. All tests were used for the specific purposes for which the assessment or measures are valid and reliable. Alexander transitioned to the exam room independently during each testing session. He maintained appropriate eye contact, engaged in reciprocal conversation, and engaged in tasks appropriately.

All evaluation instruments and procedures were administered in Alexander’s dominant languages of English and Spanish.

# SOCIOLOGICAL INFORMATION AND EDUCATIONAL HISTORY

Sociological data concerning Alexander’s family and community environment that may influence learning/behavior patterns were gathered. The following information was obtained through a Parent Information Form and a Parent Interview.

Alexander lives with mother, father, brother (15 y/o), and sister (3 y/o). In his free time, he enjoys playing video games.

School attendance records indicate Alexander began his public education during the 2018-2019 school year in Pre-K at Lake Travis Elementary.

Attendance History

Alexander has been present for the majority of school days. No concerns are noted in this area at this time.

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| SCHOOL YEAR | GRADE | ABSENCES | TARDY |
| 2018-2019 | Pre-K | 0 | 0 |
| 2019-2020 | Kindergarten | 1 | 4 |
| 2020-2021 | 1st Grade | Online instruction | |
| 2021-2022 | 2nd Grade | 4 | 0 |
| 2022-2023 | 3rd Grade | 2 | 3 |
| 2023-2024 | 4th Grade | 0 | 1 |

In Kindergarten, Ms. Torres brought Alexander to MTSS on 10/21/19 due to a parent request for speech evaluation. Parent reported that it was difficult to understand him. According to his teacher, he spoke more English than Spanish at that time. He was very bright. On 11/14/2019, he was observed by Ana Duque, SLP, and passed an articulation screener; articulation skills were reported to be on grade level. Prior Written Notice was sent to parent by Ms. Duque. It was recommended to monitor language and give opportunities to participate in the classroom.

Alexander was brought to MTSS again on 05/04/2023 due to teacher concerns with articulation and stuttering. He was observed by Weronika Monaco, SLP. It was reported that Alexander presents with articulation errors that are not developmentally appropriate in English and Spanish. In Spanish, he exhibits l/r substitution (e.g., “lojo” for “rojo”). In English, he exhibits w/r substitutions (e.g., “wabbit” for “rabbit”). In English, “r’ is expected to be mastered by age 7. In Spanish, tap “r” (e.g., “pero”) is expected to be mastered by age 5. Trilled “r” (e.g., “perro”) is expected to be mastered by age 7. He also presented with stuttering behaviors in both languages. He exhibited single sound repetitions (e.g., c-c-c-calle). Student reported experiencing slight tension in his neck/throat while stuttering. An FIE was recommended.

Alexander receives instruction in a dual-language classroom. He participates in the Gifted & Talented (Discovery) program at LTE.

Based on current data, sociological factors do not appear to adversely affect Alexander’s learning and behavior patterns to a significant degree.

The group of qualified professionals recognizes that a student shall not meet the criteria for a disability condition if the only deficiencies identified are directly attributable to a different cultural lifestyle or to a lack of appropriate educational opportunities.

# CURRENT SPEECH/LANGUAGE

The evaluation of a student’s language consists of formal and informal evaluations of language proficiency in both the receptive and expressive domains.

The Home Language Survey completed by parents indicates English is the home language. However, mother reported that they speak in Spanish.

The group of qualified professionals has determined that the student’s dominant language is English/Spanish. Alexander has reported a preference for English. This determination was made through informal evaluation.

The group of qualified professionals has reviewed formal and informal data and concluded that the student’s language proficiency when compared with age peers may be regarded in the noted domains as:

Listening Comprehension Average Oral Expression Average

Alexander expresses himself best in oral speech rather than any other method of communication.

Classroom language functioning is within the average range according to the classroom teacher’s observations. Weronika Monaco, SLP, observed language functioning and found that Alexander easily engaged in informal conversation. Alexander engaged with peers in English while his peers used English/Spanish. He presents with speech sound errors characterized by w/r substitutions. He is able to make his needs known. Alexander was able to follow instructions for testing and engage in appropriate conversation. Alexander was able to take turns during conversation and to remain on topic.

All evaluation instruments and procedures were administered in Alexander’s dominant languages of English and Spanish by a bilingual speech-language pathologist.

**Articulation**

Goldman-Fristoe Test of Articulation – Third Edition Spanish

The Goldman-Fristoe Test of Articulation, Third Edition Spanish (GFTA–3 Spanish) is a systematic means of assessing an individual’s articulation of the Spanish consonant and R and L cluster sounds. It provides information about an individual’s speech sound ability by sampling both spontaneous and imitative sound production in single words and connected

speech. GFTA–3 Spanish provides age-based normative scores separately for females and males for the Sonidos-en-palabras and Sonidos-en-oraciones tests. Intelligibility is reported as a percentage score, and Estimulación de consonantes y sínfones information is reported in table format.

## Sonidos-en-palabras

The Sonidos-en-palabras test is used to evaluate an individual's speech sound skills when labeling single words. The examiner presents picture stimuli for the individual to label. The examiner scores each consonant and R and L cluster sound in the word as a correct or incorrect production. This test has a mean of 100 and a standard deviation of 15.

The results are presented in the following table:

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Goldman-Fristoe Test of Articulation, Third Edition Spanish (GFTA–3 Spanish)** | |
| **No. of Errors** | **Standard Score** |
| 20 Errors | 68 |

Mean =100, Standard Deviation =15

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Articulation Errors** | **Initial Position** | **Medial Position** | **Final Position** |
| Substitutions | v/b, l/trilled and tap r | v/b, l/trilled and tap r | l/trilled and tap r |
| Omissions |  |  |  |
| Distortions |  |  |  |
| Additions |  |  |  |
| Blends | bl/lbr, fl/fr, pl/pr |  |  |

## Sonidos-en-oraciones

The Sonidos-en-oraciones test is used to evaluate an individual’s speech sound skills when producing words in sentences. The individual listens as the examiner tells a short story that is accompanied by picture stimuli. After the initial telling of the story, the examiner presents each sentence again, and the individual repeats the sentence. The examiner scores each consonant and R and L cluster sound in the target words from each sentence as a correct or incorrect production. This test has a mean of 100 and a standard deviation of 15.

The results are presented in the following table:

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Goldman-Fristoe Test of Articulation, Third Edition Spanish (GFTA–3 Spanish)** | |
| **No. of Errors** | **Standard Score** |
| 4 Errors | 91 |

Mean =100, Standard Deviation =15

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Articulation Errors** | **Initial Position** | **Medial Position** | **Final Position** |
| Substitutions | l/tap r |  |  |
| Omissions |  |  |  |
| Distortions |  |  |  |
| Additions |  |  |  |
| Blends | bl/br |  |  |

Alexander received a standard score of 68 on the Sonidos-en-palabras test. When compared to peers of the same age and gender, Alexander uses more sound change errors which results in a score that is in the very low/severe range. On the Sonidos-en-oraciones test, Alexander received a standard score of 91. When compared to peers of the same age and gender, Alexander uses approximately the same number of sound change errors which results in a score that is in the average range.

Goldman-Fristoe Test of Articulation – Third Edition English

The Goldman-Fristoe Test of Articulation-Third Edition (GFTA-3) is a systematic means of assessing an individual’s articulation of the consonant and consonant cluster sounds of Standard American English. It provides information about an individual’s speech sound ability by sampling both spontaneous and imitative sound production in single words and connected speech. GFTA-3 provides age-based normative scores separately for females and males for the Sounds-in-Words and Sounds-in-Sentences tests. Intelligibility is reported as a percentage score, and Stimulability information is reported in table format.

Sounds-in-Words

The Sounds-in-Words test is used to evaluate an individual's articulation skill when labeling single words. The examiner presents a picture stimulus for the individual to label. The examiner scores each consonant and consonant cluster sound in the word as a correct or incorrect production. This test has a mean of 100 and a standard deviation of 15. Sounds-in-Sentences provides a semi-structured observation of the examinee’s spontaneous sound production used in connected speech by asking the examinee to retell one or two simple, picture-based stories that the examiner has previously read aloud. Stimulability can be used to assess the examinee’s

ability to correctly produce a previously misarticulated sound when asked to watch and listen to the examiner’s production of the sound.

The results are presented in the following table:

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Goldman-Fristoe Test of Articulation-Second Edition (GFTA-3) | |
| **No. of Errors** | **Standard Score** |
| 25 Errors | 40 |

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Articulation Errors** | **Initial Position** | **Medial Position** | **Final Position** |
| Substitutions | d/voiced an dvoiceless “th”, w/”r” and vocalic “r” | w/”r” and vocalic “r” | f/voiced “th”, “uh” for “r” and vocalic “r”, l/”r” and vocalic “r” |
| Omissions |  |  |  |
| Distortions |  |  |  |
| Additions |  |  |  |
| Blends |  |  |  |

Mean =100, Standard Deviation =15

Sounds-in-Sentences

The Sounds-in-Sentences test is used to evaluate an individual’s articulation skill when producing words in connected speech. The individual listens as the examiner tells a short story that is accompanied by visual stimuli. After the initial retelling of the story, the examiner presents each sentence again, and the individual repeats the sentence. The examiner scores each consonant and consonant cluster sound in the targeted words from each sentence as a correct or incorrect production. This test has a mean of 100 and a standard deviation of 15.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Goldman-Fristoe Test of**  **Articulation-Second Edition (GFTA-3)** | |
| **No. of Errors** | **Standard Score** |
| 14 Errors | 71 |

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Articulation Errors** | **Initial Position** | **Medial Position** | **Final Position** |
| Substitutions | w/”r” and vocalic “r” | “Uh” and “w” for “r” and vocalic “r” | f/voiced “th”, “uh” for “r” and vocalic “r” |
| Omissions |  |  |  |
| Distortions |  |  |  |
| Additions |  |  |  |
| Blends |  |  |  |

Mean =100, Standard Deviation =15

Alexander received a standard score of 40 on the Sounds-in-Words test. When compared to peers of the same age and gender, Alexander uses more sound change errors which results in a score that is in the very low/severe range. On the Sounds-in-Sentences test, Alexander received a standard score of 71. When compared to peers of the same age and gender, Alexander uses more sound change errors which results in a score that is in the low/moderate range.

Intelligibility (GFTA-3)

The Intelligibility rating is used to evaluate an individual’s intelligibility in connected speech. During administration of the Sounds-in-Sentences test, the examiner listens to each sentence the individual repeats and rates the individual’s intelligibility for that sentence as 1 (good), 2 (fair), 3 (poor), or 4 (no response). This measure reports the percentage of individuals, by age, who received an overall rating of 90% "good" ratings.

Alexander's connected speech was rated as "good" in 40.0% of his productions. Connected Speech Sample

Through student interview, a connected speech sample was collected to assess Alexander’s articulation skills during conversational speech. Errors on the “r” sound were observed across the sample. For example, he said “jal” instead of “jar” and “bwanches” instead of “branches.” In Spanish, Alexander demonstrated the same difficulty appropriately producing the “r” sound. For example, he said “helmana” instead of “hermana” and “contloladol” for “controlador.”

Parent Information

Parents indicated concerns with Alexander’s speech sound production. They report that he has difficulty producing the “r” sound in English and in Spanish. Overall, they can understand him.

Teacher Information

Alexander’s teachers also report concerns with his speech sound production. They observe errors with the “r” sound as well in both languages. Overall, they can understand his communication message. However, frustration related to his difficulty producing this sound has been noted. Teachers report that his difficulty appropriately producing this sound is affecting his peer relationships. When a peer cannot understand Alexander, they will ask him a few times to

repeat what he is saying. Alexander has also reported that it bothers him when his peers cannot understand him when he engages in social interactions and reads out loud in the classroom.

Summary

Alexander presents with difficulty producing the “r” sound in English and in Spanish. In English, he frequently produces the “w” or “l” sound instead of the “r” sound (e.g., “wabbit” for “rabbit”). In Spanish, he frequently produces the “l” sound for the trilled and tap “r” (e.g., “lojo” for “rojo”).

These sounds are expected to be mastered between 7-9 years of age. Due to reports of his speech sound errors negatively impacting his social relationships, Alexander meets the eligibility criteria of a student with a speech impairment in the area of articulation.

**Language**

Clinical Evaluations of Language Functioning – 5th Edition (CELF-5) Screener

Alexander’s expressive and receptive language abilities were screened in English due to language preference. The Clinical Evaluations of Language Functioning – 5th Edition (CELF-5) screening test was used. Subtests of the CELF-5 include following directions, recalling sentences, sentence assembly, semantic relationships, and word classes. A criterion score of 11 is expected for children ages 9;0-9;11. Alexander scored a total score of 21, scoring above the criterion score for children in his age range. Alexander was able to follow multi-step directions with modifiers, listen to spoken sentences of increasing length and complexity and repeat the sentences without changing word meaning and content, word structure (morphology), or sentence structure (syntax), formulate grammatically acceptable and semantically meaningful sentences by manipulating and transforming given words and word groups, interpret sentences that (a) make comparisons, (b) identify location or direction, (c) specify time relationships, (d) include serial order, or (e) are expressed in passive voice, and demonstrate understanding of relationships between words based on semantic class features, function, or place or time of occurrence.

Teacher Information

Language information was gathered from Alexander’s general education teacher, Ms. Martinez, and is reported in the following chart:

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Language Skills** | **Below Average** | **Average** | **Above Average** |
| Comprehends word meanings |  |  |  |
| Follows oral instructions |  |  |  |
| Comprehends classroom discussion |  |  |  |
| Remembers information just heard |  |  |  |
| Displays adequate vocabulary |  |  |  |

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Uses adequate grammar for general understanding |  |  |  |
| Expresses self fluently when called upon to speak |  |  |  |
| Relates a sequence of events in order (e.g., telling a story) |  |  |  |
| Organizes and relates ideas and factual information |  |  |  |

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Compared to other students in the class:** | **Usually** | **Sometimes** | **Rarely** | **Not Observed** |
| 1. Does the student consistently initiate verbal interaction with others? |  |  |  |  |
| 2. Is the student’s communication easily understood? |  |  |  |  |
| 3. Do classmates regularly initiate interaction with this student? |  |  |  |  |
| 4. Does the student respond appropriately when classmates attempt to initiate interaction? |  |  |  |  |
| 5. Does the student seem to notice if his/her communication is misunderstood? |  |  |  |  |
| 5a. If yes, is the student able to modify their communication attempt? | He takes the time and tries to repeat what he is communicating. | | | |
| 6. If the student is upset, are they able to use words appropriately to express feelings? |  |  |  |  |
| 7. When the student is communicating, do their facial expressions and body language seem to match the situation? |  |  |  |  |
| 8. Does the student volunteer information in class? |  |  |  |  |
| 8a. If so, are comments relevant to the discussion? |  |  |  |  |
| 9. Does the student respond appropriately when asked a question? |  |  |  |  |

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 10. During class discussions, does the student ask questions that are relevant? |  |  |  |  |
| 11. Does the student ask for help when needed? |  |  |  |  |
| 12. Does the student need more repetition of instructions than classmates? |  |  |  |  |
| 13. As a listener, do you frequently have to ask questions to determine the student’s exact meaning? |  |  |  |  |

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| ***If the student has trouble communicating ideas clearly, answer the following questions:*** | | | | |
| **Compared to other students in the class:** | **Usually** | **Sometimes** | **Rarely** | **Not observed** |
| 14. Does the student mispronounce words? |  |  |  |  |
| 15. Does the student use excessive nonspecific vocabulary, such as “thing” or “stuff”? |  |  |  |  |
| 16. Is the student’s sentence structure appropriate for age/grade? |  |  |  |  |
| 17. Does the student jump from one topic to another? |  |  |  |  |
| 18. Does the student fail to provide necessary background information? |  |  |  |  |
| 19. When speaking, does the student pause, revise, or repeat so much that it is noticeable? |  |  |  |  |

Parent Information

Language information was gathered from Alexander’s parents and the information is reflected in the following chart:

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Compared to other children your child’s age, is your child able to:** | **Usually** | **Sometimes** | **Rarely** | **Not Observed** |
| Does the student seem to notice if his communication is misunderstood? |  |  |  |  |
| Does the student respond appropriately when asked a question? |  |  |  |  |
| As a listener, do you frequently have to ask questions to determine the student's exact meaning? |  |  |  |  |
| Does the student use excessive nonspecific vocabulary such as "thing" or "stuff"? |  |  |  |  |
| Does the student jump from one topic to another? |  |  |  |  |
| Does the student fail to provide necessary background information? |  |  |  |  |
| Is your child generally able to understand what you mean without repetition? |  |  |  |  |
| Is your child able to use complete sentences when speaking? |  |  |  |  |
| Is your child able to formulate questions with age-appropriate grammar? |  |  |  |  |
| Is your child able to retell stories and events so that a listener can follow the sequence and details? |  |  |  |  |
| Is your child able to use the same vocabulary as other children their age? |  |  |  |  |
| Is your child able to ask for help or information when needed? |  |  |  |  |

Parents did not report concerns with language skills. Language Sample

A language sample was obtained from Alexander through an interview and story retelling by Weronika Monaco, SLP. Alexander demonstrated age-appropriate language skills in the areas of morphology, syntax, semantics, and pragmatics. Story retelling included at least five story grammar elements (e.g., setting, characters), utilized clear and specific vocabulary, and demonstrated age-appropriate grammar.

Classroom Observation

Alexander was observed in the general education classroom by Weronika Monaco, SLP. Student was engaged in activities throughout the observation. Student consistently socialized

with peers in English characterized by initiating conversations and commenting on what he was doing and what peers were doing. He engaged in group conversations at his table. Peers initiated conversations with him. Student exhibited stuttering events (e.g., “th-th-this is mine” and “I-I got tape”). However, stuttering moments did not appear to adversely impact his interactions with peers/staff. Alexander consistently exhibited speech sound errors on the “r” sound; he produced a “w” sound instead of an “r” sound.

Summary

Alexander presents with age-appropriate expressive, receptive, and pragmatic language skills.

**Fluency, Voice, and Oral Motor Abilities**

Voice was found to be within normal limits. An examination of oral motor abilities indicated adequate structure and mobility to support functional communication.

## Stuttering Severity Instrument-4

The American Speech and Hearing Association (ASHA) defines a fluency disorder as an “[i]nterruption in the flow of speaking characterized by atypical rate, rhythm, and repetitions in sounds, syllables, words, and phrases. This may be accompanied by excessive tension, struggle behavior, and secondary mannerisms.”

Fluency encompasses a range of behaviors including typical disfluencies to the atypical disfluencies characteristic of stuttering. The following are characteristics of typical and atypical disfluencies. Culatta, R., Leeper L.H., (1990). The Differential Diagnosis of Disfluency. *National Student Speech Language Hearing Association Journal.*17, 59-64 and Published on *Stuttering Foundation: A Nonprofit Organization Helping Those Who Stutter* (http://www.stutteringhelp.org)

Typical or normal disfluencies can be characterized by the following:

* Word or phrase repetitions
* Use of conversational fillers such as “uh, um”
* Message revision
* Use of unfinished sentences
* Topic changes mid-sentence
* Increase in disfluencies when a child is tired, excited, feels rushed, etc.
* Disfluencies can occur when he is questioned or asks a questions himself
* Occurrence of disfluencies may come and go
* Children do not appear to be aware of their occurrence
* Children do not show signs of frustration, surprise, or distress at their occurrence Atypical disfluencies/stuttering can be characterized by the following:
* Developmental disorder
* Insertion of the neutral schwa vowel /Ʌ/ (i.e., “uh” vowel sound) in place of the vowel occurring in that syllable (e.g., “ruh…ruh…ruh…rabbit instead of “ra…ra…ra…rabbit”)
* Increased amount of syllable repetitions
* Use of physical or secondary behaviors not related to speaking (e.g., facial grimaces, eye blinking, foot tapping) which disappear during fluent speech
* No other etiological factors causing or maintain the behaviors can be identified
* Awareness of the behaviors
* Avoidance of speaking situations

*The Stuttering Severity Instrument – 4 (SSI-4)* was administered. Speech samples were collected. The SSI-4 is an assessment that evaluates the frequency, duration, and physical concomitants related to the presence and severity of a student's fluency disorder.

Alexander appeared comfortable talking to the SLP, whom he had previously met and worked with on multiple occasions. During the two speech samples collected while reading a

grade-level passage and during conversation, Alexander stuttered on 14/160 syllables and 48/350 syllables, respectively. This translates to an average of 20.37% stuttering when speaking. These percentages indicated a Frequency Score of 16 on the SSI-4. Stuttering was characterized by prolongations (e.g., fffffoling) and part-word repetitions (e.g., A-alice, sh-she). Alexander’s disfluencies on average lasted about a half second; however, many fleeting (i.e. less than .5 seconds) moments of disfluency were observed as well. This overall average is equivalent to a Duration score of 4. When speaking, Alexander occasionally presented with one secondary characteristic: opening his eyes wide during a stuttering event. He maintained appropriate eye contact during stuttering moments and did not present with any other physical characteristics. These observations indicated a Physical Concomitants score of 2.

These three scores, 16, 4, and 2, add up to a total score of 22. According to Table 3 of the SSI-4 for School-Age Children, Alexander’s stuttering was noted as "moderate" under the severity equivalent which ranges from "Very Mild - Mild - Moderate - Severe - Very Severe."

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Stuttering Severity Instrument – 4: Frequency** | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|  | | | | *Syllables Count* | | | *Stuttering Events* | | | | *Percent Stuttered* | |
| *Speaking Sample 1 (Reading Task)* | | | | 160 | | | 14 | | | | 8.75 | |
| *Speaking Sample 2 (Speaking Task)* | | | | 350 | | | 48 | | | | 32 | |
| *Overall Average* | | | | 20.37% | | | | | | | | |
| **Stuttering Severity Instrument – 3: Duration** | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| *Average length of 3 longest stuttering events:* | | | Half second (0.5-0.9 seconds) | | | | | | *Scale Score (2-18):* | | | 4 |
| **Stuttering Severity Instrument – 3: Physical Concomitants** | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| *0=none* | *1=not noticeable unless looking for it* | *2=barely noticeable to casual observer* | | | | *3=distracting* | | | | *4=very distracting* | | *5=severe and painful-loo king* |
| *Distracting Sounds* | | *Rating:* | 0 | | *Type:* | | |  | | | | |
| *Facial Grimaces* | | *Rating:* | 0 | | *Type:* | | |  | | | | |

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| *Head Movements* | *Rating:* | 0 | *Type:* |  |
| *Movements of the Extremities* | *Rating:* | 2 | *Type:* | Eyes widen occasionally during stuttering moments |
| **Total Overall Score** | | | | |
| *Percentile Rank:* | | 41-30 | | |
| *Severity:* | | Moderate | | |

Stuttering was also measured in Spanish. Scores cannot be reported because the SSI-4 was not normed on bilingual Spanish-English children who stutter. Alexander participated in the same tasks administered in English. During the two speech samples collected while reading a grade-level passage and during conversation, Alexander stuttered on 34/291 syllables and 39/242 syllables, respectively. This translates to an average of 13.89% stuttering when speaking. Alexander presented with the same types of stuttering (i.e., prolongations and

part-word repetitions). Alexander’s disfluencies on average lasted about a half second; however, many fleeting (i.e. less than .5 seconds) moments of disfluency were observed as well.

Alexander occasionally presented with the same physical secondary characteristic: opening his eyes wide during a stuttering event. He maintained appropriate eye contact during stuttering moments and did not present with any other physical characteristics. Stuttering appears to be present in both English and Spanish.

Overall Assessment of the Speaker’s Experience of Stuttering (OASES)

The Overall Assessment of the Speaker’s Experience of Stuttering (OASES) protocol examines the entirety of the stuttering disorder from the perspective of the individual who stutters. A

self-report, the OASES evaluates the speaker’s perceptions of observable stuttering behaviors, reactions to stuttering, and difficulties in performing daily activities involving communication.

Impact ratings indicate the extent to which various aspects of the stuttering disorder affect the speaker's life. Impact scores range from 1 to 5 and can be used to determine impact ratings, which are labeled as follows: Mild, Mild-to-Moderate, Moderate, Moderate-to-Severe, and Severe.

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Overall Assessment of the Speaker’s Experience of Stuttering (OASES)** | | |
| **Scale** | **Impact Score** | **Impact Rating** |
| General Information | 2.92 | Moderate |
| Reactions to Stuttering | 2 | Mild-Moderate |
| Communication in Daily Situations | 2.13 | Mild-Moderate |
| Quality of Life | 1.67 | Mild-Moderate |
| Overall Impact | 2.19 | Mild-Moderate |

Overall, Alexander’s responses indicate that he views himself as being able to speak fluently and communicate easily in many situations but may have some difficulty in specific situations. Alexander reported that he rarely feels angry, mad, or frustrated because he has trouble saying what he wants to say. He is never ashamed or embarrassed of his speech. Sometimes, he is nervous or anxious that he might stutter. However, he never feels sad or upset if he stutters and rarely feels guilty if he stutters. Alexander rarely feels tension when he stutters and sometimes demonstrates secondary characteristics (e.g., opening his eyes wide when stuttering). He rarely avoids eye contact or situations and lets other people talk for him. He does not believe that stuttering hinders him from communicating with people or achieving what he wants. Sometimes it’s hard for him to talk with other kids and when there are a lot of people around. It’s not very hard to talk to teachers or ask a question/read out loud in class. It’s somewhat hard to talk with his family because he feels like he stutters more in Spanish than in English. He believes that stuttering does not get in the way of him succeeding in school. Stuttering does not get in the way of his confidence or his ability to have a good life.

Although Alexander presents with moderate stuttering, his stuttering does not appear to adversely affect his ability to communicate effectively with peers and adults by asking/answering questions, commenting, and conversing.

# PHYSICAL INFORMATION

Physical conditions that may directly affect the student’s ability to profit from the educational process were considered.

Justine Rosser, R.N., school nurse, conducted a vision and hearing screening. Results are as follows:

Vision: Type of Screening: Sloan Chart

Right: Pass Left: Pass

Vision after correction: No Date: 10/18/2023

Hearing: Type of Screening: Regular Method Date: 10/18/2023

Results: Pass

According to the school nurse, Alexander does not exhibit any signs of health or medical problems at school. Alexander does not receive medications at school.

According to the parent, Alexander’s health history is unremarkable.

Alexander’s fine motor skills appear to be within normal limits. He appropriately engages in self-care tasks (e.g., dressing, toileting) and no concerns with writing have been reported.

# ASSISTIVE TECHNOLOGY

The need for assistive technology devices and services is considered to determine if a student requires such support in order to access the curriculum and make satisfactory academic progress. Consideration of assistive technology is an ongoing process driven by changes in student needs including, but not limited to, participation, access, curriculum, or environmental changes.

The term “AT device” is defined by the IDEA as: “any item, piece of equipment or product system, (whether acquired commercially off the shelf; is modified or customized) that is used to increase, maintain, or improve the functional capabilities of children with disabilities.”

The term “AT service” is defined by the IDEA as: “any service that directly assists a child with a disability in the selection, acquisition, or use of an assistive technology device.”

## Result of Consideration:

**X NO** Assistive Technology devices and/or services are not recommended at this time. It is anticipated that Alexander will be able to participate in the educational program, accomplish expected tasks, and make reasonable progress with typically available supports and services.

# EMOTIONAL/BEHAVIORAL

The evaluation of a student’s emotional and behavioral factors consists of identifying those characteristics manifested in in-school or out-of-school behavior or both which may influence learning.

Alexander’s classroom teacher, Ms. Martinez, reports the following observations concerning Alexander’s emotional/behavioral functioning in the classroom:

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Emotional/Behavioral Skill** | **Rating** |
| Generally cooperates or complies with teacher requests | Above Average |
| Adapts to new situations without getting upset | Above Average |
| Accepts responsibilities without getting upset | Above Average |
| Makes and keeps friends at school | Above Average |
| Works cooperatively with others | Above Average |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Has an even, usually happy, disposition | Above Average |
| Is pleased with good work | Above Average |
| Initiates activities independently | Above Average |
| Responds appropriately to praise and correction | Above Average |
| Resists becoming discouraged by difficulties or minor setbacks | Above Average |

Alexander’s parents report that he works on own projects, is very sensitive, has age-appropriate self-help skills, and can perform appropriate household chores.

Neither current evaluations nor information from the home or school suggest that the student presently has any serious emotional and behavioral factors that interfere significantly with the ability to learn.

# ACADEMIC/DEVELOPMENTAL PERFORMANCE

Information regarding a student’s level of academic and/or developmental performance is gathered through report cards, state-developed assessments, district assessments, teacher reports, observations, and the administration of standardized achievement tests. The collection of educational performance data is used to assess the student’s level of acquired knowledge and to determine whether the learned level of academic/developmental information is correlated to a pattern of strengths and weaknesses within a student’s academic and cognitive processing profiles.

Alexander participates in the Gifted & Talented (Discovery) program at LTE.

Results of the previous administration of the State of Texas Assessments of Academic Readiness (STAAR) are as follows:

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
|  | **Grade 3 STAAR** |
| **Reading** | Scale: 1644  Percentile: 79 Master Grade Level |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Math** | Scale: 1487  Percentile: 59 Meets Grade Level |

Parents did not report concerns regarding academic performance.

*MEASURE OF ACADEMIC PROGRESS (MAP)*

MAP Growth Assessments are a suite of computer-based assessments that measure and monitor student academic growth. In LTISD, MAP Growth Assessments are available for students K-9th grade in the areas of Mathematics, Reading, and Language Usage. Alexander was evaluated using MAP data starting Fall of 2022.

Student Growth measures are reported as Rausch Unit (RIT) and Percentile Ranks. These scores are not specific to a grade level but are continuous making it possible to use RIT scores to follow a student’s educational growth from year to year. For the purposes of Special Education evaluation, percentile ranks are reported. A percentile rank is a score that indicates the rank of a student compared to other students in a normative sample. If a student scores at the 75th percentile, it can be said that he or she has scored at least as well as, or better than, 75 percent of students his or her age from the normative sample of the assessment.

Based on the (EOY, MOY, BOY) MAP Growth assessment, Alexander’s percentile ranks and RIT ranges were as follows:

**Math**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Term/Year** | **Grade** | **RIT Range** | **Achievement Percentile** |
| **Fall 2022** | 3 | 197 | 74 |
| **Winter 2022** | 3 | 211 | 86 |
| **Spring 2023** | 3 | 211 | 76 |

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Fall 2023** | 4 | 216 | 87 |

**Reading - English**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Term/Year** | **Grade** | **RIT Range** | **Percentile Range** |
| **Fall 2022** | 3 | 197 | 73 |
| **Winter 2022** | 3 | 212 | 87 |
| **Spring 2023** | 3 | 212 | 82 |
| **Fall 2023** | 4 | 209 | 77 |

**Reading - Spanish**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Term/Year** | **Grade** | **RIT Range** | **Percentile Range** |
| **Fall 2022** | 3 | 193 | 79 |
| **Winter 2022** | 3 | 210 | 94 |
| **Spring 2023** | 3 | 206 | 88 |
| **Fall 2023** | 4 | 212 | 92 |

Alexander’s MAP data indicates that he has been making adequate growth and performance above students in his own grade.

Alexander’s academic and developmental performance appears to be developmentally appropriate at this time.

# INTELLECTUAL

Informal test measures were used in determining areas of processing related to Alexander’s academic achievement. Alexander’s cognitive abilities were assessed in an indirect manner through parent and teacher information. Alexander is able to ask and answer questions, follow multiple-step directions, produce logical and on-topic sentences, and retain information week to week. Alexander’s intellectual development appears to be developmentally appropriate at this time.

# ADAPTIVE BEHAVIOR

Adaptive behavior is the effectiveness with which individuals meet the standards of personal independence and social responsibility expected of individuals of their age and cultural group. The assessment of adaptive behavior focuses on two major issues: the degree to which individuals are able to function and maintain themselves independently and the degree to which they meet the culturally imposed demands of personal and social responsibility. Adaptive behavior represents the interaction of personal, cognitive, social, and situational variables. (Sattler, J. M., (2002). Assessment of Children: Behavioral and Clinical Applications-Fourth Edition. California. Sattler Publishing)

Adaptive behavior was assessed using informal measures. Alexander independently engages in toileting, self-care activities, and navigating the school.

Based on this data, Alexander’s adaptive behavior appears to be consistent with his current intellectual functioning.

# CONCLUSION

The group of qualified professionals (licensed speech-language pathologist) has collected and reviewed the evaluation data in order to determine if Alexander is a student with a disability condition and needs special education services.

Current evaluation results indicate that: Alexander presents with difficulty producing the “r” sound in English and in Spanish. In English, he frequently produces the “w” or “l” sound instead of the “r” sound (e.g., “wabbit” for “rabbit”). In Spanish, he frequently produces the “l” sound for the trilled and tap “r” (e.g., “lojo” for “rojo”). These sounds are expected to be mastered between 7-9 years of age. Due to reports of his speech sound errors negatively impacting his social relationships, Alexander meets the eligibility criteria of a student with a speech impairment in the area of articulation. These speech sound errors are present in both languages, therefore, difficulties are attributed to a disorder rather than a language difference. Alexander presents

with age-appropriate expressive, receptive, and pragmatic language. Voice was found to be within normal limits. An examination of oral motor abilities indicated adequate structure and mobility to support functional communication. Alexander presents with moderate stuttering. However, his stuttering does not appear to adversely affect his educational performance at this time. He effectively communicates with peers and adults by asking/answering questions, commenting, and conversing.

Consideration of assistive technology is an ongoing process driven by changes in student needs including, but not limited to, participation, access, curriculum, or environmental changes.

## Speech Disability Report

1. Is there a disability condition (i.e. Communication Disorder)?

 Yes  No

The student meets the eligibility criteria for Speech Impairment, in the areas of:

 Language  Fluency

 Articulation  Voice

1. Is there an adverse effect on educational performance (academic achievement and/or functional performance) resulting from the Communication Disorder?

 Yes  No

Academic/Educational performance is affected in the following manner: (functional implications)

 Academic/Educational performance is not affected  Oral communication cannot be understood

 Class participation/verbal interaction with peers is limited

 Needs/Wishes/Ideas are not expressed so that he can be understood  Other:

The group of qualified professionals has collected and reviewed the evaluation data in order to determine if Alexander is a student with a disability condition and needs Special Education services. Current evaluation results indicate that Alexander meets The Texas Education Agency’s criteria for the disability conditions of Speech Impairment.

## Impact of Disability

Alexander’s assessment data indicates he presents with an articulation disorder. In English, he frequently produces the “w” or “l” sound instead of the “r” sound (e.g., “wabbit” for “rabbit”). In Spanish, he frequently produces the “l” sound for the trilled and tap “r” (e.g., “lojo” for “rojo”).

These errors adversely impact his intelligibility with familiar and unfamiliar listeners. When Alexander tries to communicate with peers and staff, they sometimes struggle to understand him, which leads him to feel frustrated and adversely impacts his participation in social and academic activities.

# RECOMMENDATIONS

This multidisciplinary evaluation is considered a valid representation of Alexander’s current levels of functioning in the areas assessed. The purpose of the FIE is to identify the presence of a disability condition and provide information regarding the student’s need for special education and related services. All decisions pertaining to eligibility, services to be provided, and placements remain the responsibility of the ARD committee.

The following recommendations are based upon a review of evaluation data and educational performance:

**Language and Communication**

* **Group speech therapy to address articulation concerns**
* **Model appropriate production of “r” in conversation**
* **Provide extra time for oral response Assurances:**

The multidisciplinary team assures that:

* Information has been drawn from a variety of assessment tools and strategies to gather relevant functional, developmental, and academic information about the child, including information provided by the parent.
* More than one measure or assessment procedure was used as the criteria for determining whether a child is a child with a disability.
* Technically sound instruments were used to evaluate the relative contribution of cognitive and behavioral factors, in addition to physical or developmental factors.
* Assessments and other evaluation materials used were selected and administered so as not to be discriminatory on a racial or cultural basis.
* Assessments and other evaluation materials were administered in the child’s native language or other mode of communication and in the form most likely to yield accurate information on what the child knows and can do academically, developmentally, and functionally unless it clearly was not feasible to so provide or administer.
* Assessment and other evaluation materials were used for the purposes for which the assessments or measures are valid and reliable, except where otherwise noted.
* Assessment and other evaluation tools/materials were administered by trained and knowledgeable personnel and were administered in accordance with any instructions provided by the producer of the assessment.
* Assessments and other evaluation materials included those tailored to assess specific areas of educational need and not merely those designed to provide a single general intelligence quotient
* Assessments and other evaluation materials were selected and administered so as best to ensure that if an assessment was administered to a child with impaired sensory, manual, or speaking skills, the assessment results accurately reflect the child’s aptitude or achievement level or whatever other factors the test purports to measure, rather than reflecting the child’s impaired sensory, manual, or speaking skills.
* The child was assessed in all areas related to the suspected disability, including, if appropriate, health, vision, hearing, social and emotional status, general intelligence, academic performance, communicative status and motor abilities.
* In evaluating each child with a disability, the evaluation was sufficiently comprehensive to identify all of the child’s special education and related services needs, whether or not commonly linked to the disability category in which the child has been classified.
* Assessment tools and strategies that provide relevant information that directly assists persons in determining the educational needs of the child were used.
* Assessments of children with disabilities who transfer from one public agency to another public agency in the same school year were coordinated with those children’s prior and subsequent schools, as necessary and as expeditiously as possible, to ensure prompt completion of full evaluations.

THE FULL INDIVIDUAL EVALUATION REPORT (FIE) IS ONE OF THE COMPONENTS CONSIDERED BY THE ADMISSION, REVIEW AND DISMISSAL (ARD) COMMITTEE. THE ARD COMMITTEE CONSIDERS THESE RESULTS AND OTHER INPUT WHEN ADDRESSING THE STUDENT’S INDIVIDUAL NEEDS FOR SPECIAL EDUCATION PLACEMENT AND SERVICES. THE FINAL DECISION REGARDING THE

PLACEMENT AND SERVICES RESTS WITH THE ARD COMMITTEE.
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