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Purpose of the Current Speech & Language evaluation:
The following bilingual speech and language evaluation contains clinical observations of auditory, visual, oral-motor, and cognitive-linguistic status; and standardized and/or non-standardized measures of specific aspects of speech, spoken and non-spoken language, cognitive-linguistic communication, and analysis of current speech and language samples. Brittany is a 15;1-year-old female student, who was seen for a bilingual (Spanish/English) speech and language evaluation at her school. She attends McKinley school (Glee district), where she is currently in eighth grade. This evaluation was requested by her school staff and family, due to concerns regarding her current levels of communication functioning and possible continued eligibility for speech and language therapy services.

The purpose of the information in this report, is to provide documentation to assist the Committee of Special Education (CSE) in determination of eligibility for speech and language therapy services, to address Brittany’s current academic deficits. This bilingual Speech and Language Pathologist aimed to identify Brittany’s unique speech and language strengths and needs, and determine the areas that may require intervention, by assessing the ability to mechanically form language (to say words and sentences in terms of using the tongue and lips correctly); ability to process language (to understand spoken and printed language and to express oneself verbally and in writing); how well Brittany understands the language spoken by others (directions, stories read, teacher lecture, classroom discussion); how well expressive language is used (express needs, thoughts, and ideas verbally); how Brittany grasps the underlying structure of language (grammar, vocabulary, word usage, and how words go together to form sentences); how well language is used to meet specific needs and navigate the social world; and whether Brittany has acquired the foundation of speech and language skills needed in order to effectively participate, read and write, to perform in curriculum-based tasks in school.

Background Information: 
Relevant Medical & Developmental History-
Brittany is currently enrolled in an Integrated Co-Teaching program and receives monolingual English speech-language therapy services 2x/week. She currently has a learning disability classification and has a relevant medical history of fluctuating hearing loss, with mild hearing loss in her right ear. Her mother reportedly stated that in her latest appointment in September 2017, her hearing status was no longer a concern.

Hearing & Vision Skills-
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Brittany does not wear hearing aids, nor corrective lenses, and does not use alternative/augmentative communication devices. There is not family history of hearing impairments. During this evaluation, Brittany responded to all conversational exchanges and identified all items without visual struggles noted.

**Clinical Verbal Behavioral Observations & Pragmatic Skills:**
This evaluation was conducted at Brittany’s school, with appropriate lighting and no auditory and/or visual distractions. The conditions for assessment were somewhat optimal and Brittany was presented with clean, age-appropriate and culturally adapted assessment materials. Brittany transitioned well into the evaluation setting and responded to greetings. She initially presented as a very shy student, who slowly warmed up to this evaluator. Brittany’s social communication resembled that of a much younger student, as she was shy to engage in short dialogues; was somewhat reluctant to relate her own experiences; presented inconsistencies providing descriptive details to enhance listener understanding; using attention-getting words; clarifying and asking for clarification; and introducing and changing topics of conversation. Toward the middle of the evaluation, Brittany stopped, raised her hand, looked at the way, stay quiet for a few seconds, took a deep breath and stated: “my name is Bree-tnee, not Brittany” and looked down at the floor. At her age and academic grade, Brittany is expected to engage peers and family members in conversational exchanges, using her verbalizations to retell experiences and stories, negotiate turns, express intentions and needs, and use complex phrases to form narratives and maintain conversational exchanges in several turns without support needed.

**Cultural Considerations for Assessment:**
Basic interpersonal communication skills (BICS) and cognitive academic language proficiency (CALP) were assessed during this evaluation in a variety of tasks, to determine language dominance and/or preference in a variety of communication domains. BICS are language skills needed in social situations. It is the day-to-day language needed to interact socially with other people. English language learners (ELLs) employ BIC skills when they are on the playground, in the lunch room, on the school bus, at parties, playing sports and talking on the telephone. Social interactions are usually context embedded. They occur in a meaningful interactive context. They are not very demanding cognitively. The language required is not specialized. These language skills usually develop within six months to two years after arrival in the U.S. CALP refers to formal academic learning. This includes listening, speaking, reading, and writing about subject area content material. This level of language learning is essential for Brittany to succeed in school. Students need time and support to become proficient in academic areas. This usually takes from five to seven years. Academic language acquisition includes skills such as comparing, classifying, synthesizing, evaluating, and inferring.

> Consistent with the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act, and NYSED guidelines (updated 2014) for bilingual students and English Language Learners such as Brittany, test scores should not be reported for students for whom the normative sample is not representative. In this case, qualitative and descriptive information about Brittany’s performance on the tasks covered by said test, should take the place of a score. Numeric scores, including age ranges.
should not be used as sole measures to establish need for related services, as they are invalid and inaccurate in determination of service eligibility for children like Brittany.

Test scores are invalid when testing a student who is not reflected in the normative group for the test's standardization sample, even if the test were administered as instructed in the manual.

These are only used because they can provide valuable descriptive information about abilities and limitations, in the language of the test.

As such, selected subtests and tasks were used during this assessment solely to elicit speech, language- and reading-based tasks.

Test modifications were provided as well, allowing Brittany extra time for responses; eliminating items that were deemed culturally inappropriate; and using alternatives to standardized scoring, by providing qualitative descriptions of performance instead of scores.

**Assessment Tools:**
- Targeted clinical observation of naturalistic interactions and informed clinical opinion
- Structured dynamic assessment, conversational exchanges, and language sample analysis
- Oral Passage Understanding Scale (OPUS, 2017)
- Dynamic Assessment of Narrative & Expository Discourse (Gillam, Peña & Miller, 1999)
- ASHA: Social Communication Benchmarks
- School Age Language Assessment Measures (LEADERSProject.org)
- Use of Standardized Scores in Individual Evaluations of Culturally and Linguistically Diverse English Language Learners Ages 3 through 21 (NYSED, 2014)
- New York State P-12 Common Core Learning Standards for English Language Arts & Literacy
- American Speech & Hearing Association: Knowledge and Skills Needed by Speech Language Pathologists and Audiologists to Provide Culturally and Linguistically Appropriate Services
- ASHA: Language-Based Learning Disabilities (Reading, Spelling, and Writing)
- Regulations of the Commissioner of Education (with amendments through April 2015)

**Language Assessment:**

**Receptive Language Skills**
Receptively, Brittany followed one- and some two-step directives, with significant deficits noted following complex multiple step commands, particularly those including noun modifiers, temporal concepts, and conditions. In some instances, the ability to follow directions may be related to bilingual acquisition whereas the instructions may not be understood and can be harder to remember in a second language. However, all directions in this assessment were presented in Spanish and English. Brittany consistently demonstrated confusion when given verbal directions in either language, and often required further explanations, additional time, and repetitions to perform the tasks.
Brittany responded to simple daily routine questions involving reasoning (Why “hm- your breath will stink”); inferencing (What if “she will tell me what I need to do to make it better”); sequencing (How “put the toothpaste on the toothbrush- you put it in your mouth- your scrub it and keep scrubbing everywhere in your mouth and tongue and then you wash it and that’s it”); and stating details when given prompts.

She responded inconsistently to semantic skills including providing explanations of object function, describing similarities, describing categories, and identifying most items related based on semantic features. She relied on pictures, repetitions, and explanations for all semantic tasks, and presented difficulties understanding abstract concepts and higher language tasks

[brush/comb]: “to brush your hair”
[circle/square]: “they’re both shapes”
[hammer/nail]: “they’re both tools”
[running/jumping]: “it’s exercise”
[books/library]: “hm- in the library there are books”
[garage/car]: “cause the car goes in the garage”
[silent/quiet]: “gentle/tired because in your sleep you’re just seating there doing nothing” [incorrect]
[shirt/cloth]: “cause it’s a clothing item”
[candle/wax]: “cause a candle is made of wax”
[minute/hour]: “cause they’re time”
[north/west]: “cause those are directions”
[morning/afternoon]: “because it’s daily both of them- [prompt] it’s when you wake up” [incorrect]
[eyes/see]: “eyes and hand because it’s a part of your body” [incorrect identification]
[hearing/smelling]: “because those are your senses”
[smooth/rough]: “what? [prompt] it’s the texture”
[achieving/accomplishing]: “finishing a goal”

During reading tasks, Brittany refused to read aloud and stated that she is afraid of making mistakes when reading aloud and avoids such tasks in her classroom. Brittany was given the option to self-read the passage. She required several minutes to read a short passage. She was unfamiliar with some of the concepts in the passages. During dynamic assessment, she was unable to provide definitions for complex words (i.e., skepticism) and presented significant deficits retaining the information provided. When given assistance and prompts, she was able to provide synonyms for some of the words. She required assistance to synthesize passages and determine the main idea. When passages were read aloud by this evaluator, Brittany stated “I forgot” and “I have no idea” for all the questions. She was allowed to read the passages herself a second time. During dynamic assessment, when cues were presented to alleviate vocabulary gaps, and to assist Brittany with unfamiliar topics, Brittany continued to present deficits in reading comprehension, as she was unable to recall text details and answer complex reading comprehension questions.

A student at Brittany’s age is expected to have already mastered the ability to ask and answer questions about key details in a text during reading-based activities; retell stories, including key details, and demonstrate understanding of their central message or lesson; describe characters, settings, and major events in a story, using key details; identify words and phrases in stories or poems that suggest feelings or appeal to the senses; explain major differences between books that tell stories and
books that give information, drawing on a wide reading of a range of text types; identify who is telling the story at various points in a text; use illustrations and details in a story to describe its characters, setting, or events; compare and contrast the adventures and experiences of characters in stories; and make inferences based on story details. Brittany’s receptive language skills appear to be developing below academic expectations at the time of this assessment.

**Expressive Language Skills:**
Brittany performed inconsistently in tasks involving formulating and rephrasing descriptions and responses; describing events and actions; responding to questions and participating in conversation by using variations of sentences. She often required prompts to provide additional details which are expected to be mastered at her age:

- [if]: “if [quietly looks at the picture for a few seconds] if the blue team keeps pushing the green team [prompt], the blue team will win”
- [before]: “before [quietly looks at the picture for several seconds] the kid wants the candy before they leave”
- [because]: “the police officer is there because [quiet for a few seconds- prompts needed] there’s no hm the light thing- I don’t know how to call the thing [traffic light]” [vocabulary difficulty]
- [instead]: “instead of the robot, I want the dinosaur book”
- [until]: “if it’s closed I will wait until tomorrow”
- [although]: “although my arm is broken, I can still ride the skateboard”
- [unless]: “unless I finish my homework, I can’t go to practice”
- [if-then]: “if I don’t catch up to the bus then I won’t get to school early”
- [and- because]: “there is a man in the middle of the street because there’s construction in the area [prompt] and that’s why the woman and children can’t pass across”
- [though- even]: “though the green one is pretty [remains quiet looking at the picture] even if I wear the pink on is still on” [incorrect]
- [or- and]: “we can get snack and play in the playground [prompt] or we can go to the lion area or the elephant area”
- [before- otherwise]: “before I pay I need to count the money otherwise I’ll give you too much money”
- [after- until]: “after until [remains quiet looking at the picture- prompt needed] we go and play- what was the other word? [prompt] until we go to the park first- no- after-

A sample of over 200 words in conversational exchanges and elicited narratives with this evaluator revealed typical use of syntax, and use of most morphological markers; however, she presented vocabulary deficits causing her difficulties to formulate sentences in several occasions, exhibiting deficits in her overall narrative productions as well. Examples of elicited narratives when given verbal models, and visual cues, to create stories using detailed utterances, are as follows:

[Producing a story in English, based on pictures depicting a sequence of events involving a girl and a dog]: “the girl Luna- the funny thing is I was gonna call my dog Luna- so the dog is Luna- Luna and Charlotte- ok- Luna was under a is that a balcony? [prompt-porch] that looks like a bench but I’ll say porch- [prompt] Luna was under the porch and Charlotte saw her under there- [prompt] then- Luna went to Charlotte and licked her- and Charlotte was happy- then Charlotte imagined what would happened if she brought the dog to her mom’s house- and the mom says no- [prompt] then Charlotte put Luna inside her bag to not- to not let her mom find out- then Charlotte came home so dirty and her mom was surprised- [prompt] Charlotte’s mom wants her to take a bath- there was a noise coming
from her bag too- [prompt] then her mom came in the bathroom and she saw dog steps [pawprints] and then she saw Charlotte and Luna inside the bath and it was so dirty inside”

[answering questions asked in English, based on the pictures sequence of events]-
[What is the girl thinking here?]: “she was thinking if she brought the dog home her mom wouldn’t allow it- so she hid the dog inside the bag” [correct]
[Why is the girl putting the dog in the bag?]: “she is putting the dog in the bag to hide it from her mom” [correct]
[Why is the girl getting so dirty?]: “the girl got so dirty from the dog- the dog went on top of her” [correct]
[Why is the girl in the bathtub with a white dog now?]: “the girl is inside the bathtub with the white dog because he was dirty and muddy- he was washed with water” [correct]
[What is the mother going to do now?]: “she’s wondering how did the dog get in the bath- she’s probably gonna keep it-or not” [correct]
[What would you say to your mom if you were the girl now?]: “she will let me- if she’s not then I’ll just tell her we need to find an owner for her or him”
Brittany benefited from visual references to respond to the questions.

[Producing a story in Spanish, based on pictures depicting a sequence of events involving a boy and a rabbit]: Brittany refused to produce a narrative in Spanish, stating that she prefers English because she “know[s] more words in English”.

[Describing Grace Anatomy]: “a woman- of her lifetime[unrelated]- she’s a doctor- she starts as an intern- she couldn’t have a baby and her husband- hm they kept trying and trying and then she got pregnant and she was- she was unsure if the baby was going to live- she just kept the baby[omitted details] and she went on with her life- then baby was born on a thunder night- [thinks quietly-prompts needed] then she needed to stay in the hospital and then she went home and took care of the baby [details omitted]- she couldn’t go to work for days- then she went back to work- then her husband died and she cried and saw him inside a clinic [omitted details]- a different place than her hospital so she wouldn’t do nothing[anything] – she kept doing what she does best[vague] and then she found out that she has a sister [topic maintenance deficits]- another one- then there was a man that was a friend of hers- Meredith’s sister likes that man and she thinks that he likes her back but in the friend’s wedding he was looking at Meredith and not her sister- Meredith kissed him in the parking lot- the sister doesn’t know [inconclusive]”

Although she was able to formulate sentences given target words, picture prompts, and assistance, assessment of Brittany’s narrative skills exhibited poor use of setting; lack of more details descriptions of characters and locations; temporal references to create cohesive sequences; statement of problems and resolutions within the story to provide conclusions to her narrative; establishing and maintaining general sequences of events within the same topic; and self-monitoring to provide an acceptable narrative independently with the complexity expected to be mastered at her age and school grade. When compared to other children her age and cultural background, Brittany appears to be developing expressive language skills below academic expectations at this time.

At her age and grade, Brittany is expected to already have mastered the ability to produce complex narratives; define complex relationships and words by category and by one or more key attributes
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(e.g., a duck is a bird that swims; a tiger is a large cat with stripes); identify real-life connections between words and their use (e.g., note places at home that are cozy); distinguish shades of meaning among verbs differing in manner (e.g., look, peek, glance, stare, glare, scowl) and adjectives differing in intensity (e.g., large, gigantic) by defining or choosing them or by acting out the meanings; which are skills Brittany has not yet mastered. Her expressive language skills appear to be developing below academic expectations at the time of this assessment.

**Oral Peripheral Examination:**
Brittany exhibits apparent adequate body posture, and facial symmetry of her overall oral structures, with adequate closed mouth posture (consistent nasal breathing observed) and good containment of oral secretions at rest (no drooling noted). All structures seemed to be developing appropriately. No groping was noted during imitation of oral movements and diadochokinesis (production of successive/alternative movements and syllables). She exhibits full dentition; a stable jaw; and imitated movements to open/close, protrude (i.e., blow a kiss), and retract (i.e., smile) the lips; and lateralize (i.e. move from side to side), elevate (i.e., move up and down) and move in/out the tongue. Integrity, accuracy, and range of motion of all articulators appeared within normal limits upon gross observations and imitation of target movements.

**Voice & Fluency Assessment:**
Vocal quality, pitch, volume, rate, and resonance appeared to be within normal limits for a child of Brittany’s age, gender, and height. No voice concerns were reported. No disfluencies were observed in Brittany’s speech. Factors relating to fluency appeared grossly functional for age and gender. There were no blocks, prolongations and/or halting speech observed. No stuttering nor cluttering concerns were reported.

**Articulation and Phonology Assessment:**
Articulation and phonology were assessed via clinical observation during naturalistic conversational exchanges. Brittany exhibited intelligible speech and age-appropriate phonological skills. No phonological processes or articulation errors were observed in either language. No concerns were reported regarding pronunciation or difficulties understanding what Brittany says.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Assessments &amp; Tasks Description/ Qualitative Descriptions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SLAM Narrative Elicitation Cards</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Narrative discourse analysis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---Below academic expectations-----</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

These tasks were used to elicit language samples that can be analyzed in the context of typical language development, as well as Brittany’s background (e.g., educational experiences, family, linguistic and cultural background, etc.), targeting narrative elicitation based on pictures, and answers to WH questions based on the images and inferences/predictions of social situations. Narrative analyses help to distinguish children with language impairment from their typically developing peers.
as narrative retelling bridges the gap between oral and written language and is important for appropriate reading/writing development.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Test</th>
<th>Score</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CELF-4 Conceptos y Siguiendo Direcciones</td>
<td>14/20 correct</td>
<td>Receptive language skills below academic expectations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CELF-5 Following Directions</td>
<td>15/30 correct</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>----</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sentence formulation tasks</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Language sample analysis</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Structured conversational exchanges</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>----</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oral Passage Understanding Scale Item Set E</td>
<td>10/15 correct</td>
<td>Reading comprehension below academic expectations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CELF-5 Reading Supplement</td>
<td>8/19</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SLAM Reading Comprehension</td>
<td>11/15 correct</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>----</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

These tasks measure Brittany’s interpretation of spoken sentences of increasing length and complexity and selecting the pictures that illustrate referential meaning of the sentences; as well as the ability to interpret spoken directions with basic concepts, which requires logical operations such as inclusion and exclusion, orientation and timing, and identifying mentioned objects from among several pictured choices. The abilities evaluated relate to the school curriculum objectives for creating meaning and context in response to pictures or spoken sentences and creating stories or descriptive text. Sentence comprehension and the understanding of relationships among spoken language, real-life references, and situations are emphasized when listening to stories or descriptions of events, as well as when matching sentences that are spoken, to pictured references.

These tasks are used to measure Brittany’s ability to formulate complete, semantically and grammatically correct, spoken sentences of increasing length and complexity (i.e., simple, compound, and complex sentences), using given words (e.g., car, if, because) and contextual constraints imposed by illustrations. These abilities reflect the capacity to integrate semantic, syntactic, and pragmatic rules and constraints while using working memory. These abilities relate to the school curriculum objectives for internalizing linguistic rules (semantic, syntactic, pragmatic) and integrating these skills to produce spoken narratives and discourse. The ability to formulate complete semantically-, syntactically-, and pragmatically-acceptable spoken sentences of increasing complexity is emphasized in storytelling and sentence completion. Language sample is based on a recording of a child’s spontaneous utterances for the purpose of analyzing range in length of utterance, mean length of utterance (MLU), word order (syntax), and semantics (word usage).

These tasks measure Brittany’s ability to sustain attention and focus while listening to spoken paragraphs of increasing length and complexity, create meaning from oral narratives and text, answer questions about the content of the information given, and use critical thinking strategies for interpreting beyond the given information. The questions probe for understanding of the main idea, memory for facts and details, recall of event sequences, and making inferences and predictions. Reading Comprehension provides a parallel format for probing text comprehension and academic objectives for listening to spoken instructional materials, using the information presented, and
applying critical thinking skills to go beyond the information to learn and create new knowledge. Understanding orally presented stories and descriptions of actions, events, or opinions is required for creating meaning and learning from instructional materials across academic subjects.

Dynamic Assessment- WH questions
Interactive Assessment- Word compare/contrast
Dynamic Assessment- Expressive vocabulary/labels
Dynamic Assessment- Word definitions/categories

*Dynamic Assessment* refers to a highly interactive and process-oriented method to evaluate skills, where both Brittany and this examiner are active participants, based on naturalistic interactions, to obtain information regarding Brittany’s stimulability focus attention on critical problems; distinguish critical aspects of a pictured problem; shift focus of attention from one question to another; shift from one perspective to another; understand evaluator’s questions; integrate visual and verbal information; relate past experiences to the problems posed by the evaluator’s questions; integrate old and new information; reason logically within her developmental abilities; predict outcomes; justify a decision; construct and explain inferences within academic constraints; determine and explain causes and consequences; use grammar and vocabulary that reflects developmental complexity; and demonstrate independence and self-assurance during communicative interactions (Peña & Gillam, 1999).

**Overall description of Brittany’s speech and language skills:** At the time of this assessment Brittany exhibits receptive and expressive language skills atypical for a student with her profile.

**Current strengths:** Brittany was compliant and accepted assistance when she was having difficulties.

**Current areas that need improvement:** Brittany’s social communication resembled that of a much younger student. She required prompts and assistance to follow complex commands; perform tasks involving semantic skills; answer reading comprehension questions; producing cohesive complex narratives; and answering questions during higher language skills tasks.

**Impact of concerns on current academic performance:** According to her latest speech/language therapy annual progress report (3/9/2017), Brittany is a sweet but extremely reserved young woman who has fluctuated tremendously in her willingness to participate verbally during sessions; generally, lacks confidence in her responses; and needs encouragement to use her language for a variety of purposes. She benefits from cues to redirect her fleeting attention and requires additional time to process questions and formulate ideas. She struggles to respond to questions that require verbal reasoning and critical thinking and needs support to improve her details and sentence structure. Continued support was recommended to improve vocabulary in complex sentences.”

**Considerations from linguistically and culturally matched peers:** During this evaluation, Brittany was provided with several opportunities to use either Spanish or English and all assessment tasks were attempted in both languages when appropriate, depending on Brittany’s responses. Brittany responded to tasks using primarily English and some prompted Spanish utterances. When asked regarding language preference, she stated English. She demonstrated comprehension of some Spanish questions and commands, but often requested translation. She exhibited English dominance as her academic
Clinical Impressions:
Brittany Pierce is a 15;1-year-old student who is reportedly exposed to Spanish at home and presented as an English-dominant student during this assessment. She currently presents with global delays in her receptive and expressive language skills, with a co-occurring social communication disorder. Eligibility for speech and language therapy services will be determined at the CSE meeting.

Based on her performance during this evaluation, as well as clinical judgement of dynamic assessment, Brittany currently presents with expressive and receptive language deficits which are atypical for a student of her profile, and do not appear to be caused solely by her second language acquisition, but by delays of approximately 33% in her overall communication domains.

International Classification of Diseases-10th Edition:
F80.2 Mixed Receptive & Expressive language disorder

General Strategies:
Current recommendations from the National Reading Panel for students with reading deficits like those presented by Brittany, suggest that reading comprehension can be improved by teaching students to use specific cognitive strategies or to reason strategically when they encounter barriers to understanding what they are reading, with methods such as:
-Comprehension monitoring, where readers learn how to be aware of their understanding
-Cooperative learning, where students learn reading strategies together
-Use of graphic and semantic organizers, where readers make graphic representations
-Question answering, where readers answer questions and receive immediate feedback
-Question generation, where readers ask themselves questions about various aspects of the story
-Story structure, where students are taught to use the structure of the story as a means of helping them recall story content to answer questions about what they have read
-Summarization, where readers are taught to integrate ideas and generalize from text information.
(See the Comprehension section of the Report of the National Reading Panel)

Furthermore, classroom and curriculum modifications can continue to be used by the teacher and school staff, to provide Brittany with an environment to
-Provide the student with sentence completion tasks. Such tasks may provide typical contexts and multiple choices (e.g., “I held the door open/off”) or analogies (e.g., “I drive a car and I fly a ______”).
-Cloze procedures are also helpful with semantic difficulties. They feature missing words at any point in the sentence, rather than only at the end. The student is asked to fill in the word, or even to give several possibilities. The benefit of such a procedure is that nouns, actions, attributes, or a combination can be omitted, depending on the needs of the Brittany student.
- Introduce common prepositions in relation to the student’s body and/or use concrete
Manipulatives for students having trouble with spatial concepts.
- Use games such as “20 Questions” to encourage the student to identify a certain word through formulating and asking yes/no questions about the word. Along the same lines, riddles require a student to name a word based on a description or definition.
- Encourage the student to create sentences using provided words, whether nouns, verbs, or adjectives. Such tasks provide practice in flexibility and elaboration of language. Similarly, the student’s ability to describe cause and effect events can be facilitated through the use of sentence and story completion tasks. A group of students can be asked to participate in a serial story activity, each building on the last sentence of the story.
- Encourage the student to formulate and produce a sentence with structure similar to that of a spoken model sentence. The model sentence should be presented along with a picture representation, and a second picture of a related situation should also be provided to elicit the sentence from the student.
- Encourage the student to paraphrase. This requires the student to rephrase underlying meaning while using a different structure (ex. Stimulus sentence: “The bus was followed by the police car.” Paraphrase: “The police car followed the bus.”)
- Provide the student with opportunities to transform components into complex sentences. This task may require the student to choose from several options or to spontaneously produce the transformation. For example:
  Ellen carries her umbrella. It is raining.
  Choices: Ellen carries her umbrella after it is raining.
  Ellen carries her umbrella because it is raining.
- Encourage the student to resolve complex sentences into their components. Again, the student may be asked to do so spontaneously or to choose from presented options. For example:
  The boy who lives next door found my cat.
  Choices: The boy found the cat.
  The cat was found by the boy.

Additional suggested strategies for teachers, and school staff:
Engage Brittany in activities that require focused attention and maintain the motivation heightened, with functional vocabulary and enjoyable activities. Ensure Brittany is informed about expectations from therapy (in simple terms, based on their skill level) and classroom tasks, and provide positive reinforcement when expectations are met (use reinforcements that do not take time). Allow Brittany to see what is expected, by modeling desired tasks, giving simple short commands (do not over-instruct) and providing visual cues, verbal models, and wait for Brittany to process the instructions provided. Obtain baseline of expected skills, independent on test results, to obtain information regarding pre-intervention level of skill. Determine adequate session objectives and individualized session goals to achieve overall IEP goals provided. Show the child the skills a few times, covering all stimuli being targeted in the session. Maintain adequate and consistent practice amount, distribution, variability, schedule, and complexity within therapeutic interventions, to ensure Brittany’s generalization of skills. Offer persistent and constant feedback to Brittany, to ensure retention of skills. Activities should facilitate repeated opportunities for performance of skills and activity patterns. Carry-over notebooks and activities should be sent home to ensure the parents are informed of all activities targeted, for consistency of expectations across all environments and daily routines.
Ana M. Santos M.A., CCC-SLP; TSSLD-BE
Certified Bilingual Speech & Language Pathologist
Teacher of Students with Speech & Language Disabilities