SECTION IV: Rating Scales

Chapter 8: Communication Rating Scales

The Communication Rating Scales are to be used as organizational tools <u>after</u> the assessment data of the student's communication abilities have been completed and interpreted. The tool is designed to enable SLPs to document assessment findings according to the intensity of those findings and to make a determination of eligibility for a Speech or Language Impairment (SLI) based on assessment results, in collaboration with the IEP team. <u>The scales are not diagnostic instruments but ways to organize evaluation findings.</u> If your AU uses the rating scales, they must be scored based on a body of evidence to include formal and/or informal assessment data, educational observations, parent and family input.

The Speech-Language Pathologist will determine whether to use the COMPREHENSIVE ASSESSMENT OR OBSERVATIONAL ASSESSMENT ONLY within the RATING SCALE. Comprehensive Assessment is recommended for the area(s) of concern, unless a standardized assessment is not available due to cognitive, linguistic or cultural reasons. The Comprehensive Assessment considers functional communication skills in relation to the student's educational environment and provides evidence to support abilities not based solely on a single assessment score.

The following definitions are included to accompany the communication rating scales:

"A <u>language impairment</u> 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" (ASHA, 1993). A language impairment does not exist when: (1) language performance is appropriate to normal development; (2) language differences are primarily due to environmental, cultural or economic factors including non-standard English and regional dialect; and, (3) language performance does not interfere with educational performance. The three Language Scales are: Receptive Language Scale, Expressive Language Scale, and Pragmatic Language Scale.

<u>Discourse</u>, categorized as conversation, narration, persuasion, and exposition, is defined as higher order language skills used to understand and explain complex concepts beyond the sentence level (Nippold, 2014). This language skill has been added to the receptive and expressive language rating scales as another area to consider during an observation on the student's functional communication skills in the educational setting. Discourse is a continuum of conversational language to higher order literacy skills reflected in academic content. It takes foundational linguistic skills and applies them to the academic skills of listening, speaking, reading, writing, and thinking. In the educational setting students participate through **conversational discourse** where they are able to share their ideas and feelings with others; **narrative discourse** where they are able to recount an event or experience, formulate a story, retell a story without listener prompting; and **expository discourse** where they need to understand the instructional language of the teacher, text, and classroom discussion.

<u>Auditory Processing</u> and <u>Auditory Perception</u> are included in the Receptive Language Scale since they are part of the eligibility criteria in the Early Childhood Education Act (ECEA **2.08(9)(a))** for Speech or Language Impairment. The role of the speech language pathologist is to determine how the student is processing and perceiving auditory information as related to language development. There is a hierarchical development of

auditory processing skills which have individual functions but work together in an integrated system. Areas for consideration are: sensation (acuity), perception (discrimination, sequencing, analysis and synthesis) auditory association and auditory attention. Sensation can be determined through medical/education records, hearing screening or other appropriate sources. Perception, auditory association and auditory memory can be assessed through a variety of formal and informal assessments, parent/teacher report, observation or other appropriate sources.

Some skills commonly associated with auditory processing abilities which could be evaluated by the speech-language pathologist are listed in the table along with a brief definition and some examples which was adapted from the chart by Robert Keith (Keith, 2004). Several assessments have subtests which could more formally assess these skills. The subtest would only be used to support how this component is scored.

Table 1: Auditory processing and auditory perception skills

Auditory Processing Skills	Definition	Examples
Sensation (acuity)	The ability to hear sounds	Audiogram. Educational/medical report
Auditory discrimination	The ability to discriminate between phonemic elements of speech that are acoustically similar (sun/fun).	Minimal pairs, same or different word lists
Auditory sequencing	The ability to recall the order of a series of details.	Recalling numbers, words, syllables, details of a story in sequence,
Auditory attention	To direct attention to relevant acoustic signals, specifically speech or linguist stimuli, and sustain that attention for an appropriate amount of time.	Following directions in class, filtering background noise to attend to teacher
Auditory synthesis	The ability to merge or blend isolated phonemes into words. Auditory synthesis is critical to the reading process.(/t/a/p/ = tap)	Blending words from sounds, making compound words
Auditory analysis	The ability to identify phonemes or morphemes embedded in words as seen in verb tense (e.g., worked vs. works) and other morphological markers.	Making 2 words from compound words, taking words apart by their sounds
Auditory association	The ability to attach meaning from an acoustic signal and associate it to its source or label, such as non-linguistic sounds or words.	Words that go together, matching sounds to pictures, word classes
Auditory memory	The ability to store and recall auditory stimuli in the appropriate order or sequence (e.g., following directions, retelling a sequential story in order).	Following novel directions, recalling details from a story read aloud

(Adapted from the chart on page 125 by Robert Keith)

If there are concerns with the auditory system which warrant further assessment to determine Auditory Processing Disorder (APD or (C)APD), the speech-language pathologist should consult with an audiologist. Speech language pathologists do not diagnose (C)APD. A diagnosis of Auditory Processing Disorder does not

automatically make a student eligible for special education services. For further information please consult the technical assistance document on <u>The Consideration of Clinical Diagnoses in the Educational Identification</u> of <u>Disabilities in Accordance with IDEA 2004</u>.

An <u>articulation impairment</u> is the "atypical production of speech sounds...that may interfere with intelligibility" (ASHA, 1993). Errors in sound production are generally classified as motor-based or cognitive/linguistic-based (Bernthal and Bankson, 1988). Motor-based errors are generally called articulation impairments; cognitive/linguistic-based errors are referred to as impairments of phonological processes. While some practitioners classify phonological process errors as language impairments, for purposes of these guidelines they are included, along with articulation impairments under the category of phonology. An articulation impairment does not exist when: (1) sound errors are consistent with normal articulation development; (2) articulation differences are due primarily to unfamiliarity with the English language, dialectal differences, temporary physical disabilities or environmental, cultural or economic factors; or, (3) the errors do not interfere with educational performance resulting in a denial of FAPE.

A fluency impairment includes stuttering, cluttering and other speech related disorders. "A fluency disorder is an interruption in the flow of speaking characterized by atypical rate, rhythm, and repetitions in sounds, syllables, words, and phrases. This may be accompanied by excessive tension, struggle behavior, and secondary mannerisms (ASHA, 1993)." A fluency impairment does not exist when (1) disfluent behaviors are part of normal speech development and/or (2) disfluent behaviors do not interfere with educational performance resulting in a denial of FAPE. In the standardized assessment component of the rating scale for Fluency standard deviation can be either above or below the mean depending on the assessment being used. When using a standardized assessment that doesn't fit the typical mean score with normal distribution (mean = 100, SD = 15), use guidance from the assessment manual to determine the appropriate rating. For example, in the OASES, a rating of Moderate-to-Severe is .5-1.49 SD above the mean, which would relate to a score of 3 or 4 on the rating scale. Other instruments may report scores descriptively, in which case a score of Mild = 2 on the rating scale, Moderate = 3, Severe = 4.

A <u>voice impairment</u> is the abnormal production and/or absence of vocal quality, pitch, loudness, resonance, and/or duration which is inappropriate for an individual's age and/or gender (ASHA, 1993). A voice impairment does not exist when vocal characteristics: (1) are the result of temporary physical factors, such as allergies, colds, enlarged tonsils and/or adenoids, or short term vocal misuse or abuse; (2) are the result of regional, dialectic or cultural differences; and/or, (3) do not interfere with educational performance resulting in a denial of FAPE. The American Speech-Language-Hearing Association (ASHA) recommends that individuals receive a medical examination and medical clearance from contraindicating physical problems prior to participating in voice therapy. Consideration should be given to the policies and procedures within an AU, if medical clearance is required in order to determine eligibility for special education. SLPs should consult with their local administration for policies and procedures regarding the evaluation and treatment of voice disorders.

Understanding Academic Language and Adverse Effect

The Academic Language component in the Language rating scale and the Adverse Effect component in all rating scales can be challenging to score, since the terms used are subjective based on the examiner's interpretation of the formal and informal data. Another way to consider these components is if the student needs specially designed instruction to support their education or can the classroom teacher accommodate the need. Typically a student who needs occasional assistance or is mildly impacted can be supported by the classroom teacher, such as having directions repeated or checking in for understanding. If the support is such

that the student needs further instruction beyond the classroom teacher's abilities, then a *moderate* or *severe* impact should be considered.

Another resource to use to support the student's skills would be the Academic Standards being taught at the student's grade level. For example, if the student struggles with understanding inferences but this is taught within the grade level standards, then it would be in the teacher's purview to teach this skill.

Using the Rating Scales with students who have Significant Communication Needs *

For students with significant cognitive and/or complex, unique communication needs, it may not be possible to assess communication skills through traditional measures. Reasonable action should be taken to gather a body of evidence to determine the student's communication skills and needs. Using developmental charts, family or teacher interviews, observation of the student's communication skills or other appropriate tools can help to assess communication needs and services.

The following areas of communication should be addressed through the body of evidence gathered to assess the student's unique communication skills and needs.

- Communicative interactions
- Communicative Intentions
- Communicative Methods
- Understanding and Use of language to:
 - o Develop social relationships
 - o Communicate needs
 - Demonstrate growth in educational setting
- Impact on educational setting

Further consideration should be given to what supports the student needs to be successful in the current educational setting. Consider the following supports:

- Communication Partner strategies
- Environment strategies

Assessments of the speech language pathologist's choice may be used to assist in determining services. Individual AUs may have specific assessment measures that they recommend for students with cognitive or complex communication needs

Using the SLI Guidelines with Children Evaluated and Served under Part C

Based on S.B. 07-255, Child Find Responsibilities under IDEA, AUs are responsible for determining significant developmental delay for children under the age of three based on the definition within the <u>Early Intervention Colorado State Plan under Part C of the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act</u>. The determination of significant developmental delay is based on either an equivalence of 25% or greater delay in one or more areas of development (adaptive, cognitive, communication, physical, including vision and hearing, and social emotional) when compared with chronological age or the equivalence of 1.5 standard deviations or more below the mean in one or more areas of development. It is the responsibility of the local Community Centered Board personnel to determine a child's eligibility for Part C services based on the findings of the Child Find team's evaluation information. To access more information on Child Find click on the following link Child Find website for children birth to 5 years.

Using Scales with students who are Culturally, Linguistically Diverse

Use the **Observational Rating Scale** and do not report normative standard scores with a student who is culturally-linguistically diverse (CLD) unless assessments used are standardized with normative samples that match the demographic background of the student. See Section III: *Assessment Considerations for English Learners* of the **Colorado Speech or Language Impairment Guidelines for Assessment and Eligibility** for further information on assessing culturally and linguistically diverse students.

Procedures for scoring the Communication Rating Scales

The information in this section is for use with students served under IDEA Part B (3-21 Years). For children served under IDEA Part C (birth-3) eligibility is defined by a 25% or greater delay in one or more of the defined areas.

- 1. Use the Communication Rating Scales to rate the student's communication in each area of concern. Normative assessments should be used for identified areas of concern, unless norm-referenced measures are not available for area of concern or the population, such as English learners, students with intellectual disabilities or those using alternative forms of communication. In these situations you would start with the Observational Component. * Be sure to include in your evaluation a rationale for not using normative assessments
- 2. For each Communication Rating Scale completed, it is necessary to circle the appropriate scores in each component within that scale. For example, if you are completing the Articulation /Phonology Rating Scale, Normative Assessment (if used), Observational Assessment; Consistency, Stimulability, and Self-correction; Oral Motor Structure and Function; and Adverse Effect on Educational Performance components must be scored. If using a standardized assessment, use the overall score of the assessment or composite score or index. Do not use a subtest or individual test within an assessment in this component. The component scores are all weighted according to their importance in the determination of a potential disability. If one subtest or test within an assessment is significantly lower, compare or observe these skills in the educational environment when scoring the observational section. Do not alter the weighted scores. For example, do not score Consistency, Stimulability and Self-Correction as a "2.5".

No zeros (0) are to be used on these scales.

- 3. The following Communication Rating Scales are designed to be used for students who are served under IDEA Part B (3-21 years):
 - a. Language Rating Scale (Receptive/Expressive Language Rating Scales
 - b. Pragmatic Language Rating Scale
 - c. Articulation/Phonology Rating Scale
 - d. Fluency Rating Scale
 - e. Voice Rating Scale
- 4. For each Communication Rating Scale, all of the component ratings should be summed to determine the total score.

5. The total score for each Communication Rating Scale corresponds to one of the following ratings. Be sure to use the appropriate rating (either Part B or Part C). The rating is then used to guide determination of eligibility for speech-language services.

Part B students

Rating of 1 =	1 (Within Normal Limits)

Rating of 2 = 2 (Mild) Rating of 3 = 3 (Moderate) Rating of 4 = 4 (Severe)

Under Part B, students with overall ratings of 3 or 4 may be eligible for speech or language services. The model of service delivery should be based on the needs of the student, ensuring the least restrictive environment, access to the general education curriculum and/or appropriate age-related activities, and reasonable educational benefit from services, as discussed at the IEP meeting. Consult individual Administrative Units (AUs) for additional guidance regarding eligibility for services for students.

Variance in Determining the Rating

For each Communication Rating Scale, the SLP determines the **Rating** based on the **Total Score** (Figure 1).

TOTAL SCORE: 12

COMPREHENSIVE ARTICULATION/PHONOLOGY ASSESSMENT TOTAL SCORE: Normative (Standardized); Observational Assessment, Stimulability and Self-Correction; Oral Motor Structure and Function; and Adverse Effect							
Total Score	5	6 7 8 9 10 11 12	13 14 15 16 17 18	19 20 21 22 23 24			
Rating	No Impairment	Mild	Moderate	Severe			
	Rating = 1	Rating = 2	Rating = 3	Rating = 4			

[Figure 1]

At the eligibility meeting, the SLP, in collaboration with the IEP team, may consider the following information: student attendance, cognition, rate of progress, response to interventions, cultural, economic, and linguistic differences, or other factors to add or subtract **one** point to/from the **Total Score**, not the **Rating**. The use of variance should be considered only during the eligibility meeting, if the addition or subtraction of a point would shift the student to another **Rating**. For example, if the student has a total score of 12 on the Articulation/Phonology Rating Scale, the student would receive a Rating of 2 (Mild for Part B) (Figure 2).

TOTAL SCORE: 12

Normative (S	COMPREHENSIVE ARTICULATION/PHONOLOGY ASSESSMENT TOTAL SCORE: Normative (Standardized); Observational Assessment, Stimulability and Self-Correction; Oral Motor Structure and Function; and Adverse Effect					
Total Score	5	6 7 8 9 10 11 12	13 14 15 16 17 18	19 20 21 22 23 24		
Rating	No Impairment	Mild	Moderate	Severe		
	Rating = 1	Rating = 2	Rating = 3	Rating = 4		

[Figure 2]

Suppose the IEP team, due to other factors supported by documentation not previously considered, determines that the score is not reflective of the student's needs. They can add a point to the score making it 13 (Figure 3), which would correspond to a Rating of 3 (Moderate for Part B). There would be no reason to discuss variance if the consideration was to lower the score, since an 11 would keep the student in the same **Rating**.

TOTAL SCORE: 12

Normative (St	COMPREHENSIVE ARTICULATION/PHONOLOGY ASSESSMENT TOTAL SCORE: Normative (Standardized); Observational Assessment, Stimulability and Self-Correction; Oral Motor Structure and Function; and Adverse Effect					
Total Score	Total Score 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 19 20 21 22 23 24					
Rating	No Impairment	Mild	Moderate	Severe		
	Rating = 1	Rating = 2	Rating = 3	Rating = 4		

[Figure 3]

If your AU/BOCES/District requires the Communication Rating Scale scores to be reported in the IEP, then any changes in the **Rating** based on IEP team discussion should also be documented within the IEP. For example, in 'Student Needs and Impact of Disability' and/or in the Prior Written Notice.

RECEPTIVE LANGUAGE RATING SCALE PART B STUDENTS

Normative Assessment: Comprehensive, standardized measure(s) and scores. Do not use individual subtest/test with in an assessment. NORMATIVE ASSESSMENT SHOULD BE COMPLETED IF THIS IS AN AREA OF CONCERN. IF NOT, PROVIDE A RATIONALE.* See Appendix B for students who are culturally, linguistically diverse.	SCORE = 1 1 standard deviation from the mean for example: Standard Score (SS) = 85 when the mean is 100 and the standard deviation is 15	SCORE = 2 >1.0 - 1.5 standard deviations from the mean for example: Standard Score (SS) = 84-78 when the mean is 100 and the standard deviation is 15	SCORE = 3 □ >1.5 - 2.0 standard deviations from the mean for example: Standard Score (SS) = 77-70 when the mean is 100 and the standard deviation is 15	score = 4 >2.0 standard deviations from the mean for example: Standard Score (SS) = 69 or below when the mean is 100 and the standard deviation is 15
Observational Assessment of Language Comprehension Measures: - Classroom observation - Curriculum based assessment/s - Informal probes - Other: The examples are possible suggestions and are NOT intended to be all-inclusive lists.	Understanding all of the following are age appropriate: Phonological Awareness Morphological Awareness (root words, suffixes, prefixes) Syntactic/Grammatical language features Semantics (listening and reading vocabulary) Discourse (narrative, conversational, expository, verbal reasoning higher order language)	Student has difficulty understanding One of the following areas (Check area) Phonological Awareness Morphological Awareness (root words, suffixes, prefixes) Syntactic/Grammatical language features Semantics (listening and reading vocabulary) Discourse (narrative, conversational, expository, verbal reasoning, higher order language)	Student has difficulty understanding Two of the following areas (Check areas) Phonological Awareness Morphological Awareness (root words, suffixes, prefixes) Syntactic/Grammatical language features Semantics (listening and reading vocabulary) Discourse (narrative, conversational, expository verbal reasoning, higher order language)	4 Student has difficulty understanding Three or more of the following areas (Check areas) Phonological Awareness Morphological Awareness (root words, suffixes, prefixes) Syntactic/Grammatical language features Semantics (listening and reading vocabulary) Discourse (narrative, conversational, expository verbal reasoning higher order language)

RECEPTIVE LANGUAGE RATING SCALE

Auditory Droposina	1	2	2	4
Auditory Processing and Auditory Perception: The examples are possible suggestions and are NOT intended to be all-inclusive lists. Work with your audiologist if you suspect an Auditory Processing Disorder.	Auditory Processing and Auditory Perception are judged to be Within Normal Limits.	One of the areas is deficient sensation (acuity) perception (discrimination, sequencing, analysis, synthesis) association auditory attention auditory memory	Two of the following areas are deficient: sensation (acuity) perception (discrimination, sequencing, analysis, synthesis) association auditory attention auditory memory	Three or more of the following areas are deficient: sensation (acuity) perception (discrimination, sequencing, analysis, synthesis) association auditory attention auditory memory
Academic Language Skills: Refer to <u>CDE Academic</u> <u>Standards</u>	The student needs little or no assistance in understanding language (conversation or academic).	The student needs occasional cues, models, explanations or assistance in understanding language (conversation or academic).	The student needs frequent cues, models, explanations or assistance in understanding language (conversation or academic).	The student needs consistent cues, models, explanations or assistance in understanding language (conversation or academic).
Adverse Effect on Educational Performance/ Academic Language:	There is evidence to support Receptive language skills are adequate for the student's participation in age appropriate academic and/or non-academic learning environments.	There is evidence to support Receptive language skills mildly impact educational performance and can be addressed in age appropriate academic and/or non-academic learning environments.	There is evidence to support Receptive language skills moderately impact educational performance and the student's ability to participate in age appropriate academic and/or non-academic learning environments.	There is evidence to support Receptive language skills severely impact educational performance and the student's ability to participate in age appropriate academic and/or non-academic learning environments.

RECEPTIVE LANGUAGE RATING SCALE

STUDENT: SLP:	DATE:
---------------	-------

Instructions:

- 1. Check the box for the most appropriate description for each component: *Normative (Standardized), Observational (Descriptive), Auditory Processing and Auditory Perception, Academic Language, and Adverse Effect.*
- 2. Compute the total score and record below.
- 3. Determine the Rating.

TOTAL SCORE:

	COMPREHENSIVE RECEPTIVE LANGUAGE ASSESSMENT TOTAL SCORE: Normative (Standardized), Observational Assessment, Auditory Processing and Auditory Perception, Academic Language Skills, and Adverse Effect						
Total Score 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24							
Rating	No Impairment Rating = 1	Mild Rating = 2	Moderate Rating = 3	Severe Rating = 4			

OR

	OBSERVATIONAL ASSESSMENT ONLY - RECEPTIVE LANGUAGE ASSESSMENT TOTAL SCORE: Observational Assessment, Auditory Processing and Auditory Perception, Academic Language Skills, and Adverse Effect						
Total Score	Total Score 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20						
Rating	No Impairment Rating = 1	Mild Rating = 2	Moderate Rating = 3	Severe Rating = 4			

Final determination of disability is made by the Multidisciplinary Team.

Expressive Language Rating Scale PART B STUDENTS

Normative Assessment:	SCORE = 1	SCORE = 2	SCORE = 3	SCORE = 4		
Comprehensive, standardized measure(s) and scores. Do not use individual subtest/test	1 standard deviation from the mean	>1.0 - 1.5 standard deviations from the mean	>1.5 – 2.0 standard deviations from the mean	>2.0 standard deviations from the mean		
with in an assessment. NORMATIVE ASSESSMENT SHOULD BE COMPLETED IF	for example: Standard Score (SS) = 85 when the mean is 100 and the	for example: Standard Score (SS) = 84-78 when the mean is 100	for example: Standard Score (SS) = 77-70 when the mean is 100 and the	for example: Standard Score (SS) = 69 or below when the mean is 100		
THIS IS AN AREA OF CONCERN. IF NOT, PROVIDE A RATIONALE.* See Appendix B for students who are culturally, linguistically diverse.	standard deviation is 15	and the standard deviation is 15	standard deviation is 15	and the standard deviation is 15		
Observational	1	2	3	4		
Assessment: The lists are possible suggestions and are NOT intended to be all-inclusive lists.	Expressing all of the following are age appropriate: Syntactic/Grammatical language features	Student has difficulty expressing One of the following area (Check area) Syntactic/Grammatical language features	Student has difficulty expressing Two of the following areas (Check areas) Syntactic/Grammatical language features	Student has difficulty expressing Three or more of the following areas (Check areas) Syntactic/Grammatical language features		
Check descriptive tool used: Classroom observations	Morphology: use of roots, affixes, free/bound morphemes	affixes, free/bound morphemes	affixes, free/bound morphemes	Morphology: use of roots, affixes, free/bound morphemes	Morphology: use of roots, affixes, free/bound morphemes	Morphology: use of roots, affixes, free/bound morphemes
Oral and/or Written Language Sample	Phonological skills Semantics (speaking and	Phonological skills	Phonological skills	Phonological skills		
Checklist(s)	writing vocabulary)	Semantics (speaking and writing vocabulary)	Semantics (speaking and writing vocabulary)	Semantics (speaking and writing vocabulary)		
Curriculum based assessment/s	Discourse (narrative, conversational, expository, higher order language)	Discourse (narrative, conversational, expository,	Discourse (narrative, conversational, expository,	Discourse (narrative, conversational, expository,		

EXPRESSIVE LANGUAGE RATING SCALE PART B STUDENTS

STUDENT:	SLP:		DATE:	
Academic Language Skills:	1	2	3	4
Refer to <u>CDE Academic</u> <u>Standards</u>	The student needs little or no assistance in using language.	The student needs occasional cues, models, explanations or assistance in using language.	The student needs frequent cues, models, explanations or assistance in using language.	The student needs consistent cues, models, explanations or assistance in using language.
Adverse Effect On	1	4	6	8
Educational Performance:				
	There is evidence to	There is evidence to	There is evidence to	There is evidence to
	support Expressive	support Expressive	support Expressive	support Expressive
	language skills are	language skills mildly	language skills	language skills severely
	adequate for the	impact educational	moderately impact	impact educational
	student's participation in	performance and can be	educational performance	performance and the
	age appropriate academic	addressed in age	and the student's ability	student's ability to
	and/or non-academic	appropriate academic	to participate in age	participate in age
	learning environments.	and/or non-academic	appropriate academic	appropriate academic
		learning environments.	and/or non-academic	and/or non-academic
			learning environments.	learning environments.

EXPRESSIVE LANGUAGE RATING SCALE PART B STUDENTS

STUDENT:	SLP:	DATE:

Instructions:

- 1. Check the box for the most appropriate description for each component: *Normative (Standardized), Observational (Descriptive), Academic Language, and Adverse Effect.*
- 2. Compute the total score and record below.
- 3. Determine the Rating.

TOTAL SCORE:

COMPREHENSIVE EXPRESSIVE LANGUAGE ASSESSMENT TOTAL SCORE: Normative (Standardized), Observational Assessment, Academic Skills, and Adverse Effect						
Total Score	Total Score 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20					
Rating	No Impairment Rating = 1	Mild Rating = 2	Moderate Rating = 3	Severe Rating = 4		

OR

OBSERVATIONAL ASSESSMENT ONLY – EXPRESSIVE LANGUAGE ASSESSMENT TOTAL SCORE: Observational Assessment, Academic Skills, and Adverse Effect						
Total Score	Total Score 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16					
RatingNo Impairment Rating = 1Mild Rating = 2Moderate Rating = 3Severe Rating = 3						

Final determination of disability is made by the Multidisciplinary Team.

PRAGMATIC Language RATING Scale PART B STUDENTS

Normative Assessment: Comprehensive, standardized	SCORE = 1 1 standard deviation	SCORE = 2 >1.0 - 1.5 standard deviations	SCORE = 3 >1.5 – 2.0 standard deviations	SCORE = 4
measure(s) and scores. Do not use individual subtest/test with	from the mean	from the mean	from the mean	the mean
in an assessment. NORMATIVE	for example:	for example:	for example:	for example:
ASSESSMENT SHOULD BE COMPLETED IF THIS IS AN AREA OF CONCERN. IF NOT, PROVIDE A RATIONALE.* See Appendix B for students who are culturally, linguistically diverse.	Standard Score (SS) = 85 when the mean is 100 and the standard deviation is 15	Standard Score (SS) = 84-78 when the mean is 100 and the standard deviation is 15	Standard Score (SS) = 77-70 when the mean is 100 and the standard deviation is 15	Standard Score (SS) = 69 or below when the mean is 100 and the standard deviation is 15
Observational	1	2	3	4
Assessment of Pragmatics: Check descriptive tool used: Pragmatics/Communication sample Checklist(s) Observations Other The examples are possible suggestions and are NOT intended to be all-inclusive lists.	Pragmatic skills are judged as average relative to expectations when compared to culturally, linguistically, same age peers.	One of the areas is deficient Functions of Communication (e.g. Informing, Requesting, Demand, Refusal, Greetings) Topic Selection (e.g. Introduction, Maintenance, Shift, Termination) Turn-Taking (e.g. Gaining attention, Initiation, Response, Repair, Interruption,) Non-Verbal Communication (e.g. Proximity, Gesture, Facial Expression, Eye Gaze.) Social Inference (e.g. Joint Attention, Perspective Taking, Word Choice: specificity, accuracy, cohesion, Empathy Paralinguistic (e.g. prosody, intonation, rate, loudness) Other	Two areas are deficient Functions of Communication (e.g. Informing, Requesting, Demand, Refusal, Greetings) Topic Selection (e.g. Introduction, Maintenance, Shift, Termination) Turn-Taking (e.g. Gaining attention, Initiation, Response, Repair, Interruption,) Non-Verbal Communication (e.g. Proximity, Gesture, Facial Expression, Eye Gaze.) Social Inference (e.g. Joint Attention, Perspective Taking, Word Choice: specificity, accuracy, cohesion, Empathy Paralinguistic (e.g. prosody, intonation, rate, loudness) Other	Three or more areas are deficient Functions of Communication (e.g. Informing, Requesting, Demand, Refusal, Greetings) Topic Selection (e.g. Introduction, Maintenance, Shift, Termination) Turn-Taking (e.g. Gaining attention, Initiation, Response, Repair, Interruption,) Non-Verbal Communication (e.g. Proximity, Gesture, Facial Expression, Eye Gaze.) Social Inference (e.g. Joint Attention, Perspective Taking, Word Choice: specificity, accuracy, cohesion, Empathy Paralinguistic (e.g. prosody, intonation, rate, loudness) Other

PRAGMATIC LANGUAGE RATING SCALE PART B STUDENTS

STUDENT: SLP: DATE: Adverse Effect on 6 1 4 8 **Educational Performance:** There is evidence to There is evidence to There is evidence to There is evidence to support **Pragmatics** are support **Pragmatics** are support **Pragmatics** support **Pragmatics** adequate for the developing and mildly moderately impact the severely impact the student's participation in student's ability to impact educational student's ability to age appropriate performance and can be participate in age participate in age addressed in age appropriate academic appropriate academic academic and nonacademic learning appropriate academic (e.g., classroom) and non-(e.g., classroom) and non-(e.g., classroom) and nonacademic (e.g., academic (e.g., environments with a playground, lunchroom, variety of communication academic (e.g., playground, lunchroom, playground, lunchroom, early childhood, vocation, early childhood, vocation, partners. early childhood, vocation, community) learning community) educational settings and with a community) learning environments or with a variety of communication variety of communication environments with a variety of communication partners. partners. partners.

PRAGMATIC LANGUAGE RATING SCALE

STUDENT: SI	LP: DATE:
-------------	-----------

Instructions:

- 1. Check the box for the most appropriate description for each component: *Normative (Standardized)*, and/or *Observational (Descriptive)*, *Pragmatics and Adverse Effects*.
- 2. Compute the total score and record below.
- 3. Determine the Rating.

TOTAL SCORE:

COMPREHENSIVE PRAGMATICS ASSESSMENT TOTAL SCORE: Normative (Standardized), Observational (Descriptive), Adverse Effect						
Total Score	tal Score 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16					
Rating	No Impairment Rating = 1	Mild Rating = 2	Moderate Rating = 3	Severe Rating = 4		

OR

OBSERVATIONAL ONLY - PRAGMATICS ASSESSMENT TOTAL SCORE: Observational Assessment (Descriptive), Adverse Effect						
Total Score	Total Score 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12					
RatingNo Impairment Rating = 1Mild Rating = 2Moderate Rating = 3Severe Rating = 3						

Final determination of disability is made by the IEP team.

Articulation/PHONOLOGY Rating Scale

STUDENT: SLP: DATE: Normative Assessment of SCORE = 1SCORE = 2SCORE = 3SCORE = 4**Articulation/Phonology:** 1 standard deviation from >1.0 - 1.5 standard >1.5 – 2.0 standard deviations >2.0 standard deviations from Comprehensive, standardized the mean deviations from the from the mean the mean measure(s) and scores. Do not use mean individual subtest/test with in an for example: for example: for example: assessment. for example: Standard Score (SS) = 85 Standard Score (SS) = 77-70 when the Standard Score (SS) = 69 or below NORMATIVE ASSESSMENT when the mean is 100 and Standard Score (SS) = 84 mean is 100 and the standard when the mean is 100 and the SHOULD BE COMPLETED IF THIS IS the standard deviation is 15 -78 when the mean is standard deviation is 15 deviation is 15 AN AREA OF CONCERN. IF NOT. 100 and the standard **PROVIDE A RATIONALE.* See** deviation is 15 Appendix B for students who are culturally, linguistically diverse. 3 **Observational Assessment** 1 2 4 of Articulation/Phonology: All of the following are Speech production is **Two** are present **Three** are present adequate for speech characterized by the Check descriptive tool used: Intelligibility often results in production. following. Intelligibility consistently results Speech sample communication breakdown due to in communication breakdown Checklist(s) Production of speech is Speech sound errors sound productions **noticeable** in due to sound productions Observations within the developmental are present and may error extensive in error Other be non-developmental range in all educational Unresolved phonological patterns, Unresolved phonological settings including early The lists are possible suggestions and are Intelligibility typical or idiosyncratic patterns, typical or idiosyncratic. NOT intended to be all-inclusive lists. childhood environments. occasionally results in Articulation errors including Articulation errors including Errors, if present, are communication (substitutions, omissions, (substitutions, omissions, consistent with normal breakdown distortions and additions) which distortions and additions) which development are not found in age-matched are not found in age-matched peers who are culturally and peers who are culturally and linguistically similar linguistically similar **Vowel Errors Vowel Errors**

Use compensatory speech patterns/ Idiosyncratic Errors

May use compensatory speech

communication

patterns /Idiosyncratic Errors

ARTICULATION/PHONOLOGY RATING SCALE

Consistency, Stimulability	1	2	3	4
and Self-correction:	Both are checked	At least two are checked	At least two are checked	At least two are checked
Judgments are based on the student's performance as compared to developmental, dialectic, cultural and linguistic expectations. NOTE: Ability to self-correct should NOT be considered for children ages 0 THROUGH 3.	Consistent sound patterns Stimulable for all sounds within the developmental norms.	 ☐ Minor inconsistencies in sound production ☐ Stimulable for error sound/s in at least one context within the developmental norms. ☐ Frequent self-corrections noted. 	 ☐ Frequent inconsistencies in sound production ☐ Limited stimulability for error sound/s within the developmental norms. ☐ Inconsistent self-correction 	 ☐ Consistent error patterns ☐ Not stimulable for error sound/s within the developmental norms. ☐ No self-corrections noted.
Oral Motor Structure and Function:	1 Oral structures appear normal and adequate for speech production.	Mild difficulties in oral motor and/or sequencing do not interfere with speech production.	Moderate difficulties in timing, sequencing and/or coordination of speech sound/s are evident.	Severe difficulties in timing, sequencing and/or coordination of speech sound/s are evident. Additional neuro-motor and/or structural deficits present.
Adverse Effect on Educational Performance:	Speech is adequate for the student's participation in all ageappropriate educational settings including early childhood environments.	Speech sounds are developing. Speech errors mildly impact the student's participation in all age-appropriate educational settings including early childhood environments.	Speech errors moderately impact student's participation in all ageappropriate educational settings including early childhood environments.	Speech errors severely impact student's participation in all ageappropriate educational settings including early childhood environments.

ARTICULATION/PHONOLOGY RATING SCALE

P: DATE:
)

Instructions:

- 1. Check the box for the most appropriate description for each component: Normative (Standardized), Observational (Descriptive), Consistency, Stimulability and Self-Correction/ Oral Motor Structure and Function, and Adverse Effect.
- 2. Compute the total score.
- 3. Circle below to determine the Rating.

TOTAL SCORE:

OR

OBSERVATIONAL ASSESSMENT ONLY – ARTICULATION/PHONOLOGY ASSESSMENT TOTAL SCORE: Observational Assessment; Consistency, Stimulability and Self-Correction; Oral Motor Structure and Function; and Adverse Effect						
Total Score	Total Score 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20					
Detino	No Impairment	Mild	Moderate	Severe		
Rating	Rating = 1	Rating = 2	Rating = 3	Rating = 4		

Final determination of disability is made by the Multidisciplinary Team.

FLUENCY RATING SCALE

(STUTTERING, CLUTTERING AND RELATED DISORDERS)

Normative Assessment	SCORE = 1	SCORE = 2	SCORE = 3	SCORE = 4
of Fluency (stuttering, cluttering, and related disorders):	1 standard deviation from the mean	>1.0 - 1.5 standard deviations from the mean	>1.5 – 2.0 standard deviations from the mean	>2.0 standard deviations from the mean
•	for example:	for example:	for example:	for example:
Comprehensive, standardized measure/s and scores	Standard Score (SS) = 85 when the mean is 100 and the standard deviation is 15	Standard Score (SS) = 84-78 when the mean is 100 and the standard deviation is 15	Standard Score (SS) = 77-70 when the mean is 100 and the standard deviation is 15	Standard Score (SS) = 69 or below when the mean is 100 and the standard deviation is 15
Observational	1	2	3	4
Assessment of Overt Behaviors:	Check all that apply. Use the score in the highest column with a check	Check all that apply. Use the score in the highest column with a check	Check all that apply. Use the score in the highest column with a check	Check all that apply. Use the score in the highest column with a check
Check descriptive tool used: Speech sample Checklist(s) Observations over multiple days and settings	Speech fluency, intelligibility and rate are Within Normal Limits.	 Mild disfluencies (e.g. whole/part word, phrase repetitions, prolongations, or blocking) no visible tension; Average duration: ≤ 0.5 second Frequency of disfluency: < 5% of an adequate speech sample. 	Moderate disfluencies (e.g. whole/part word and/or phrase repetitions, prolongations, or blocking) with visible tension; Average duration: 0.6 - 9.0 sec. Frequency of disfluency: 5-11% of an adequate speech	Severe disfluencies (e.g. whole/part word and/or phrase repetitions, prolongations, or blocking) with visible tension; Average duration: ≥10.0 seconds ☐ Frequency of disfluency: 12% or greater of an adequate
Other:		Rate of/flow of speech is perceived as fast and/or irregular with no impact intelligibility/comprehensibility. No observable communication avoidance behaviors (e.g. substitutions, sentence abandonment) or minimal or no physical secondary behaviors (e.g. eye blinks, head jerks)	sample. Rate of/flow of speech is perceived as fast and/or irregular and frequently/ moderately impacts intelligibility/ comprehensibility. Some observable communication avoidance behaviors (e.g. substitutions, conspicuous interjections) or moderate physical secondary behaviors (e.g. eye blinks, head jerks)	speech sample. Rate of/flow of speech is perceived as fast and/or irregular and consistently/ severely impacts intelligibility/ comprehensibility. Pervasive observable communication avoidance behaviors (e.g. substitutions, interjections, sentence abandonment) or severe physical secondary behaviors (e.g. eye blinks, head jerks)

FLUENCY RATING SCALE (STUTTERING, CLUTTERING AND RELATED DISORDERS)

Observational Assessment of	1	2	3	4
Covert Behaviors <u>Use with students 6 or older.</u>	No or minimal covert behaviors are reported	Student sometimes: (check all that apply)	Student often: (check all that apply)	Student nearly always (check all that apply)
Based on Report: (Student self-report if 6 years or older) Check descriptive tool used:		avoids or experiences anxiety around speaking situations	avoids or experiences anxiety around speaking situations	avoids or experiences anxiety around speaking situations
☐ Self-assessment ☐ Checklist/Questionnaire		avoids a particular sound/word	avoids a particular sound/word	avoids a particular sound/word
☐ interview ☐ Other: The examples are possible suggestions and		is embarrassed or frustrated about his/her speech	is embarrassed or frustrated about his/her speech	is embarrassed or frustrated about his/her speech
are NOT intended to be all-inclusive lists.		is teased about speech	is teased about speech	is teased about speech
Observational Assessment of	1	2	3	4
Risk Factors	No Reported concerns or All	One is selected	Two are selected	Three or more are selected
Use with students Birth-5. Based on Report (Birth	should be selected	Onset after age 4	Onset after age 4	Onset after age 4
through 5 years)	Onset prior to age 4 Stuttering for less than 6	Stuttering for more than 6 months	Other Risk Factors (Male, known family history of stuttering)	☐ Male ☐ Known family history of
	months No Negative emotional reaction to stuttering	Negative emotional reaction to stuttering	Stuttering for more than 6 months	stuttering Stuttering for more than 6 months
			Negative emotional reaction to stuttering	Negative emotional reaction to stuttering
Adverse Effect of Fluency on	1	4	6	8
Educational Performance:	Fluency skills are within normal limits for the student's participation in age appropriate academic and non-academic learning environments.	Disfluencies mildly impact the student's participation in age appropriate academic and non-academic learning environments.	Disfluencies moderately impact the student's participation in age appropriate academic and non-academic learning environments	Disfluencies severely impact the student's participation in age appropriate academic and non-academic learning environments.

FLUENCY RATING SCALE (STUTTERING, CLUTTERING AND RELATED DISORDERS)

STUDENT:	SLP:	DATE:
STUDENT:	SLP:	DAIE:

Instructions:

- 1. Check the box for the most appropriate description for each component: *Normative (Standardized), Observational Overt Behaviors (Descriptive), Observational Covert Behaviors (Descriptive), Adverse Effect)*
- 2. Compute the total score.
- 3. Circle below to determine the Rating.

TOTAL SCORE:

COMPREHENSIVE FLUENCY ASSESSMENT TOTAL SCORE: Normative (Standardized), Observational Overt Behaviors (Descriptive), Observational Covert Behaviors (Descriptive), Adverse Effect						
Total Score	ore 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20					
Rating	No Impairment	Mild	Moderate	Severe		
J	Rating = 1	Rating = 2	Rating = 3	Rating = 4		

OR

OBSERVATIONAL ASSESSMENT ONLY – FLUENCY ASSESSMENT TOTAL SCORE: Observational Overt Behaviors (Descriptive), Observational Covert Behaviors (Descriptive), Adverse Effect						
Total Score	Total Score 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16					
Rating	No Impairment	Mild	Moderate	Severe		
	Rating = 1	Rating = 2	Rating = 3	Rating = 4		

Final determination of disability is made by the Multidisciplinary Team.

VOICE RATING SCALE

Observational Assessment of Pitch: Too High Too Low Monotone Excessive Variation Pitch Breaks Disordered Intonation Patterns	Score = 1 Pitch is Within Normal Limits in all educational settings If Formal Testing is not indicated, a rationale must be provided.	Score = 2 Pitch deviations are present and occasionally interfere with communication.	Score = 3 Pitch deviations are present and often interfere with communication.	Score = 4 Pitch deviations are present and consistently interfere with communication.
Observational Assessment of Loudness: Too loud Too soft Limited Variation Excessive Variation Mono Loudness	Loudness is Within Normal Limits in all educational settings.	Deviations in loudness are present and occasionally interfere with communication.	Deviations in loudness are present and often interfere with communication.	Deviations in loudness are present and consistently interfere with communication.
Observational Assessment of Quality: Breathy Strident Harsh Hoarse Tremor Weak Voice Loss of Voice Glottal Fry Hard Glottal Attacks Reverse Phonation	Quality is Within Normal Limits in all educational settings.	Deviations in quality of voice are present and occasionally interfere with communication.	Deviations in quality of voice are present and often interfere with communication.	Deviations in quality of voice are present and consistently interfere with communication.

VOICE RATING SCALE

Observational Assessment of Resonance: Hypernasal	1 Resonance is Within Normal Limits in all	Deviations in resonance occasionally	Jeviations in resonance are present	4 Deviations in resonance are present
Hyponasal Nasal Emission Assimilation Nasality Mixed/Cul-de-Sac	educational settings.	interfere with communication.	and frequently interfere with communication.	and consistently interfere with communication.
Adverse Effect on Educational Performance:	1	4	6	8
Difficulty being heard or	Voice characteristics	Voice deviations are present and mildly	☐ Voice deviations are	☐ Voice deviations are

VOICE RATING SCALE

STUDENT:	SLP:	DATE:
----------	------	-------

Instructions:

- 1. Check the box for the most appropriate description for each component: Pitch, Loudness, Quality, Resonance, Adverse Effect.
- 2. Add the scores from each category to determine the total score.
- 3. Circle below to determine the Rating.

TOTAL SCORE:

VOICE ASSESSMENT TOTAL SCORE: Observational Assessment of Pitch, Loudness, Quality, and Resonance and Adverse Effect						
Total Score	core 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22					
	No Impairment	Mild	Moderate	Severe		
Rating	Rating = 1	Rating = 2	Rating = 3	Rating = 4		

Final determination of disability is made by the Multidisciplinary Team.

SIGNIFICANT COMMUNICATION NEEDS PROFILE

This profile was created to assist the SLP in describing the student's unique communication strengths and needs. *This profile is a way to gather the assessment data, whether formal or informal, to assist in the discussion for speech or language services.* Determination of eligibility and services, if needed, is made by the IEP team.

The following areas of communication should be addressed through the body of evidence gathered to assess the student's unique communication skills and needs.

Communicative interactions (e.g. shared and balanced interactions, initiate, respond maintain a topic) **Communicative Intentions** (e.g. accept/refuse, request and comment on objects/actions/people, show humor).

Communicative Methods (e.g. verbal, AAC, sign language, gestures, points) **Understanding and Use of language to:**

- o Develop social relationships
- Communicate needs
- o Demonstrate growth in academic and /or educational setting

Impact on Educational Performance (adequate communication skills to participate in current setting)

Further consideration should be given to what supports the student needs to be successful. Consider the following supports:

Communication Partner strategies (e.g. wait time, modeling, expanding on student's utterance) **Environment strategies** (e.g. visual supports, predictability, routines)

Communication Matrix (Charity Rowland, 2004) is a free assessment tool designed to assess the beginning stages of communication. This tool is appropriate for students who are nonverbal as well as those whose verbal skills are emerging. You may access this tool through the <u>communication matrix</u> website. This is just one assessment which may provide data points for communication services.