

**\*All names in this report have been omitted and falsified. \***

**Gary M. Eisenberg, Ph.D.**  
Licensed Clinical Psychologist #PSY 3907  
609 W. Littleton Blvd Suite 307  
Littleton, CO 80120  
303-808-4140

**PSYCHOEDUCATIONAL EVALUATION**

NAME: Steven Sunflower    SEX: M    BIRTHDATE: 01/07/2012    AGE: 7 - 9

SCHOOL: Elderflower Elementary    GRADE: 2

PARENT: Samuel and Sarah Sunflower

DATE OF EVALUATION: 09/26/2019

**PSYCHOLOGIST:** Gary M. Eisenberg, Ph.D.

**REASON FOR REFERRAL:**

Steven's behavior is very consistent with ADHD. In addition, dyslexia runs in father's family. Although Steven's reading is on grade level he struggles with comprehension and expressing himself. He likes numbers. Psychostimulant medication has been ineffective due to untoward side effects.

**BACKGROUND:**

Steven Sunflower is the second of three children of Samuel and Sarah Sunflower. Father reports that he was diagnosed with dyslexia as a young student. Very motivated, he was able to work through it.

Steven was delivered three weeks early because of low amniotic fluid. He was a breech birth with the cord wrapped around his neck and born slightly blue. Given intermittent breathing and poor oxygen consumption, he was on oxygen for the first five months of his life. That being said, he was and is described as a happy baby and child. Developmental stages passed at a normal rate and without incident. He did listen to limit setting. Of medical note was RSV as a baby plus excess mucus. There were no other concerns in his medical history including that of his eyes and ears.

Preschool reported that Steven was not progressing with his numbers and letters. In kindergarten he was reported to not be progressing with his reading. There he was pulled out for reading support. The school has recommended a full evaluation.

Parents work closely with him at homework time. There they find he is slow to learn his letters and letter sounds. His tutor has indicated that he has strong and weak days in terms of his ability to retain a word. He may or may not remember a newly-taught word.

Throughout the years Steven has been frustrated when he cannot express his point of view accurately. Sometimes his descriptions do not match the situation.

On the other hand, Steven can focus well on sports because of his passion about them. He also is significantly better in math skills relative to reading.

Steven acts as if fine-motor coordination is awkward. The ability to use scissors was delayed. He has always disliked writing going back to coloring as a younger child and arts and crafts currently.

**OBSERVATIONS:**

Steven Sunflower is a handsome, tall young man who enjoyed the individual attention that testing afforded. Throughout testing he was generally wiggly but easily responded to redirection. He did enjoy holding his fidget throughout the two 2-hour testing sessions. Even during break time he evidenced a short attention span when playing with the office toys. He would go from toy to toy with little follow through on each.

Steven’s modus operandi was to guess on difficult test items rather than bearing down. This was a rather regular habit but again did respond well to regular redirection. Steven also wrote many of his letters and numbers in a reversed fashion, especially the ‘5.’

**TESTS ADMINISTERED:**

- Wechsler Intelligence Scale for Children, Fifth Edition (WISC-V)
- Kaufman Test of Educational Achievement, Third Version (KTEA-3)
- Woodcock-Johnson IV, Tests Of Cognitive Ability (brief)
- Achenbach Child Behavior Checklist
- Continuous Performance Test (IVA).
- Records Review
- Interview

**TEST RESULTS:**

**PRIMARY SUMMARY**

**Subtest Score Summary**

<b>Domain</b>	<b>Subtest Name</b>	<b>Scaled Score</b>	<b>Percentile Rank</b>
Verbal	<b>Similarities</b>	12	75
Comprehension	<b>Vocabulary</b>	12	75
Visual Spatial	<b>Block Design</b>	10	50
Fluid Reasoning	<b>Matrix Reasoning</b>	11	63
	<b>Figure Weights</b>	10	50
Working Memory	<b>Digit Span</b>	10	50

Processing Speed	<b>Coding</b>	7	16
	Symbol Search	6	9

## PRIMARY SUMMARY (CONTINUED)

### Composite Score Summary

Composite	Composite Score	Percentile Rank	Qualitative Description
Verbal Comprehension	111	77	High Average
Fluid Reasoning	103	58	Average
Processing Speed	80	9	Low Average
<b>Full Scale IQ</b>	102	55	Average

## Kaufman Test of Educational Achievement, Third Edition Standard Report

Composite/Subtest	Sum of Subtest Standard Scores	Standard Scores	Percentile Rank	Grade Equivalent	Age Equivalent
<i>Core Composites</i>					
<b>Academic Skills Battery (ASB) Composite</b>	573	93	32	-	-
Math Concepts & Applications	-	101	53	2.3	7:7
Letter & Word Recognition	-	91	27	1.6	6:10
Written Expression	-	82	12	1.2	6:4
Math Computation	-	103	58	2.5	7:10
Spelling	-	91	27	1.6	6:10
Reading Comprehension	-	105	63	2.6	7:10
<b>Reading Composite</b>	196	98	45	-	-
Letter & Word Recognition	-	91	27	1.6	6:10
Reading Comprehension	-	105	63	2.6	7:10
<b>Math Composite</b>	204	102	55	-	-
Math Concepts & Applications	-	101	53	2.3	7:7
Math Computation	-	103	58	2.5	7:10
<b>Written Language Composite</b>	173	86	18	-	-
Written Expression	-	82	12	1.2	6:4
Spelling	-	91	27	1.6	6:10

Composite/Subtest	Sum of Subtest Standard Scores	Standard Scores	Percentile Rank	Grade Equivalent	Age Equivalent
<i>Supplemental Composites</i>					
<b>Sound-Symbol Composite</b>	168	81	10	-	-
Phonological Processing	-	81	10	K.5	5:10
Nonsense Word Decoding	-	87	19	<1.0	6:1
<b>Decoding Composite</b>	178	88	21	-	-
Letter & Word Recognition	-	91	27	1.6	6:10
Nonsense Word Decoding	-	87	19	<1.0	6:1
Silent Reading Fluency	-	90	25	1.5	6:7
Word Recognition Fluency	-	95	37	1.9	6:10
<b>Oral Language Composite</b>	302	100	50	-	-
Associational Fluency	-	102	55	2.6	7:7
Listening Comprehension	-	105	63	2.9	8:1
Oral Expression	-	95	37	1.6	6:10
<b>Oral Fluency Composite</b>	182	88	21	-	-
Associational Fluency	-	102	55	2.6	7:7
Object Naming Facility	-	80	9	PK.7	4:10
<b>Comprehension Composite</b>	210	106	66	-	-
Reading Comprehension	-	105	63	2.6	7:10
Listening Comprehension	-	105	63	2.9	8:1
<b>Expression Composite</b>	177	86	18	-	-
Written Expression	-	82	12	1.2	6:4
Oral Expression	-	95	37	1.6	6:10
<b>Orthographic Processing Composite</b>	266	85	16	-	-
Spelling	-	91	27	1.6	6:10
Letter Naming Facility	-	80	9	K.2	5:0
Word Recognition	-	95	37	1.9	6:10

Fluency					
<b>Academic Fluency Composite</b>	-	-	-	-	-
Writing Fluency	-	87	19	<2.0	<7:1
Math Fluency	-	85	16	1.1	6:4

<b>WOODCOCK-JOHNSON IV TESTS OF COGNITIVE ABILITY AND ORAL LANGUAGE</b>			
<b>Subtest</b>	<b>Grade Equiv.</b>	<b>Age Equiv.</b>	<b>SS</b>
<b>PERCEPTUAL SPEED</b>	<b>&lt;K.0</b>	<b>5 - 2</b>	<b>57</b>
Sound Blending	<b>2.9</b>	<b>8 - 3</b>	<b>104</b>
Number-Pattern Matching	<b>&lt;K.0</b>	<b>5 - 0</b>	<b>46</b>
Letter-Pattern Matching	<b>K.2</b>	<b>5 - 6</b>	<b>74</b>

### **DISCUSSION OF TEST RESULTS:**

Wechsler defined intelligence as “the aggregate or global capacity of the individual to act purposefully, to think rationally, and to deal effectively with his environment.” Currently it is assumed to be a measure of potential, not actual achievement, the latter of which is affected by such factors as motivation and ability to process information. Although I.Q. test scores may vary a few points in time, the general level or “range” does not generally vary as achievement test scores do.

### **INTERPRETATION OF WISC-V RESULTS**

#### **FSIQ**

The FSIQ is derived from seven subtests and summarizes ability across a diverse set of cognitive functions. This score is typically considered the most representative indicator of general intellectual functioning. Subtests are drawn from five areas of cognitive ability: verbal comprehension, visual spatial, fluid reasoning, working memory, and processing speed. Steven's FSIQ score is in the Average range when compared to other children his age (FSIQ = 102, PR =

55, CI = 96-108). Although the WISC-V measures various aspects of ability, a child's scores on this test can also be influenced by many factors that are not captured in this report. When interpreting this report, consider additional sources of information that may not be reflected in the scores on this assessment. While the FSIQ provides a broad representation of cognitive ability, describing Steven's domain-specific performance allows for a more thorough understanding of his functioning in distinct areas. Some children perform at approximately the same level in all of these areas, but many others display areas of cognitive strengths and weaknesses.

### **Verbal Comprehension**

The Verbal Comprehension Index (VCI) measured Steven's ability to access and apply acquired word knowledge. Specifically, this score reflects his ability to verbalize meaningful concepts, think about verbal information, and express himself using words. Overall, Steven's performance on the VCI was above average for his age (VCI = 111, PR = 77, High Average range, CI = 102-118). High scores in this area indicate a well-developed verbal reasoning system with strong word knowledge acquisition, effective information retrieval, good ability to reason and solve verbal problems, and effective communication of knowledge. Steven's performance on verbal comprehension tasks was stronger than his performance on tasks requiring him to work quickly and efficiently (VCI > PSI, BR = 4.1%). Steven's processing speed was a relative weakness when compared to verbal comprehension, but does not appear to be interfering with his capacity to perform complex verbal tasks.

With regard to individual subtests within the VCI, Similarities (SI) required Steven to describe a similarity between two words that represent a common object or concept and Vocabulary (VC) required him to name depicted objects and/or define words that were read aloud. He performed comparably across both subtests, suggesting that his abstract reasoning skills and word knowledge are similarly developed at this time (SI = 12; VC = 12).

### **Fluid Reasoning**

The Fluid Reasoning Index (FRI) measured Steven's ability to detect the underlying conceptual relationship among visual objects and use reasoning to identify and apply rules. Identification and application of conceptual relationships in the FRI requires inductive and quantitative reasoning, broad visual intelligence, simultaneous processing, and abstract thinking. Overall, Steven's performance on the FRI was typical for his age (FRI = 103, PR = 58, Average range, CI = 96-110). Steven's overall performance on the FRI was stronger than performance on tasks that measured processing speed (FRI > PSI, BR = 10.1%). It appears that he is well able to solve complex problems despite having difficulty on other tasks.

The FRI is derived from two subtests: Matrix Reasoning (MR) and Figure Weights (FW). Matrix Reasoning required Steven to view an incomplete matrix or series and select the response option that completed the matrix or series. On Figure Weights, he viewed a scale with a missing weight(s) and identified the response option that would keep the scale balanced. He performed comparably across both subtests, suggesting that his perceptual organization and quantitative reasoning skills are similarly developed at this time (MR = 11; FW = 10).

## **Processing Speed**

The Processing Speed Index (PSI) measured Steven's speed and accuracy of visual identification, decision making, and decision implementation. Performance on the PSI is related to visual scanning, visual discrimination, short-term visual memory, visuomotor coordination, and concentration. The PSI assessed his ability to rapidly identify, register, and implement decisions about visual stimuli. His overall processing speed performance was slightly low for his age and was an area of relative weakness compared to his overall ability (PSI = 80, PR = 9, Low Average range, CI = 73-91; PSI < FSIQ, BR = <=5%). Low PSI scores may occur for many reasons including visual discrimination problems, distractibility, slowed decision making, motor difficulties, or generally slow cognitive speed. His performance on processing speed tasks was weaker than his performance on language-based tasks (PSI < VCI, BR = 4.1%). Additionally, his performance on processing speed tasks was a weakness relative to his performance on tasks requiring him to use logic-based reasoning (PSI < FRI, BR = 10.1%).

The PSI is derived from two timed subtests. Symbol Search required Steven to scan a group of symbols and indicate if the target symbol was present. On Coding, he used a key to copy symbols that corresponded with simple geometric shapes. Performance across these tasks was similar, suggesting that Steven's associative memory, graphomotor speed, and visual scanning ability are similarly developed (SS = 6; CD = 7). His score on Symbol Search was slightly below other children his age, suggesting that he works somewhat slowly on tasks requiring short-term visual memory, visual motor coordination, and cognitive flexibility. Performance on this task was weak when compared to his overall ability and may be an area for further development (SS = 6; SS < MSS-F, BR = <=10%).

## **Additional Subtests Contributing to the FSIQ**

In addition to the index scores described in this report, the FSIQ includes subtests that measure other areas of cognitive ability. When compared to other children his age, Steven exhibited typical performance across other subtests contributing to the FSIQ. On Block Design (BD), he showed average performance when putting together multicolored blocks to match pictured designs. Block Design measures the ability to analyze and synthesize abstract visual information. His score on this Visual Spatial subtest was typical for his age (BD = 10). During Digit Span (DS), Steven listened to sequences of numbers and then recalled the numbers in forward, backward, or ascending order. Digit Span measures mental manipulation, cognitive flexibility, and mental alertness. On this Working Memory task, his performance was similar to other children his age (DS = 10).

The Kaufman Test of Educational Achievement, Third Version (KTEA-3) is a comprehensive academic achievement test that measures all forms of academic achievement as well as their underpinning processes.

Three forms of reading achievement were administered: Letter and Word Recognition, Reading Comprehension and Silent Reading Fluency. Letter and Word Recognition requires the student to identify letters and pronounce words of gradually increasing difficulty. Reading Comprehension is an untimed test of silent reading comprehension includes several items types. Early items require matching a symbol or word(s) with its corresponding picture. Subsequent

items require reading a simple instruction and responding by performing the action. Later items involve reading passages of increasing difficulty and answering literal and/or inferential questions about them. The most difficult items require rearranging five sentences into a coherent paragraph and then answering questions about the paragraph. In Silent Reading Fluency the student silently reads simple sentences and marks yes or no in the Response Booklet to indicate whether the statement is true or false, completing as many items as possible within a two-minute time limit.

Although the Reading Composite score fell right on grade level, please note that Steven's ability to read the individual word was measured far below his reading comprehension. Reading speed, as measured by the Silent Reading Fluency subtest, was also measured about a half grade level below placement.

Three tests of math achievement were administered: Math Concepts and Applications, Math Computation and Math Fluency. In Math Concepts and Applications the student responds orally to items that require the application of mathematical principles to real-life situations. Skill categories include number concepts, operation concepts, time and money, measurement, geometry, fractions and decimals, data investigation, and higher math concepts. In Math Computation the student writes answers to as many math calculation problems as possible. Skills assessed include simple counting and number identification; addition, subtraction, multiplication, and division operations; fraction and decimals; square roots and exponents; and algebra. In Math Fluency the student writes answers to as many additions, subtraction, multiplication, and division problems as possible in 60-seconds.

Consistent with parental report, math scores were right on grade level.

Writing was measured by the Spelling subtest. Here his score fell at a 27<sup>th</sup>ile, also a full half-grade level below placement.

Subsequently, processing tests were administered to better understand the root of these weaknesses.

The Kaufman Test of Educational Achievement, Third Version (KTEA-3) allows for multiple forms of measuring decoding. In Steven's case he received the Nonsense Word Decoding and Letter Naming Facility subtests. In Nonsense Word Decoding the student applies phonics and structural analysis skills to decode nonsense words of increasing difficulty. In Letter Naming Facility the student names a combination of upper and lower case letters as quickly as possible during two short trials.

Both of these subtests did rate well below average. Decoding is the ability to apply the student's knowledge of sound-syllable and sound-letter relationships, to accurately pronounce words. Good decoding skills allow them to pronounce words quickly and efficiently. Steven's difficulties with decoding come to the fore when speed is required.

Dovetailing with weaker decoding are subtests measuring Phonological Processing. Here the student is required to manipulate sounds as in rhyming, matching blending segmenting and

deleting sounds. Phonological processing is a concept that relates to one's facility in using the sounds of one's language to understand words and therefore language. The Phonological Processing score falling at the 10<sup>th</sup> percentile attest to real weaknesses here.

Steven received the Object Naming Facility subtest. In Object Naming Facility the student names pictured objects as quickly as possible during two short trials. In fact, we see the youngster responds so slowly and processes so weakly (as in Object Naming Facility) that it suggests that processing from a visual stimulus is generally slow.

The one exception was Associational Fluency. Here scores were more average. However, there is no reading required in this subtest. It relates to his pure ability to access information mentally...which he does very well. Retrieval of stored information is strong.

When responding verbally, Steven is able to understand that which he hears. This was shown in the Listening Comprehension subtest. In the Listening Comprehension test, each item requires the examinee to listen to either a sentence read by the examiner (for the early items) or a recorded passage played from the Audio CD. After listening to each sentence or passage, the student responds orally to literal and/or inferential comprehension questions asked by the examiner. Here he scored slightly above average and close to a third-grade level.

Hence, the reason for referral was, according to parents, dyslexia. This youngster was checked for the visual-orthographic component of learning disabilities. To this end he received the Number Pattern Matching and Letter-Pattern Matching subtests of the Woodcock-Johnson IV, Tests Of Cognitive Ability. Number Pattern Matching measures the ability to quickly identify and circle the two identical numerals in a row of six. The visual-orthographic component to reading, formerly called visual processing and/or dyslexia, was measured by the Letter-Pattern Matching and Number-Pattern Matching subtests. Number Pattern Matching measures the ability to quickly identify and circle the two identical numerals in a row of six. Letter-Pattern Matching requires the student to match which of five syllables are identical.

Summarized on the Perceptual Speed cluster score, we see scores well below average. Observationally, these subtests were truly a struggle. Sometimes Steven's subvocalized before picking the right answer. It took him a very long time to scan and decide which of two number/letters were identical. Clearly there is a visual-orthographic element to his reading disability.

Remember that spelling scores were one of his lowest academic achievement scores. Steven has never liked writing, going back to the days where he was only asked to color. The Written Expression subtest asks the student to write sentences and checks for proper grammar and punctuation. Steven's sentences were brief, choppy and often circuitous.

Hence, he was tested for dysgraphia. The KTEA-3 already suggested that by a 13<sup>th</sup> percentile score in Orthographic Processing (Composite).

Subsequently, he received the Developmental Test of Visual Motor Integration. This is a simple copying task where the student must reproduce familiar geometric designs. His writing was

minute with multiple erasures. His age-equivalent score of *six years, ten months* was almost one full year below age level. This student is being diagnosed with dysgraphia which means he struggles to express his thoughts in writing. Low facility in Phonological Processing delays his recall of the sound-syllable relationship which is then exacerbated by his fine-motor struggles.

Steven was then rechecked for ADHD. To this end parents included the Achenbach Child Behavior Checklist. Here parent rates the youngster on 112 different items. The psychologist subsequently classifies them into diagnostic categories. Steven only had one spike, that in the area of attention problems. That included failure to finish, lack of concentration, confusion, daydreaming and inattentiveness.

Steven then received the Continuous Performance Test (IVA). The Continuous Performance Test (IVA) is a fine, objective measure of focus and concentration. The student's hand is on the mouse while the computer-based instructions change in a manner that requires sustained focus. This is a 20 minute computerized exam where the student must "click on" a stated target whereby inhibiting his responses to others. Continuous Performance Test (IVA) scores are expected to average 100, whereby 85 or below is considered below average. Steven was unable to persist past five or seven minutes. He lacked the focus to complete this test in a reliable fashion.

By default, this by itself suggests attentional deficits. History, observations and testing are all very consistent with a diagnosis of Attention Deficit Hyperactivity Disorder – Combined Type.

### **SUMMARY:**

Steven Sunflower is a seven-year-old second grader referred for a full evaluation of ADHD and dyslexia, the latter of which runs in the family. Throughout testing Steven was generally wiggly but easily responded to redirection. Even during break time his limited attention span with toys suggested trouble with focus. When test items became difficult, Steven tended to guess rather than bear down. Please note he wrote many of his letters and numbers in a reversed fashion.

Psychoeducational testing indicates a Full-Scale IQ exactly in the average range (102). However, the Full-Scale IQ is artifactually slightly decreased by a very low Processing Speed Index score. The latter suggests difficulty writing and writing quickly.

Achievement testing indicates that Steven's reading comprehension is on grade level whereby his ability to read the individual word and reading speed was rated lower. Math scores were right on grade level. Spelling was rated at a 27%. Written Expression was awkward, choppy and slow and rated at a 12<sup>th</sup> percentile.

Subtests measuring Phonological Processing were a key finding. Here the student is required to manipulate sounds as in rhyming, matching blending segmenting and deleting sounds. Phonological processing is a concept that relates to one's facility in using the sounds of their language to understand words and therefore language. A Kindergarten level score indicates that this is one of the primary impediments comprising his learning disability.

Multiple tests of processing and word decoding all indicate impaired abilities to quickly retrieve sound-symbol information from memory. Steven is a slow processor whether it be for reading or remembering facts. Listening comprehension on the other hand was above average.

Processing testing also indicates there is a visual-orthographic element to Steven's reading difficulties. This means he cannot quickly process the appearance of a word or syllable. Impediments in both visual and language-based areas attest to the severity of the learning disability. Hence this student meets criterion for a reading learning disability, also referred to as dyslexia.

Processing and writing tests also demonstrated real difficulties translating thoughts into the written sphere. His VMI score was one full grade level below placement, suggesting difficulties with writing. Not only is he slow to access sounds and words, but poor fine motor coordination also hampers writing and contributes to dysgraphia. Dysgraphia refers to the inefficient translation of thoughts into the written sphere.

Consistent office observations plus parent observations of difficulty finishing, concentrating and a tendency to daydream ... all indicated the diagnosis of ADHD. This was consistent with CPT test results, parent history and survey results.

### **DIAGNOSIS:**

DSM 5: Attention Deficit Hyperactivity Disorder – Combined Type  
Learning Disorder  
With impairments in reading (dyslexia).  
With impairments in written expression (dysgraphia).

### **RECOMMENDATIONS:**

1. This youngster has already tried most major forms of psychopharmacological interventions for ADHD without success. Therefore, resources emphasizing alternative treatment of ADHD including nutrition and vitamins were discussed with parents and referrals given.
2. This report should be shared with officials at Elderflower Elementary so that details can be added to his Section 504 Plan. This child principally needs help with phonics. His principal reading weaknesses are only in the foundations of reading. When his brain finally assimilates the sound-syllable association his reading will begin to be more fluid. Sometimes a child like this spends so much time deciphering the individual word that fewer resources are left over for comprehension. In future years, Steven will need to recheck whether or not he has comprehended before he moves on. Those reading recommendations are inserted below.

Additional accommodations for the 504:

- Post visual schedules and also read them out loud.
  - Provide colored strips or bookmarks to help focus on a line of text when reading.
  - Hand out letter and number strips so the student can see how to write correctly.
  - Use large-print text for worksheets.
  - Provide extra time for reading and writing.
  - Give the student multiple opportunities to read the same text.
  - Use reading buddies during worktime (as appropriate).
  - Partner up for studying—one student writes while the other speaks, or they share the writing.
  - Give step-by-step directions and read written instructions out loud.
  - Simplify directions using key words for the most important ideas.
  - Highlight key words and ideas on worksheets for the student to read first.
  - Check in frequently to make sure the student understands and can repeat the directions.
  - Show examples of correct and completed work to serve as a model.
  - Help the student break assignments into smaller steps.
  - Reference: Understood.org; Classroom Accommodations for Dyslexia
3. Tutoring for dyslexia was recommended and referrals given. Vetted tutors can be found on the International Association of Dyslexia, (Rocky Mountain Branch) website.
  4. Additional nonpharmacological interventions for ADHD were discussed including teaching Steven the bodily components of focus.
  5. Drill into Steven the meaning of focus. Focus equals one being seated, back against chair, eyes on paper and listening. Steven should learn to do a “body inventory” when he is asked to focus. Focus should become a household word e.g. comments can be made about whether other family members are focusing. All feedback to the child about diminished focus should be tied to a body part. For instance, “What should your eyes be doing?”
  6. At home and at school, attentional deficits could be further approached by implementing the following specific recommendations:
    - A) Eye contact prior to instruction giving.
    - B) Brief and specific directions – not multiple tasks.
    - C) Have the child repeat the instructions in his own words.
    - D) Whenever possible, use visual cues.
    - E) Emphasize the relationship between behavior and consequences, e.g. unfinished homework results in poor grades.
    - F) Reduce distractions during homework time (e.g. use a large uncluttered desk area with no distractions on the walls in front).
  7. Method of socially-acceptable movement to channel his need for movement were strongly recommended such as Bouncey Bands or sitting pillows.

8. Consider the following Bibliography:

**Helping Your Child with Language-Based Learning Disabilities: Strategies to Succeed in School and Life with Dyslexia, Dysgraphia, Dyscalculia, ADHD, and Processing Disorders**

by Franklin PhD, Daniel and Cozolino PhD, Louis |

**Overcoming Dyslexia**

by Shaywitz M.D., Sally

**IDA Dyslexia Handbook: What Every Family Should Know**

**Beginning to Read: Thinking and Learning about Print - A Summary**

Marilyn Jager Adams

an integrated treatment for the process of skillful reading,

**DYSLEXIA: Fact and Fiction** by Meg Porch, M.A., CCC-SP, CALT.

**Writing Better: Effective Strategies for Teaching Students with Learning Difficulties**

Steven Graham & Karen R. Harris

**Bigger Than Me: How a Boy Conquered Dyslexia to Play with the NFL**

Jovan Haye

9. If needed consider using an advocate to facilitate the 504 or IEP

**Children's Law Center 720 259 2164**

**Roxanne Bradley 303 506 0171**

Or a book about Advocacy in the Public Schools:

Dyslexia Advocate!: How to Advocate for a Child with Dyslexia within the Public Education System

by Kelli Sandman-Hurley

Wrightslaw: All About IEPs

by Peter W. D. Wright and Pamela Darr Wright and Sandra Webb O'Connor

### **READING COMPREHENSION RECOMMENDATIONS**

#### **1. Active comprehension strategies.**

Good readers

- are extremely active as they read
- think aloud as they go through text
- are aware of why they are reading a text,
- gain an overview of the text before reading,
- make predictions about the upcoming text,
- read selectively based on their overview,
- associate ideas in text to what they already know,
- note whether their predictions and expectations about text content are being met,
- figure out the meanings of unfamiliar vocabulary based on context clues,
- *underline, reread, make notes and paraphrase to remember important points*
- interpret the text, evaluate its quality, and review important points as they conclude reading.

They are busy generating questions about ideas in text while reading; constructing mental images representing ideas in text; summarizing; and analyzing stories read into story grammar components of setting, characters, problems encountered by characters, attempts at solution, successful solution, and ending

#### **2. Monitoring.**

- Good readers know when they need to exert more effort to make sense of a text. For example, they know when to expend more decoding effort -- they are aware when they have sounded out a word but that word does not really make sense in the context. When good readers have that feeling, they try rereading the word in question.
- Good readers are also aware of the occasions when they are confused, when text does not make sense. When readers did not understand a text, they were taught to seek clarification, often through rereading. Ask themselves consistently, "Is what I am reading making sense?"

#### **3. Use a systematic reading technique like SQR3.**

- Develop a systematic reading style, like the SQR3 method and make adjustments to it, depending on priorities and purpose. The SQR3 steps include Survey, Question, Read, Recite and Review.

#### **4. Reading and listening comprehension can be helped by teaching students to summarize facts in a logical**

sequence so they can either verbalize or write what they have just heard or seen. This means that parents can help her do so after she watches a television show or a movie. Parents, teachers and tutors should also help him summarize a paragraph. Should she not be able to predict the next paragraph or summarize accurately, Steven should learn to self-monitor enough so that he will go back and reread!

5. Memory for recently read information can be helped by aiding the child in maximizing the depth of processing. This means to have them think about what they have just read and make connections to it. Taking studying breaks or spacing homework assignments will also improve memory function. Relate the story to your child's existing knowledge. Associative techniques such as Mnemonics have also been helpful.
6. Remember to establish the W's...who, what, where, when, why. Generate questions as you read. Use Imagery. Make inferences.

CC: Dr. Phillip Feelgood, Pediatrician

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Gary M. Eisenberg, Ph.D.", written in a cursive style.

Gary M. Eisenberg, Ph.D.  
Clinical Psychologist  
CO License # PSY 3907