

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

**PSYCHOEDUCATIONAL EVALUATION**  
**Sample and Fictitious Report**

NAME: Susan Chartuse      SEX: F      BIRTHDATE: 08/23/2005      AGE: 11 - 8

SCHOOL: Orange Sables Elementary      GRADE: 5.7      TEACHER: Jonsie

PARENT: Elizabeth Chartuse

DATE OF EVALUATION: 04/29/2017

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

**REASON FOR REFERRAL:**

Susan's parents were concerned that she may have ADHD or dyslexia. She still has difficulty pronouncing words. Focus issues delay completing work in a timely manner.

**BACKGROUND:**

Susan Chartuse is the only child of Elizabeth Chartuse. She lives with her mother in Denver, CO. Assisting in supporting in this evaluation was grandmother, Sara, who also plays an active role raising her granddaughter.

A review of early **history** indicates that mother was on bed rest for the last three months of the pregnancy due to high blood pressure. She also was on Tegretol for seizures. Baby Susan was lactose intolerant. The discomfort sometimes associated with that settled down by age six months. Family history also indicates that mother had some struggles with reading but was much stronger verbally.

Developmental milestones passed at an average rate including first words at age 12 months. Of medical note were chronic ear infections and tonsils removed at age eight. She can be a stuffy and allergic child.

Once walking began, Susan was very active and climbed. Once she climbed out of her high chair and broke her arm. She did get into the mischief that a young active toddler might find.

Preschool teachers noted that she would wander off during class. Susan was retained in kindergarten. However, she began reading well and enjoyed this thoroughly. First-grade teachers reported that she could not sit in her seat.

Now a fifth grader at Orange Sables Elementary, she particularly enjoys freestyle writing. She does complain that math is difficult. She knows that her spelling and reading is below average.

Parents have to urge her to complete homework. She tends to take breaks, lie on her chair and draw.

Outside of the classroom Susan enjoys computer play and My Little Pony. She can do the latter for hours. Susan has good friends and social skills.

By third grade the youngster had trouble with times tables, telling time and knowing her coins. She also struggles with organization, keeping track of objects in her backpack and tends to lose some of her possessions.

### **OBSERVATIONS:**

Susan Chartuse is an attractive young lady of average height and weight for her age. Throughout testing she had the clear habit of mentally drifting when work became difficult or she may have not had an answer. Redirection was successful in getting her back on track.

On difficult reading passages, Susan might confabulate words that were not in the sentence. Other times, she took impulsive guesses at to what she thinks it may have said. In general, she was a slow reader with obvious decoding issues.

Throughout testing Susan did become discouraged easily with difficult schoolwork. She seemed to take any kind of failure seriously.

When struggling, Susan also had a tendency to put her arms in her shirt and chew her jacket.

### **TESTS ADMINISTERED:**

Wechsler Intelligence Scale for Children, Fifth Edition (WISC-V)  
Woodcock-Johnson IV, Tests Of Cognitive Ability  
Woodcock-Johnson IV, Tests Of Oral Language  
Woodcock-Johnson IV, Tests Of Achievement Form A and Extended  
Connors' Parent Rating Scale – Revised  
Achenbach Child Behavior Checklist  
Continuous Performance Test (IVA)

## **TEST RESULTS:**

### **PRIMARY SUMMARY**

#### **Subtest Score Summary**

<b>Domain</b>	<b>Subtest Name</b>		<b>Scaled Score</b>	<b>Percentile Rank</b>
Verbal	<b>Similarities</b>	SI	5	5
Comprehension	<b>Vocabulary</b>	VC	7	16
Visual Spatial	<b>Block Design</b>	BD	11	63
Fluid Reasoning	<b>Matrix Reasoning</b>	MR	15	95
	<b>Figure Weights</b>	FW	11	63
Working Memory	<b>Digit Span</b>	DS	10	50
Processing Speed	<b>Coding</b>	CD	9	37

### **PRIMARY SUMMARY (CONTINUED)**

#### **Composite Score Summary**

<b>Composite</b>		<b>Composite Score</b>	<b>Percentile Rank</b>	<b>Qualitative Description</b>
Verbal Comprehension	VCI	78	7	Very Low
Fluid Reasoning	FRI	118	88	High Average
<b>Full Scale IQ</b>	<b>FSIQ</b>	<b>98</b>	<b>45</b>	<b>Average</b>

<b>WOODCOCK-JOHNSON IV TESTS OF COGNITIVE ABILITY &amp; TESTS OF ORAL LANGUAGE</b>			
<b>Subtest</b>	<b>Grade Equiv.</b>	<b>Age Equiv.</b>	<b>%'ile</b>
Story Recall	<b>10.6</b>	<b>16 - 2</b>	<b>70</b>
Number-Pattern Matching	<b>3.6</b>	<b>8 - 11</b>	<b>8</b>
Number Series	<b>3.1</b>	<b>8 - 6</b>	<b>21</b>
<b>FLUID REASONING</b>	<b>3.3</b>	<b>8 - 8</b>	<b>20</b>
Concept Formation	<b>3.5</b>	<b>8 - 10</b>	<b>25</b>
Oral Vocabulary	<b>6.0</b>	<b>11 - 4</b>	<b>54</b>
Visual Auditory Learning	<b>5.5</b>	<b>10 - 11</b>	<b>49</b>
Oral Comprehension	<b>17.7</b>	<b>&gt;30</b>	<b>96</b>

Sound Blending	13.0	21	90
----------------	------	----	----

<b>WOODCOCK-JOHNSON IV TESTS OF ACHIEVEMENT FORM A &amp; EXTENDED</b>			
<b>Subtest</b>	<b>Grade Equiv.</b>	<b>Age Equiv.</b>	<b>%'ile</b>
Letter Word Identification	2.9	8 - 2	6
Passage Comprehension	4.3	8 - 5	8
<b>BROAD READING</b>	3.1	8 - 5	7
<b>READING SKILLS</b>	3.1	8 - 5	11
Word Attack	3.7	9 - 0	29
<b>READING</b>	3.2	8 - 6	9
Sentence Reading Fluency	2.6	7 - 11	5
<b>MATHEMATICS</b>	3.5	8 - 10	6
Applied Problems	3.3	8 - 7	11
Calculation	3.8	9 - 2	8
<b>BROAD MATHEMATICS</b>	3.5	8 - 10	5
Math Facts Fluency	3.1	8 - 5	8
<b>MATH CALCULATION SKILLS</b>	3.7	9 - 0	5
Writing Samples	5.5	10 - 11	48
<b>ACADEMIC APPLICATIONS</b>	3.9	9 - 3	19

**DISCUSSION OF TEST RESULTS:**

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

## **Full Scale IQ**

The FSIQ is derived from seven subtests and summarizes ability across a diverse set of cognitive functions. This score is typically considered the most representative indicator of general intellectual functioning. Subtests are drawn from five areas of cognitive ability: verbal comprehension, visual spatial, fluid reasoning, working memory, and processing speed. Susan's FSIQ score is in the Average range when compared to other children his age (FSIQ = 98, PR = 45, CI = 92-104). Although the WISC-V measures various aspects of ability, a child's scores on this test can also be influenced by many factors that are not captured in this report. When interpreting this report, consider additional sources of information that may not be reflected in the scores on this assessment. While the FSIQ provides a broad representation of cognitive ability, describing Susan's domain-specific performance allows for a more thorough understanding of his functioning in distinct areas. Some children perform at approximately the same level in all of these areas, but many others display areas of cognitive strengths and weaknesses.

## **Verbal Comprehension**

The Verbal Comprehension Index (VCI) measured Susan's ability to access and apply acquired word knowledge. Specifically, this score reflects his ability to verbalize meaningful concepts, think about verbal information, and express himself using words. Overall, Susan's performance on the VCI was lower than most children his age and was an area of personal weakness compared to his overall ability (VCI = 78, PR = 7, Very Low range, CI = 72-87; VCI < FSIQ, BR = <=2%). Low scores in this area may occur for a number of reasons including poorly developed word knowledge, difficulty retrieving acquired information, problems with verbal expression, or general difficulties with reasoning and problem solving. His scores on verbal comprehension tasks were weaker than his performance on tasks that required him to use logic to solve problems (VCI < FRI, BR = 0.4%).

With regard to individual subtests within the VCI, Similarities (SI) required Susan to describe a similarity between two words that represent a common object or concept and Vocabulary (VC) required him to name depicted objects and/or define words that were read aloud. He performed comparably across both subtests, suggesting that his abstract reasoning skills and word knowledge are similarly developed at this time (SI = 5; VC = 7). His performance on Similarities was below most other children his age and was one of his lowest scores (SI = 5; SI < MSS-F, BR = <=2%). This suggests that his verbal concept formation and abstract reasoning skills are areas of weakness when compared to his overall level of ability. This may be an area for targeted intervention.

## **Fluid Reasoning**

The Fluid Reasoning Index (FRI) measured Susan's ability to detect the underlying conceptual relationship among visual objects and use reasoning to identify and apply rules. Identification and application of conceptual relationships in the FRI requires inductive and quantitative reasoning, broad visual intelligence, simultaneous processing, and abstract thinking. Susan's performance on the FRI was diverse, but overall was above average for his age. These subtests emerged as one of Susan's strongest areas of performance during the current assessment (FRI = 118, PR = 88, High Average range, CI = 110-124; FRI > FSIQ, BR = <=2%). High FRI scores

indicate a well-developed ability to abstract conceptual information from visual details and to effectively apply that knowledge. Additionally, his performance on fluid reasoning tasks was particularly strong when compared to his performance on tasks that involved language-based skills (FRI > VCI, BR = 0.4%). Susan's relatively stronger fluid abilities might be further examined to determine if the difference between his fluid and crystallized abilities is primarily related to a preference for visual rather than verbal stimuli.

The FRI is derived from two subtests: Matrix Reasoning (MR) and Figure Weights (FW). Matrix Reasoning required Susan to view an incomplete matrix or series and select the response option that completed the matrix or series. On Figure Weights, he viewed a scale with a missing weight(s) and identified the response option that would keep the scale balanced. Susan demonstrated diverse performance on these two tasks. The discrepancy between Susan's scores on the Matrix Reasoning and Figure Weights subtests is clinically meaningful. These subtests differ in the specific abilities involved, and consideration of the difference between the two scores informs interpretation of the FRI. Identifying the missing piece in patterns on Matrix Reasoning was a strength for Susan (MR = 15; MR > MSS-F, BR = <=2%); however, he showed greater difficulty balancing scales under a time constraint during Figure Weights (FW = 11; MR > FW, BR = 13.4%). This pattern of scores implies a relative strength in inductive reasoning compared to quantitative reasoning. It is possible that his understanding of part-whole relationships may currently be better developed than his mathematical reasoning skills. When Susan solves novel problems, he may have difficulty applying quantitative concepts.

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

In addition to the index scores described in this report, the FSIQ includes subtests that measure other areas of cognitive ability. When compared to other children his age, Susan exhibited typical performance across other subtests contributing to the FSIQ. On Block Design (BD), he showed average performance when putting together multicolored blocks to match pictured designs. Block Design measures the ability to analyze and synthesize abstract visual information. His score on this Visual Spatial subtest was typical for his age (BD = 11). During Digit Span (DS), Susan listened to sequences of numbers and then recalled the numbers in forward, backward, or ascending order. Digit Span measures mental manipulation, cognitive flexibility, and mental alertness. On this Working Memory task, his performance was similar to other children his age (DS = 10). On Coding (CD), a Processing Speed subtest, Susan worked at an average speed when copying symbols that were paired with numbers (CD = 9). Coding measures short-term visual memory, psychomotor speed, visual perception, visual-motor coordination, visual scanning ability, cognitive flexibility, and procedural and incidental learning ability. This subtest also reflects his attention, concentration, and motivation.

Note an exceptional disparity between the Verbal Comprehension Index and the Fluid Reasoning Index. This means that Susan struggles with language across the board. However, underneath there is a very bright child who understands concepts and sees more than she can express. It is this psychologist's belief that the IQ might be a slight underestimate due to her ADHD and low frustration tolerance.

The Woodcock-Johnson IV, Tests Of Cognitive Ability, Tests of Oral Language and Tests of Achievement series yield three scores: Grade Equivalent, Percentile, and Standard Score. The

latter is on the same mathematical scale as the I.Q. and hence is directly comparable to it as "expectation." Since Susan received a Full Scale I.Q. of 98, one would use this as the hallmark with which to compare the WJ Standard Scores (SS). The Woodcock-Johnson IV, Tests Of Achievement was administered to rate actual academic skills as they stand currently.

Four tests of reading achievement were administered: Letter-Word Identification, Passage Comprehension, Sentence Reading Fluency and Word Attack. Letter-Word Identification measures isolated sight vocabulary, the ability to quickly recognize letters and words by sight. Passage Comprehension measures comprehension of contextual information. The test requires a subject to read a phrase, sentence, or short paragraph, to understand the main idea of the written material, and then to supply a missing word to complete the passage. Word Attack measures isolated phonics skills, or the ability to apply sound-symbol relationships and to analyze words by their sound-symbol patterns. The subject is required to read isolated, phonically consistent nonsense words or relatively low frequency words. Nonsense words are consistent with standard English sound-symbol patterns and virtually all phonemes in the English language are represented. In Sentence Reading Fluency, the student quickly reads simple sentences and decides if they are true or false.

The Broad Reading cluster score places her reading skills a full 2-1/2 grade levels below placement. Note that her reading comprehension score was higher than the ability to pronounce the individual word. This student is able to use her intelligence to understand meaning. However, she truly struggles with phonics. Pronunciation took a very long time. Note a low Word Attack score, which supports this hypothesis. Spending so much time pronouncing the individual word, fewer resources are left over for comprehension. Reading is therefore quite effortful.

A single test of writing skill was administered, Writing Samples. Writing Samples allows the student to creatively complete sentence stems. Susan's expressive writing is indeed strong. When there are no prompts, Susan then became uninhibited about the requirements and more fully expressed herself in a way that she desired. In other words, when allowed to follow her own line of logic, her written expression is superior. However, if she has to answer specific questions or prompts her performance drops. This is why she enjoys creative writing.

Three tests of math achievement were administered: Calculation, Applied Problems and Math Facts Fluency. Calculation measures the ability to perform mathematical calculations fundamental to more complex mathematical reasoning and problem solving. Applied Problems measures skill in analyzing and solving practical problems in mathematics. This test requires subjects to comprehend the nature of the problem, recognize relevant information, identify and perform necessary calculations and sometimes include distracting information. Math Facts Fluency requires students to solve simple addition, subtraction, and multiplication facts quickly. It is a timed test, similar to a school's "mad minute" math test. Scores relate to processing and math skills.

The Broad Math cluster score places her math skills at a 3.5 grade equivalent or approximately two grade levels behind placement. On the Applied Problems or word problems subtest she simply could not follow the steps. There appear to be weaknesses in logical processing.

Subsequently, the Woodcock-Johnson IV, Tests Of Cognitive Ability and Woodcock-Johnson IV, Tests Of Oral Language were administered to check processing tests.

Given the concern about her ability to follow a line of logic, fluid reasoning tests were administered in the form of the Concept Formation subtest. Susan needed a lot of support to get through this test. Her 33<sup>rd</sup>ile score indicates that she struggles with fluid or logical reasoning and abstract concepts.

Reading processing was then analyzed. Reading weaknesses will be in either the auditory, visual or memory areas. Susan was first administered a series of auditory processing tests that included Sound Blending. Auditory processing is the ability to analyze and synthesize auditory stimuli. Auditory processing involves the perception of patterns among sounds. Sometimes called "phonological awareness" auditory processing plays an important role in acquiring reading and spelling skills. Deficiencies in auditory processing can negatively impact language development and comprehension of one's native language. Note a college-level score. This student has an excellent ear.

Dovetailing with auditory processing is listening comprehension. This was measured by the Story Recall exam. In Story Recall, the youngster must listen to a story and then recall the elements of that story as close to verbatim as possible. Both receptive and expressive language skills are required. Hence linguistic competency, listening comprehension, and language development are measured. Note a tenth-grade level score.

Susan has an excellent ability to follow complex information when it is spoken.

Memory function was then checked via the Visual-Auditory Learning subtest. To be successful, a subject must form associations of the test stimuli, store this information, and then retrieve it later. Because the subject points to accurate answers, the test is free of verbal language requirements. Visual-Auditory Learning measures the ability to associate new visual symbols with familiar words in oral language and to translate a series of symbols presented as a reading passage (a visual-auditory association task). The test requires the subject to recall verbal labels of rebuses presented in various combinations. This score was at grade level, suggesting that Susan's memory function is adequate.

Visual processing was then checked via the Number-Pattern Matching subtest. Number Pattern Matching measures the ability to quickly identify and circle the two identical numerals in a row of six. This fell at a 19<sup>th</sup>ile, suggesting real difficulties visually processing that which she sees. This means it will take her a long time to perceive the visual components of a word.

Hence, when reading is analyzed, we see adequate memory function and very good auditory processing. The real deficit is in visual processing. This means that the child's phonics, therefore reading, is impaired by the words and letters dancing in her mind before she can properly orient them. Another word for this disorder is dyslexia.

This youngster was checked for ADHD via the Conners' Parent Rating Scale – Revised and the Achenbach Child Behavior Checklist. Both were completed by mother, Elizabeth Chartuse. On the Achenbach Child Behavior Checklist parent rates the youngster on 112 different items. The psychologist subsequently classifies them into diagnostic categories. Mrs. Chartuse was concerned about difficulty concentrating, sitting still, daydreaming and inattention. Scores spiked at a clinically significant level on scales of inattention. Other concerns were in the area of somatic complaints including constipation, fatigue, headaches and nausea. Somatic complaints fell at a borderline level of clinical significance. There have been occasional rule-breaking behaviors such as truancy and stealing. Conners' Parent Rating Scale – Revised scores were even more elevated than the Achenbach Child Behavior Checklist. She scored a T of 87 in executive functioning and a T of 88 for hyperactivity and impulsivity.

Susan did take the Continuous Performance Test (IVA). The Continuous Performance Test (IVA) is a fine, objective measure of focus and concentration. The student's hand is on the mouse while the computer-based instructions change in a manner that requires sustained focus. This is a 20 minute computerized exam where the student must "click on" a stated target whereby inhibiting his responses to others. Continuous Performance Test (IVA) scores are expected to average 100, whereby 85 or below is considered below average. She did receive a full-scale attention quotient of 101. This would be considered a passing score. Mouse ratings of physical fidgetiness were nil. It is this psychologist's impression that this test was indeed a false negative. Susan does have a very clear history of hyperactivity dating back to age one, when she "got into things" and would climb out of her high chair. Even preschool teachers noted wandering. In the office setting she easily zoned out when work became difficult. Both rating scales, history and examiner observation all heartily support a diagnosis of ADHD.

### **SUMMARY:**

Susan Chartuse is an 11-year-old fifth grader referred for possible ADHD and dyslexia. Her tutor is reporting difficulty with pronunciation and focusing.

Psychoeducational testing indicates a Full-Scale IQ of 98, fully within the average range. However, there was an enormous discrepancy between her verbal abilities (Verbal Comprehension Index = 78) versus her nonverbal abilities (Fluid Reasoning Index = 118). This means there are overarching weaknesses in language. Yet underneath that Susan is an intelligent youngster who may observe, think, but just has trouble explaining. She may know more than she lets on.

Reading scores placed her overall reading ability at an early third-grade level – meaning that she is 2-1/2 years behind her current placement. She truly struggled in phonics, which is the foundation of reading. Placing so many efforts to pronounce the individual word, fewer resources are left over for comprehension.

Writing though was exceptionally creative, thorough and interesting. When Susan is not inhibited by answering somebody else's question she feels free to express herself in writing. Math also was placed at a mid-third grade level. She had great difficulty in sequencing, especially following the steps in math word problems.

Processing tests very clearly point to visual processing deficits, sometimes termed dyslexia. This means that the letters and words may dance around in her mind before she can identify them. This is frustrating to the child to say the least. Other processing areas were good including listening skills and memory function. Susan also has a higher-order learning disability. Processing tests show difficulty following fluid or logical reasoning. This is the reason that she struggles in mathematics or may not follow the sequences from paragraph one to paragraph two.

This student has an early history of a high activity level. Elementary school teachers noticed wandering and difficulty staying seated. In the office setting she mentally drifted when work became difficult. Therefore history, observations and testing do heartily support a diagnosis of Attention Deficit Hyperactivity Disorder – Combined Type.

### **DIAGNOSES:**

DSM 5: Attention Deficit Hyperactivity Disorder – Combined Type  
Learning Disorder with impairments in reading  
Learning Disorder with impairments in mathematics

### **RECOMMENDATIONS:**

1. This student's attentional and learning difficulties have caused a modus operandi of avoidance. Susan tries to avoid difficult schoolwork and other everyday tasks that require focus. In addition, now she has become pessimistic about her probabilities of success. With a low frustration tolerance she might give up before exerting effort. Therefore it is this psychologist's recommendation that psychostimulant medication be discussed with her pediatrician.
2. It is imperative, however, that this student's self-esteem be maintained. Therefore, she must be enrolled in extracurricular activities that she enjoys. Sports and youth group were discussed.
3. A nonpharmacological treatment of ADHD is exercise. Daily athletics were strongly recommended to mother and grandmother.
4. In order to increase this youngster's comprehension, Mrs. Chartuse might try watching television with her daughter. Periodically, the program should be paused and inquiries made as to exactly what might be occurring in complex scenes. Motives and expectations for outcomes should also be discussed.
5. The importance of a good night's sleep was emphasized. Daily exercise will also help in this endeavor.
6. This report should be reviewed by the Child Study Team at Orange Sables Elementary. This psychologist would strongly recommend that the following accommodations be added to her IEP including:

- A. Extra movement breaks during tests.
- B. Extended test time for all school-based tests and high-stakes testing (1-1/2 times standard allotment).
- C. The privilege of taking tests in a quiet and solitary environment.

## **READING COMPREHENSION RECOMMENDATIONS**

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

Good readers

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

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

### **2. Monitoring.**

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

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

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

4. Reading and listening comprehension can be helped by teaching students to summarize facts in a logical sequence so they can either verbalize or write what they have just heard or seen. This means that parents can help her do so after she watches a television show or a movie. Parents, teachers and tutors should also help her summarize a paragraph. Should she not be able to predict the next paragraph or summarize accurately, Hayley should learn to self-monitor enough so that she will go back and reread!
  
5. Memory for recently read information can be helped by aiding the child in maximizing the depth of processing. This means to have them think about what she has just read and make connections to it. Taking studying breaks or spacing homework assignments will also improve memory function. Associative techniques such as Mnemonics have also been helpful.

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

cc: Dr. Sam Feelgood  
Stacy Fluency, Guidance Counselor