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## The COMPARES Key

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>COMPARES Key of Rating Symbols for Research Associating Processing &amp; Achievement Areas</th>
<th>Description of Relationship</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Strong convincing evidence. Research shows a strong to very strong relationship, and is consistent. Meta-analyses may confirm the correlation between this processing area and achievement area.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Convincing evidence. One or more research studies or meta-analyses show a strong relationship, but findings may be inconsistent or contradictory. A recognized expert in the field may state in an article or a textbook that there is a significant or relevant relationship, yet current research may not focus on the explicit connection. An fMRI study may show activation of a brain area known to be associated with a particular cognitive process while engaged in a related academic task.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Partially convincing evidence. Some research shows a moderate or relevant relationship, but findings may be inconsistent, contradictory, or preliminary.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Unconvincing evidence. Research shows a weak relationship, and/or is anecdotal rather than quantitative, and/or lacks peer review, and/or has few or no bibliographic citations.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>∅</td>
<td>No research found that shows even a weak correlation as of the publication date of this document. If a study was found that shows “no relation,” this study is cited in the annotated version of the COMPARES.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Overview of the COMPARES

Directions for use: The overview of the COMPARES document allows assessment teams a quick glance at the strength of the research link between the processing area and academic achievement area. Assessment teams need to examine the specific page number(s) (which are located directly to the right of the rating symbol) for the areas of question and take into consideration the other information provided within the COMPARES.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Processing Area</th>
<th>Processing Area</th>
<th>Basic Reading Skills (Decoding)</th>
<th>Reading Fluency</th>
<th>Reading Comprehension</th>
<th>Written Expression</th>
<th>Math Calculation</th>
<th>Math Problem-Solving</th>
<th>Listening Comprehension</th>
<th>Oral Expression</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Auditory Processing</td>
<td>Phonological Processing</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>108</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Auditory Memory</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>108</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Auditory Processing Speed</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>103</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Auditory Processing</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>103</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Visual-Spatial Processing</td>
<td>Visual-Spatial Processing</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>104</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>109</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Orthographic Processing</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>104</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>109</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Visual Memory</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>104</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>109</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Visual Processing Speed</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>104</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>109</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cognitive Abilities</td>
<td>Memory</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>105</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>110</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Rapid Naming Skills</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>105</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>110</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Conceptualization and Fluid Reasoning/Problem-Solving</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>110</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Expression</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>110</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Language Processing (Crystallized Knowledge)</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>110</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Processing Speed</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>106</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>111</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Executive Functions</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>106</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>111</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sensory-Motor Skills</td>
<td>Visual Motor, Fine Motor, Graphomotor, Sensorimotor</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>107</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>112</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sensorimotor Memory</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>107</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>112</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sensorimotor Speed</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>107</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>112</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Oral Motor/Oral Motor Speed</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>107</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>113</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attention</td>
<td>Attention</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>107</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>113</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Please reference the COMPARES for specific information.

* Please refer to page 88 for additional information regarding Attention.
**COMPARES for California’s Five Processing Areas, Sub-Areas, and Academic Areas**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Processing Area</th>
<th>Sub-Area</th>
<th>Basic Reading Skills (aka Reading Decoding)</th>
<th>Reading Fluency*</th>
<th>Reading Comprehension</th>
<th>Written Language</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Auditory Processing (Ga)</td>
<td>Phonological Processing (including phonemic awareness and sound discrimination, phonetic coding, phonologic memory)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Developmental Note¹: Auditory processing matures early, after gradual development.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>See also “Memory” under “Cognitive Abilities.”</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Auditory Memory, Auditory Short-Term Memory, Auditory Working Memory, Verbal Memory, Verbal Working Memory, Phonological Memory, Phonological Short-Term Memory</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Developmental Note¹: Working Memory matures late after gradual development.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>See also “Memory” under “Cognitive Abilities.”</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Auditory Processing Speed</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>See “Processing Speed” and “Rapid Naming Skills” under Cognitive Abilities section.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Studies by McGrew & Wendling (2010), Benson (2008), and Evans et al (2001) suggest that there is a direct relationship between basic reading skills (e.g., decoding) and reading fluency. Therefore, where significance is found between a processing area and basic reading skills, it may be possible to infer a relationship between that processing area and reading fluency, even if the research was not explicitly examining proficiency in reading fluency. In addition, reading fluency initially has a strong effect on reading comprehension but that effect is reduced with age (Benson 2008).
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### FORMAL ASSESSMENT TOOL RECOMMENDATIONS

*Use informed professional judgment*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>LANGUAGE PROFICIENCY</th>
<th>WMLS-R NU</th>
<th>WJ IV- OL</th>
<th>Batería III</th>
<th>BVAT-NU</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>CALP PROFICIENCY</strong> (L1) Native</td>
<td><strong>CALP PROFICIENCY</strong> (L2) Second</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Profile #1</td>
<td>Profile #2</td>
<td>Profile #3</td>
<td>Profile #4</td>
<td>Profile #5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CALP Limited (1-2)</td>
<td>CALP Emerging (3)</td>
<td>CALP Fluent (4-5)</td>
<td>CALP Limited (1-2)</td>
<td>CALP Emerging (3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>↓ Nonverbal</td>
<td>↓ Nonverbal and possibly in L1</td>
<td>↓ Assesses in native language</td>
<td>↓ Nonverbal and possibly in L2</td>
<td>↓ Assess in second language</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### POSSIBLE ASSESSMENT MODALITY

*CALP* (Language Proficiency)

1. **Profile #1**
   - Calp Limited (1-2)
   - Assesses in native language

2. **Profile #2**
   - Calp Emerging (3)
   - Nonverbal

3. **Profile #3**
   - Calp Fluent (4-5)
   - Nonverbal and possibly in L1

4. **Profile #4**
   - Calp Limited (1-2)
   - Nonverbal and possibly in L2

5. **Profile #5**
   - Calp Emerging (3)
   - Assesses in native language

6. **Profile #6**
   - Calp Fluent (4-5)
   - Nonverbal and possibly in L1 & L2

7. **Profile #7**
   - Calp Limited (1-2)
   - Assess in second language

8. **Profile #8**
   - Calp Emerging (3)
   - Assess in second language or possibly L1 & L2

9. **Profile #9**
   - Calp Fluent (4-5)
   - Assess in second language or possibly L1 & L2

*The tests above are general guidelines. Always use informed professional judgment.*

*Follow your District protocols & procedures, unless they are discriminatory*
Case Study: Mary – Background Information

Mary is a 5th grade student at your school. She has been attending your school since kindergarten. She was born in the US, but parents were both born in Mexico and immigrated to the US 15 years ago. At home, parents speak Spanish with Mary and her two older siblings. Mary speaks English at school and with her brother and sister, and speaks Spanish mainly with her parents and grandparents, who also live in the home.

Mary has been struggling for many years with reading. The school has provided intervention both during the school day as well as during the after-school program, when available for her grade level. Despite all of the intervention, she continues to struggle.

When she began attending Kindergarten, the school assessed her primary language (IPT) as well as her English (CELDT). Similar to the CELDT, the IPT scores on a 5-point scale with 5 being the highest score. Her primary language score was a 2 and her initial CELDT was a 2 overall. She has made slow but steady progress in her Listening and Speaking skills, with 4th grade scores being a high 3 in listening and a low 3 in speaking; however, her Reading and Writing scores consistently alternate between scores of 1 and 2.

Mary showed early signs of reading difficulties, with difficulties remembering the letter sounds, which impacted her blending of sounds. While she has learned these skills slowly, her reading is still very slow and she struggles to respond to comprehension questions when she has to read the words on her own. Her reading difficulties are also impacting her math homework, as she struggles to accurately read the word problems for homework.

Parents have been in attendance at all SST meetings (2nd and 4th grades). They are also very worried about her reading, as her two older siblings did not show the same difficulties at school. They cannot help her with her homework, but they make sure she attends all of the intervention programs that have been made available. They also encourage her older sister to help her with her homework.

Parents wrote a letter 10 days ago requesting testing, with the assistance of the 5th grade teacher. They expressed concern about dyslexia and the SST decided to move forward with assessment.
### K-ABC-2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subtest</th>
<th>Standard Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sequential Processing</strong></td>
<td>72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-Number Recall</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-Word Order</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-Hand Movements</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Planning Ability</strong></td>
<td>95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-Story Completion</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-Pattern Reasoning</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Learning Ability</strong></td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-Atlantis</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-Rebus</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Delayed Recall</strong></td>
<td>75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-Atlantis Delayed</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-Rebus Delayed</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Simultaneous Processing</strong></td>
<td>92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-Rover</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-Triangles</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-Block Counting</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Knowledge</strong></td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Verbal Knowledge</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Riddles</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### WJ-IV COG

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subtest</th>
<th>Standard Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Cognitive Processing Speed</strong></td>
<td>91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-Letter-Pattern Matching</td>
<td>90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-Pair Cancellation</td>
<td>95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Auditory Processing</strong></td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-Phonological Processing</td>
<td>108</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-Nonword Repetition</td>
<td>87</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Mary’s Assessment Scores

### VMI-6

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subtest</th>
<th>Standard Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>VMI</td>
<td>95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Visual Perception</td>
<td>95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Motor</td>
<td>90</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


#### READING COMPOSITES/SUBTESTS

- Basic Reading Composite: 85
- Word Reading: 84
- Pseudoword Reading: 88

#### MATH COMPOSITES/SUBTESTS

- Mathematics Composite: 96
  - Math Problem Solving: 95
  - Numerical Operations: 100

#### WRITTEN LANGUAGE COMPOSITE/SUBTESTS

- Written Expression Composite: 89
  - Essay Composition: 90
  - Sentence Composition: 89
  - Spelling: 93

#### BASC-3

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subtest</th>
<th>Parent</th>
<th>Teacher</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Attention Problems</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Executive Functioning</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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### WJ-IV COG

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subtest</th>
<th>Standard Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Comprehension-Knowledge</strong></td>
<td>77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-Oral Vocabulary</td>
<td>79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-General Information</td>
<td>77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Fluid Reasoning</strong></td>
<td>89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-Number Series</td>
<td>90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-Concept Formation</td>
<td>87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Short-Term Working Memory</strong></td>
<td>85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-Verbal Attention</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-Numbers Reversed</td>
<td>89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Cognitive Processing Speed</strong></td>
<td>91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-Letter-Pattern Matching</td>
<td>85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-Pair Cancellation</td>
<td>95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Auditory Processing</strong></td>
<td>83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-Phonological Processing</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-Nonword Repetition</td>
<td>85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Long-Term Retrieval</strong></td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-Story Recall</td>
<td>75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-Visual-Auditory Learning</td>
<td>83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Visual Processing</strong></td>
<td>94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-Visualization</td>
<td>97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-Picture Recognition</td>
<td>90</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### VMI-6

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subtest</th>
<th>Standard Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>VMI</td>
<td>95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-Visual Perception</td>
<td>95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-Motor</td>
<td>90</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### CHC ABILITY DOMAINS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ability</th>
<th>Composite</th>
<th>Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gc</td>
<td>KABC-II Knowledge (Gc:VL) Test Comp</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gf</td>
<td>KABC-II Planning (Gf) Test Comp</td>
<td>95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gv</td>
<td>KABC-II Simultaneous (Gv) Test Comp</td>
<td>92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ga</td>
<td>WJ IV COG Auditory Processing (Ga) Test Comp</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gs</td>
<td>WJ IV COG Cognitive Processing Speed (Gs:P) Test Comp</td>
<td>91</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### ACHIEVEMENT/SLD DOMAINS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Test</th>
<th>Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>WJAT-III Basic Reading Skills (BRS) Test Comp</td>
<td>85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WJAT-III Reading Comprehension (RC;Grw-R:RC) Subtest</td>
<td>78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WJAT-III Oral Reading Fluency (RF;Grw-R:RS) Subtest</td>
<td>75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WJAT-III Essay Composition (WE;Grw-W:WA,EU) Subtest</td>
<td>90</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Areas of weakness below form the Inhibiting Cognitive Composite (ICC)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ability</th>
<th>Composite</th>
<th>Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Grw-R BRS</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grw-R RC</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grw-W RF</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>72</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### CHC Composites designated as strengths are used for computation of the g-Value and FCC (top oval in the DD/C model) and those designated as weaknesses are used for computation of the ICC (bottom left oval in the DD/C model). When a domain contains a strength and a weakness, the strength is used in calculation of the g-Value/FCC and the weakness is used in the calculation of the ICC.

### PSW Analyzer

#### 1. g-Value:
The g-Value reflects overall cognitive ability based on the CHC abilities judged by the evaluator to be strengths. The g-Value is interpreted according to the likelihood that an individual possesses at least average overall general ability.

#### 2a. Facilitating Cognitive Composite (FCC)
Represents an individual's overall general ability (based on strengths) and is used to evaluate differences relative to a specific pattern of cognitive and academic weaknesses.

#### 2b. Alternative Cognitive Composite (ACC)
You may enter an alternative value if desired or when the FCC is not believed to be the best estimate of general ability.

#### 3. Inhibiting Cognitive Composite (ICC)
Represents an aggregate of an individual's overall weaknesses and is used to evaluate consistency and the relationship between cognitive and academic weaknesses. If there is only one cognitive weakness, the ICC is used.

#### 4. Frequency of Difference - Overall Strength to Cognitive Weakness
Select level to be used for determining if the size of a difference is infrequent or uncommon. Default value is 5% and is adjusted for test unreliability. A more conservative or liberal value may be selected. If multiple comparisons are made, a stricter value may be appropriate.
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---

**Name:** Mary CASP  
**Age:** 10 years 3 month(s)  
**Grade:** 5  
**Date:** 10/15/2016

---

### Cognitive Strengths

The value here is either the Facilitating Cognitive Composite (FCC) or a user-entered Alternative Cognitive Composite (ACC).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>FCC</td>
<td>93</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Academic Weakness

The first weakness in the list is selected by default. You may select a different area of academic weakness from the drop down menu for analysis.

### Supporting Academic Strengths

Areas listed in the drop down menu above have been identified as academic strengths for the individual.

### Cognitive Weakness

If calculated, the Inhibiting Cognitive Composite (ICC) is selected below by default. You may select a different area of cognitive weakness from the drop down menu for analysis.

### Are weaknesses domain specific?

Using the FCC as the predictor, if the difference between Actual and Predicted specific cognitive performance equals or exceeds the Critical Value, then the size of the difference is unusually large and infrequent and the weaknesses is domain specific.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Difference</th>
<th>Critical Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>19.82</td>
<td>12.65</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Yes, domain specific**

### Is the difference statistically significant?

A "YES" in these boxes indicates that the difference between the Facilitating Cognitive Composite (FCC or alternative) and the Actual cognitive or the Actual academic weakness score is statistically significant at a 95% level of probability (one-tailed; assumes the cognitive/academic weakness is < cognitive aggregate).

- **p < .05**
- **YES**

### Is there a BELOW AVERAGE aptitude-achievement consistency?

**YES, CONSISTENT**

---

The small box on the left in this section addresses the first component of the criterion through consideration of the degree to which the meaning of the scores is consistent based on their respective magnitudes (e.g., are they both indicative of a weakness relative to most people?). The small box on the right addresses the second component through evaluation of the extent to which the cognitive weakness, either collectively (e.g., via the ICC) or individually, is empirically related to the academic weaknesses, as suggested by mainly correlational research. Relationships that are LOW suggest that the cognitive weakness may not be a contributory factor in the academic weaknesses. However, in all cases, clinical judgment should be exercised. The larger box directly above yields a decision with respect to the consistency criterion based on consideration of both the magnitude of the reported and selected cognitive and academic weaknesses and the strength of the relationship between them.

---
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The Psychological Processing Analyzer (PPA) conducts a cross-battery analysis of psychological processing test scores, analyzes achievement test scores for strengths and weaknesses, and compares achievement scores with related processing scores. The PPA can be used to determine a pattern of strengths and weaknesses (PSW) in both achievement and psychological processes. Statistically significant intra-individual scores are identified for this purpose. When an examinee has both a below average score and an intra-individual weakness, that psychological process or academic skill is labeled as a deficit. When an examinee has both an above average score and an intra-individual strength, that psychological process or academic skill is labeled as an asset.

Definitions of Psychological Processes

Attention includes self-inhibitory processes that allow one to focus, sustain, and divide attention. Difficulties with attentional control are associated with poor academic productivity and with deficient mathematics achievement.

Auditory Processing consists of the processes involved in perceiving, analyzing, synthesizing, and discriminating speech and other auditory stimuli. Auditory processing has strong relations with language and literacy skills.

Executive Functions regulate behavior and cognitive functions during purposeful, goal-directed, problem-solving. Well-developed executive functions are most important for applied academics, such as reading comprehension, mathematics reasoning, and written expression. Academic productivity, such as completing homework, also depends on adequate executive processes.

Fine Motor processes, such as motor planning, are involved in the control and coordination of small muscle movements that occur in the fingers. Fine motor skills affect penmanship, which in turn influences written expression and academic performance.

Fluid Reasoning includes problem solving and deductive and inductive reasoning. Fluid reasoning plays an important role in higher-level, applied academics, such as reading comprehension and mathematics reasoning.

Verbal Long-Term Recall is the delayed recall of new verbal learning and the efficient retrieval of previously acquired verbal knowledge. All aspects of academic learning and performance depend heavily on verbal long-term recall.

Visual-Spatial Long-Term Recall is the delayed recall of new visual-spatial learning. This type of memory is associated with daily functioning, reading, and mathematics learning and performance.

Oral Language includes the linguistic processes that allow one to communicate effectively, such as the ability to construct meaningful sentences. Oral language development has a strong influence on the acquisition of literacy.
Phonological Processing involves the awareness and manipulation of phonemes, the smallest units of speech that are used to form syllables and words. Basic reading and writing skills, as well as the development of oral expression and listening comprehension, depend heavily on the development of phonological processing.

Verbal Working Memory manipulates and transforms verbal information that is being held in short-term memory or has been retrieved from long-term memory. Verbal working memory capacity has strong relations with language and literacy skills.

Visual-Spatial Working Memory manipulates and transforms visual-spatial information that is being held in short-term memory or has been retrieved from long-term memory. This type of memory is associated with daily functioning and with mathematics learning and performance.
PPA Version 5.1.0 Report

Student's Last Name: Casp
Student's First Name: Mary
Age: 10   School: Amazing
Examiner: Me
Grade: 5th   Teacher: Mrs. Exellent
Dates of Evaluation: 10/15/2016

PSW Among Processes

Mary appears to have average psychological processing aptitudes in Attention, Executive Functions, Fine Motor, Fluid Reasoning, Phonological Processing, Processing Speed, and Visual-Spatial Processing. In contrast, Mary has below average process scores in Auditory Processing, Visual-Spatial Long-Term Recall, and Verbal Working Memory.

When a process score is significantly different from the predicted score for that process, an intra-individual strength or weakness is indicated. Mary has a significant intra-individual weakness in Verbal Working Memory. The intra-individual weaknesses that can be considered a deficit include Verbal Working Memory.

Differences Between Related Processes

The table labeled 'Pairwise Comparisons of Related Processes' identifies processes that have weaknesses relative to the specific processes they are paired with. These pairwise strengths and weaknesses should not be used for specific learning disability diagnosis. Rather, the table provides in-depth information that should be used for interventions or treatment planning. Only closely related processes are included in the table.

PSW Among Academic Skills

Mary appears to have average academic skills in Mathematics Calculation, Mathematics Problem Solving, Written Expression, and Listening Comprehension. In contrast, Mary has below average academic skills in Basic Reading Skills, Reading Fluency, Reading Comprehension, and Oral Expression.

When an achievement score is significantly different from the predicted score for that skill, an intra-individual strength or weakness is indicated.
Consistency Between Achievement Scores and Process Scores

When one or more of the processes that strongly influence the development of a specific area of achievement are intra-individual weaknesses, the examinee is likely to have a deficiency in that achievement area. The "Consistency Between Achievement Scores and Process Scores" table compares academic skills and psychological processes that are highly related. Consistency between an achievement score and a process score is indicated by a "No" in the "Significant Difference" column. Consistency between a process score and a related area of deficient achievement provides support for a diagnosis of a specific learning disability. A process score that is significantly lower than a related area of deficient achievement is also evidence for specific learning disability. When a process score is significantly higher than a deficient area of achievement, the deficiency in achievement cannot be attributed to a weakness in that particular process. The following Achievement and Process scores are consistent:

Basic Reading Skills
Auditory Processing, Processing Speed, Visual-Spatial Long-Term Recall

Reading Fluency
Visual-Spatial Long-Term Recall

Reading Comprehension
Auditory Processing, Verbal Working Memory, Visual-Spatial Long-Term Recall, Visual-Spatial Working Memory

Mathematics Calculation
Attention, Executive Functions, Fluid Reasoning, Processing Speed, Visual-Spatial Processing, Visual-Spatial Working Memory

Mathematics Problem Solving
Executive Functions, Fluid Reasoning, Processing Speed, Visual-Spatial Working Memory

Written Expression
Attention, Auditory Processing, Executive Functions, Fine Motor, Phonological Processing, Processing Speed, Verbal Working Memory

Oral Expression
Executive Functions, Phonological Processing, Processing Speed, Verbal Working Memory

Listening Comprehension
Auditory Processing, Executive Functions, Phonological Processing, Processing Speed, Verbal Working Memory