

Kent ISD

Speech and Language Evaluation, Eligibility and Service Guidelines



2008

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Table of Contents.....	i
Kent ISD Superintendent’s Preface.....	iv
Superintendent and PSA Endorsement Pages	v
Speech and Language Guidelines Contributors and Design and Editing Team.....	vii

INTRODUCTION

Background.....	1
Purpose.....	1
How to Use This Document.....	2

PART 1 – CRITICAL ISSUES

Early Intervening Services Using Research-Based Curriculum Interventions	5
Position Statement.....	5
Evaluation	8
Screening and Observation.....	8
Referral	9
General Procedures for Evaluation	10
General Education Intervention Information.....	10
Evaluation Requirements	11
Use of Tests.....	11
Sensitivity and Specificity	13
Interpretation of Test Scores.....	14
Cognitive Referencing.....	15
Informed Clinical Opinion	16
Eligibility	17
Diagnostic Assurance Statements	17
Speech-Language Impaired as a Primary Disability.....	17
Speech-Language Impaired as a Secondary Disability.....	17
Auditory Processing Disorders.....	18
Listening Comprehension and Oral Expression	20
Descriptors.....	20
Programs and Services	24
Introduction	24
Present Level of Academic Achievement and Functional Performance	24
Placement	24
Speech-Language Services as a Supportive Related Service	26
Dismissal of Speech and Language Services	27
Obligations to Nonpublic and Home Schools.....	28
Caseload, Workload, and Scheduling	30
Caseload and Workload.....	30
Scheduling	31

PART 2 – SUPPLEMENT TO SECTIONS OF THE MICHIGAN SPEECH-LANGUAGE-HEARING ASSOCIATION GUIDELINES

Articulation and Phonology.....	34
Introduction	34
Prevention.....	34
Early Intervening	34
The Formal Special Education Process: Evaluation Review/Consent.....	35
Articulation Norms.....	36
Fluency	37
Voice	40
Language	42
Overview	42
General Information – Birth through 5 Years of Age	46
Preschool	47
Secondary.....	49
Infant-Toddler Speech and Language.....	53
English Language Learners	59
Assistive Technology	66

SUMMARY

Glossary.....	68
References.....	72

FIGURES

Figure 1 – Responsiveness to Intervention and the SLP.....	7
Figure 2 – The Processing Continuum Model	19
Figure 3 – Preventing Inappropriate Placements of Language Minority Children in Special Education	63

TABLES

Table 1 – The SLP and RtI Activities within Tiers.....	6
Table 2 – Characteristics of Auditory Processing Disorder and Language Processing Disorder	19
Table 3 – Workload Activity Clusters.....	32
Table 4 – Fluency Risk Factors.....	38

APPENDICES

Appendix A – Michigan Revised Administrative Rules for Special Education Related to Speech-Language	75
Appendix B – Kent ISD Request for a Speech and Language Screening	77
Appendix C – Articulation Eligibility Guide/Team Summary	78

Appendix D – Fluency Eligibility Guide/Team Summary	79
Appendix E – Voice Eligibility Guide/Team Summary	80
Appendix F – Language Eligibility Guide/Team Summary	81
Appendix G – Preschool Language Eligibility Guide/Team Summary	82
Appendix H – Infant/Toddler Eligibility Guide/Team Summary (Birth to 3 years)	83
Appendix I – Culturally and Linguistically Diverse Guide/Team Summary	84
Appendix J – Tests Used in Kent ISD	85
Appendix K – Kent ISD Speech and Language Diagnostic Report	87
Appendix L – Strategies to Improve Auditory Performance	89
Appendix M – Teacher Checklist for Oral Expression	90
Appendix N – Teacher Checklist for Listening Comprehension	91
Appendix O – Iowa-Nebraska Articulation Norms	92
Appendix P – Preschool Teacher Assessment for Speech-Language Evaluation	93
Appendix Q – Parent Checklist: Speech-Language (Preschool)	94
Appendix R – Hearing Development Screening Checklist.....	95
Appendix S – Early Childhood Developmental Milestones.....	96

KENT ISD SUPERINTENDENT'S PREFACE

Kent Intermediate School District (Kent ISD) has developed and formally adopted a series of eligibility guidelines for special education. These guidelines include those for autism spectrum disorder (Kent ISD, 2005), emotionally impaired (Kent ISD, 2003), and learning disabilities (Kent ISD, 1999). Our guidelines have increased the use of a common language for evaluations, eligibility determination, and service provision within Kent ISD. This in turn helps to provide more consistent services to students who move within the ISD.

Similarly, guidelines for speech and language have been needed and requested. The requests have been made because of growing variability in policy and procedure for speech and language services among and within local education agencies within Kent ISD. Inconsistencies exist in evaluation methods, criteria for identifying speech and/or language-impaired, criteria for determining special education eligibility, programs and services, and last but not least, the dismissal or exit criteria of local districts.

Since 1990, the 65-page Michigan Speech-Language-Hearing Association's (MSHA) *Suggestions for Identification, Delivery of Service, and Exit Criteria* was the most commonly used reference for speech and language pathologists (SLPs) in Michigan. This document was significantly revised and expanded to nearly 400 pages in December 2006 as the *Michigan Speech-Language-Hearing Association Guidelines* (MSHA, 2006). The new *MSHA Guidelines* document encompasses suggestions for eligibility, service delivery, and exit criteria for speech-language pathologists in both the clinical and school settings, as well as, for general education and special education.

We hope that in the same manner these Guidelines provide a resource from representatives of our Kent ISD community of practitioners: (1) to help to guide local discussion of the critical issues impacting speech and language services across Kent ISD, and (2) to provide consistent Kent ISD policy and procedure statements in response to the policies and procedures suggested in the *MSHA Guidelines*. It is important to keep in mind that in case of discrepancies in discretionary practices between *MSHA Guidelines* and Kent ISD Guidelines, the Kent ISD Guidelines should, in the interest of consistency, generally prevail. Ultimately, all policies and procedures should be implemented with a keen regard for bottom-line impact on each individual student's level of academic achievement and functional performance.

Kevin Konarska, Superintendent
Kent Intermediate School District

SUPERINTENDENT AND PSA ENDORSEMENT PAGES

The undersigned certify:

That representative(s) from my school district have been involved in or apprised of the *Speech and Language Evaluation, Eligibility and Service Guidelines* which were developed to assist in the evaluation, eligibility and management of services to students with disabilities within the Kent Intermediate School District. My signature certifies that my district will use and implement the *Speech and Language Evaluation, Eligibility and Service Guidelines*.

Superintendents

Kevin Konarska
Kent Intermediate School District

Jerry Phillips
Caledonia Community Schools

Ethan Ebenstein
Comstock Park Public Schools

Daniel Behm
Forest Hills Public Schools

Pat Murphy (Interim)
Godwin Heights Public Schools

Ron Caniff
Grandville Public Schools

Thomas K. Martin
Kenowa Hills Public Schools

Scott Palczewski, Ed.D.
Kentwood Public Schools

Norman L. Taylor
Northview Public Schools

Dan Takens
Byron Center Public Schools

Andrew G. Booth
Cedar Springs Public Schools

Sara Magana Shubel, Ph.D.
East Grand Rapids Public Schools

David Britten
Godfrey Lee Public Schools

Bernard Taylor, Jr., Ed.D.
Grand Rapids Public Schools

Samuel L. Wright
Kelloggsville Public Schools

William J. Smith
Kent City Community Schools

Greg Pratt
Lowell Area Schools

Michael S. Shibler, Ph.D.
Rockford Public Schools

Kent Swinson
Sparta Area Schools

Gary Rider
Thornapple Kellogg Schools

Jon A. Felske
Wyoming Public Schools

Public School Academy Representatives

Administrator
Byron Center Charter School

Administrator
Chandler Woods Charter Academy

Administrator
Creative Technologies Academy

Administrator
Cross Creek Charter Academy

Administrator
Excel Charter Academy

Administrator
Grand Rapids Child Discovery Center

Administrator
Grand River Preparatory High School

Administrator
Knapp Charter Academy

Administrator
Lighthouse Academy

Administrator
New Branches School

Administrator
Ridge Park Charter Academy

Administrator
Vanguard Charter Academy

Administrator
Vista Charter Academy

Administrator
Walker Charter Academy

Administrator
West Michigan Academy of Environmental Science

Administrator
William C. Abney Academy

SPEECH AND LANGUAGE GUIDELINES CONTRIBUTORS

Subcommittee Chairs and Key Contributors

Aurea Ayala, M.A., CCC-SLP
Speech-Language Pathologist
Grand Rapids Public Schools

Susan Dahlman, M.A., CCC-SLP
Speech-Language Pathologist
Grand Rapids Public Schools

Kathi DeYoung, M.A., CCC-SLP
Speech-Language Pathologist
Kenowa Hills Public Schools

Cinda Gibson, M.A., CCC-SLP
Speech-Language Pathologist
Grand Rapids Public Schools

Thomas Reens, M.S., CCC-SLP
Speech-Language Pathologist
Rockford Public Schools

Judith VanderWoude, Ph.D., CCC-SLP
Professor
Calvin College

Tammy Watts, M.Ed.
Director of Special Education
Godwin Heights Public Schools

Mary Caldwell, M.A.
Speech-Language Pathologist
Forest Hills Public Schools

Ronda DeVries, M.A., CCC-SLP
Speech-Language Pathologist
Sparta Area Schools

Kyley Erard, M.A., CCC-SLP
Speech-Language Pathologist
Grand Rapids Public Schools

Mari Price, M.Ed.
Director of Special Education
Thornapple Kellogg Schools

Carol Tully Uhlman, Ed.D.
Project Director
Kent Intermediate School District

Anna VanSwol, M.A., CCC-SLP
Speech-Language Pathologist
Grand Rapids Public Schools

Ann Zoellner, M.A.
Supervisor of Special Education
Grand Rapids Public Schools

Other Speech and Language Committee Members

Jill Carpenter, M.A., CCC-SLP (2007-08)
Speech-Language Pathologist
Grandville Public Schools

Curt Johnson, M.A.
Speech-Language Pathologist
Thornapple Kellogg Schools

Kelli Kobayashi, M.A., CCC-SLP
Speech-Language Pathologist
Sparta Area Schools

Melanie Heffner, M.A., CCC-SLP
Speech-Language Pathologist
Caledonia Community Schools

Steve Kadau, M.A.
Principal of Lincoln School
Grand Rapids Public Schools

Mark Kuipers, M.Ed.
Transition Teacher
Grand Rapids Public Schools

Barb Meyers, M.A, CCC-SLP
Supervisor of Special Education
Grand Rapids Public Schools

Sharon O'Donnoghue, M.Ed.
Director of Special Education
Kentwood Public Schools

Elizabeth Ruiters, M.A., CCC-SLP
Speech-Language Pathologist
Byron Center Public Schools

Beth C. Skinner, M.A.
School Psychologist
Forest Hills Public Schools

Beverly VanDyke, M.S.W.
Special Education Coordinator
Forest Hills Public Schools

Kathy Wortman, M.A.
Speech-Language Pathologist
Northview Public Schools

Other Contributors

Jeane Allard, M.A.
Principal, Ken-O-Sha Preschool/Campus ECC
Grand Rapids Public Schools

Barbara Corbin, L.M.S.W.
Early On Coordinator-Kent County
Kent Intermediate School District

Casey L. Gordon, M.Ed.
English Language Learner Coordinator
Kent Intermediate School District

Philip D. Hamburg, M.S.W., L.M.F.T.
Program Director
Michigan Family Resources, Head Start

Heather Koole, M.A., CCC-SLP
Speech-Language Pathologist
Grand Rapids Public Schools

Jason Maas, Ed.S.
School Psychologist
Wyoming Public Schools

Andrea Morgan-Floyd, Ed.S. (2006-07)
School Psychologist
Grandville Public Schools

Tammi Roose, M.A., CCC-SLP
Speech-Language Pathologist
Wyoming Public Schools

Jean Silbar, M.A., CCC-SLP
Executive Director
Comprehensive Therapy Center

Renee Smith-Mertz, M.A., CCC-SLP
Speech-Language Pathologist
Lowell Area Schools

Amanda Werner, M.S., CCC-SLP
Speech-Language Pathologist
East Grand Rapids Public Schools

Donald Brightman, Ph.D.
Director of Special Education
Grand Rapids Public Schools

Mary Jo Goethal, M.Ed.
Speech-Language Pathologist
Rockford Public Schools

James Grooters, Ed.S.
School Psychologist
Grandville Public Schools

Alissa Hofstee, Ed.S.
School Psychologist
Grand Rapids Public Schools

Rita Loper, M.S.
School Psychologist
Grand Rapids Public Schools

Kindy Segovia, O.T.R.
Assistive Technology Coordinator
Kent Intermediate School District

Heather Slater, Psy.S., N.C.S.P.
School Psychologist
Rockford Public Schools

Kimberlee Stevens, Ed.S.
School Psychologist
Kelloggsville Public Schools

Janel Switzer, M.Ed.
Principal, Duncan Lake Early Childhood Center
Caledonia Community Schools

Tony Urbanski, M.A.
Speech-Language Pathologist
Grand Rapids Public Schools

Lynn Waters, M.A., CCC-A
Licensed Audiologist
Ken-O-Sha Diagnostic Center
Grand Rapids Public Schools

Michelle Williams, M.Ed.
English Language Learners Coordinator
Grand Rapids Public Schools

DESIGN AND EDITING TEAM

Joan Meyer
Special Education Secretary
Kent Intermediate School District

John Dickey, Ph.D.
Assistant Director of Special Education
Data and Technical Assistance
Kent Intermediate School District

Karen Dailey
Administrative Assistant to the Assistant Superintendent
for Finance
Kent Intermediate School District

Lucy Hough-Waite, M.A., S.P.S
Director of Special Education and Early Childhood
Kent Intermediate School District

Mary DeVries
Special Education Secretary
Kent Intermediate School District

Laurie VanderPloeg, M.A.
Assistant Director of Special Education Compliance,
Monitoring, and Parent Support
Kent Intermediate School District

INTRODUCTION

Background

The *MSHA Guidelines* (2006) are an excellent resource for speech-language pathologists (SLPs). There are, nonetheless, several significant issues that concern speech-language pathologists working in the school setting which require further clarification by local districts. These are identified in the *MSHA Guidelines* document and include:

- Documenting indirect workload activities and scheduling of services (p. WC-7).
- Early intervening process (p. PL-2) and notification and permission of parents for early intervention (pp. L-9, F-6, V-4).
- Determining the presence of a speech and language disorder using multiple assessments, test selection guidelines, and score comparison guidelines (pp. SLI-4-6, L-27).
- Dual certification and related service (pp. SLRS-2-3, LD-12).
- When to certify a student as learning disabled in oral expression and/or listening comprehension rather than SLI (p. LD-18).
- How to document assistive technology needs in the IEP (pp. AT-8-9).
- Dismissal criteria (pp. SLI-9-10, SLRS-5).

Staskowski (2007) and Ehren (2007) in separate presentations have emphasized the changing role of speech-language pathologists as a result of changes in laws and the needs of students. Language is the foundation of literacy and speech-language pathologists are the experts in language. The role of the speech-language pathologist needs to be different, not more of the same. Staskowski and Ehren have emphasized the unique contribution that speech-language pathologists can make as members of educational teams.

Purpose

The purpose of the present document is to clarify local procedures and create consistent policies that will guide educators in meeting the individual needs of students within Kent ISD in the area of speech and language. Every student is unique and must be treated as an individual. However, there are research-based and legal parameters that we must all keep in mind and to which we must adhere. These include, but are not limited to:

- *Michigan Speech-Language-Hearing Association Guidelines* (2006)
- Federal law: *Individuals with Disabilities Education Act* (IDEA, 2004) and *No Child Left Behind* (NCLB, 2002)
- Code of Federal Regulations (CFR) implementing applicable federal laws

- American Speech-Language-Hearing Association (ASHA) resources
- *Revised Administrative Rules for Special Education* (Michigan, 2008) (see Appendix A)
- Education YES
- Kent ISD Policy
- Research and Promising Practices

Best practices and current trends in education, especially those successfully utilized within Kent ISD were researched and considered and are incorporated into this document.

The intent of these guidelines is to increase consistency across Kent ISD in early intervention, evaluation, special education qualification, service, and dismissal. The committee recognizes that there still may be some minor differences between some local districts. Keeping differences to a minimum and working towards more uniform practices by school personnel is a goal.

How to Use This Document

The present document was written for reference use by speech-language pathologists, administrators, teachers, and other professionals. It is divided into parts. Part 1 addresses critical issues identified by *MSHA Guidelines* which need clarification by local districts. Part 2 is a response to the articulation, voice, fluency, and language sections of *MSHA Guidelines*. Part 2 also includes revised and expanded sections on infant-toddler speech and language and English Language Learners (ELL).

For individual student concerns a first response may be a screening to determine the extent of speech-language concerns. The speech-language pathologist may be a participant in such screenings (with parent permission – see Appendix B). Hopefully, many student concerns will be effectively addressed before resorting to a formal special education evaluation.

Once a special education evaluation has been initiated, the “Eligibility Guide/Team Summary” forms in *MSHA Guidelines* for the various areas are recommended either in their entirety or with some modifications. (See Appendices C through I) The detailed explanation for each section of these forms appears in the *MSHA Guidelines* and will not be repeated in the present document.

Special note should be taken when referring to the section on Infants and Toddlers (pp. LI-1—LI-12) in the *MSHA Guidelines*. This section was substantially modified and supplemented for use in Kent ISD and should be substituted for pages LI-1 through LI-12 in the *MSHA Guidelines*.

The complete *MSHA Guidelines* document is an excellent comprehensive resource. It contains expanded and technical information specific to the speech-language pathologist profession. These two documents are intended to be used together since they contain different information.

Guidelines are always moving targets and need to be updated as laws change, as laws are interpreted, and new research emerges. This is a living document and as such will need to be revised and updated periodically. These guidelines and subsequent updates are available at www.kentisd.org.

PART 1: CRITICAL ISSUES

Early Intervening Services Using Research-Based Curriculum Interventions	5
Position Statement.....	5
Evaluation	8
Screening and Observation.....	8
Referral	9
General Procedures for Evaluation	10
General Education Intervention Information	10
Evaluation Requirements	11
Use of Tests.....	11
Sensitivity and Specificity	13
Interpretation of Test Scores.....	14
Cognitive Referencing.....	15
Informed Clinical Opinion	16
Eligibility	17
Diagnostic Assurance Statements	17
Speech-Language Impaired as a Primary Disability.....	17
Speech-Language Impaired as a Secondary Disability.....	17
Auditory Processing Disorders.....	18
Listening Comprehension and Oral Expression	20
Descriptors.....	20
Programs and Services.....	24
Introduction	24
Present Level of Academic Achievement and Functional Performance	24
Placement	24
Speech-Language Services as a Supportive Related Service	26
Dismissal of Speech and Language Services	27
Obligations to Nonpublic and Home Schools.....	28
Caseload, Workload, and Scheduling	30
Caseload and Workload.....	30
Scheduling	31

EARLY INTERVENING SERVICES USING RESEARCH-BASED CURRICULUM INTERVENTIONS

The concept of early intervening services for school-age students comes from IDEA 2004. The intent is to provide preventive services to children who have not been identified as needing special education and related services but may be experiencing some problems. Early intervening services are designed to address grades K-12 with an emphasis on grades K-3. The most commonly used model is called “Response to Intervention” (RtI). For the purposes of this document, research-based curriculum interventions will be referred to as RtI or early intervening services.

The core principles of this integrated, research-based approach, aimed at enhancing educational outcomes for all children, include:

- Early identification of students not achieving at benchmark
- High-quality instruction and interventions matched to student need
- Frequent monitoring of student progress to make decisions about instruction or goals
- Use of child response data to make educational decisions, including professional development, curriculum, and individual intervention decisions. (MAASE, 2007)

While there are many RtI models, the U.S. Department of Education does not endorse or mandate any particular model. At the time of this printing the Michigan Department of Education also has not developed policy regarding RtI. However, the aforementioned components are generally accepted as required RtI components. Early intervening services will look different in different districts. Kent ISD is a diverse intermediate school district and the needs of students in 20 local districts and 16 public school academies will dictate how early intervening services are implemented. Students for whom speech-language concerns are noted would likely be identified through the child study team process. This process may vary between different districts and even among individual schools within the same district. Just as the child study team process is a general education initiative, so too are early intervening services. These services ideally occur prior to a special education referral.

Position Statement

Kent ISD supports the position of the American Speech-Language-Hearing Association that:

“speech-language pathologists play a critical and direct role in the development of literacy for children and adolescents with communication disorders, including those with severe or multiple disabilities. Speech-language pathologists also make a contribution to the literacy efforts of a school district or community on

Part 1: Critical Issues – Early Intervening Services

behalf of other children and adolescents. These roles are implemented in collaboration with others who have expertise in the development of written language and vary with settings and experience of those involved.” (ASHA, 2001)

According to Ehren, Montgomery, Rudebusch, and Whitmire (2006) speech-language pathologists offer expertise in the following:

- language basis of literacy and learning,
- collaborative approaches to instruction, and
- understanding the use of student outcomes data when making instructional decisions.

Districts should be cautioned not to overlook the extensive resources available from speech-language pathologists as vital members of early intervening teams. Often early intervening services include two or more levels of intervention. The following two charts are examples of possible speech-language pathologist activities related to various levels of RtI:

Table 1 - The SLP and RtI Activities within Tiers

Tier One

With Teachers	With Students
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Participation on planning and decision-making teams • Professional development • Parent education • Analyzing student progress in relation to language underpinnings • Assistance to teachers in differentiating instruction • Assistance to teachers in making decisions about progress 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Administration of emergent literacy screenings on selected students • Demonstration of language-sensitive classroom techniques • Observation of selected students in the classroom

Tier Two

With Teachers (or other interventionists)	With Students
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Participation on teacher assistance teams • Participation in parent conferences for selected students • Analyzing student progress • Selecting additional interventions • Making decisions about progress 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Administration of prescriptive assessments on <i>selected</i> students • Targeted diagnostic intervention for <i>a short time</i> for selected students • Demonstration of targeted interventions


Tier Three

With Teachers (or other interventionists)	With Students
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Participation on child study teams to establish need for comprehensive evaluation • Analyzing student progress • Coordinating interventions • Making decisions about progress • Development of an IEP • Engaging teachers as partners in therapeutic intervention • Reporting progress to parents • Making accommodations to curriculum, assessment, and instruction for students with disabilities 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Administration of normative diagnostic and dynamic assessments on <i>selected</i> students as part of a comprehensive evaluation • Therapeutic intervention based on stages of therapy and literacy <p style="text-align: right;">Ehren, 2007</p>

Figure 1



Responsiveness to Intervention and the SLP



Ehren, 2007

EVALUATION

The *Federal Register* (v. 71, no. 156, August 14, 2006) contains regulations implementing changes necessitated by the reauthorization of IDEA (2004). The evaluation of children with disabilities is addressed in §300.122. It states that they must be evaluated in accordance with §§300.300 through 300.311 of subpart D of part II. These sections include legal requirements for parental consent (§300.300), screening for instructional purpose which is not for evaluation (§300.302), evaluation procedures (§300.304), additional requirements for evaluations and reevaluations (§300.305), and the determination of eligibility (§300.306). *Michigan Revised Administrative Rules for Special Education (2002)* also addresses these requirements in Rules 340.1710, 340.1721, and 340.1745.

Screening and Observation

General Screening – Screening across general populations for instructional purpose is not an evaluation (such as “Kindergarten round-up”). Instructional purpose means determining appropriate instructional strategies for curriculum implementation. This type of screening does not require parental permission when the test or other evaluation tool is administered to all students, unless consent is required from all parents.

Consultation and Observation by Special Education Staff – In general, state policy limits prereferral consultation to direct interaction with general education personnel or student observation. It excludes direct interaction with general education students not in referral. Activities conducted outside of these procedures are considered general education, and outside of the scope of special education funded staff.

Individual Screening – Screening includes brief, limited contact with a student by special education staff with the intent to help a building team decide if a special education referral is appropriate. Written parental consent should be obtained prior to any individualized screening contact with a student. See Appendix B for a sample consent form. It is important that such individual screening remains limited to a brief probe that does not rise to the level of activities typical of a special education evaluation. If it is felt that evaluation is needed, a formal referral and parent consent should be initiated prior to a special education evaluation (see below).

Early Intervening Services – Up to 15% of IDEA Flowthrough funds may be used (per activities and outcomes specified section in grant application) to support early intervening activities (also see *Early Intervening Services*). The intent of these services is to prevent special education referrals by implementation of tiered general and special education intervention for children not identified as needing special education but who may be experiencing problems in one or more areas of achievement such as reading.

Referral

A concern may develop into a formal referral when the *Consent for Initial Special Education Evaluation* form is signed by the parent or guardian and is received by the local district administration. The 30-school-day timeline for completion and IEP imposed by the State of Michigan begins when the referral is actually received by the district (R. 340.1721(c)(2)). If the student already qualifies for special education then the completion date is noted on the *Evaluation Review and Plan* (ERP) form. If a date for completion is not noted for a reevaluation, it is assumed to be 30 school days from the date of parent's signature.

School personnel may receive a written statement from a parent or guardian requesting an "evaluation" or "testing". A written request is not the start of the formal evaluation with a 30-school-day timeline. However, it does start a process that requires a written response. Within ten days of receiving a written request for an evaluation, the parent must be notified using a *Consent for Initial Special Education Evaluation* form (340.1721(1)).

Best practice indicates the local district should take an immediate proactive response and contact the person requesting the evaluation. The district representative should determine why the evaluation is sought and the nature of the evaluation. This information is required as part of R 340.1721(1)(a). At this time the educator making the contact should respond to concerns and explain the process. Depending on the specific situation, the process might range from taking the concerns to the building's child study team/student study team for intervention to immediately preparing the paperwork for parental signature to start a formal evaluation. Ideally, a face-to-face meeting is best since communication may be better and timelines for referral notices and evaluation consents or written withdrawals of request can be taken care of at one time.

It is important all parties understand that no student can qualify for special education under IDEA (2004) unless it can be documented that prior to the referral research-based interventions within the general education classroom have been provided and have been unsuccessful (§300.306(b)). These interventions are usually recommended and monitored as part of a general education building team process, sometimes called "child study team", or "student study team".

All communication and responses should be documented. If the parent decides to withdraw a written request for an evaluation, that withdrawal must be in writing. When this happens the withdrawal is often contingent upon some other action and possible reconsideration of a referral later, which should also be in writing. If any parental communication is oral, school personnel should still document the verbal exchange in writing.

[Refer to the latest edition of the Kent ISD *Instructions for Other Special Education Forms* for sample forms and procedural information.]

General Procedures for Evaluation

A special education evaluation includes the use of a variety of assessment tools and strategies to gather relevant functional, developmental, and academic information about the child, including information provided by the parent (§§300.304 & 300.305). Reevaluations require review of existing evaluation data from the school and any data that may be provided by the parents; observations by teachers and related service providers; formal testing; and documentation of the need for special education services. An evaluation report must be provided in writing to the IEP Team including the parents for determination of eligibility and needed services.

A reevaluation requires an *Evaluation Review and Plan* form. The ERP form documents a review of the information available and any additional information needed to determine if a student continues to have a disability and whether the child continues to need special education services.

A variety of sample forms are referenced in Part 2 and are included in the appendices. These include forms for parent information, teacher information, observations, etc. As noted above, the *MSHA Guidelines Eligibility Guide/Team Summary* forms (2006) are recommended to aid in determining special education eligibility for SLI (Appendices C -I). Kent ISD's *Speech and Language Impairment Eligibility Recommendation* form must be completed following a special education referral for a speech-language evaluation or reevaluation.

General Education Intervention Information

Documentation from early intervening services using research-based curriculum interventions must be included as part of an evaluation (§300.306(b)) Detailed recommendations for Kent ISD constituent districts are given in Part 1 of this document. No student can qualify for special education services under IDEA regulations and Michigan rules without documentation of a special education evaluation. The term "prereferral process" should not be used as it too often implies a pre-emptive decision about initiating a special education referral. There should be differentiated general education services available to all students with the goal of students benefiting appropriately from such services. A student cannot be determined as having a disability if the student has not been provided appropriate academic instruction or has limited English proficiency. Early intervening services are used to determine if appropriate instruction has been provided to meet the student's needs and assist in documenting the need for specially designed instruction available only through special education. This is particularly important when working with ELL students (see the ELL section of this document). The lack of benefit and success in the general education curriculum even after research-based curriculum interventions have been tried indicates a need for a special education evaluation. Special education eligibility is discussed in the next section.

Evaluation Requirements

An evaluation to determine eligibility for special education as a student with a speech and language impairment must include the following information and documentation:

- Ability/achievement/developmental level
- Relevant behavior observations
- Speech/language level
- Spontaneous language sample
- Educationally relevant medical information, if any
- Information from parents

Use of Tests

Tests are used to aid in determining ability/achievement/developmental level and the student's speech/language level. There are two types of tests: standardized and nonstandardized. Both play an important role in the evaluation procedure.

Standardized Tests are required as part of the evaluation if available for the area of concern. They cannot be the sole determining factor for determining eligibility, but aid in determining levels of:

- Ability
- Achievement
- Development
- Speech
- Language

Nonstandardized Tests and assessment procedures may and should be used to support and expand on standardized test results. They are useful in determining both strengths and weaknesses but cannot be used without standardized tests for determining eligibility. They aid in developing interventions, goals and objectives, and documenting progress over time. Nonstandardized tests and assessment procedures include:

- Criterion referenced tests
- Standardized tests administered using nonstandard procedures
- Developmental scales
- Checklists
- Dynamic assessments (test-teach-retest)
- Play-based assessment

Part 1: Critical Issues - Evaluation

- Speech intelligibility measures
- Review of student records
- Spontaneous language samples

Any test or evaluation material must comply with §300.304(c)(1). Each public agency must insure that assessments and other evaluation materials:

- i. are selected and administered so as not to be discriminatory or racially biased;
- ii. are provided and administered in the child's native language;
- iii. are used for the purposes for which the assessments or measures are valid and reliable;
- iv. are administered by trained and knowledgeable personnel; and
- v. are administered in accordance with any instructions provided by the producers of the assessments.

Additionally, ethical standards outlined in *Standards for Educational and Psychological Testing* (AERA, APA & NCME, 1999) need to be met. Anyone administering tests should be familiar with this publication.

Each test should have an accompanying manual. It should contain enough information to determine the appropriate use of the test and interpretation of scores obtained. Information and data on the normative sample, reliability, and validity should be provided.

The *normative sample* is the population with which the test was normed. In order to apply the test norms to the larger population the sample should:

- Represent the most recent census
- Be large enough to insure reliability and validity
- Be representative of the student to be tested in terms of racial-ethnic and geographic status and disability

Reliability refers to the consistency of scores over time/freedom from measurement error. There are several types of reliability, each determined using statistical procedures. Test-retest reliability is generally looked at as the best indicator of a test's reliability. This is determined by administering the same test to the same group after a period of time and correlating the scores.

Validity tries to answer the question, "Does the test measure what it purports to measure?" Validity cannot be measured like reliability. It is inferred using a variety of methods including accumulated evidence and theory supporting specific interpretations of the test.

Language is complex and difficult to measure, thus language tests tend to be less reliable and valid than is desirable. Each test should be considered by the standards set for that test to be a valid method of identification. A general rule is that a test-retest reliability of .9 or higher is best; .8 to .9 is okay; and less than .8 is unsuitable. For this topic a close reading of the *MSHA Guidelines* at pages SLI-1 through SLI-11 is strongly suggested.

Sensitivity and Specificity

ASHA and MSHA stress the importance of sensitivity and specificity for a test (.80 or better). If the test does not have acceptable levels of sensitivity and specificity, then one needs go no further in reviewing the acceptability of other psychometric standards such as population sample, reliability, and validity (Spaulding, Plante & Farenella, 2006). Sensitivity and specificity are terms that are not as familiar as validity and reliability to speech-language pathologists and others.

Sensitivity refers to the degree to which a test correctly identifies a language impaired student as language impaired.

Specificity refers to the degree to which a test correctly identifies a non-language impaired student as non-language impaired.

As the importance of these measures has become apparent, more publishers are including this information in their test manuals. This data is also becoming more available in the research literature.

Hutchinson (1996) provides a useful explanation and guidelines for looking at psychometric information. He outlines 20 questions test users should ask about any test they consider. Guidance is also provided regarding what to look for when answering these questions. This article provides a foundation for speech-language pathologists to use in reviewing tests. This paper in conjunction with the Spaulding, Plante, Farinella (2006) research provides speech-language pathologists a foundation on which to assess the appropriateness of a specific test for a specific student.

Sensitivity and specificity are different for each test and affect the cut-off score. The goal is to have both sensitivity and specificity as high as possible yet balanced to keep the possibility of under- or over-identification as low as possible. In *Eligibility Criteria for Language Impairment: Is the Low End of Normal Always Appropriate?* Spaulding, et al (2006) present a research-based review of 43 commonly used tests. From these sensitivity and specificity were available for only ten. Of these only nine had acceptable sensitivity and specificity (80% or better). Reliability and validity is generally moderate for each of these. The point at which an appropriate identification rate is achieved is the cut-off score for that test. MSHA recommends using .80 or higher as the criterion when selecting tests.

Interpretation of Test Scores and Recommended Tests

Test scores are only one factor in determining eligibility. While arbitrary cut-off scores from 1.5 to 1.33 standard deviations (SD) from the mean have been historically used for eligibility decisions, a close reading of the test administration manual is strongly suggested. Even when valid and reliable, a test score in itself is not a sole determination of eligibility for special education. For example, a cut-off score one standard deviation (SD) below the mean (score of 85 for an SD of 15) will capture all students with disabilities, but may also overidentify a significant number of nonimpaired students (particularly culturally-linguistically diverse students). A cut score at two standard deviations below the mean (score of 70 for an SD of 15) will greatly reduce overidentification, but may increase underidentification of students appropriate for speech-language pathologist services. Test scores are just one piece of information that must be considered with other types of information when assessing the impact of a suspected disability.

Each individual test needs to be considered by the standards for only that test (Plante, 2003). *IDEA and Your Caseload* (ASHA, 2003) indicates that using a uniform cut-off score across all tests may result in over- or under-identification. One cut-off score is not applicable to all tests or subtests.

The data on tests commonly used in Kent ISD was updated by the present committee. Seven tests and overall cut-off scores that meet acceptable criteria for identification of language impaired students are:

Test	Cut-off
Clinical Evaluation of Language Fundamentals-Fourth Edition (CELF-4, total).....	70-78
Clinical Evaluation of Language Fundamentals Preschool-Second Edition (CELF-P)	70-78
Preschool Language Scales-Fourth Edition (PLS-4).....	85
Structured Photographic Language Test-Third Edition (SPELT-3).....	95
Structured Photographic Language Test-Preschool (SPELT-P)	79
Test of Examining Expressive Morphology (TEEM).....	75
Test of Narrative Language (TNL).....	85

Consult the administration manual for each test for technical subtest data.

A comprehensive list of tests most commonly used in Kent ISD is provided in Appendix J. Information is also included for each test on age span, publication date, and test-retest reliability for total test and subtests where available. Caution is advised when looking at subtest scores. They are generally less reliable than total test scores.

Sensitivity and specificity are also different for subtests than they are for total tests, but data for total tests are all that are usually provided in the manuals.

This does not imply that there is no use for other tests or subtests. They play an important role in the total evaluation as noted above. Their usefulness includes identifying weaknesses in need of remediation, providing guidance in determining goals and objectives, and documenting progress over time.

Cognitive Referencing

The term “cognitive referencing” has been used frequently in the speech-language literature. *MSHA Guidelines* (2006) call cognitive referencing the practice of comparing a student’s language performance to their performance on cognitive measures. “Severe discrepancy” refers to the degree of discrepancy between a standardized ability test and a standardized achievement test and is a term more frequently used by school psychologists for the same concept. The consensus is that neither cognitive referencing nor severe discrepancy should be used as the sole determining factor in determining special education eligibility. Legally, there should never be any one determinate for eligibility, such as a language-cognitive ability discrepancy or any other single factor (§300.304(b)(2)). As noted above, an evaluation consists of much more than one or two test scores.

There are times when the concept of cognitive referencing is useful and aids in the comprehensive evaluation. For example, in *Speech-Language Guidelines for Schools*, the Kansas State Department of Education (2005) endorses the use of a severe discrepancy between the performance of the student and his or her peer, or evidence of a severe discrepancy between the student’s ability and performance in the area(s) of concern as part of the procedure for determining eligibility for special education speech and language services. This is not the sole criterion; it is part of the entire evaluation process. The severe discrepancy determination is made by examining interventions, school records, interviews, observations, and assessments, not just by comparing one test score to another.

Looking at a discrepancy using the Kansas method can be useful in determining reasonable language expectations. It helps in understanding the whole child. Is the student’s speech-language performance within an expected range for that student based on the multiplicity of available information? A psychoeducational evaluation by the school psychologist may be needed when working with complex cases. The psychologist’s input may help in determining reasonable language expectations. His/her evaluation may impact eligibility, type of service needed, service provider, and dismissal of services. Extreme caution should be used when considering reasonable language expectations for a very young child.

Informed Clinical Opinion

Although this term has been used and applied primarily to the birth to 36-month age group and is referred to in law (IDEA, Part C) the concept seems applicable across the spectrum. No one procedure, test, battery of tests, checklist, or observation alone is valid, reliable, or legal for special education identification. Professionals gathering various forms of data regarding a student must always interpret the data and include information from parents and others, then synthesize that information as a member of a team. There is less formal documented information available for younger children. As a student gets older there is more information such as standardized test scores, school records, and research-based early intervention data, and thus there is more concrete information on which to base an informed decision.

Final decisions regarding special education eligibility have generally included some degree of “professional opinion” or “professional judgment”. Basing this part of the evaluation on information versus simple opinion is really making an informed clinical opinion. (Schackelford, 2002; Bagnato, Smith-Jones, Matesa & McKeating-Esterle, 2006). ASHA (2003) also discusses the role of professional judgment based on documentation. The term “informed clinical opinion” reflects how each professional and each team should interpret the data and information collected during the evaluation. Informed clinical opinion will be the term used in this document.

ELIGIBILITY

Following the comprehensive evaluation, the relevant *Eligibility Recommendation* form(s) is/are completed. If the evaluation is an initial evaluation, or there is consideration of adding or removing a special education area of disability, it would be considered a Mutidisciplinary Evaluation Team (MET) recommendation. The IEP Team reviews evaluation data and other information presented to them and then determines eligibility.

Diagnostic Assurance Statements

The *Speech and Language Impairment Eligibility Recommendation* form specifies three diagnostic assurance statements which are based on IDEA regulations and Michigan rules. The needed information to complete these statements is derived from the documentation provided from both early intervening services and the comprehensive evaluation. This includes test (standardized and nonstandardized) results, observations, relevant medical information, and information from parents.

- The educational performance of this student is adversely affected by a communication disorder;
- The suspected disability is not due to limited English proficiency nor lack of instruction in math or the essential components of reading, and
- This student requires specially designed instruction available only through special education.

These three statements must be true for the student to have a disability under special education (IDEA) law. The student may have a disability, but if it does not adversely affect his/her educational performance, is due to limited English proficiency or related to lack of instruction in math or reading, he/she is not eligible for special education. If these statements are true, but his/her needs can be met in the general education setting without special education programs/services, then he/she is not eligible.

Speech-Language Impaired as a Primary Disability

When the early intervention and evaluation procedures have been completed and indicate a disability, and the assurance statements have been determined to be true, the student is eligible for special education. If the only area of concern is speech and language and that is the only area in which all the eligibility criteria has been met, the student would have a "primary disability" in this area.

Speech-Language Impaired as a Secondary Disability

In cases when a student is referred and evaluated in more areas than speech and language, careful consideration needs to be given to any and all areas in which the student may have a disability. When the student has been

determined to qualify for special education with an impairment other than SLI, the label other than SLI should be used for the primary disability

A secondary SLI label should be added on a case-by-case basis. Complex cases might warrant the secondary label. Two possible situations are:

- When a student qualifies under SLI and another disability and the IEP Team determines that both labels are necessary.
- If the speech-language impairment is significant and the additional label is needed for a complete picture of the student.


Remember, a secondary SLI label is not required for a student to receive service. Services can be provided as a related service. However, in such cases, a “diagnostic” report is still required per MI Rule 340.1745 (Appendix K).

Auditory Processing Disorder

An auditory processing disorder (APD in this document) is sometimes also referred to as Central Auditory Processing Disorder (CAPD). APD is not defined in IDEA regulations or the Michigan rules because it is not a special education eligibility category. Richard (2001, p. 8) states, “While most professionals can cite behavioral and academic examples of processing, few can clearly explain what processing entails.” ASHA (1995) says it is a difficulty in the perceptual processing of auditory information in the central nervous system.

APD is discussed in the *MSHA Guidelines* (APD-1). Although this section is brief, it provides a good foundation from which to build an understanding of this complex concept. *The Source for Processing Disorders* (Richard, 2001) is referenced and provides more comprehensive information. MSHA uses a working definition of APD as what is done with what is heard. Language development can be affected when the auditory system is unable to appropriately respond to auditory input.

An APD is different from a language processing disorder (LPD). APDs involve the ability to perceive and assign meaning to sounds. LPDs involve processing verbal information that requires a verbal or nonverbal response. APD is generally associated with the medical field and is evaluated and diagnosed by an audiologist. LPD is an educational term, but is not a special education eligibility in and of itself. Richard (2001) explains that auditory processing and language processing lie on a continuum. Characteristics of SPD and LDP (MSHA, 2006; Richard, 2001) are presented in the following tables.



Richard (2001) states "...processing is moving back and forth between auditory features of the signal and language features of meaning. In other words, processing occurs on a continuum beginning at a level of pure auditory processing, transitions to a mix of both auditory and language processing, and ultimately end in pure language processing".

Table 2 – Characteristics of Auditory Processing Disorder and Language Processing Disorder	
Auditory Processing Disorder	Language Processing Disorder
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • History of otitis media • Normal pure-tone hearing • Poor short- and long-term memory • Difficulty following oral directions, especially in noise • Frequent requests for speaker to repeat themselves • Poor attention span/daydreams • Possible mild speech and language issues • Possible problems with academics • Possible behavioral problems • Fatigues easily during auditory tasks • Age-commensurate IQ • Poor prosody • Poor rhyming and/or musical skills • Reading and/or spelling difficulties • Difficulty localizing 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Age-commensurate IQ and vocabulary with academic deficits • Difficulty with word retrieval • Use of neutral, generic, or less-specific labels • Problems with pragmatics • Misuse of words with a similar phonetic structure • Incomplete sentences or thoughts • Reauditorizes the stimulus (verbal repetition) • Delayed response time (use of fillers, etc.) • Frequently responds "I don't know or "I forgot"

Part 1: Critical Issues - Eligibility

If a school is informed that a student has been diagnosed with an APD the early intervention team for that building should gather information to determine if the student is having difficulties in school. Questions should include asking if the teacher and/or family have to make any special modifications for the child to succeed. For example, if the child has to spend six hours per week so they can pass their spelling test and everyone else only needs one, that should be a red flag. Does the teacher need to have an aide work with the child in order for them to get their work done?

If he/she isn't having academic difficulty, then nothing further needs to be done. If he/she is, then interventions as discussed in the early intervention section need to be implemented. Appendix L, *Strategies to Improve Auditory Performance*, from the *MSHA Guidelines* can be helpful in either situation.

If the student is having academic difficulties that cannot be resolved with these interventions and/or other research-based interventions, then the student may have a disability. This is uncommon when there are no co-morbid problems such as Attention Deficit-Hyperactivity disorder (ADHA), anxiety issues, LD, SLI, but when it exists and significantly impacts the educational progress of a student, it can be evident as a learning disability in listening comprehension. Both the speech-language pathologist and school psychologist must be involved in an evaluation of this type. For additional information, see the section in this document that addresses listening comprehension.

Listening Comprehension and Oral Expression

"There are many and varied interpretations as to when to certify a student as having a learning disability (LD) in oral expression and/or listening comprehension rather than speech and language impaired (SLI). As the terms oral expression/listening comprehension under learning disability, and the term SLI appears redundant with no clear guidelines defined in state/federal law as to how these certifications are qualitatively different, the speech-language pathologists should follow the policies set forth by their individual school district." (MSHA, 2006, p. LD-18). As noted above, individual or local school district in this document means Kent ISD.

Neither listening comprehension nor oral expression is defined in IDEA regulations or the Michigan rules. These terms appear in the list of areas of eligibility for learning disability, but do not appear under SLI. The committee developed descriptors for use in this document.

Descriptors

Listening Comprehension – A disability in listening comprehension would be evident in the student's:

- Difficulty or inability to concentrate on, comprehend, and apply spoken language
- Difficulty with comprehension and interpretation of spoken language
- Problems with information received aurally

Part 1: Critical Issues - Eligibility

- Difficulty processing oral information in a timely manner in the educational setting.

Many of these characteristics are also indicative of APD and/or

Oral Expression – Oral expression appears to be more difficult to identify. Some general characteristics include:

- Difficulty in expressing concepts orally they seem to understand
- Difficulty speaking grammatically correct English, even though English is their only or first language
- Difficulty following or having a conversation about an unfamiliar idea
- Trouble telling a story in the proper sequence
- Difficulty organizing thoughts for responsive language vs. spontaneous speech

As in all situations where a student is exhibiting difficulty in the education setting, the first involvement needs to be by the early intervention team. If the results of research-based interventions are unsuccessful, then a special education referral is appropriate.

Evaluation – A comprehensive evaluation by both the speech-language pathologist and school psychologist needs to be conducted when a learning disability in oral expression or listening comprehension is suspected. Sample checklists unique to these two areas are included in Appendices M and N. It may be premature to validly assess these areas before there has been sufficient exposure to systematic instruction, curriculum and interventions.

Care is needed to make sure the evaluator is not giving visual cues. Consequently the tests that deal with evaluating auditory information should not include pictures or objects as they can be used as a crutch to help the child remember what he/she have heard. Both the SLP and psychologist have to include timed tests as the speed of processing may be part of the issue.

Both the speech-language pathologist and school psychologist must conduct comprehensive evaluations when considering learning disability in listening comprehension or oral expression. These professionals need to work together and both evaluations should support any such determination. While consideration of these categories of eligibility are included in law, no one subcategory of learning disability eligibility should be used as a “catch-all” or prematurely eliminated from consideration.

The school psychologist’s evaluation is necessary to determine if the student meets the criteria for any traditional learning disability category, such as one in basic reading skills, or another area. When the learning disability label is considered, the evaluation and results should be consistent with the eligibility requirements. If a student’s listening comprehension or oral expression is impaired to the point it negatively impacts educational performance, then

Part 1: Critical Issues - Eligibility

standardized achievement tests and additional evaluation information should reflect this. Identification as learning disability in listening comprehension should be approached cautiously and rarely used. Identification as learning disability in oral expression should be approached cautiously and rarely if ever used.

Eligibility – The label of learning disability in listening comprehension or oral expression should be used conservatively and follow strict special education eligibility guidelines. Sometimes parents or educators believe a student needs help or an outside agency has stated a Central Auditory Processing Disorder exists. School personnel must remember that the disability must have a significant diverse impact on educational performance and require special education. A student with listening comprehension difficulties may demonstrate significantly lower scores on standardized tests in the area of auditory memory for sentences, recall of semantic information, following directions and listening to paragraphs. Other points to consider are listed below:

- Other areas of language, such as semantic understanding, syntax skills, and expressive language would typically fall within the average range.
- In addition, subtests administered by the school psychologist that assess auditory memory and recall, would confirm the difficulty in performing related auditory tasks.
- Traditional learning disability categories and attention deficit hyperactivity disorder (ADHD) should also be evaluated as areas of potential disability.
- There should be substantiated evidence from classroom teacher input and observations indicating significant misinterpretation or gaps in auditory information gathered by the student in processing the curriculum.

A comprehensive evaluation including documentation by the student intervention team and the evaluations by the speech-language pathologist and school psychologist is used in determining if a student has a disability in listening comprehension or oral expression. Documentation of a disability, its affect on educational performance, and the need for specialized instruction are required in determining eligibility for special education services. Informed clinical opinion becomes very important if the student does not meet traditional guidelines. But clinical opinion must still be based on information from a comprehensive evaluation including all data.

Students eligible under listening comprehension or oral expression need assistance in the development of compensatory skills. More manageable pacing for processing information is needed in order to progress within the curriculum. The needs of these students may require the frequency and intensity of instruction available through the services of a resource room or teacher of the learning disabled. Other levels of support could be sufficient to meet the needs of the student depending on the severity and impact of the disability.

Part 1: Critical Issues - Eligibility

Summary of Listening Comprehension and Oral Expression – In conclusion, consideration of learning disability in listening comprehension or oral expression requires both the speech-language pathologist and the school psychologist to conduct very thorough and comprehensive evaluations. Identification as learning disability in listening comprehension should be rare, and in oral expression extremely rare.

PROGRAMS AND SERVICES

Introduction

The IEP Team determines eligibility. Determination is based on the evaluation(s) and other relevant information presented by the team. Following a determination of eligibility, the team determines and writes the student's present level of academic achievement and functional performance (PLAAFP) for the IEP report.

Present Level of Academic Achievement and Functional Performance

The present level of academic achievement and functional performance (PLAAFP) is the foundation on which the rest of the IEP is developed. The narrative summary of a PLAAFP must include four elements:

1. Baseline data for each area of need
2. A detailed starting point for instruction
3. Identification of areas of need
4. An impact statement

Baseline data should include both strengths and concerns, but must include data related to the area(s) of the disability. Data may be derived from tests, classroom performance (such as work samples, teacher-made tests, etc.), documented observation (written, systemic, ongoing), and/or state or district-wide assessments. Other data sources include provider logs, checklists, attendance records, and other sources.

A detailed starting point for instruction must describe the target skills with enough detail to give a starting point for instruction. Areas in which the student requires specially designed instruction needs to be identified. Each area must be addressed in at least one of the following:

- Annual goals
- Supplementary aids/services/supports
- Secondary transition plan/services

An impact statement is a description of how the disability affects the student's progress in the general education curriculum and involvement in age-appropriate activities.

Placement

First and foremost IDEA regulations require that students with disabilities must be educated in the least restrictive environment (LRE) (§300.550). This requires that they be educated with children who are not disabled to the maximum extent possible. The term placement refers to points along the continuum of programs and services, not

Part 1: Critical Issues – Programs and Services

to the physical location. Special education placement is determined by the IEP Team based on needs identified in the PLAAFP.

A continuum of alternative placements must be available to meet the needs of students with disabilities (§300.551). This includes programs and related services. Some smaller districts may not have enough students with disabilities in lower incidence categories or with specific needs to have every alternative available at a student's local school, or even within the district. In these cases, districts make available placements through cooperative arrangements with other districts in Kent ISD. The placement decision is made on an individual student's needs, not on what is available in a specific location.

Students eligible for special education who have a need for speech-language services should receive services that are:

- Curriculum-based
- Outcome-oriented
- Educationally relevant
- Designed to improve the student's ability to access and make progress in the general curriculum and, for preschoolers, in age-appropriate activities
- Centered around student need
- Research-based

Students with a primary SLI label will generally be placed on the caseload and receive services from the speech-language pathologist. Services may be provided in a variety of ways but must be specially designed to fulfill the requirements for the student to progress in the general curriculum. These students usually remain in their general education classroom. Possible models of services may include:

- Consultation with the general education teacher
- SLI services within the general classroom setting (push-in services)
- Small groups in a pull-out setting
- Individual sessions in a pull-out setting.

Some students with cognitive impairment, physical impairment, severe multiple impairment, or autism spectrum disorder may require categorical special education programs and/or alternate curriculums. Speech-language needs for these students can often be met by the special education teacher with or without a speech-language pathologist

Part 1: Critical Issues – Programs and Services

consultation. Depending on the curriculum, there may be some situations when small group or individual services may be necessary for varying periods of time.

There may be rare occasions when a student has such a severe speech-language impairment that he/she may require a special education placement with a teacher consultant or a special education program, yet meets only the SLI criteria.

Speech-Language Services as a Supportive Related Service

Neither IDEA regulations nor the Michigan rules require a second disability label (SLI) for a student to receive services from a speech-language pathologist. Ehrens (May, 2007) and Staskowski (2007) recommend providing speech-language pathologist as an added service when appropriate. With a required written diagnostic report provided by the speech-language pathologist (at Michigan rule 340.1745; see Appendix K), speech and language services may be added to an IEP for any student who qualifies for special education under another category. Services should provide the necessary support for: the student's area(s) of need identified in the present level of academic achievement and functional performance; goals and objectives; and progress in the general curriculum. A placement of speech-language pathologist services as a supportive related service differs in procedure for a student with SLI as an identified area of primary or secondary disability. For a primary or secondary SLI eligibility label, an *Evaluation Review and Plan* and an *Eligibility Recommendation* form for speech and language impairment are required. Both are needed when adding a student to, or exiting a student from, SL services as well as for three-year reevaluations.

A diagnostic report by the speech-language pathologist is also required in these cases. There are no regulatory standards for the content of a diagnostic report. A written document should reasonably justify the speech-language pathologist services provided, and give a baseline for future consideration of continuation or termination of such services. When SLI services are provided only as a related service, the *Eligibility Recommendation* form is not required. However, a diagnostic report is still required. As noted above, a secondary SLI label should be considered in cases where it is difficult to identify which of the disabilities is primary or where it is needed to give an accurate picture of a student with a severe speech and language impairment.

Use of speech-language pathologist as a supportive related service without requiring SLI as a secondary label can reduce the procedural complications of an eligibility label (and paperwork) and enable the speech-language pathologist to more directly and efficiently target student needs. For example, speech-language pathologists may have more time to assist building teams by providing more early intervening services. Given the relative ease in

Part 1: Critical Issues – Programs and Services

procedural requirements however, it is important that the speech-language pathologist systematically implements a judicious approach to determine when this kind of placement is appropriate to add to a caseload and workload.

Dismissal of Speech and Language Services

Dismissal of speech language service – When SLI is not a category of eligibility, dismissal from speech-language services can be made only when the student is determined by an IEP Team to no longer require direct speech-language services. A written diagnostic report by the speech-language pathologist is always required. Under these circumstances the discontinuation of related service can be documented in either an IEP or with an IEP Addendum. Dismissal from service is distinctly different from terminating a primary or secondary SLI eligibility (see below).

Termination of a primary or secondary SLI eligibility – If the student has a primary or secondary SLI label, determination of ineligibility as SLI by an IEP Team requires an *Evaluation Review Plan* (ERP) and a subsequent evaluation (as needed). Dismissal does require a written diagnostic report documenting why the SLI label is no longer appropriate. The *Eligibility Recommendation* form for SL must be completed and an IEP be held whenever the student has a primary or secondary SLI label. When SLI as a category of disability is terminated, speech-language pathologist services are not necessarily terminated. A student may still receive speech-language pathologist services as a supportive related service for another (replacement) category of disability as appropriate and indicated by the diagnostic report. To help guide decision making when considering a change or termination of speech-language pathologist eligibility or services, see Appendix K.

Consultation for IEP Goals and Objectives – An IEP Team may determine that a student with an IEP does not need direct speech-language pathologist services, but speech-language pathologist consultation support for remaining special education providers is appropriate. Consultation is documented in the IEP (Section 4) as a related service (specifying service, location, rule number, session, frequency, duration). The speech-language pathologist consultation should be focused on helping special education providers address goals and objectives on the IEP. To verify service delivery, the speech-language pathologist should log dates and topics of consultation contacts.

Monitoring for Observation/Screening not Directly Linked to IEP Goals and Objectives – After terminating direct speech-language pathologist service for a student, it may be appropriate for the speech-language pathologist to continue involvement in general screening, observation, or individual screening as described in the Evaluation section of this document. Monitoring activities may also include crisis intervention, assistive technology or other prosthetic equipment issues, or classroom material preparation. If the student will otherwise continue to have an

Part 1: Critical Issues – Programs and Services

IEP under another eligibility after termination of direct speech-language pathologist services, monitoring activities should be documented in the supplementary aids and accommodations section of the IEP (Section 2) as a supplementary aid or accommodation (specifying frequency and location for when monitoring occurs).

Obligations to Nonpublic and Home Schools

A significant speech-language pathologist service delivery issue in Kent ISD is provision of service to nonpublic schools (in Michigan law the term “nonpublic school” also applies to a registered home school). In Michigan’s *Auxiliary Services Act*, public districts must provide auxiliary services to nonpublic elementary and secondary schools within its boundaries. All special education related services are included in the Act. A public school must provide the same auxiliary services (and thus all special education related services including speech-language pathologist services) on an equal basis to pupils in the elementary and secondary grades at the nonpublic school. As for any IEP, these special education related services must address needs related to student achievement and functional performance. But for students in nonpublic schools, public school personnel may not directly provide instruction in the areas of core academic curriculum, as defined by Michigan Curriculum Framework, the Michigan Merit Curriculum, and the associated Michigan Grade Level Content Standards. The core academic content area remains the responsibility of the nonpublic school.

Evaluation services for special education are also an auxiliary service. Public school speech-language pathologists may therefore be involved in evaluations of students attending local nonpublic schools. If the outcome of an evaluation results in special education eligibility, some likely IEP considerations are:

1. **A proposed IEP for only related services** – The parent may decide to retain the student’s enrollment at the nonpublic school, and the related services may be provided by the public district at the nonpublic school or other IEP Team determined site.
2. **A proposed IEP determines the need for a special education classroom program** – If the student requires specialized instruction beyond related services. The student’s resident public district is obligated to offer special education classroom programs to the student. This requires coordination between districts if the resident district is not where the nonpublic school is located. In such cases, options to meet student needs include the following:
 - a. The parent may decide to enroll the student in their resident public district to access the special education classroom program as well as related services.
 - b. The parent may decide to retain the student in the nonpublic school with enhanced general education support, and with supportive special education related services provided by the public district serving the nonpublic school.

Part 1: Critical Issues – Programs and Services

- c. If a potential need for a special education classroom program is anticipated during the evaluation, public school staff should be especially prompt in involving the parent and resident district so that all parties are aware of the issues about needs and solutions that will be discussed at the IEP Team meeting.
3. **Dual Enrollment** – Whether involved in special education or not, any student may simultaneously enroll in both the resident public district and a nonpublic school. In dual enrollments, the public school is still restricted from providing instruction in core curriculum as described above.
4. **The Auxiliary Act does not apply to preschool children** – Since the *Auxiliary Services Act* does not include preschool, questions about special education services should be directed to the student’s resident district. Consultation, evaluation, and special education programs/services are all the responsibility of the resident district.

The topic of public services to nonpublic schools is more complicated than presented in this brief summary. For example, issues often involve distinctions among programs/services and accommodations, and core versus non-core curriculum. For further information, contact your district administration or refer to policies in *Information on Nonpublic and Home Schools* published by the Michigan Department of Education.

CASELOAD, WORKLOAD, AND SCHEDULING

Caseload and Workload

The term caseload refers to the students who are receiving direct services and have an Individualized Educational Program (IEP). The term workload includes not only the speech-language pathologist's caseload but also encompasses the many additional activities which speech-language pathologists perform in the school setting.

Workload includes:

- Direct services to students including instruction, interventions, and evaluations
- Indirect services to support the implementation of the students' IEPs
- Indirect activities that support students in the least restrictive environment and in the general education curriculum
- Activities that support compliance with federal, state, and local mandates and activities that result from membership in a community of educators.

In *A Workload Analysis Approach for Establishing Speech-Language Caseload Standards in Schools: Guidelines* (ASHA, 2002) the activities included in each of the four areas are defined. It is clear that in the modern day school setting best practices include many activities outside of providing direct services to students with IEPs.

Often in Michigan, administrators simply manage speech-language pathologist caseloads by tracking maximum caseload size of 60 (per Michigan Rule 340.1745) with little regard to quality of service and impact on student literacy. However, schools are also mandated to monitor student performance on State Performance Plan (SPP) indicators required by the IDEA regulations. Unfavorable performance on SPP indicators may trigger state-level determinations, intervention and, in troublesome cases, financial sanctions. Deploying related service staff, including speech-language pathologists, is a valuable resource in meeting SPP targets. It is hoped that the speech-language pathologist is utilized as a language specialist who can “bring to the table” expertise for building teams working to address bottom-line student performance in the language-intensive activities of reading and language arts.

Successful implementation of new practices (such as RtI) will require a change in perspective from speech-language pathologists, administrators, teachers and parents. Speech-language pathologists will have the opportunity to utilize their unique and varied expertise and contribute to student success. However, it is not realistic to expect speech-language pathologists to continue to provide RtI interventions and still provide best practice/research-based services to caseloads that often exceed 60 students. The concept of a Workload Analysis

Approach, which has been recommended by ASHA since 2002, is essential to successful RtI implementation (see **Workload Activities Cluster Chart** at the end of this section).

Scheduling

Each of the constituent districts of Kent ISD will need to make decisions regarding the model of provision of services to students. Within each district the populations of students served vary from students with severe multiple impairments, to students with autism spectrum disorder, to students with mild articulation impairments. No one model will work for all populations and all age groups. Individualized Education Programs (IEPs) need to remain individualized, and must not be created to fit existing models of service delivery. IEPs should reflect individual student needs in every manner, including the model of service delivery. Several scheduling options that depart from traditional service must be considered to help better manage speech/ language workloads.

Flexible Scheduling – According to the *MSHA Guidelines* this model combines service delivery options and provides opportunities for individual, small group, classroom and indirect services while allowing the speech-language pathologist to schedule other job related responsibilities.

3:1 Model – (Three weeks of direct service: 1 week of indirect service) In this model three weeks of a four week cycle are dedicated to providing direct services to students (individual therapy, small group therapy, push in lessons and evaluations) while the other week is reserved for indirect services such as consultation, collaboration, developing materials, and completion of paperwork including Medicaid billings. A variation of this model is a weekly version where four days include direct services and the fifth day is reserved for indirect services.

Creative Scheduling – This schedule involves varying times in a schedule to meet the specific needs of a group of students. Time is blocked in a week to meet the specific needs of the students, but the service provided to that group may differ by day. Some days may include direct service provision to the students in the therapy room. Some days may include push-in services in the classroom and some days may include individual sessions with the students.

Speedy Speech/Five Minute Articulation – Many speech-language pathologists around the state offer services to students utilizing sessions that are shorter sessions but with higher intensity and/or frequency. The speech-language pathologist drills the student with mild to moderate articulation impairments in short, individual (5-minute), and frequent (daily, three times a week) sessions. Sessions may occur near the classroom to decrease transition time. Some schedules rotate students so they are served six weeks on then six weeks off (or another predetermined length of time), to allow more students to be served. Results reported anecdotally are said to be as good as, or better than, the more traditional articulation therapy.

Table 3 - WORKLOAD ACTIVITY CLUSTERS

<p style="text-align: center;">Direct services to students</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Counsel students • Evaluate students for eligibility for special education • Identify students with speech and language impairment • Implement IEPs and IFSPs • Provide direct intervention to students using a continuum of service-delivery options • Reevaluate students 	<p style="text-align: center;">Indirect activities that support students in the least restrictive environment and general education curriculum</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Engage in dynamic assessment of students • Connect standards for the learner to the IEP • Consult with teachers to match student’s learning style and teaching style • Design and engage in prereferral intervention activities • Design/recommend adaptations to curriculum and delivery of instruction • Design/recommend modifications to the curriculum to benefit students with special needs • Participate in activities designed to help prevent academic and literacy problems • Observe students in classrooms • Screen students for suspected problems with communication, learning, and literacy
<p style="text-align: center;">Indirect services that support students’ education programs</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Analyze demands of the curriculum and effects on students • Attend student planning teams to solve specific problems • Attend teacher/service provider meetings (planning, progress, monitoring, modifications to program) • Communicate and coordinate with outside agencies • Contribute to the development of IEPs and IFSPs • Coordinate with private, nonpublic school teachers and staff • Design delivery plans • Design and implement transition evaluations and transition goals • Design and program high-, medium-, and low-tech augmentative communication systems • Program and maintain assistive technology/augmentative communication systems (AT/AC) and equipment for AT/AC • Train teachers and staff for AT/AC system use • Engage in special preparation to provide services to students (e.g., low incidence populations, research basis for intervention, best practices) • Interview teachers • Make referrals to other professionals • Monitor implementation of IEP modifications • Observe students in classrooms • Plan and prepare lessons • Plan for student transitions • Provide staff development to school staff, parents, and others 	<p style="text-align: center;">Activities that support compliance with federal, state, and local mandates</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Attend staff/faculty meetings • Collect and report student performance data • Complete compliance paperwork • Complete daily logs of student services • Complete parent contact logs • Document services to students and other activities • Document third-party billing activities • Participate in parent/teacher conferences • Participate in professional association activities • Participate in professional development • Participate on school improvement teams • Participate on school or district committees • Serve multiple schools and sites • Supervise paraprofessionals, teacher aides, interns, CFYs • Travel between buildings • Write funding reports for assistive technology and augmentative communication • Write periodic student progress reports • Write student evaluation reports <p style="font-size: small;">Adapted from A Workload Analysis Approach for Establishing Speech-Language Caseload Standards in the Schools: Guidelines. Available from www.asha.org/members/slp/schools/resources/schools_resources_caseload.htm Copyright 2002 by American Speech-Language-Hearing Association. All rights reserved.</p>

**PART 2: RESPONSE TO SECTIONS OF
THE MICHIGAN SPEECH-LANGUAGE-HEARING ASSOCIATION GUIDELINES**

Articulation and Phonology	34
Introduction.....	34
Prevention	34
Early Intervening.....	34
The Formal Special Education Process: Evaluation Review/Consent	35
Articulation Norms	36
Fluency	37
Voice.....	40
Language.....	42
Overview	42
General Information – Birth through 5 Years of Age	46
Preschool	47
Secondary	49
Infant Toddler Speech and Language.....	53
English Language Learners.....	59
Assistive Technology	66

ARTICULATION AND PHONOLOGY

Introduction

Speech errors classified as language impairments are included in these Guidelines under the combined category of articulation and phonology. Errors in sound production are generally classified as motorically-based or cognitively/linguistically based (Bernthal and Bankson, 1988). Motorically-based errors are generally called articulation impairments and may be characterized by the omission, distortion, substitution, addition and/or sequencing of speech sounds. Cognitively/linguistically-based errors are referred to as impairments of phonological processes.

Prevention

Speech-language pathologists have a role in educating school personnel and parents about normal articulation and phonological development. Teachers and parents may be interested in promoting articulation development by providing correct models, listening activities, and by discussing articulation placements during instruction. For example, a kindergarten or first grade teacher may discuss tongue placement when introducing sounds for each letter or during phonological awareness activities. Increasingly, speech-language pathologists are providing phonemic awareness instruction to children, both with and without identified communication impairments, in the classroom as part of prevention initiatives. Mass articulation screenings have not been in practice in Michigan for some time. There is some discussion in the literature of this practice being renewed within a response-to-intervention (RtI) framework applied to articulation (Moore-Brown & Montgomery, 2004). Most typically, though, children's articulation and phonological disorders are identified through teacher and parent referral.

Early Intervening

When a teacher or parent has concerns about a student's articulation, s/he consults the speech-language pathologist. The speech-language pathologist observes and screens (with proper permissions and procedures) the student's speech, talks to the child's parents and teachers, and discusses how the student's articulation difficulties may be affecting educational performance. If the staff believes, with consultation from the speech-language pathologist, the errors in articulation may be resolved without speech-language pathologist intervention; the speech-language pathologist then suggests strategies and follow-up for the student, teacher, and parents to use.

If the student begins to progress adequately, interventions/suggestions will continue to be used as needed by the teacher and/or parents. When there is adequate student progress in response to the interventions, no referral is necessary. If it is determined that the student is not making adequate progress based on data collected, the special

Part 2: Response to MSHA – Articulation and Phonology

education evaluation process should begin. The parent will be contacted to complete a *Consent for Initial Special Education Evaluation*.

The Formal Special Education Process: Evaluation Review/Consent

Consent for Initial Special Education Evaluation – When concerns for a student’s academic achievement and functional performance persist after interventions in general education, a special education referral may be warranted. The team reviews all of the pertinent data collected, completes the *Consent for Initial Special Education Evaluation* form, and obtains parents’ signatures. Gathering information from teachers, parents and students is an important aspect of the evaluation process. This information may be gathered through a variety of checklists provided by the 2006 *MSHA Guidelines* on pages A-11 through 13 respectively.

Articulation and Phonology Testing – Formal assessment may include both articulation and phonology. Norm-referenced tests which are both valid and reliable should be administered. A speech-language pathologist should use caution in the interpretation of standardized scores to determine the need for services. Although some assessments will reveal standardized scores below the average range for single sound errors, services may not be necessary if there is not adverse educational effect. It is important to consider all aspects of the *Articulation Eligibility Guide/Team Summary* (Appendix C) to determine the need for services.

Summary of Adverse Educational Effect and Eligibility – Based on the information gathered, the team decides whether the student is experiencing an adverse educational effect as a result of articulation or phonological errors. If it is determined that an articulation or phonological errors and concerns negatively impact the student’s ability to be successful in the general education environment (nonacademic and academic communication and classroom participation), special education eligibility should be considered. If there is not an adverse educational effect, the student is not eligible for special education services even if the child demonstrates some articulation errors. Both (1) the presence of errors and (2) an adverse effect on education requiring specialized instruction must be present to be considered eligible.

Dismissal Criteria – Please refer to pages SLI-7, SLI-8 of the *MSHA Guidelines*. Speech-language pathologists should keep in mind that there is research suggesting that students who are dismissed at 75-85% accuracy in conversational speech often go on to fully correct, suggesting that this is an appropriate time for dismissal (Diedrich, 1980).

Articulation Norms

There has been much discussion and varying opinions regarding which of many articulation sound charts should be used to determine when a student should be expected to have acquired specific sounds. *MSHA Guidelines* (2006) include two charts. One is the *Iowa-Nebraska Articulation Norms* (Table A-1). The second is the norms from *The Clinical Assessment of Articulation and Phonology (CAAP)* (Table A-2). Both sets of norms are based on when 90% of the population achieve a specific sound.

Kent ISD recommends using the *Iowa-Nebraska Articulation Norms* (Appendix O). The copy in Appendix O is from *Speech Language Pathology Services in Schools: Guidelines for Best Practice* (Virginia DOE, 2006) and is presented in tabular form. This recommendation is based on the replication of the results over time and the frequency with which states have adopted these norms as their standard for statewide guidelines for speech and language.

The most recent study of these norms was in 1990 (Smit, Hand, Freilinger, Bernthal, & Bird). This study was a replication of studies in 1957, 1967, 1975, 1976, 1986 and 1988. The findings of Smit, et al (1990) demonstrate that the ages of acquisition of tested consonant single sounds have generally remained constant or moved to earlier ages. Ages of acquisition for a few phoneme singles and for most clusters have either remained constant or have moved to slightly later ages.

No single piece of data should be used to identify a student with a disability.

FLUENCY

Definition of Stuttering – *Disfluency (stuttering) is an abnormally high frequency or duration of stoppages in the forward flow of speech that occurs in the form of repetitions of sounds or syllable prolongation of sounds, blocks of airflow or voicing. Often accompanied by awareness, embarrassment, signs of physical tension, or increased rate of speech (MSHA, 2006, F-2).*

Cluttering is a disorder of speech and language processing resulting in rapid, dysrhythmic, sporadic, unorganized, and frequently unintelligible speech. Accelerated speech is not always present, but an impairment in formulating language almost always is (MSHA, 2006, F-2).

Early Intervention – Teachers and parents who have concerns regarding a student’s fluency should consult with a speech-language pathologist to determine if further assessment is necessary. The speech-language pathologist and others will collect information through observations, checklists, and parent and teacher input. Strategies and suggestions related to how a teacher and family respond to the child’s disfluency may be made.

If the team feels that with consultation from the speech-language pathologist, the disfluency may be resolved, the speech-language pathologist then suggests strategies for the student, teacher and parent to use. The speech-language pathologist then follows up periodically. The speech-language pathologist may also elect to use early intervening to document this process. If the difficulty persists, then a complete speech and language assessment may be necessary.

If there appears to be disfluency that adversely affects the child’s educational performance which needs direct intervention from the speech-language pathologist, an evaluation process will begin and parent consent for evaluation will be needed. *An example of when to immediately use the formal assessment process might include a case where there is a family history of stuttering behavior, and the student shows multiple secondary characteristics and disfluencies, along with self-awareness of the disfluent behavior. (MSHA, 2006)*

Input – Input from teachers, the student, and parents are all important components of the fluency assessment. Examples of checklists are found in the *MSHA Guidelines (2006)*. Reviewing family history, student self-esteem, motivation/attitude, and self-assessment of communication as it relates to their fluency are all important information to be considered.

Risk Factors – There are several risk factors that increase the likelihood that a student will continue to stutter. See table following.

Table 4 - Fluency Risk Factors

(Ainsworth & Fraser, 2006; Yairi & Ambrose, 2005)

Risk Factors	Where Obtained	Present or Absent
Male (stuttering affects males 3 – 4 times more than females.) Females likely to recover without intervention.		
Age of Onset Students who begin stuttering prior to the age of 3 ½ years are more likely to outgrow stuttering. Students who begin stuttering after age 3 ½ years may continue to demonstrate stuttering behaviors.	Parent Input	
Time Since Onset If a student has been stuttering longer than 6 months, they may be less likely to outgrow the behavior on their own. The likelihood to a student who has stuttered longer than 12 months increases even more.	Parent Input	
Family History Approximately 60% of people who stutter have a family member who stuttered.	Parent Input	
Presence Other Speech/Language Impairment Students with other speech/language disorders are at higher risk for stuttering (SFA, 2006).	Parent Input	
Pattern of Stuttering If the student is relatively unaware of their disfluencies, the risk for a fluency disorder is reduced compared to a student who is aware of their stuttering. Whole word repetition at the beginning of an utterance is more typical in development than blocks (when phonation is interrupted).	SLP Observation or Parent/Teacher Report	
Sensitivity of Child Students who are emotionally more sensitive may respond to stressful situations with stuttering behaviors.	Parent Input	
Environment Family reaction, fast-paced family schedule, family dynamics such as high expectations, communication style of parents and/or teachers, significant life event (death, divorce, etc.)	Parent Input	

12/2006

Michigan Speech-Language Guidelines APD-6

Test Administration or Analysis of Frequency and Duration of a Connected Speech Sample – The primary goal of the initial assessment is to both determine eligibility and to identify an appropriate treatment plan. The speech-language pathologist and team must determine whether a fluency impairment exists, how it adversely affects educational performance (academic, nonacademic, or extracurricular), and how intervention should be designed to help the student to progress in the general education curriculum. See the *Stuttering Severity Instrument* (MSHA, 2006, F-14).

Classroom Observations of Adverse Effect – Observe the student during a time of day when the teacher indicates student’s disfluencies interfere with participation. Collect more information regarding whether the student’s

Part 2: Response to MSHA – Fluency

fluency is adequate for successful participants in that curricular task or whether the student lacks the fluency skills and strategies needed.

Cluttering – Analyze disfluencies for differential diagnosis of stuttering versus cluttering. Please refer to the cluttering checklist in MSHA, 2006, F-17,18.

Other Assessment Information – The speech-language pathologist should complete a broad-based screening of language, articulation, oral-motor, and voice to explore the possibility of additional impairments.

Summary of Eligibility in Fluency – If there is documented evidence of stuttering and/or cluttering and an adverse impact on educational performance, and absence of cultural/linguistic or environmental/economic differences, then the student should be considered eligible as speech and language impaired in the area of fluency. **Both** the presence of a disability and adverse education effect must be addressed to be considered eligible. Only one of these criteria does not justify eligibility as a student with a disability.

VOICE

Definition – A voice impairment is defined as the abnormal production and or absence of vocal quality, pitch, loudness, resonance, and or duration which is appropriate for an individual’s age and or sex (ASHA, 1993, p. 40). When this disorder adversely affects educational performance, then a voice impairment may be present as described in the Michigan rule.

Early Intervention – Teachers and parents with concerns regarding a student’s vocal quality should consult with a speech-language pathologist to determine if further assessment is necessary. The speech-language pathologist and others will collect information through observations, checklists, and parent and teacher input. When students present with laryngitis or hyponasality, a brief conversation about the duration, symptoms and possible presence of a cold or allergies can alleviate concern. The speech-language pathologist listens to the student’s voice, interviews the parents, and together with the classroom teacher determines how the student’s voice adversely affects educational performance.

If the team feels that with consultation from the speech-language pathologist, the vocal quality may be resolved, the speech-language pathologist then suggests strategies for the student, teacher and parent to use. The speech-language pathologist then follows up periodically. The speech-language pathologist may also elect to use early intervening to document this process.

If there appears to be vocal quality that adversely affects the child’s educational performance which needs direct intervention from the speech-language pathologist, then a referral or *Evaluation Review and Plan* process will begin and parent consent for evaluation will be obtained. A request for a medical evaluation, such as a visit to an otolaryngologist (ENT), may occur during the early intervening or evaluation process.

Input – Ideally, the parent provides a written medical report from a laryngeal examination for the evaluation for voice structure and function. Input and interviews from teachers, the student, and parents are all important components of the vocal quality assessment. Interviews with nonclassroom school personnel will help determine whether there is vocal abuse/misuse in a variety of settings. Parent interviews may reveal environmental factors such as second-hand smoke, food allergies, and medical conditions, such as sinusitis, enlarged adenoid/tonsils, and bulimia. Examples of checklists are found in the *MSHA Guidelines* (2006).

Part 2 – Response to MSHA – Voice

Consideration of Cultural/Linguistic Differences (CLD) – It is important to investigate cultural and linguistic variables that may affect voice production. Cultural variations can influence variations in volume, pitch, and quality.

Consideration of Temporary Physical Factors – Voice difficulties as a result of temporary physical factors should not be considered as a voice impairment/disability. These might include factors such as allergies, sinusitis, gastro-esophageal reflux, colds, abnormal tonsils or adenoids.

Vocal Quality – Use observations, checklists, or interviews to assess the student's vocal characteristics looking for difficulties such as breathiness, stridency, or hoarseness. Breath supply should be evaluated for the amount and efficiency of air to sustain speech. Phonatory efficiency should be evaluated to assess the student's ability to sustain quality phonation. Muscle tension during speech production should also be evaluated looking for signs of hypertension, hypotension, and anxiety when speaking.

Pitch – Use observations, checklists, or interviews to assess the student's use of pitch looking for difficulties such as extraordinarily high or low pitch, pitch breaks, or monotone.

Loudness – Use observations, checklists, or interviews to assess the student's use of loudness, looking for difficulties such as excessive loudness, or softness.

Resonance – Resonance disorders are usually the result of a variety of structural abnormalities such as cleft palate, and velopharyngeal insufficiency (hypernasality) or nasal polyps and enlarged adenoids (hyponasality). Use of observations, checklists or interviews to assess the student's resonance, looking for difficulties such as hyponasality, hypernasality, nasal emissions, and/or assimilation nasality on vowels.

Additional Areas of Assessment for Planning Intervention – Use observations, checklists, or interviews to assess: breath rate, phonatory efficiency, muscle tension, intelligibility, and speech avoidance.

Summary of Eligibility in Voice – If there is evidence of a voice disorder, an adverse impact on educational performance, and the absence of cultural/linguistic or environmental/economic differences, then the student should be considered eligible as speech and language impaired in the area of Voice. Both the presence of a disability and adverse education effect must be addressed to be considered eligible. Only one of these criteria cannot justify eligibility as a student with a disability.

LANGUAGE

Overview

According to the Michigan Speech-Language-Hearing Association, “The prevention, assessment and intervention for language impairments are the most common activities of the school-based speech-language pathologist” (MSHA, 2006). Participation, access, and progress in the general education curriculum are dependent upon a student’s skills in oral and written language.

Definition of a Language Disorder – ASHA (1993, p. 40) provides the following definition of a language disorder and its components:

A language disorder is impaired comprehension and/or use of spoken, written and/or other symbol systems. The disorder may involve (1) the form of language (phonology, morphology, syntax), (2) the content of language (semantics), and/or (3) the function of language in communication (pragmatics) in any combination.

1. Form of Language

- (a) Phonology is the sound system of language and the rules that govern sound combinations.*
- (b) Morphology is the system that governs the structure of words and the construction of word forms.*
- (c) Syntax is the system governing the order and combination of words to form sentences and the relationships among the elements within a sentence.*

2. Content of Language

- (a) Semantics is the system that governs the meanings of words and sentences.*

3. Function of Language

- (a) Pragmatics is the system that combines the above language components in functional and socially appropriate communication.*

General Education Interventions – It is recommended that when students are suspected of having language concerns, the same process be used (child study team/student assistance team and early intervention strategies) as when districts consider the presence of other potential learning difficulties. If general education interventions have been implemented and progress does not occur, it may be decided to formally assess a student’s language skills.

When the decision is made to pursue a formal assessment of a student’s language skills, the primary goal of an initial assessment is to answer the following questions:

Part 2: Response to MSHA - Language

- Does a language impairment exist?
- Does the language impairment have an “adverse educational impact” on school performance in the academic, nonacademic, and/or extracurricular domains?
- Does the student require specialized instruction?

Determining Eligibility for Language Impairment – The following information and documentation is required to determine eligibility for special education as a student with a speech-language impairment:

- Ability/achievement/developmental level
- Relevant behavior observations
- Speech/language level
- Spontaneous language sample
- Educationally relevant medical information
- Information from parents

Sample forms are available in the *MSHA Guidelines* (2006), L-13,15-17, et seq.

Ability/Achievement/Developmental Level – Assessment information regarding a student’s ability level, achievement level, or developmental level may be available from psycho-educational, school social work, physical therapy and/or occupational therapy evaluation reports. Information from progress monitoring procedures (such as DIBELS, MLPP), group standardized achievement tests (such as the Iowa Test of Basic Skills, Terra Nova, Gates Reading Test, etc.), writing rubrics, or content specific measures (e.g., integrated theme tests in reading, district-wide assessments of reading and mathematics) should also be gathered and considered as part of the assessment process.

A review of accommodations, modifications, and interventions that have been provided to the student through the child study process and the intervention model should be completed. These strategies and the student’s response to them need to be documented.

Sample forms are available in the *MSHA Guidelines* (2006) L-8.

Relevant Behavior Observations – Information regarding behavior in the school environment may be found in the student’s cumulative file, prior evaluations, reports by private providers and public and/or private agencies, as well as the teacher and the parent input forms. Curriculum-based language assessments should also be reviewed.

These assessments measure whether the student’s “language behavior” is adequate to successfully participate in

Part 2: Response to MSHA - Language

the curricular tasks at his/her grade level or whether the student has the needed skills or strategies to accomplish grade level tasks.

Speech-language Level – Multiple forms of assessment are required by IDEA 2004. These forms may include parent input, teacher input, a file review, curriculum-based language assessment, language samples, standardized test results, and outside speech-language assessments if provided by the parents. The standardized test profile is only one factor to be considered in the assessment profile when determining eligibility. Standardized test(s) chosen for the assessment should be reliable and valid, and have adequate sensitivity and specificity. Information regarding the use of standardized tests may be found in the Evaluation section of this document.

As noted in the section of this document that discusses cognitive referencing, the following points are repeated:

- A cognitive-language discrepancy is not required for making an eligibility decision for SLI
- A cognitive-language discrepancy should never be the sole determining factor in making any eligibility decision, but it can be a vital piece of understanding the whole child's abilities and performance
- Cognitive referencing can be useful in determining reasonable language expectations
- A cognitive-language discrepancy should be used with extreme caution when determining eligibility for a very young child

Spontaneous Language Sample – Best practice in language sampling includes collecting both an oral language sample and samples of the student's written language. Information should be collected for the word, sentence, and discourse levels for both oral and written forms of language.

Educationally Relevant Medical Information – Relevant medical information may be obtained from past or current assessments by medical professionals and from the parent. In the school setting, relevant information may include, but is not limited to, information about medical concerns that affect school performance (such as vision, hearing, or attention issues).

Information from Parents – Information from parents may be gathered through interviews, checklists, or questionnaires. Information that may be obtained includes birth history, developmental history, health history, medical history, and specific information about the development of speech-language skills.

Sample forms are available in the *MSHA Guidelines* (2006).

Part 2: Response to MSHA - Language

Results of Assessment – The speech-language pathologist and team then consider all information gathered during the assessment phase including the student’s response to general education intervention(s), input from multiple sources, and standardized test results. Next, the team proceeds to summarize information related to the student’s suspected disability.

Summary of Assessment Information – When all the relevant information has been collected and reviewed, the team considers whether the assessment results support the identification of a language impairment. The speech-language pathologist describes whether this impairment adversely affects the student’s participation in the general curriculum.

Summary of Adverse Educational Impact – Based on the information gathered and reviewed, the IEP Team decides whether the child is experiencing an adverse educational impact as a result of language impairment. There are two possible outcomes:

- The language impairment negatively impacts the student’s ability to be successful in the general education environment (in academic, nonacademic, and/or extracurricular domains), special education eligibility as a student with language impairment would be considered.
- The student has a language impairment which does not have an adverse educational effect, therefore he/she is not eligible for special education services.

It must also be established that the suspected disability is not due to limited English proficiency, lack of instruction in math or the essential components of reading, and that the student requires special education programs/services (Kent ISD *Speech and Language Impairment Eligibility Recommendation* form).

Summary and Recommendation for Eligibility as Language Impaired – When it has been determined that a language disability is present which adversely affects educational performance, eligibility for speech and language services must be considered by the IEP Team. A Kent ISD *Speech and Language Impairment Eligibility Recommendation* form must be completed whether or not the student qualifies for language services.

Once eligibility has been recommended, the IEP Team must describe the present level of academic achievement and functional performance (PLAAFP). This description must describe the needs of the student, identify the evidence aligned to the need, and explain how each need affects the student’s ability to access and perform in the general education curriculum.

General Information – Birth through 5 Years of Age

Children in the infant to preschool age group present some unique issues. These children may qualify for and receive some form of speech-language services under *Early On*, special education, or Head Start. The differences between these can be confusing.

Early On – In Michigan, the State Department of Education has been designated as the “lead agency” for the coordination among school and non-school agencies for services to children ages birth through 2. Michigan’s program for children birth through 2 with developmental delay and/or an established condition is the *Early On* program. *Early On* may merely coordinate services or directly provide services. As children served by *Early On* near the age of 3, specific planning activities are provided for transitioning children to appropriate preschool settings for children ages 3 through 5 according to each child’s needs and family situation. All children ages birth through 2 in Kent ISD have access to *Early On* services, either through Kent ISD or from the child’s local district.

Special Education – While the IDEA regulations include children ages 3 through 21, special education in Michigan extends this age range downward to birth, and thus includes school-based speech-language pathologist evaluation services for children from birth. Head Start is one source of referrals, as young children may also be referred to special education from a variety of sources. Services are provided by educational agencies such as Kent ISD or local school districts. Although location of services may be school-based, there is a preference for providing service in the child’s natural environment such as the home, child care setting, or preschool.

Head Start – Head Start provides services to children from families with income at or below the poverty line, children from families receiving public assistance, and foster children. The Head Start population must include up to 10% of children with disabilities, who have a written IEP.

Every child referred to Head Start in Kent County is required to be screened for speech and language as part of the Head Start screening process. If the screening indicates significant concerns in speech and/or language, a comprehensive evaluation is completed by a Masters level speech-language pathologist with a Certificate of Clinical Competence (CCC), a student in the Speech Pathology program at Western Michigan University, or a Speech Specialist with a B.A. Some of the tests currently used in Head Start include: *Receptive One Word Picture Vocabulary Test (ROWPVT)*, *Expressive One Word Picture Vocabulary Test (EOWPVT)*, *Preschool 2 Clinical Evaluation of Language Fundamentals (CELF)*, and *Preschool Language Scale 4th Edition (PLS-4)*. In the Early Head Start program they use the *Ages and Stages Questionnaire (ASQ)* and *Infant-Toddler Developmental Assessment (IDA)*.

Part 2: Response to MSHA - Language

Early Head Start children from birth to age three who qualify for speech and/or language services are referred to *Early On* and are served under an IFSP, either by *Early On* or a SPL from the resident school district. Children aged three to five in Head Start are screened by a Head Start Speech Specialist. If the speech and/or language concerns are significant or there appears to be other areas of significant concern, children are referred to the local resident school district for further evaluation and/or programming.

Preschool

The preschool section of *MSHA Guidelines* (2006, PL) is fairly consistent with Kent ISD practice. Suggested checklists for teachers and parents are presented in Appendices P and Q. The rest of this section is comprised of a summary of the more important points presented by *MSHA Guidelines*.

This section provides information specific to children in their preschool years, ages 3 through 5 with language as their primary concern or disability. This section should be used in conjunction with the more detailed School Age Language section of this document. Service delivery for preschool-aged children may vary depending on the work setting of the speech-language pathologist and district policies. Service delivery varies depending on whether speech-language pathologists can collaborate with a preschool program or when a student is brought in by the parent for speech and language services. When students are brought in for evaluations, speech-language pathologists may only have a one to two hour period of time to determine intervention needs. Following determination of eligibility, the parent may bring the child for weekly intervention needs. Following determination of eligibility, the child may come in just for intervention or they may be recommended to attend a special education preschool program.

Pre-Referral/Early Intervening/Referral Process – Typically, a parent/caregiver, preschool teacher, daycare provider, or pediatrician is the first person to become concerned about the preschooler's communicative development.

Parent/caregivers will often consult with a speech-language pathologist to decide whether a concern warrants further evaluation. Sometimes parent concerns are the result of a lack of understanding about the variances that occur in typically developing language proficiency. Therefore, an informal interview should be completed to determine if the concerns are typical of language development or if a comprehensive evaluation is warranted. If a formal evaluation is not necessary at the time of concern, speech-language pathologists may provide suggestions to be carried out at home or in the classroom to facilitate the continuation of language development. The team may decide to make a more formal plan for early intervening services. In this case, refer to the Language section for the form and instructions (page L-8).

Initial Eligibility Assessment – A worksheet in Appendix G, the *Preschool Language Eligibility Guide/Team Summary*, outlines the procedures in a formal assessment. The assessment section is organized by this table, as each row in the Summary Guide is a heading in the text. This is followed by an explanation of suggested assessment activities and the sequence in which they may be carried out. The primary goals of the initial assessment are to determine eligibility and to identify an appropriate treatment plan. This means that the speech-language pathologist and team must determine:

- Whether a language impairment exists,
- Whether the language impairment adversely affects educational performance (academic, nonacademic, or extracurricular), and
- How intervention should be designed and implemented in order to help the student to progress in age-appropriate activities and curriculum.

Play-Based Activities to Collect Further Assessment Information – Gathering and forming impressions regarding samples of the preschooler's oral language is another essential component of the evaluation. An oral language sample can provide the speech-language pathologist with information regarding the preschooler's language subsystems, frustration when communicating, and communication when scaffolding is provided. The speech-language pathologist usually plays with the child for 10 to 15 minutes using developmentally appropriate toys.

Observing Language Subsystems and Utilizing Dynamic Assessment Through Play – During a play-based activity, the speech-language pathologist should take notes about all of the language subsystems (such as, phonology, syntax, morphology, semantics, and pragmatics). When evaluating phonology skills, the speech-language pathologist is noting the level of intelligibility as well as phonemes/speech sounds that the child can and cannot produce. In regards to syntax, the speech-language pathologist determines the preschooler's mean length of utterance and complexity of the utterance. Morphological markers are another subsystem of interest. Observation of the child's semantics can provide the speech-language pathologist with the types of words the child is using (such as, nouns, verbs, prepositions). It is just as important to collect information regarding pragmatic language including the ways the child communicates (such as, crying, pointing, intonation) and the functions the attempts serve (to request, protest, greet, name, comment). For some children, the goal is to determine whether the preschooler has intent to communicate. If intent is demonstrated, the speech-language pathologist should question how the preschooler communicates. If intent is not demonstrated, it is important to provide the preschooler with opportunities to protest, request, and name objects during play. The speech-language pathologist should continue to provide support and accommodations to the preschooler to see if communication functioning improves. Often,

Part 2: Response to MSHA - Language

communication improves with scaffolding, when picture symbols are introduced, or when language is made simpler and less complex. During this time, the speech-language pathologist documents if the preschooler's language improved with such interventions or if the preschooler continued to have difficulty. Observing how the preschooler reacts to these scenarios is beneficial when treatment planning.

Evidence of Communicative Frustration – Play-based assessments can also give the speech-language pathologist information regarding the preschooler's frustration level when trying to communicate. This can be a determining factor when qualifying a preschooler of this age for speech and language services.

Observation of Parent-Preschooler Interactions – Many children display more or less language when they are with familiar people such as their parents/caregivers or siblings. Speech-language pathologists can observe these differences when the child is coming to and from the therapy room. They can also be observed by providing 10 to 15 minutes of play between the child and parent. The observation also allows the speech-language pathologist an opportunity to suggest home intervention techniques.

Secondary

Assessment Considerations for Adolescents – Initial identification of an adolescent with a language impairment is rare at the secondary level and often involves a teacher or parent referral (Larson & McKinley, 2003).

1. It is recommended that the referral follow the student study procedures, which applies to all special education referrals. Make sure that appropriate intervention procedures have been tried and documented. The student study team reviews the comprehensive educational history from the cumulative file to explore patterns in the student's education that correspond to the initial concern.
2. During the student study phase, the speech-language pathologist should carefully consider the impact of teacher presentation style and classroom routines in a variety of the student's scheduled classes as they relate to language (Larson & McKinley, 2003). The speech-language pathologist should explore these areas further when gathering information about the student's language problems and determine if the communication breakdown occurs in the student's comprehension of the message or the teacher's presentation of the material. This information may also be useful when recommending classroom accommodations and modifications.
3. Following appropriate screening and observations, accumulated curriculum-based language assessment, dynamic assessment, language samples and portfolio reviews may provide useful information about the student's language abilities.

Part 2: Response to MSHA - Language

4. Standardized testing should be used as part of the initial speech and language assessment to determine receptive or expressive language deficits.

Assessment Considerations for Redetermination – Students who are being reevaluated for SLI eligibility may fall into several categories listed below. The *Evaluation Review and Plan* (ERP) will drive the evaluation requirements.

1. Students who may have shown a consistent speech and language impairment through at least two comprehensive evaluations (or since preschool and early elementary), indicating a pervasive speech and language impairment throughout their educational experience. This group of students may require a review of past MET findings, input from staff and parents, and a careful examination of present level of functioning within the curriculum. Formal standardized testing may not be required to define the eligibility due to consistent patterns over a number of evaluations. If so, a report reflecting previous MET reports, staff input and educational implications is sufficient.
2. Students may have demonstrated increased language skills in their pragmatic, semantic or syntactical skills, either through documented observation or through improvement within the curriculum. This progress may have positively impacted academics indicating a possible reduction of services or elimination of the SLI eligibility. In that instance, it would be advisable to conduct formal standardized testing to assess growth, as well as the other information gathered from involved staff, to help determine eligibility status.
3. Students may have dual labels of eligibility at the secondary level, such as a primary eligibility as learning disabled, autism spectrum disorder, or cognitive impairment, with a secondary eligibility of SLI. At this juncture in special education services, it may be appropriate to assess if the resulting and lingering language difficulties are a residual effect of the primary learning difficulty (learning disability, autism spectrum disorder or cognitive impairment) or if there is a specific speech and language disability. This determination should seriously be considered by the evaluation team, who will then decide if the secondary eligibility of SLI remains appropriate and necessary. Regardless, the duplication of services between the special education teacher and speech-language pathologist should be assessed. If services pertinent to the language deficit are being delivered in the special education classroom, consultation or monitoring by the speech-language pathologist may be considered more appropriate for that student at this stage in his/her education.

Intervention Consideration for Adolescents – As with any student diagnosed with a language impairment, intervention planning should be curriculum-based and goals should emphasize a strategies-based type of intervention rather than instruction of discrete skills. Therefore, it may be more appropriate for the speech-language

Part 2: Response to MSHA - Language

pathologist to collaborate with the teacher on implementing strategies in the classroom everyday, rather than employing direct or duplicate instruction. The speech-language pathologist may monitor the student's use of strategies through the teacher's reporting on classroom instruction and performance.

Service Delivery Considerations for Adolescents – Service delivery models should reflect the type of intervention needed for the student based on the IEP. Wallach and Butler (1994) caution against “importing” traditional elementary pull-out models to the secondary level. Consultation or monitoring are important service delivery options in any secondary setting. It is essential that the speech-language pathologist schedule time for collaborating with other school professionals to discuss language instruction needs and monitoring of student progress, as well as development of materials.

Adolescent language development should be contextually-based so increasing language development is accomplished through the special education classroom learning opportunities. Language is learned in a pragmatic, experiential manner and can be expanded and reinforced throughout the student's program. Consultation with staff concerning student's needs and appropriate language skills may occur periodically or as requested. The choice of monitoring student progress or consulting with the student, including working on defined goals, are viable service delivery options.

Students who are placed in categorical special education classrooms should receive embedded language instruction through their curriculum, and may not require continued direct speech-language pathologist services. Resources and language enrichment lessons can be provided to teaching staff. The more that speech-language pathologist services are integrated into the student's daily routine and academic curriculum, the more effective learning will be. Direct service to adolescent-aged students should be limited to skills that can only be delivered through specialized therapy techniques provided by a speech-language pathologist.

Students in a resource room program are usually provided teacher instruction related to vocabulary. Understanding terms within the curriculum is more directly tied to their educational program. Instruction in this area may include vocabulary reinforcement through study guides or various modalities of learning, test-taking strategies, learning memorization techniques, visualizing and verbalizing information, resources to draw on, and so on. The speech-language pathologist is available in a consultative role if specific problems arise. If there are pragmatic communication issues that are interfering during this stage of adolescence, then a more direct speech and language intervention may be appropriate.

Part 2: Response to MSHA - Language

For students who qualify as SLI only, direct services may be indicated for fluency, voice, or articulation difficulties. The intensity and determination of service will be dependent on the student's need for improvement, level of sustained progress, priority of service within the student's academic requirements, and support of involved evaluation team members, parents, staff, student, and speech-language pathologist.

Dismissal Considerations for Adolescents – Speech-language pathologists may find it helpful to utilize the Kent ISD *Speech and Language Diagnostic Report* (Appendix K) when recommending a change in SLI eligibility or service. Note that this report is not an evaluation report, but the “diagnostic report” pursuant to Michigan rule 340.1745 that requires a diagnostic report for the provision of speech-language service whether or not the student is SLI eligible.

Consideration for Dismissal from Speech

- Completion of all goals on the IEP, no longer a speech or language impairment
- Secondary label of SLI is no longer appropriate with the primary eligibility taking precedence for existing communication differences
- Lack of benefit from services documented by speech-language pathologist
- Dual support is being provided within other services of special education
- ELL, cognitive impairment, autism spectrum disorder factors indicate language/communication meet expectations
- Speech and language abilities no longer interfere with academic and/or vocational functioning

Test Recommendations for Adolescents

- *Clinical Evaluation of Language Fundamentals–4 CELF-4*
- *Test of Adolescent Language–R TOAL*
- *Test of Language Competency TLC*
- *Comprehensive Assessment of Spoken Language CASL*
- *WORD Test–Adolescents*

INFANT-TODDLER SPEECH AND LANGUAGE

Speech-language pathologists using this section should also refer to the language section for general guidance including the definition of speech language impairment (Rule 340.1710) in the Michigan rules and Part C of IDEA. Part C, or *Early On* Michigan, specifically focuses on infants, toddlers and their families. Compliance with Part C of IDEA regulations are unique to speech-language pathologists working with children birth to 36 months of age. These regulations impact not only the evaluation and service delivery for these children, but also the referral and consent process.

There are several basic tenants affecting the speech-language pathologist working with this population:

- Evaluation of children from birth to 36 months of age must include all areas of development, (social-emotional functioning, cognitive skills, motor skills, and speech and language development) and relevant medical information such as hearing and vision status.
- Service delivery must be provided in the child's natural environment, defined as *settings that are natural or normal for the child's age peers who have no disability* (IDEA, 1997).
- Provisions must be made for year-round services.
- Parents and caregivers are defined as the primary "client" because they have the most naturally occurring opportunities to interact with the child throughout the day.
- After the initial evaluation process, a speech-language pathologist may or may not be the primary worker or service coordinator for the child and family since a "transdisciplinary" model is used in Kent ISD. In this model, various types of special education service providers work across all areas of early development. The Individual Family Service Plan (IFSP)/Individualized Education Program (IEP) process will determine the goals and outcomes for the child and family. The child's goals and outcomes will help determine the services to be provided.

Determining if a Formal Assessment is Needed – It is important to distinguish between a formal request for evaluation versus a parent or agency inquiry. Often, a parent or caregiver is simply looking for information about typical child development, community resources, or the referral process. The speech-language pathologist, or intake staff, may provide this information without beginning a formal evaluation. However, when a parent requests an evaluation for a suspected delay, Part C of federal special education rules require that an evaluation be completed.

Part 2: Response to MSHA – Infant & Toddler

The caregiver interview is often the first step in determining if a formal assessment by a speech-language pathologist is needed. Thorough knowledge of child development is required of the interviewer to discuss if a child is displaying typical developmental patterns and is expected to continue to develop appropriately within the context of the child's current environment. If the child's speech and language delay appears to be significant enough to require a special education evaluation, a speech-language pathologist should be included in the evaluation team.

Assessment Considerations – Often, communication concerns are recognized before other co-occurring impairments. Therefore, the speech-language pathologist may be the first professional to identify additional areas of concern regarding development.

The *Infant Toddler Eligibility Guide/Team Summary* worksheet (Appendix G) provides suggestions for how each part of the evaluation should be carried out. The purpose of this form is to provide a framework for organizing eligibility components.

Gather Input – Formal written consent to evaluate as well as an explanation of the referral process is required before the evaluation begins. A language assessment should begin with a comprehensive interview with parents/caregivers to explore concerns, gather familial history of communication disorders, and obtain the child's medical and developmental history. Particular attention needs to be paid to how the infant/toddler uses language within the context of his or her everyday routines.

Hearing screening is required as part of a birth to 3 evaluation, however, certain types of hearing loss may be missed through the screening process. A formal audiological evaluation may be required. The following are red flags for hearing loss (Appendix R: *Early On Hearing Development Screening Checklist*):

- Family history of hearing loss
- Lack of responsiveness to sounds/voices
- Limited babbling/vocal play
- Lack of calming by sound alone
- Delayed speech/language development
- Language development with poor articulation
- Developmental delays
- Parent/caregiver concerns

Part 2: Response to MSHA – Infant & Toddler

Observation of Parent-Child Interactive Play – As with all language evaluations, observe the child’s interaction skills in a naturalistic environment during play with the parent or caregiver and/or sibling. Observations of play between comfortable communicative partners can provide a speech-language pathologist with valuable information. This information will be important to compare to results on standardized instruments. For example, did the child use more or less words, make more or fewer communicative attempts, show increased or decreased eye contact, demonstrate increased or decreased direction following structured versus unstructured assessment situations? In addition, this observation can meet the requirement of Part C of IDEA for parent/child interaction to be observed and documented in the evaluation report.

Communication Information Gathered During Play-Based Evaluation – Throughout the play-based evaluation, the speech-language pathologist should provide support and accommodations with the infant/toddler to determine if communication functioning improves. Communication can improve when scaffolding, modeling, picture symbols, gestures or signs are introduced. During this time, the speech-language pathologist should document if the infant/toddler’s language improved with such interventions or if he/she continued to have difficulty.

Prelinguistic Communication and Pragmatics – During play activities and daily routines, it is vital to collect information regarding the way the child communicates (such as crying, pointing, intonation) and the functions that it serves (such as, requesting, protesting, greeting, naming, commenting). When evaluating infants and toddlers who are not yet at the word level, it is important to consider prelinguistic features of communication. Children begin communicating from birth through pre-intentional communication acts (crying, eye gaze, sounds). Children then begin using those communication acts in an intentional way before a formal language system develops. An important milestone for this age group is the child’s ability to establish joint attention with others by sharing attention and affective states with both eye gaze and facial expression. It is important to provide the child with opportunities to protest, request, and name objects while considering how the child’s communication skills differ across environments and individuals (such as parents/caregivers, extended family, or others).

Vocabulary (Semantics) – The child’s vocabulary should be assessed to determine if it is appropriate for the child’s age. Receptive and expressive vocabulary can be assessed through standardized testing, parent interview, checklists and/or within a dynamic context. Examples of observations for receptive vocabulary may include: Does the child turn to his name, point to pictures in storybooks, or follow directions during daily routines or play activities? Examples of expressive vocabulary observations include: Does the child use different types of words (nouns, verbs, description words) during daily routines and play activities? Does the child use his/her vocabulary appropriately?

Part 2: Response to MSHA – Infant & Toddler

Form (Syntax) – Mean length of utterance (MLU) should be assessed to determine if it is appropriate for the child's age. The speech-language pathologist should also assess how well the infant/toddler understands when others talk.

Intelligibility (Articulation/Phonology) – When assessing the intelligibility of an infant/toddler, it is important to determine whether the child is understood by familiar listeners, in context, and if a referent is needed or not. If the infant/toddler is understood, it should be noted if contextual cues were needed. If an infant/toddler is described and/or is evidenced as being “frequently unintelligible” by a familiar listener, it would be beneficial to determine the percentage of intelligibility. If intelligibility is a concern, refer to the Articulation section for guidelines in this area (Appendix S: Early Childhood Developmental Milestones). If the child does not use words to communicate, an inventory of sounds (consonant and vowels) and syllable types used should be collected.

Motor Speech – During the evaluation process, oral motor structure and function should be assessed. An oral motor evaluation with young children may include observations of motor planning skills, mouth posture during play and rest, drooling, dentition, eating and swallowing skills, and articulator movements.

Language Sample

Test Profile – Standardized assessment is required when evaluating any child's speech and language skills. Information from comprehensive assessment tools can help determine language function compared to age-matched peers when using the author's guidelines for interpretation of test scores. It is also important to look for variations within the infant/toddler's language profile that may suggest deficits within a language subsystem which should be explored further. A list of commonly used tests standardized for the infant/toddler population is found at the end of this section.

Consideration of Cultural/Linguistic Differences – When an infant/toddler's native language is not English, it is important to consider that the language or cultural differences may be impacting his/her language development. Non-English speaking children at this age often are not exposed to more than one language and the evaluation should take this into account by attempting to administer the test in the child's native language. Refer to the English Language Learners section for guidelines in this area and Bilingual/Non-English Speaking Families Parent Interview for assistance with determining appropriate language for evaluation.

When internationally adopted infants and toddlers are evaluated for possible speech-language impairment, it is important to consider development specific to this population. Many variables need to be considered including the child's environment in their native country (placement in orphanage, home care, or other setting), amount of time spent in this country, age at adoption, and social-emotional factors related to a major life change for this child.

Summary of Adverse Educational Effect – A culmination of information gathered from all the above sources should be used to assist in the final determination of whether the infant/toddler’s language delay has an adverse effect on educational performance. At this age level, adverse effect can be defined as the impact the delay has on participation in developmental activities, daily routines, and family life. When considering eligibility for speech-language services in the infant/toddler population, consider the following:

1. Results of standardized assessments demonstrating language skills below the level expected for the infant/toddler’s age.
2. Child is unable or ineffective in their abilities to express wants and needs or exchange information effectively.
3. Child is unable or ineffective in demonstrating understanding of spoken language.

Considerations for Ineligible Children – At the conclusion of the evaluation process, children may be determined to not meet the guidelines for SLI but still display delays in their speech and language skills. The *Early On* team at Kent ISD provides service for children under three who do not qualify for special education but do have a documented developmental delay or established condition. These children do not need to be reevaluated. With parent consent, the multidisciplinary evaluation (MET) report, along with the IFSP/IEP paperwork can be forwarded to the Kent ISD *Early On* team for service provision. If parents remain concerned, and no delay exists, referrals to community developmental support services should be made.

Intervention – Once a child has qualified for language intervention, services can be provided in a variety of ways. Thought must be given to service delivery within the child’s natural environment, which usually is the home. Service delivery models may include direct services on an individual and/or small group basis, service coordination, and/or consultative services including a variety of possibilities, such as providing coaching to the parent/caregivers.

Intervention is based on a family-driven “coaching” model in which parents are empowered to provide intervention strategies within the context of their daily routines. By fostering a partnership between family and professionals, child outcomes are improved (Jung, 2003).

Dismissal Criteria – An infant/toddler should be dismissed from speech-language pathologist services once he/she has acquired speech and language skills within an age-appropriate range. Assessments, observations, and parent/caregiver input should all be gathered before dismissal of services is rendered. Dismissal may be considered if:

1. Results of language assessment indicate age-appropriate receptive, expressive, and pragmatic language skills;

Part 2: Response to MSHA – Infant & Toddler

2. Phonological sound development is within an age-appropriate range; and
3. Child outcomes have been met.

Commonly Used Standardized Assessments for the Infant/Toddler Population

Global Language Instruments:

Preschool Language Scale 4th Edition (PLS-4)

Preschool Language Scale Spanish – 4th Edition

Receptive Expressive Emergent Language Test 3rd Edition (REEL-3)

Expressive Language Instruments:

Expressive One Word Picture Vocabulary Test (EOWPT)

Receptive Language Instruments:

Peabody Picture Vocabulary Test (PPVT-4)

Articulation Instruments:

Goldman-Fristoe Test of Articulation (GFTA-2)

Clinical Assessment of Articulation and Phonology (normed ages 2-6 to 8-11)

Other Assessment Tools Helpful in Evaluation of Infant/Toddlers

Carolina Curriculum

Communication & Symbolic Behavior Scales

Communication & Symbolic Behavior Scale Checklist

Clinical Evaluation of Language Fundamentals – Preschool (CELF-P) Pragmatic Checklist

ENGLISH LANGUAGE LEARNERS

English Language Learners (ELL) is the term used in this document to refer to students who need special considerations due to cultural and/or linguistic differences. ELL is also the term adopted by the State of Michigan for use in reference to all students who are limited English proficient (LEP). *MSHA Guidelines* (2006) refer to these students as “culturally and linguistically diverse populations” and include this information in three sections: CLD-I, CLD-L, and CLD-A.

English language learners do not qualify for special education simply because of their limited English language or articulation. As a matter of fact Federal law §300.306 (IDEA, 2004) and Michigan Rule 340.534 (MDE, 2006) specifically state that the student’s communication difficulties must not be due to limited English proficiency.

ELL students are entitled to considerations under other federal and state requirements (34 CFR Part 100). If a district has enough ELL students to warrant having its own ELL coordinator, he/she would be the first person to consult for information and assistance. Kent ISD provides support to local districts via the services of an ELL coordinator and website (kentisd.org) under ELL. *Casey’s Crash Course on Compliance* for ELL on the Kent ISD website is a useful guide for local districts including information on the English Language Proficiency Assessment (ELPA), MEAP and other test accommodations.

Anyone working with the ELL population should be familiar with the typical natural second language acquisition process. Acquisition of a second language can look like a SLI, but in fact is not. Typical stages include:

1. **Silent Period** – The student is focusing on comprehension of English. Lasting up to a year after initial exposure, this period is marked by responses to English which are non-verbal or limited to one or two words. Progress can be interrupted or slowed down if the student is required to perform too early in the acquisition process.
2. **Language Loss** – First language skills diminish from lack of use. This often occurs when students spend more time in all English-speaking classrooms. This is a transition period and can look like a SLI.
3. **Reduced Exposure** – Poor performance in either language may result from limited exposure to a rich vocabulary. This may result from someone else speaking for the student, poor attendance, or other factors. Underlying conceptual development may be underdeveloped due to reduced learning opportunities.
4. **Code-switching** – The student changes from one language to another in the same sentence or paragraph.
5. **Inter-language** – A temporary language system which fluctuates as the student tests hypotheses about language and modifies rules as a result of these trials. The student is integrating aspects of both languages.

Part 2: Response to MSHA – English Language Learners

6. **Interference** – As the student becomes more fluent in English, aspects of the first language such as syntax may occur when using English.
7. **Fossilization** – The student achieves good fluency in English, but continues to make certain specific mistakes in structure or vocabulary (such as endings left off or pronoun confusion).

Keep in mind the typical natural second language acquisition process when looking for indicators of a noncultural or language based disability. Differences in sentence structure, speech sound production, vocabulary, and the pragmatic uses of language are to be expected when learning a new language. A student may have difficulty learning because of a lack of exposure to English language or because of cultural experiences that are not commensurate with the school's expectations.

Two levels of language proficiency are identified by Cummins (1992). The first is basic interpersonal communication skills (BICS) which refers to language learned and used when there are clues to aid in comprehension. The second level is cognitive academic language proficiency (CALP) which refers to language used in academic learning with few clues and generally involve abstract concepts. A student needs both BICS and CALP to be successful academically.

Possible indicators of a noncultural or language based disability in students who are ELL include (Kayser, 1998; MSHA, 2006; Roseberry-McKibbin, 2002):

- Short mean length of utterance (MLU)
- Difficulties affecting grammar and sentence structure
- Difficulty in learning language at a normal rate, even with special assistance in both languages
- Slow academic achievement despite adequate academic English proficiency
- Communication difficulties at home
- Communication difficulties when interacting with peers from a similar background
- Inappropriate responses when peers initiate interaction
- Difficulty being understood by peers
- Overall communication skills which are substantially poorer than those of peers
- Frequent inappropriate responses
- Failure to express basic needs adequately
- Communication that is disorganized, incoherent, and leaves the listener confused
- Speech and/or language difficulties generally evident in **both** English and the primary language

Part 2: Response to MSHA – English Language Learners

- See *MSHA Guidelines* pages CLC-L11 to L12 for a list of phonological and language features in dialects and languages in the United States.

Preventative, research-based early intervention is essential in working with ELL students. Scaffolding support for instruction and a dynamic assessment approach (test-teach-retest) works very well. ELL students benefit more from this process than many other students and the information gained is an essential part of determining if the student is speech or language impaired. The student's rate of learning over time under ideal conditions (research-based interventions) is invaluable in separating cultural or linguistic differences from a special education speech or language impairment. When the speech-language pathologist works under the workload versus caseload approach (outlined earlier in this document) he/she could be very helpful with the early intervention team's efforts.

School districts have different resources and personnel of varying skill levels to work with English language learners. Kent ISD staff and website, as well as print and web-based resources are available.

Kent ISD staff:

- Collaborate with area schools and local service agencies to coordinate ELL services,
- Develop and provide professional development resources such as workshops, newsletters, website, and instructional materials,
- Identify and promote effective practices for assessment, data collection, and analysis of ELL student learning,
- Research and share the latest scientifically-based effective instructional practices for ELL students, and
- Develop partnerships with local colleges and universities to assist schools in translation and interpretation with non-English speaking families.

Print resources include:

- *Assessment and Intervention Resource for Hispanic Children* (Kayser, H., 1998). Although written with a Hispanic focus, much of this applies to students with other cultural and linguistic differences.
- *Cultural and Linguistic Diversity Resource Guide for Speech-Language Pathologists* (Goldstein, B., 2002). A practical and easy to use book that "...bridges the gap between existing research and the use of that information in ...practice..." (p. xii).
- *Differentiated Literacy Instruction for English Language Learners* (Quiocho, A. L. & Ulanoff, S. H., 2009). Focuses on initial assessment and interventions for literacy instruction in English language development; also contains information on assisting ELL students who have been qualified for special education services.

Part 2: Response to MSHA – English Language Learners

- *Multicultural Students with Special Language Needs-Second Edition* (Rosberry-McKibben, 2002). An excellent resource for intervention and assessment strategies for working with students who come from a wide range of diverse cultural and linguistic backgrounds.
- *Special Education Considerations for English Language Learners: Delivering a Continuum of Services* (Hamayan, E., Marler, B., Sanchez-Lopez, C., & Damico, J., 2007). Discusses interventions to be utilized before, during, and after special education qualification as well as continuing integration of English language development .
- *Teaching English Language Learners: A Differentiated Approach* (Rothenberg & Fisher, 2007). Contains very specific strategies and activities for the practitioner.


Web-based resources as of January 2008 include:

- Colorin Colorado (www.colorincolorado.com) has Latino focus but also offers literacy and school tip sheets for parents in several languages.
- Kent ISD (www.kentisd.org) is a good first source for ELL information.
- Kent District Library (www.kdl.org). Resources are available in the *Play, Grow and Learn* area including developmental activities for early literacy and reading tips in eight languages.
- National Clearinghouse for English Language Acquisition and Language Instruction Educational Programs (www.ncele.gwu.edu). NCELA "...collects, analyzes, synthesizes and disseminates information about language instruction educational programs for English language learners and related programs." It is funded by the U.S. Department of Education under Title III of the No Child Left Behind (NCLB) Act of 2001.

The flowchart presented in Figure 3 is based on Garcia & Ortiz (1988) *Preventing Inappropriate Referrals of Language Minority Students to Special Education* which provides an overview of the process which should be followed prior to considering a special education referral. This model is designed to provide insights for classroom teachers and team members regarding potential sources of student difficulties "...by raising a series of questions which must be addressed before a referral to special education is initiated." (Garcia & Ortiz, 1988, p. 2) The original article gives a very detailed explanation of each step and should be consulted for complete information. If the eight-step series of questions, answers and recommendations are followed, it should be easier to make a determination if a student's academic difficulties are the result of cultural or linguistic differences or might be related to a special education handicapping condition.

Part 2: Response to MSHA – English Language Learners

Figure 3–Preventing Inappropriate Placements of Language Minority Students in Special Education
(Garcia and Ortiz, 1988)



Part 2: Response to MSHA – English Language Learners

These strategies as well as those contained in the resources previously mentioned should be helpful in determining if the observed difficulties are the result of cultural or linguistic differences.

Evaluating ELL students for special education as speech-language impaired or under any other category is complex. The goal of an evaluation is to determine if a student is SLI after any cultural or linguistic differences have been factored out.

After following the above procedures, if it is determined that a special education evaluation is appropriate, the same requirements under IDEA §300.304 for any other evaluation apply. However, special considerations need to be given to:

1. The cultural competence of the speech-language pathologist (MSHA, 2006, p CLD-I-1) and others working with the student
2. The use of interpreters throughout the process (MSHA, 2006, pp. CLD-I-2 & 3)
3. A comparison of any tests used with the *Standards for Educational and Psychological Testing* (AERA, APA, NCME, 1999) Chapter 9 “Testing Individuals of Diverse Linguistic Backgrounds”. These standards include:
 - The student’s language proficiency in both English and primary language
 - Validity and reliability of the test for this specific individual
 - Use of interpreters (pp. 95-96)
4. *MSHA Guidelines* (2006) emphasize when using “...an English standardized assessment tool with an interpreter or any other adaptations of the procedures, then the standardized score(s) cannot be used to make eligibility decisions.” (p. CLD-I-3).
5. Any test used for determining eligibility should also be evaluated for use according to the prior Critical Issues section on the use of standardized tests.
6. At this time there are probably no “good” tests for determining eligibility for this population.
7. Additional requirements for an evaluation §300.304 (IDEA, 2004) take on a vital role in determining special education eligibility. More time and importance needs to be given to areas such as parent input, observations, review of existing data, results of research-based interventions, and other related data.

It is recommended that the “Culturally and Linguistically Diverse Guide/Team Summary” (Appendix I) from the *Guidelines* 2006 be used by the team. Obtaining parent information for this population necessitates establishing a rapport and ongoing working relationship over time. The question of how this child performs relative to other children in the family should be asked and the information utilized by the evaluator. Although this is not legally required, best practice in Kent ISD has shown that the student is a valuable source of information and his/her input should be solicited and utilized in the evaluation process. An informed clinical opinion as discussed in the

Part 2: Response to MSHA – English Language Learners

Evaluation section of this document necessitates that any and all relevant information be considered in making a special education eligibility determination.

In summary, English language learners are a difficult and complex population with whom to work and to evaluate for special education. The questions and eight-step process outlined in Figure 3 can aid the student in learning and help separate cultural and linguistic differences from a speech-language impairment. Early intervention using research-based strategies should be utilized both prior to consideration for a special education referral and during the evaluation. The information obtained during early intervention can form a solid basis for a special education evaluation.

ASSISTIVE TECHNOLOGY

It is the mission of the Kent ISD Assistive Technology program to expand the knowledge and use of assistive technology (AT) within the local districts so all students can learn in a manner which best meets their needs and abilities.

AT Legislation:

The term “assistive technology device” means any item, piece of equipment, or product system, whether acquired commercially off the shelf, modified, or customized, that is used to increase, maintain or improve functional capabilities of children with disabilities. (IDEA, §300.5) The term “assistive technology service” represents any service that directly assists a child with a disability in the selection, acquisition, or use of an assistive technology device (IDEA, §300.6)

Who We Are:

The Kent ISD Assistive Technology Coordinator collaborates with representatives from all local area districts, including all public, charter and non-public schools, on assistive technology issues in compliance with the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA) regulations. Emphasis is placed on building district capacity and local staff skills to address student’s assistive technology needs at a local level.

Resources Available:

- AT Equipment – A lending library is available to schools within Kent ISD for trial of devices and software with students.
- Consultation – Assistance with the process of determining the AT needs of students, both individually and within programs is provided.
- Training – In-services and workshops are provided by the AT Coordinator, committee members and others.
- Information – Books, videos, catalogs, websites, phone and email consultations are available upon request in all areas of AT.

What Can You Do:

- Find out who is the assistive technology contact person in your district, program or building.
- Explore available devices, software and resources within your own district, including no-tech, low-tech and high-tech.

Part 2: Response to MSHA – Assistive Technology

- Utilize Kent ISD Assistive Technology resources to learn more about AT/communication and it's role in student performance.
- Begin to address the AT/communication needs of your students.

Where to Go For More Information:

Assistive Technology Coordinator at Kent ISD: 616-365-2244

www.kentisd.org – click on the Assistive Technology link

GLOSSARY

Apraxia – Impaired ability to generate the motor programming for speech movements. It is a planning/programming problem resulting from a central nervous system lesion.

Articulation – A speech disorder that affects the phonetic level; difficulty saying particular consonant and vowel sounds.

Assessment – The orderly process of gathering, analyzing, interpreting, and reporting student performance from multiple sources over a period of time.

Auditory Processing – Auditory processing is a term used to describe recognition and interpretation of sounds. Hearing occurs when sound travels through the ear and is changed into electrical information that can be interpreted by the brain. An auditory processing disorder means that something is adversely affecting the processing or interpretation of auditory information.

Basic Interpersonal Communication Skills (BICS) – Face-to-face conversational fluency, including mastery of pronunciation, vocabulary, and grammar.

Blocks – Inappropriate cessation of sound and air, often associated with freezing of the movement of the tongue, lips and/or vocal folds. Blocks often develop later, and can be associated with muscle tension and effort.

Cluster Reduction – The deletion through the lips or tongue; tight closure in the larynx (voice box); forceful repetitions or prolongation of sounds, usually at the beginning of words; difficulty in making voiced sounds (phonation); and/or silent blocks, in which no sound comes out at all on one or more consonants from a two or three consonant cluster.

Cluttering – A disorder of speech and language processing resulting in rapid, dysrhythmic, sporadic, unorganized, and frequently unintelligible speech. Accelerated speech is not always present, but cluttering is frequently accompanied by an impairment in formulating language.

Cognitive/Academic Language Proficiency (CALP) – Language proficiency associated with schooling, and the abstract language abilities required for academic work.

Code-switching – Moving from one language to another, inside a sentence or across sentences.

Culture – The customs, lifestyle, traditions, behavior, attitudes, and artifacts of a given people.

Diadochokinetic – Refers to the rapid production of alternating sounds. Diadochokinetic rate (DDK) refers to an assessment tool, that measures how quickly an individual can accurately produce a series of rapid, alternating sounds (tokens); may be one syllable such as "puh," two or three syllables such as "puh-tuh" or "puh-tuh-kuh," or familiar words such as "pattycake" or "buttercup." Other names for DDK rate include maximum repetition rate.

Glossary

Dialect – The form of a language peculiar to a specific region; features a variation in vocabulary, grammar, and pronunciation.

Diplophonia – the production by the voice of two separate tones through abnormal variations in the vocal fold vibration.

Disfluency – (stuttering) is an abnormally high frequency or duration of stoppages in the forward flow of speech.
See **Blocking**.

Dysarthria – Speech disorders that result from the disruption of muscular control due to lesions of either the central or peripheral nervous systems. It is classified as a neuromotor disorder.

Early Childhood Developmental Delay (ECDD) – A primary delay in a child through 7 years of age that cannot be differentiated through existing criteria for any other impairment, manifested by a delay in 1 or more areas of development equal to or greater than half of the expected development.

English Language Learner (ELL) – Children and adults who are learning English as a second or additional language; applies to learners across various levels of proficiency in English.

Evaluation – Judgments about students' learning made by interpretation and analysis of assessment data.

Expressive Language – For Speech-Language, the production of language to convey meaning to others. See **Receptive Language**.

Final Consonant Deletion – The deletion of the final consonant or consonant cluster in a syllable or word.

Fluency Disorder – An interruption in the flow of speaking characterized by atypical rate, rhythm, and repetitions in sounds, syllable words, and phrases. This may be accompanied by excessive tension, struggles with behavior, and secondary mannerisms.

Fronting – The substitution of sounds in the front of the mouth.

Hypernasality – Too much resonance in the nasal cavity.

Hyponasality – Too little resonance in the nasal cavity which may sound similar to the speech of someone experiencing a head cold.

Limited English Proficient (LEP) – Refers to students with restricted understanding or use of written and spoken English.

Mean Length of Utterances (MLU) – Calculated by collecting 100 utterances spoken by a child and dividing the number of morphemes by the number of utterances. A higher MLU is taken to indicate a higher level of language proficiency.

Measurement Error – The difference between an observed score and the corresponding true score.

Morphology – The study of morphemes, which is the smallest linguistic unit that has semantic meaning. In spoken language, morphemes are composed of phonemes, the smallest linguistically distinctive units of sound. See **Phonology**.

Glossary

Multilingualism – The ability to speak more than two languages; proficiency in more than two languages.

Native Language – An individual's first, primary, or home language.

Non-English Speaking (NES) – Individuals who are in an English-speaking environment but who have not acquired any English proficiency.

Normative Sample – A selection of a specified number of test takers from a larger population on which statistical data that summarize the test performance are determined.

Oral-motor – Refers to physical functioning and coordination related to the physiological production of speech.

Phonemic Awareness – The ability to hear and manipulate the sounds in words.

Phonetics – Organizing speech sounds into patterns of sound contrasts to create words.

Phonology – The study of phonemes, the smallest linguistically distinctive units of sound. See **Morphology**.

Prevocalic Voicing – The voicing of an initial voiceless consonant in a word.

Prelinguistics – The developmental stage of natural expression in newborn to young children that includes crying, cooing, babbling, and intonation; prior to intentional use of phonemes for initial word formation.

Pragmatics – The area of language function as it is used in social contexts.

Receptive Language – For Speech-Language, the discrimination, interpretation, and comprehension of meaning from received sounds produced by sources external to the listener. See **Expressive Language**.

Resonance Disorder – Disorders of speech sound quality, often characterized by physiological anomalies, such as hyper/hyponasality, nasal air escape, or malformed/malfunctioning functioning palate. Distinguished from **Voice disorders** caused by the actual production of speech in the larynx.

Scaffolding – Building on a person's existing repertoire of knowledge and understanding. Adult support for learning and student performance of the tasks through instruction, modeling, questioning, feedback, graphic organizers, or other techniques across successive meetings. These supports are gradually withdrawn.

Semantics – The aspect of language function that relates to understanding the meanings of words, phrases and sentences.

Standard Deviation (SD) – In statistics, a measure of how data points in a set (presumed to be distributed in a bell curve) are distributed around the mean. A low standard deviation means that the data are tightly clustered around the mean; a high standard deviation means scores are more scattered. Many tests use a scoring scale with mean of 100 and standard deviation of 15, meaning that about 68% of all scores across a broad sample will fall within +1 or -1 standard deviations (a score of 85 to 115).

Stopping – The substitution of a stop consonant for a fricative or affricate.

Stuttering – (Disfluency) is an abnormally high frequency or duration of stoppages in the forward flow of speech.

Subtractive Bilingualism – The learning of a new language at the expense of the primary language.

Syllable Reduction – The deletion of a syllable from a word containing two or more syllables.

Glossary

Syntax – The structural sequence of language.

Transdisciplinary Approach – Professionals from different disciplines work together, with one of them serving as the primary contact with the family. The primary contact uses strategies that the other team members provide; the other team members have direct contact with the child and family only as necessary.

Reliability – The degree to which test scores for a group of test takers are consistent over repeated applications of a measurement procedure; the degree to which scores are free of errors of measurement for a given group.

Specificity – The degree to which a test accurately identifies speech-language impaired as speech-language impaired.

Sensitivity – The degree to which a test accurately identifies non-speech-language impaired as non-speech-language impaired.

Validity – The degree to which a test measures what it purports to measure; evidence that inferences from the evaluation are trustworthy.

Vocal Nodules – Added layers of tissue on the vibrating edge of the vocal folds that vary in size from pinpoint to the size of a peppercorn. They develop as the body attempts to protect itself against abuse and overuse of the voice.

Voice Disorder – Disorders caused by dysfunction of the larynx in the actual production of speech. Distinguished from sound quality Resonance disorders caused by other structural/functional issues.

REFERENCES

- Ainsworth, S. & Fraser, J. (2006). *If your child stutters: A guide for parents* (7th ed.). Memphis, TN: Stuttering Foundation of America.
- American Educational Research Association, American Psychological Association (1999) *Standards for educational and psychological tests*. National Council on Measurement in Education, Joint Committee on Standards for Educational and Psychological Testing. Washington, D.C.: American Educational Research Association.
- American Speech-Language Hearing Association (ASHA) (2003). *IDEA and your caseload: A template for eligibility and dismissal criteria for students ages 3 to 21*. Rockville, MD: Author.
- American Speech-Language Hearing Association (2002). *A workload analysis for establishing speech-language caseload in the schools: Guidelines*. Rockville, MD: ASHA. Available at: www.asha.org/members/slp/schools/resources/schools_resources_caseload.htm
- American Speech-Language Hearing Association (2001). *Roles and responsibilities of speech-language pathologists with respects to reading and writing in children and adolescents*. American Speech-Language Hearing Association Committee on Reading and Writing. Rockville, MD: Author.
- American Speech-Language-Hearing Association (1993). Definitions of communication disorders and variations. *ASHA*, 35 (Suppl. 10). 40-41.
- American Speech-Language Hearing Association Committee on Reading and Writing. Rockville, MD: Author.
- American Speech-Language Hearing Association. (1995). (*Central*) *Auditory processing disorders technical report*. Rockville, MD: Author. Available at www.asha.org
- Assistance to states for the education of children with disabilities and preschool grants for children with disabilities: Final rule*. 70 Fed. Reg. 46540 (2006) (codified at 34 C.F.R. § 300 and 301)
- Auxiliary services for nonpublic school children*. (2008). Michigan Administrative Code, §340.291-295.
- Cummins, J. (1992). The role of primary language development in promoting educational success for language minority students. In C. Leyba (Ed.), *Schooling and Language Minority Students: a Theoretical Framework*. Los Angeles: California State University.
- Diedrich, W.M. (1980). *Articulation learning*. Boston: College-Hill Press.
- Disney, S., Plant, E., Whitmire, K. & Spinelle, E. (2003). *Educationally relevant assessments*. Rockville, MD: American Speech-Language-Hearing Association.
- Echevarria, J., Vogt, M., & Short, D.J. (2004). *Making content comprehensible for English learners: The SIOP model* (2nd ed). Boston: Pearson.
- Ehren, B., Montgomery, J., Rudebusch, J., & Whitmire, K. (2006) *Responsiveness to intervention: New roles for speech-language pathologists*. Available at: www.asha.org/members/slp/schools/prof-consult/NewRolesSLP.htm

References

- Ehren, B.J. (2007) Responsiveness to intervention: An opportunity to reinvent speech-language services in schools. *The ASHA Leader*, 12 (13), 10-12, 25.
- Ehren, B. (May, 2007). Powerpoint Presentation. Calvin College, Grand Rapids, MI.
- Garcia, S.B. and Oritz, A.A. (1988). *Preventing inappropriate referrals of language minority students to special education*. Available at: <http://www.ncela.gwu.edu>
- Goldstein, B. (2000). *Cultural and linguistic diversity resource guide for speech-language pathologists*. San Diego, CA: Singular Publishing Group.
- Hayaman, E., Marler, B., Sanchez-Lopez, C., Damico, J. (2007). *Special Education Considerations for English Language Learners: Delivering a Continuum of Services*. Philadelphia: Caslon.
- Hutchinson, T.A. (1996). What to look for in the technical manual: Twenty questions for users. *Language, Speech, and Hearing Services in Schools*, 27, 109-121.
- Jung, L. A. (2003). More is better: Maximizing natural learning opportunities. *Young Exceptional Children*, 6(3), 21-27.
- Individuals with Disabilities Education Act of 2004*, 20 U.S.C. §1400 et seq. (2004).
- Kansas State Department of Education, Student Support Services. (2005). *Speech-language guidelines for schools: With a focus on research-based practice*. Topeka, KS: Author.
- Kayser, H. (1998). *Assessment and intervention resource for Hispanic children*. San Diego: Singular Publishing Group.
- Kent Intermediate School District (2007). *Speech and Language Impairment eligibility recommendation form*. Grand Rapids, MI: Author.
- Kent Intermediate School District (2005). *Autism Spectrum Disorder evaluation and eligibility guidelines*. Grand Rapids, MI: Author.
- Kent Intermediate School District (2003). *Guidelines for determining Emotional Impairment*. Grand Rapids, MI: Author.
- Kent Intermediate School District (1999). *Learning Disability evaluation guidelines*. Grand Rapids, MI: Kent ISD
- Larson, V. L. & McKinley, N. L. (2003). *Communication solutions for older students: Assessment and intervention strategies 9 to 19 years*. Eau Claire, WI: Thinking Publications.
- Michigan Association of Administrators of Special Education (MAASE) (2007). *Response to intervention: Enhancing the learning of all children*. Lansing, MI: Author.
- Michigan Revised Administrative Rules for Special Education*. (2006). Michigan Administrative Code, §340.1700 et seq.
- Michigan Speech-Language Hearing Association. (2006). *Michigan speech-language guidelines: Suggestions for eligibility, service delivery, and exit criteria revised*. Lansing, MI: Author.

References

- Michigan Speech-Language Hearing Association. (1990). *Michigan speech-language guidelines: Suggestions for eligibility, service delivery, and exit criteria revised*. Lansing, MI: Author.
- Moore-Brown, B.J. & Montgomery, J.K. (2001). *Making a difference for America's children: Speech-language pathologists in public schools*. Eau Claire, WI: Thinking Publications.
- No Child Left Behind Act of 2001*. 20 U.S.C., §6311 *et seq.* (2002).
- Oller, D.K. (1980) *The emergence of sounds of speech in infancy*. In G. Yenit-Kamishian, J. Kavanaugh, & C.A. Ferguson (Eds.). *Child Phonology* (Vol.1: Production). New York: Academic Press.
- Quiocho, A. L., & Ulanoff, S. H. (2009). *Differentiated Literacy Instruction for English Language Learners*. Boston: Allyn & Bacon.
- Richard, G.J. (2001). *The source for processing disorders*. East Moline, IL: LinguiSystems.
- Roseberry-McKibbin, C. (2002). *Multicultural students with special language needs: Practical strategies for assessment and Intervention* (2nd ed.). Oceanside, CA: Academic Communication Associates, Inc.
- Rothenberg, C., Fisher, D. (2007). *Teaching English language learners: A differentiated approach*. Upper Saddle River, NJ: Pearson/Merrill/Prentice Hall.
- Schackelford, J. (2002). *Informed clinical opinion*. (NECTAC Notes No. 10). Chapel Hill, NC: The University of North Carolina.
- Smit, A.B, Hand, L., Freilinger, J., Bernthal, J.B. & Bird, A. (1990). The Iowa articulation norms project and its Nebraska replication. *Journal of Speech and Hearing Disorders*, 55, 779-798.
- Spaulding, T. J., Plante, E., Farinella, & K. A. (2006). Eligibility criteria for language impairment: Is the low end of normal always appropriate? *Language, Speech, and Hearing Services in Schools*, 37, 61-72.
- Staskowski, M. (2007). Powerpoint Presentations. Calhoun Intermediate School District and Ionia Intermediate School District, MI.
- Stoel-Gammon, C. (1987). Phonology skills of 2-year-olds. *Language, Speech, and Hearing Services on Schools*, 18, 323-329.
- Virginia Department of Education. (2006) *Speech language pathology services in schools: Guidelines for best practice*. Available at: www.doe.virginia.gov
- Yairi, E. & Ambrose, N. (2005). *Early childhood stuttering: For clinicians by clinicians*. Austin, TX: Pro-Ed.

**APPENDIX A – MICHIGAN REVISED ADMINISTRATIVE RULES FOR
SPECIAL EDUCATION RELATED TO SPEECH-LANGUAGE**

R 340.1710 Speech and language impairment defined; determination.

Rule 10. (1) A “speech and language impairment” means a communication disorder that adversely affects educational performance, such as a language impairment, articulation impairment, fluency impairment, or voice impairment.

(2) A communication disorder shall be determined through the manifestation of 1 or more of the following speech and language impairments that adversely affect educational performance:

(a) A language impairment which interferes with the student’s ability to understand and use language effectively and which includes 1 or more of the following:

- (i) Phonology.
- (ii) Morphology.
- (iii) Syntax.
- (iv) Semantics.
- (v) Pragmatics.

(b) Articulation impairment, including omissions, substitutions, or distortions of sound, persisting beyond the age at which maturation alone might be expected to correct the deviation.

(c) Fluency impairment, including an abnormal rate of speaking, speech interruptions, and repetition of sounds, words, phrases, or sentences, that interferes with effective communication.

(d) Voice impairment, including inappropriate pitch, loudness, or voice quality.

(3) Any impairment under subrule (2) (a) of this rule shall be evidenced by both of the following:

(a) A spontaneous language sample demonstrating inadequate language functioning.

(b) Test results on not less than 2 standardized assessment instruments or 2 subtests designed to determine language functioning which indicate inappropriate language functioning for the student’s age.

(4) A student who has a communication disorder, but whose primary disability is other than speech and language may be eligible for speech and language services under R 340.1745(a).

(5) A determination of impairment shall be based upon a comprehensive evaluation by a multidisciplinary evaluation team, which shall include a teacher of students with speech and language impairment under R 340.1796 or a speech and language pathologist qualified under R 340.1792.

R 340.1745 Services for students with speech and language impairment.

Rule 45. All of the following provisions are specific requirements for speech and language services:

(a) The speech and language services provided by an authorized provider of speech and language services shall be based on the needs of a student with a disability as determined by the individualized education program team after reviewing a diagnostic report provided by an authorized provider of speech and language services.

(b) The determination of caseload size for an authorized provider of speech and language services shall be made by the authorized provider of speech and language services in cooperation with the district director of special education, or his or her designee, and the building principal or principals of the school or schools in which the students are enrolled. Caseload size shall be based upon the severity

Appendices

- and multiplicity of the disabilities and the extent of the service defined in the collective individualized education programs of the students to be served, allowing time for all of the following:
- (i) Diagnostics.
 - (ii) Report writing.
 - (iii) Consulting with parents and teachers.
 - (iv) Individualized education program team meetings.
 - (v) Travel.
- (c) Individual caseloads of authorized providers of speech and language services shall not exceed 60 different persons and shall be adjusted based on factors identified in subdivision (b) of this rule. Students being evaluated shall be counted as part of the caseload.
- (d) An authorized provider of speech and language impaired services shall be either a teacher of students with speech and language impairment under R 340.1781, R 340.1782, and R 340.1796, or a person with a master's degree, as qualified under R 340.1792.

Appendices

APPENDIX C – ARTICULATION ELIGIBILITY GUIDE/TEAM SUMMARY

Student _____ Birthdate _____ Date _____

Speech-Language Pathologist _____ Team Members _____

Medical History Input – Attach report or interview of student’s doctor or other appropriate medical professionals

Hearing Screen Pass _____ Fail _____
 History of chronic otitis media Yes _____ No _____
 History of medical issues related to articulation Yes _____ No _____

Attach documentation as applicable. *Collected in part during prereferral phase		Does not Support Eligibility	Supports Eligibility
Response to Intervention If early intervening was implemented, that process showed the need for the formal assessment. The student’s response documented on the early intervening form may be transferred to the diagnostic report. *			
Input	Teacher(s) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview <input type="checkbox"/> Observations and comments *		
	Parent <input type="checkbox"/> Interview and comments *		
	Student <input type="checkbox"/> Interview and comments *		
	Review of Pertinent Information <input type="checkbox"/> CA-60 review <input type="checkbox"/> Report cards Educational achievement and other records <input type="checkbox"/> Curriculum-based assessments <input type="checkbox"/> Other/Trial therapy outcomes		
Consideration of cultural/linguistic differences * If the student uses dialect or languages other than Standard American English, complete the process in the Culturally and Linguistically Diverse Articulation Section, CLD-A			
Consideration of environmental or economic differences Provide documentation from team reports, teacher, and parent reviews (if needed)			
Connected Speech Samples Consider evidence of a disorder and adverse educational effect	Sound Production Listen for types of errors present in discourse		
	Intelligibility Does intelligibility impede educational performance?		
Speech-motor Functioning <input type="checkbox"/> Oral-peripheral examination <input type="checkbox"/> Evidence of Speech/Motor Disorders (i.e., dysarthria, apraxia) <input type="checkbox"/> Diadochokinetics			
Articulation Test Assess articulation and compare to standards set for that assessment instrument			
Phonological Process Test/Checklist/Analysis Assess the presence of phonological processes and compare to standards set for that assessment instrument			
Stimulability Is the student stimulable for specific phonemes?			
Summary of Disability Comments about the presence or absence of disability.		Summary of Adverse Educational Effect Comments about the presence or absence of adverse effects on social, vocational, or academic performance based upon all of the above assessment components.	
Summary of Eligibility in Articulation Comments and decision regarding the student’s eligibility.			

Appendices

APPENDIX D – FLUENCY ELIGIBILITY GUIDE/TEAM SUMMARY

Student _____ Birthdate _____ Date _____

Speech-Language Pathologist _____ Team Members _____

Medical History Input – Attach report regarding medical issues that may be relevant (if applicable)

Hearing Screen Pass _____ Fail _____

History of chronic otitis media Yes _____ No _____

		Does not support eligibility	Supports Eligibility
Response to Intervention If Early Intervening was implemented, that process showed the need for the formal assessment. The student's response documented on the Early Intervening Form may be transferred to the diagnostic report.			
Gather Input	Teacher Input Collect teacher input.		
	Parent Input Collect parent input including family history.		
	Student Input Collect the student's input including student's self-esteem, motivation/attitude, and self-assessment of communication as it relates to their fluency.		
Review of Pertinent Information			
Risk Factors Family history, gender, student's response to disfluency			
Consideration of cultural/linguistic differences Complete the process in the Culturally and Linguistically Diverse section if indicated			
Test Administration or Analysis of Frequency and Duration of a Connected Speech Sample Administer a formal test of complete frequency and duration analysis			
Classroom Observation of Adverse Effect Observe the student during a time of day when the teacher indicated that the student's disfluencies interfere with participation. Collect more information regarding whether the student's fluency is adequate for successful participation in that curricular task or whether the student lacks the fluency skills and strategies needed.			
Cluttering Analyze disfluencies for differential diagnosis of stuttering vs. cluttering. Please refer to the Cluttering checklist on pages F- 17 & 18 of the <i>MSHA Guidelines (2006)</i> .			
Other Assessment Information Complete a broad-based screening of language, articulation, oral-motor, and voice to explore the possibility of additional impairments.			
Summary of Disability Comments about the presence or absence of disability.	Summary of Adverse Educational Effect Comments about the presence or absence of adverse effects on social, vocational, or academic performance based upon <u>all</u> of the above assessment components.		
Summary of Eligibility in Fluency Comments and decision regarding the student's eligibility.			

Comments: _____

Appendices

APPENDIX E – VOICE ELIGIBILITY GUIDE/TEAM SUMMARY

Student _____ Birthdate _____

Speech-Language Pathologist _____ Date _____

Medical Evaluation Input – Attach report regarding medical issues that may be relevant (if applicable)

Report or interview with student’s otolaryngologist, audiologist, allergist, or other appropriate medical professionals

Medical evaluation has been completed and results made available Yes _____ No _____

School SLP attended medical evaluation Yes _____ No _____

Comments:

Attach documentation as applicable. *Collected in part during prereferral phase	Does not Support Eligibility *	Supports Eligibility **
Response to Intervention * If Early Intervening was implemented, then document the student’s response in the diagnostic report.		
Teacher Input * Interview, checklist, or comments		
Parent Input * Interview, checklist, or comments		
Student Input * Interview, checklist, or comments		
Consideration of cultural/linguistic differences * Complete the process in the Culturally and Linguistically Diverse section if indicated		
Consideration of environmental or economic differences *		
Consideration of Temporary Physical Factors * Are vocal characteristics due to temporary physical factors such as allergies, colds or short term vocal abuse?		
Vocal Quality Use observations, checklists, or interviews to assess the student’s vocal characteristics looking for difficulties such as breathiness, stridency, or hoarseness.		
Pitch Use observations, checklists, or interviews to assess the student’s use of pitch looking for difficulties such as extraordinarily high or low pitch, pitch breaks, or monotone.		
Loudness Use of observations, checklists, or interviews to assess the student’s use of loudness, looking for difficulties such as excessive loudness, or softness.		
Resonance Use observations, checklists, or interviews to assess the student’s resonance, looking for difficulties such as hyponasal, hypernasal, nasal emissions, assimilation nasality on vowels.		
Additional Areas of Assessment That Will Assist in Planning Intervention Use observations, checklists, or interviews to assess these areas. Circle those that apply: Breath Rate Phonatory Efficiency Muscle Tension Intelligibility Speech Avoidance		
Summary of Disability	Summary of Adverse Educational Effect	
Summary of Eligibility in Voice Team comments and decision regarding the student’s eligibility.		

Comments: _____

Appendices

APPENDIX F – LANGUAGE ELIGIBILITY GUIDE/TEAM SUMMARY

Student _____ Birthdate _____ Date _____

Speech-Language Pathologist _____ Team Members _____

Medical History Input: Attach report or interview of student's doctor or other appropriate medical professionals if applicable

Hearing Screen Pass _____ Fail _____
 History of chronic otitis media Yes _____ No _____
 History of medical issues related to articulation Yes _____ No _____

		Eligibility Determination Phase	
		Does not Support Eligibility	Supports Eligibility
		*Collected in part during prereferral phase	
Input	Teacher(s) <input type="checkbox"/> interview/observations	*	
	Parent <input type="checkbox"/> notification (prereferral) <input type="checkbox"/> interview/observations	*	
	Student <input type="checkbox"/> interview/comments	*	
	Review of Pertinent Information Educational achievement and other records such as: MLPP, DIBELS, student permanent record (CA-60)	*	
Consideration of cultural/linguistic differences Complete the process in the Culturally and Linguistically Diverse – Language Section if indicated		*	
Consideration of environmental or economic differences Provide documentation from team reports, teacher, and parent reviews if needed.		*	
Curriculum-Based Language Assessment Watch the student attempt a curricular task reported to be difficult either with you or in the classroom. Determine whether the student's language is adequate for successful participation in that curricular task or whether the student lacks the language skills and strategies needed.		*	
Language Samples/Narrative Tasks/Portfolio Assessment Collect oral and written language samples to further investigate the student's language function within the curriculum.	Word level: Phonology, morphology, semantics, reading decoding, spelling, word retrieval, and pragmatics		
	Sentence level: Morphology, syntax, semantics, formulation, and pragmatics		
	Discourse level: Organization, semantics, syntax, formulation, cohesion, and pragmatics		
Results of Student's Response to Intervention Document the results of the early intervening process. Note the level of accommodation or intervention strategies that the student requires to be successful in the curriculum. Could the student be successful if the classroom teacher used these strategies or are special education services needed? Trial Intervention If early intervening was not done prior to the referral, then provide a period of trial intervention in order to assess the level of accommodation or intervention strategies that the student requires to be successful in the curriculum and get information needed to design intervention plan related to the curriculum.		*	
Test Profile	Test scores below average by standards set for that test		
	Variation within language test profile		
Summary of Disability Team comments about the presence or absence of disability.		Summary of Adverse Educational Effect Team comments about the presence or absence of adverse effects on social, vocational, or academic performance based upon all of the above assessment components.	
Summary of Eligibility in Language Team comments and decision regarding the student's eligibility.			

Appendices

APPENDIX G – PRESCHOOL LANGUAGE ELIGIBILITY GUIDE/TEAM SUMMARY

Student _____ Birthdate _____ SLP _____ Date _____

Attach documentation as applicable.		<i>Does not Support Eligibility</i>	<i>Supports Eligibility</i>
Gathering Input	Parent Conduct a ten-to-fifteen minute interview regarding the child's use of language, concerns, and health history. Use the Communication Means and Communication Checklist to gather information regarding the child's language within the home environment.		
	Teacher Interview, checklist, or comments		
	Other Pertinent Information Review educational and medical records regarding student		
Play Activities/ Communication Samples Play with the child for 10 to 15 minutes using developmentally appropriate toys.	Language Subsystems Make notes regarding the child's language skills in regards to phonology, syntax, morphology, semantics and pragmatics.		
	Evidence of Communicative Frustration Does the preschooler demonstrate struggle in an effort to communicate? Does the preschooler refuse to communicate, tantrum, etc.?		
	Dynamic Assessment Does the preschooler's language improve with minimal scaffolding or accommodation (given picture symbols or speech scripts to model) or does the preschooler continue to have difficulty?		
Test Profile			
Observation of Parent-Preschooler Interactions Observe how the preschooler's language is different when interacting with a parent. This may be done through observations of the child and parent coming and going from the therapy room or by spending time observing them in a short, play-based interaction.			
Consideration of Cultural/Linguistic Differences Complete the process in the Culturally and Linguistically Diverse Section if indicated			
Consideration of Environmental or Economic Differences Provide documentation from team reports, teacher, and parent. Reviews if needed.			
Summary of Disability Team comments about the presence or absence of disability.	Summary of Adverse Educational Effect Team comments about the presence or absence of adverse effects on social, vocational, or academic performance based upon all of the above assessment components.		
Summary of Eligibility in Language Team comments and decision regarding the student's eligibility.			

Comments:

**APPENDIX H – INFANT/TODDLER ELIGIBILITY GUIDE/TEAM SUMMARY
(Birth to 3 years)**

Student _____ Birthdate _____ SLP _____ Date _____

		<i>Does not Support Eligibility</i>	<i>Supports Eligibility</i>
Attach documentation as applicable.			
Gathering Input	Parent Concerns Interview, Checklist, or Comments Hearing Screening Required Familial History Medical History Motoric Development (Gross, Fine, and Oral) Communication Development		
Observation of Parent-Child Interactive Play Observe how the child's language is different when interacting with a caregiver (use more/less words, more/less gestures, increased MLU, other)			
Communication Samples During Dynamic Play Play with the child: Does the child's speech/language improve with minimal scaffolding, imitation, modeling?	Use (Pragmatics) Means & Functions Discourse – attend to speaker, initiate, turn taking		
	Vocabulary (Semantics) What types of words – names, nouns, verbs, prepositions, other		
	Form (Syntax, Morphology) MLU		
	Intelligibility (Phonological Processing/Articulation) Speech – Motor & Functioning		
Evidence of Communicative Frustration Does the child demonstrate struggle in an effort to communicate? Does the child refuse to communicate, tantrum, retreat to passivity?			
Consideration of Cultural/Linguistic Differences Complete the process in the Culturally and Linguistically Diverse Section if indicated			
Consideration of Environmental or Economic Differences Provide documentation from team reports and parent input reviews if needed.			
Test Profile	Test scores below age expectancies		
	Variation within language test profile		
Summary of Disability Team comments about the presence or absence of disability.	Summary of Adverse Educational Effect Team comments about the presence or absence of adverse effects on communication, social, and pre-academic performance based upon all of the above assessment components.		
Summary of Eligibility in Language Team comments and decision regarding the child's eligibility.			

Comments:

**APPENDIX I – CULTURALLY AND LINGUISTICALLY DIVERSE
GUIDE/TEAM SUMMARY**

Student _____ Birthdate _____ Date _____
 Speech-Language Pathologist _____ Team Members _____
 Native Language _____ Other Languages Spoken _____
 Dialects Spoken _____ Languages Spoken in Home _____

		Suggests Speech or Language DIFFERENCE	Suggests Speech or Language Disorder						
Input	Teacher(s) <input type="checkbox"/> interview/observations								
	Bilingual Staff Interview Obtain information about the student and the culture								
	Parent Complete parent interview (with interpreter, if needed) to obtain socio-cultural history, developmental history, and information about language competence								
	Student interview/comments								
	Review of Pertinent Information Educational achievement and other records such as: MLPP, DIBELS, student permanent record (CA-60)								
Observations	Family-Student Observation (if available) Observe the student interacting with family								
	Classroom Observation Observe the student participating in the curriculum								
Curriculum Presentation/Student-Teacher Interaction Determine whether the student is responding to the presentation format of the classroom or curriculum materials. Does the student expect a different presentation given their cultural background? Is this mismatch causing learning or language difficulties? (For example, students from Asian cultures may need to learn that it is expected to ask questions and to interact in a group.)									
Further Classroom Adaptations/Modifications Select additional classroom accommodations and modifications to support the student during a trial period.									
Dynamic Assessment / Trial Intervention Assist the student with the task during single or over multiple sessions. How well does the student perform with help? Does the student experience success with minimal scaffolding or accommodation (e.g., given a strategy, can do it independently) or does the student continue to have difficulty?									
Referral Decision Together with the student's team, decide whether the student is suspected of having a disability beyond a language difference and needs a formal evaluation. If a formal evaluation is completed, now turn to the appropriate section of these guidelines and follow those procedures along with the considerations below.									
Assessment Considerations for Students Suspected of Having a Disability Complete the Eligibility Guide/Team Summary in the section									
<table style="width: 100%; border: none;"> <tr> <td style="width: 50%; border: none;"><input type="checkbox"/> Use of an interpreter for bilingual students</td> <td style="width: 50%; border: none;"><input type="checkbox"/> Alternative assessments/inventories</td> </tr> <tr> <td style="border: none;"><input type="checkbox"/> Extended case study</td> <td style="border: none;"><input type="checkbox"/> Language sampling in multiple settings/partners</td> </tr> <tr> <td style="border: none;"><input type="checkbox"/> Application of Interpreter Guidelines</td> <td style="border: none;"><input type="checkbox"/> Application CLD criterion to standardized test selection/use</td> </tr> </table>				<input type="checkbox"/> Use of an interpreter for bilingual students	<input type="checkbox"/> Alternative assessments/inventories	<input type="checkbox"/> Extended case study	<input type="checkbox"/> Language sampling in multiple settings/partners	<input type="checkbox"/> Application of Interpreter Guidelines	<input type="checkbox"/> Application CLD criterion to standardized test selection/use
<input type="checkbox"/> Use of an interpreter for bilingual students	<input type="checkbox"/> Alternative assessments/inventories								
<input type="checkbox"/> Extended case study	<input type="checkbox"/> Language sampling in multiple settings/partners								
<input type="checkbox"/> Application of Interpreter Guidelines	<input type="checkbox"/> Application CLD criterion to standardized test selection/use								

Comments:

12/2006

Michigan Speech-Language Guidelines CLD-L4

APPENDIX J – TESTS USED IN KENT ISD

With Acceptable Levels of Sensitivity and Specificity Data

Test	Year Published	Age	Test-Retest Reliability		Total Test Maximum		Cut-off Score
			Subtests	Total Test	Sensitivity	Specificity	
CELF-4 ¹	2003	6:00-21:11	.72-.90	.88-.92	.87	.96	70
CELFP-2 ²	2004	3:00-6:11	.78-.90	.91-.94	.82	.86	70
PLS-4 ³	2002	Birth-6:11	.82-.95	.90-.97	.80	.88	85
SPELT-3 ⁴	2003	4:00-9:11	N.A.	.94 (n=56)	.90	1.0	95
SPELTP-2 ⁵	2004	3:00-5:11			.83	.95	79.15
TEEM ⁶	1983	3:00-7:12	N.A.	.94 (n=12)	.90	.95	75
TNL ⁷	2004	5:00-11:11	N.A.	.90 (n=27)	.92	.87	85

¹Clinical Evaluation of Language Fundamentals–Fourth Edition
²Clinical Evaluation of Language Fundamentals Preschool–Second Edition
³Preschool Language Scales–Fourth Edition
⁴Structured Photographic Expressive Language Test–Third Edition
⁵Structured Photographic Expressive Language Test Preschool–Second Edition
⁶Test for Examining Expressive Morphology
⁷Test of Narrative Language

Without Acceptable Levels of Sensitivity and Specificity Data

Test	Year Published	Age	Test-Retest Reliability		Total Test Maximum		Cut Off Score
			Subtests	Total Test	Sensitivity	Specificity	
EOWPVTR ¹	2000	2:00-18:11	N.A.		.71	.71	96
PEST ²	1993	3:00-7:06	N.A.	.94	.49	.90	Individual
PPVT-3 ³	1997	2:05-90+	N.A.	.91-.94	.74	.71	104
ROWPVT ⁴	2000	2:00-18:11			.77	.77	97
TLC-E (L1) ⁵	1999	5:00-9:11	.86-.95	.97	.90	.86	N.A.
TLC-E (L2) ⁶	1999	9:00-18:11	.86-.96	.97	.90	.86	N.A.
TOWK ⁷	1992	5:00-17:11			.33	1.0	85

¹Expressive One-Word Picture Vocabulary Test–Revised
²Patterned Elicitation Syntax Test
³Peabody Picture Vocabulary Test–Fourth Edition
⁴Receptive One-Word Picture Vocabulary Test
⁵Test of Language Competence–Expanded (Level 1)
⁶Test of Language Competence–Expanded (Level 2)
⁷Test of Word Knowledge

Appendices

Without Sensitivity and Specificity Data

Test	Year Published	Age	Test-Retest Reliability		Total Test Maximum		Cut-off Score
			Subtests	Total Test	Sensitivity	Specificity	
BOEHM-3 ¹	2001	Grade K-2	N.A.	.70-.89 (n=313)	N.A.	N.A.	N.A.
BOEHM-P3 ²	2001	3:00-5:11	N.A.	.90-.94 (n=98) (4:00-5:11)	N.A.	N.A.	N.A.
CASL ³	1999	3:00-21:11	.68-.94	.92-.93	N.A.	N.A.	N.A.
LPT3-EI ⁴	2005	5:00-11:11	.13-.93	.69-.92	N.A.	N.A.	N.A.
OWLS ⁵	1995	3:00-21:00	.73-.88	.81-.89	N.A.	N.A.	N.A.
REEL-3 ⁶					N.A.	N.A.	N.A.
TOAL-R ⁷					N.A.	N.A.	N.A.
THT ⁸	1996	6:00-11:00			N.A.	N.A.	N.A.
TOLD-I3 ⁹	1997	8:00-12:00			N.A.	N.A.	N.A.
TOLD-P3 ¹⁰	1997	4:00-8:11			N.A.	N.A.	N.A.
TOPS-R ¹¹	1986				N.A.	N.A.	N.A.
TTC ¹²	1978	3:00-12:05	N.A.	N.A.	N.A.	N.A.	N.A.
TWT-A ¹³	1989				N.A.	N.A.	N.A.
TWT-R ¹⁴	2004	6:00-11:00			N.A.	N.A.	N.A.

- ¹Boehm Test of Basic Concepts-Third Edition
²Boehm Test of Basic Concepts-Preschool-Third Edition
³Comprehensive Assessment of Spoken Language
⁴Language Processing Test 3-Elementary
⁵Oral and Written Language Scales-Listening Comp. and Oral Expression
⁶Receptive Expressive Emergent Language Test-Third Edition
⁷Test of Adolescent Language-R
⁸The Help Test
⁹Test of Language Development-Intermediate-Third Edition
¹⁰Test of Language Development-Primary-Third Edition
¹¹Test of Pragmatic Skills-Revised
¹²Token Test for Children
¹³The Word Test-Adolescent
¹⁴The Word Test-Elementary-Revised

N.A.-Not Available

Spaulding et al (2006)
 Burors 16th Mental Measurements Yearbook
 Test Manuals

APPENDIX K – KENT ISD SPEECH AND LANGUAGE DIAGNOSTIC REPORT

Kent ISD Speech and Language Diagnostic Report

Do Not Use for Initial Evaluations

Kent ISD
2930 Knapp NE
Grand Rapids MI 49525
(616) 365-2299

- Master Service Provider
 Cumulative Other
 Parent

Student _____ Birthdate _____ Speech Services Provided From: _____ To: _____ Grade: _____
Evaluation Date(s): _____ PEB: _____ Parent: _____ School: _____
Service Provider: _____

Eligibility Per Last IEP (if any): None ASD CI ECDD EI HI LD PI OHI SLI SXI TBI VI

Complete If a Current IEP Exists:

Area(s) of SLI eligibility per last IEP: None Articulation Fluency Language Voice

Services per last IEP (Circle): None Audiological OT PT School Health (Nurse) SSW Speech TC Other _____

Program per last IEP (Circle): None ASD CI Departmentalized ECDD EI HI LD OHI Resource SXI VI

<input type="checkbox"/> A referral for SLI eligibility was considered		<input type="checkbox"/> SLI services were considered	
<i>Circle yes or no for each eligibility and service item</i>			
Yes No	Speech and/or language is within the expected range given current medical, dental, neurological, physical, cognitive, emotional, and/or developmental factors.	Yes No	SLI services are appropriate regarding a present or anticipated eligibility label of SLI.
Yes No	Speech and/or language problem(s) interfere(s) with academic and/or vocational functioning (or age-appropriate activities for preschool student).	Yes No	SLI services are appropriate regarding a present or anticipated eligibility label in an area of eligibility other than SLI.
Yes No	An eligibility of SLI is appropriate for the student's performance or condition that requires special education services (see next page for information for specific areas of functioning).	Yes No	Another special or general education instructional service or program is more appropriate to meet communication needs.

RECOMMENDATIONS	
<i>See next page for details</i>	
SLI Eligibility:	
<input type="checkbox"/> Not recommended in this report – SLI is not an eligibility area appropriate for the student <input type="checkbox"/> The student meets the criteria for speech/language impairment (SLI) in the area(s) of _____ Articulation Language Fluency Voice	
Speech-Language Services:	
<input type="checkbox"/> Speech/language services are not recommended at this time <input type="checkbox"/> Speech/language services are recommended at this time	

Appendices

ASSESSMENT RESULTS	
<i>Check all areas considered and circle yes or no within each checked area</i>	
<input type="checkbox"/> Service History (if any)	
Yes	Minimal measurable progress over a period of one to two school years during which consecutive and varied management strategies have been used.
No	There has been limited carry-over skills due to a lack of mental, physical or emotional ability to self-monitor or generalize in one or more environments.
<input type="checkbox"/> Articulation	
Yes	The student maintains a minimum of 75% correct production of error phonemes over a minimum of 4 TALK probes.
No	Appropriate compensatory strategies have been learned and implemented.
<input type="checkbox"/> Language	
Yes	(1) Standardized test administration obtained scores of less than 1 1/3 rd standard deviations below the expected performance range; and (2) compensatory strategies have been implemented to promote successful functioning in the educational setting. Test(s) administered/scores: _____
No	Language skills are judged to be adequate in remediated area(s) determined by informal measures. Specifically, _____
Yes	A disability which precludes normal expressive language exists, but the student communicates through the use of an augmentative communication system.
No	
<input type="checkbox"/> Fluency	
Yes	Fluency is within normal limits for age, gender, and speaking situations or exhibits some transitory dysfluencies.
No	Riley Stuttering Severity Instrument score is between 0% and 4%.
<input type="checkbox"/> Voice	
Yes	Modal pitch is optimal, and/or laryngeal tone is clear, and/or intensity is appropriate, and/or nasality is within normal limits at least 75% of the time under varying conditions of use.
No	Status of the laryngeal area is improved according to physician report.
COMMENTS / RECOMMENDATIONS	
_____ _____ _____ _____ _____ _____ _____ _____ _____ _____	

_____ Date

_____ Speech-Language Pathologist

APPENDIX L – STRATEGIES TO IMPROVE AUDITORY PERFORMANCE

Strategies for Teachers

Classroom Environment

- Reduction of noise/minimize distractions
- Preferential seating away from noise
- Use of classroom amplification system

Teaching Techniques

- Clear enunciation at a slow-moderate rate of speech
- Insert purposeful pauses between concept, let the words *hang in the air*
- Keep directions or commands short and simple and have student repeat directions
- Use praise often and be positive
- Provide visual cues during lecture/directions (such as written outline on the board)
- Provide repetition of oral information and steps of assignment
- Give breaks between intense concepts taught for comprehension
- Check for comprehension early/often and check knowledge of prerequisite information
- Preview and review concepts for lecture
- Offer short essay tests as an alternative to multiple choice
- Record lectures for repeated listening
- Offer closed captioning for videos
- Make connections with other material whenever possible – refer often to previous lessons
- Augment information, especially with visual materials (show a film; look on web; find additional books about topic; act it out; recommend family activity; fieldtrip)

Peer Assistance

- Use a positive peer partner for comprehension of directions or proofing work
- Use cooperative learning groups
- Use a note-taker

Assignment Modifications

- Allow extended time to complete assignments and/or tests
- Offer short essays as an alternative to multiple choice
- Provide visual instructions
- Preview language of concept prior to assignment
- Checks frequently for comprehension at pre-determined points
- Vary grading techniques

Strategies for Student

- Teach use of visual cues to supplement auditory information
- Teach use of short- and long-term memory techniques (i.e. rehearsal, chunking, mnemonics, visual imagery)
- Teach student to listen for meaning rather than every word
- Teach active listening behaviors
- Teach student to advocate for themselves by asking frequent questions about the material, asking for multiple repetitions or requesting speaker to “write it down”
- Use of tape recorder for assignments
- Teach organizational strategies for learning information
- Teach use of an electronic note-taker or word processor

Strategies for Parents

- Keep directions or commands short and simple
- Use praise often and be positive
- Use visuals or gestures at home to compensate for listening difficulties
- Assist the student in asking clarification questions and being their own advocate
- Preview and review classroom material and review tape recorded information

Appendices

APPENDIX M – TEACHER CHECKLIST FOR ORAL EXPRESSION

Student _____ Date _____ School _____

Birthdate _____ Grade _____ Teacher _____

<u>YES</u>	<u>NO</u>	<u>SOMETIMES</u>	<u>THE STUDENT:</u>
1. _____ _____	_____	_____	1. States identifying information: name (), age (), birthday (), phone number (), and family information ().
2. _____ a. _____ b. _____ c. _____ d. _____ e. _____ f. _____ g. _____ h. _____	_____	_____	2. Uses correct grammatical structure for a variety of purposes. a. Formulates sentences correctly b. Uses subject/verb appropriately c. Uses verb tenses appropriately d. Asks questions correctly – yes/no () and “wh” questions () e. Answers questions correctly – yes/no () and “wh” questions () f. Uses negation correctly g. Uses pronouns correctly – personal (), demonstrative (this/that) h. Formulates plurals correctly – regular () and irregular ()
3. _____	_____	_____	3. Labels common objects correctly.
4. _____	_____	_____	4. Uses age-appropriate vocabulary.
5. _____ _____	_____	_____	5. Uses appropriate location () temporal () quantitative () expressions for age level () (e.g., above/below, before/after, more/several).
6. _____	_____	_____	6. Makes eye contact when speaking.
7. _____	_____	_____	7. Carries on a conversation with appropriate voice level.
8. _____	_____	_____	8. Knows how to begin, maintain, and end a conversation.
9. _____	_____	_____	9. Restates thoughts in alternative form.
10. _____	_____	_____	10. Tells stories or relates information in the proper sequence with beginning, middle, and/or end.
11. _____	_____	_____	11. Uses speech rather than gestures to express self.
12. _____	_____	_____	12. Speaks easily without seeming to be frustrated.
13. _____	_____	_____	13. Accounts for listeners shared background when formulating expression (e.g., uses pronouns and articles only clear referents, gives enough information about the topic).
14. _____	_____	_____	14. Responds correctly to humor (), sarcasm () and figures of speech ().
15. _____ a. _____ b. _____	_____	_____	15. Recognizes when to match voice level and intonation to a variety of situations: a. place (playground, classroom, assembly). b. intent (question/answer in class, show emotions, give reports).

Source: Ohio Department of Education (1991). Ohio handbook for the identification, evaluation and placement of children with language problems. Used with permission.

APPENDIX N – TEACHER CHECKLIST FOR LISTENING COMPREHENSION

Student _____ Date _____ School _____

Birthdate _____ Grade _____ Teacher _____

	<u>YES</u>	<u>NO</u>	<u>SOMETIMES</u>	<u>THE STUDENT:</u>
1.	___	___	___	1. Enjoys having stories read aloud.
2.	___	___	___	2. Has an attention span for verbal presentation adequate for age level.
3.	___	___	___	3. Attends to all of what is said rather than “tuning out” portions.
4.	___	___	___	4. Is able to ignore auditory distractions.
5.	___	___	___	5. Faces source of sound directly – does not tilt one ear toward teacher or other source.
6.	___	___	___	6. Responds after first presentation – does not often ask for things to be repeated.
7.	___	___	___	7. Understands materials presented through the visual channel (written/drawn).
8.	___	___	___	8. Responds to questions within expected time period.
9.	___	___	___	9. Follows two- or three-step directions.
10.	___	___	___	10. Demonstrates understanding (verbally or nonverbally) of the main idea of a verbal presentation.
11.	___	___	___	11. Comprehends <i>who, what, when, where, why</i> and <i>how</i> questions appropriate for age level.
12.	___	___	___	12. Demonstrates understanding of vocabulary appropriate for age level.
13.	___	___	___	13. Discriminates likenesses and differences in words (<i>toad-told</i>) and sounds (<i>t-d</i>).
14.	___	___	___	14. Demonstrates understanding of temporal (<i>before/after</i>), position (<i>above/below</i>), and quantitative (<i>more/several</i>) concepts.
15.	___	___	___	15. Understands subtleties in word or sentence meaning (idioms, figurative language).
16.	___	___	___	16. Interprets meaning from vocal intonation.
17.	___	___	___	17. Understands a variety of sentence structures (cause-effect passive voice – The ball was bounced by the girl.) and clauses (clause that modifies the subject: – The dog that chased the cat was hit.).

Source: Ohio Department of Education (1991). Ohio handbook for the identification, evaluation and placement of children with language problems. Used with permission.

APPENDIX O – IOWA-NEBRASKA ARTICULATION NORMS

Listed below are the recommended ages of acquisition for phonemes and clusters, based generally on the age at which 90% of the children correctly produced the sound.

Phoneme	Age of Acquisition (Females)	Age of Acquisition (Males)
/m/	3;0	3;0
/n/	3;6	3;0
/ŋ/	7;0	7;0
/h-/	3;0	3;0
/w-/	3;0	3;0
/j-/	4;0	5;0
/p/	3;0	3;0
/b/	3;0	3;0
/t/	4;0	3;6
/d/	3;0	3;6
/k/	3;6	3;6
/g/	3;6	4;0
/f-/	3;6	3;6
/-f/	5;6	5;6
/v/	5;6	5;6
/θ/	6;0	8;0
/ð/	4;6	7;0
/s/	7;0	7;0
/z/	7;0	7;0
/ʃ/	6;0	7;0
/tʃ/	6;0	7;0
/l-/	5;0	6;0
/-l/	6;0	7;0
/r-/	8;0	8;0
/ə-/	8;0	8;0

Word-Initial Clusters	Age of Acquisition (Females)	Age of Acquisition (Males)
/tw kw/	4;0	5;6
/sp st sk/	7;0	7;0
/sm sn/	7;0	7;0
/sw/	7;0	7;0
/sl/	7;0	7;0
/pl bl kl gl fl/	5;6	6;0
/pr br tr dr kr gr fr/	8;0	8;0
/θr/	9;0	9;0
/skw/	7;0	7;0
/spl/	7;0	7;0
/spr str skr/	9;0	9;0

Note regarding phoneme positions:

/m/ refers to prevocalic and postvocalic positions

/h-/ refers to prevocalic positions

/-f/ refers to postvocalic positions

¹³Smit, Hand, Freilinger, Bernthal, and Bird (1990). *Journal of Speech and Hearing Disorders*, 55, 779-798.

**APPENDIX P – PRESCHOOL TEACHER ASSESSMENT FOR
SPEECH-LANGUAGE EVALUATION**

Name: _____
Teacher: _____

Grade: _____
Date: _____

Please compare the child's performance with his/her peers.

The child:	Yes	Sometimes	No
Uses social language (hi, bye, please, thank you)			
Is learning new words every week			
Repeats new words without being asked			
Uses describing words (big, red, etc.)			
Gets my attention with words			
Rejects/denies/says no			
Takes turns in a "conversation"			
Asks for help			
Is understood by familiar adults			
Is understood by unfamiliar adults			
Names pictures in a book			
Listens to a short picture book			
Answers "yes/no" questions			
Answers "wh" questions			
Asks questions with his/her tone of voice			
Asks "yes/no" questions			
Asks "wh" questions (what, where, why, how)			
Uses pronouns correctly (I, she, he, my, etc.)			
Knows some songs or nursery rhymes			
Has trouble saying sounds; list: _____			
Is teased by peers about the way he/she talks			
Has difficulty following directions			
Has difficulty attending If Yes or Sometimes, check all that apply: <input type="checkbox"/> one to one <input type="checkbox"/> during lengthy instruction <input type="checkbox"/> small group <input type="checkbox"/> large group <input type="checkbox"/> noisy environment			
Has noticeable hesitations, repetitions, or tension when speaking			
Has an unusual voice (e.g., hoarse, nasal, high-pitched)			
Has a rate or volume that interferes with understanding him/her			

Rate your concern for the child's communication skills.

None 0 1 2 3 A lot

Approximately how many words are in the child's vocabulary? (*check quantity*) 10 11 to 50 more than 50

How many words does the child combine into sentences? _____

Does the child's communication skills influence his/her adult and peer relationships or participation in activities?

Yes No If YES, explain: _____

What does the child do when he/she is not understood? Check all that apply: points or gestures gives up

repeats the words says different words other: _____

Teacher signature _____ Date _____

Please return to _____ By _____

Appendices

APPENDIX Q – PARENT CHECKLIST FOR SPEECH-LANGUAGE (PRESCHOOL)

Child's Name : _____ Date of birth: _____

Person completing this form: _____ Date: _____

Return to: _____ By: _____

Your input will help us understand your child's speech skills. Please check the following. Thank you.

My child:	Yes	Sometimes	No
Responds to his/her name			
Says 10 words			
Is learning new words every week			
Repeats new words			
Says 50 words			
Puts two words together			
Gets my attention with words			
Rejects/says no			
Asks questions with his/her tone of voice			
Takes turns in a "conversation"			
Asks for help			
Says 3-4 word sentences			
Is understood by family members			
Is understood by familiar adults			
Is understood by unfamiliar adults			
Follows one-step directions			
Follows two-step directions			
Listens to a short picture book			
Names pictures in a book			
Answers "yes/no" questions			
Answers "wh" questions			
Asks "yes/no" questions			
Asks "wh" questions (what, where, why, how)			
Uses pronouns correctly (I, me, we)			
Knows some songs or nursery rhymes			
Participates in pretend play			

Rate your concern for your child's communication skills.

None 0 1 2 3 A lot

What other information do you think would be helpful for this evaluation? (Please identify on the back.)

APPENDIX R – HEARING DEVELOPMENT SCREENING CHECKLIST

Hearing Development Screening Checklist

Child's Name : _____ Date of birth: _____

Person completing this form: _____ Date: _____

Birth to 3 Months:

- | Yes | No | |
|-----|-----|--|
| ___ | ___ | Does your child startle, awaken or cry at loud sounds? |
| ___ | ___ | Does your child turn to you when you speak? |
| ___ | ___ | Does your child smile when spoken to? |
| ___ | ___ | Does your child seem to recognize your voice and quiet down if crying? |

4 to 6 Months:

- | | | |
|-----|-----|---|
| ___ | ___ | Does your child respond to "No", or changes in your tone of voice? |
| ___ | ___ | Does your child look around for the source of new sounds, e.g., the door bell, vacuum, dog barking? |
| ___ | ___ | Does your child notice toys that make sounds? |

7 Months to 1 Year:

- | | | |
|-----|-----|--|
| ___ | ___ | Does your child recognize words for items like "cup", "shoe", "juice"? |
| ___ | ___ | Does your child respond to requests like "Come here" or "Want more"? |
| ___ | ___ | Does your child enjoy games like peek-a-boo or pat-a-cake? |
| ___ | ___ | Does your child turn or look up when you call his or her name? |

1 to 2 Years:

- | | | |
|-----|-----|---|
| ___ | ___ | Can your child point to pictures in a book when they are named? |
| ___ | ___ | Does your child point to a few body parts when asked? |
| ___ | ___ | Can your child follow simple commands and understand simple questions such as: "Roll the ball." "Kiss the baby." "Where's your shoe?" |

2 to 3 Years:

- | | | |
|-----|-----|---|
| ___ | ___ | Does your child continue to notice sounds (telephone ringing, television sounds or knocking at the door)? |
| ___ | ___ | Can your child follow two requests like: "Get the ball." Or "Put it on the table." |

All Ages:

- | | | |
|-----|-----|--|
| ___ | ___ | Do you have any concerns about your child's hearing? |
|-----|-----|--|

Conditions associated with possible hearing loss: *(Parent or physician may check any that apply)*

- | | | | |
|-----|---|-----|--------------------------------|
| ___ | repeated episodes of otitis media (ear infection) | ___ | family history of hearing loss |
| ___ | prematurity | ___ | failed hearing screening |
| ___ | cranio-facial anomalies | ___ | experienced head trauma |
| ___ | excessive noise exposure | ___ | exposure to ototoxic drugs |
| ___ | any serious illness (including high fever) | | |

Outcome:	Referral to:	___	Audiology evaluation	Date: _____
		___	ENT assessment	Date: _____
		___	<i>Early On®</i>	Date: _____

Compiled by Connie Doss & Catherine Hula, Ingham ISD, Reformatted by Clinton County RESA, EOTTA 5-6-05

APPENDIX S – EARLY CHILDHOOD DEVELOPMENTAL MILESTONES

Infant Speech Production		
Stage	Approximate Age	Characteristics
1. Phonation	Birth – 1 month	Reflexive and vegetative sounds such as sneezes, burps, and crying; quasiresonant nuclei (i.e., vowel-like sounds without full resonance)
2. Coo and Goo	2 – 3 months	Primitive CV and VC syllables containing /k/ and /g/ approximants.
3. Exploration/Expansion	4 – 6 months	Vocal play; fully resonated vowels; friction noises; may produce “raspberries”; squeals; marginal babbling.
4. Canonical Babbling	7 – 9 months	CV syllable productions are more adult-like; reduplicated sequences of CV productions (e.g., [bababa]); stops, nasals, and glides are more frequent consonants; consonants tend to be anterior productions.
5. Variegated Babbling	10 – 12 months	CV sequences containing different consonants and vowels (e.g., [bamidu]); increased phonetic inventory; adult-like prosody and intonation.

Oller (1980)

Phonetic Inventories of 2-Year-Olds		
Consonants appearing in 50% of the Phonetic Inventories of 2-Year-Olds		
	Initial Position	Final Position
Stops	b* t d* k g	p t k*
Nasals	m n	n
Fricatives	f s h	s
Affricates		
Liquids		
Glides	w	r

Stoel-Gammon (1987)

ADDENDUM TO APPENDIX S – PHONETIC INVENTORIES OF 2-YEAR-OLDS

The chart below should not be used as the sole measure of determining SLI eligibility.

Phonetic Inventories of 24-Month-Olds		
Consonants appearing in 50% of the Phonetic Inventories of 24-Month-Olds match the consonant phonemes of the adult word at a level of 70%.		
	Initial Position	Final Position
Stops	b* t d* k g	p t k*
Nasals	m n	n
Fricatives	f s h	s
Affricates		
Liquids		
Glides	w	r

*These phonemes were present in 90% of the inventories. (Stoel-Gammon, 1987)

Phonological Behaviors That Predict Long-Term Speech Delays at 18 to 35 months*

Phonetic Inventory	Order of acquisition of phonemes is slow, not deviant; during a 10 min. communication sample, 18-24 month-olds use an average of 14 different consonants and 24-30 month-olds use an of average 18 with exemplars from the classes of stops, nasals, fricatives and glides
Syllable Structure	Fewer syllables with more than one consonant or consonant cluster; 24 month olds typically produce words of the form CV, CVC, CVCV and CVCVC
Sound Errors	Less than 45% of consonants correct
Inconsistent Substitution Errors	Individual phonemes are produced in a variety of ways
Atypical Sound Errors	Unusual substitutions; vowel errors
Slow Rate of Resolution	Little change over the 24-36 month time period

*Adapted from Paul, R. (2007); Williams and Elbert (2003); Paul and Jennings (1992); and Stoel-Gammon (1987).

References

Paul, R. (2007). *Language Disorders from Infancy Through Adolescence*. St. Louis: Mosby.

Paul, R., and Jennings, P. (1992). Phonological behavior in toddlers with slow expressive language development. *Journal of Speech and Hearing Research*, 35, 99-107.

Stoel-Gammon, C. (1987). Phonology skills of 2-year-olds. *Language, Speech, and Hearing Services on Schools*, 18, 323-329.

Williams, A. and Elbert, M. (2003). A prospective longitudinal study of phonological development in late talkers. *Language, Speech and Hearing Services in Schools*, 34, 138-154.