



DIAGNOSTIC ASSESSMENT FOR DYSLEXIA

Name: Child Name
Date of Birth: July 3, 2011
Date of Evaluation: November 4, 2023
Chronological Age: 12 years, 4 months
Grade: 7th

Reason for Referral

Child Name is a 12-year-old male residing in Bushnell, FL. He was referred for a dyslexia evaluation because his mother is concerned about his struggle with reading and spelling. She reports it is hard for him to read and spell on grade level.

Background information

According to the Student and Family History Form completed by Child's mother, Child began walking and talking independently at the age of 12 months. A family history of reading problems/dyslexia, other learning disabilities, ADHD, and anxiety is also indicated.

Child currently receives structured literacy tutoring and exhibits the following literacy difficulties: difficulty reading and spelling words, messy handwriting, avoids reading or writing activities, and needs extra time to complete reading, spelling, or writing tasks.

Tests Administered

- Tests of Dyslexia - Screener (TOD-S)
- Tests of Dyslexia - Comprehensive (TOD-C)
- TOD-C Parent/Caregiver Rating Scale
- TOD-C Self Rating Scale

Testing Observations

Testing was conducted in two sessions, **1½ to 2½** hours in length each. All sessions were conducted via Zoom with a stable internet connection and optimal electronic devices. Child was cooperative and seemed to put forth strong effort during both sessions of testing. Brain breaks were taken as needed throughout the testing sessions. Child seemed to remain calm throughout testing. Results are considered accurate and valid.

Tests of Dyslexia – Screener (TOD-S)

The TOD-S is a norm-referenced screener comprised of three tests that can be administered to individuals in kindergarten through adulthood or ages 5-89 years old. It provides a Dyslexia Risk Index (DRI), which can help determine whether a more in-depth assessment is needed.

Dyslexia Risk Index (DRI): The DRI provides a standard score estimating the likelihood of dyslexia based on the TOD-S results. In this case, the score fell in the **At-Risk** range, indicating **Below Average** performance and a **moderate to significant** risk for dyslexia. This reflects **limited** foundational reading skills **and the need for further evaluation**. Based on these results, Child was administered relevant components of the TOD-C for additional assessment.

Tests of Dyslexia – Comprehensive (TOD-C)

The TOD-C is a norm-referenced assessment designed to provide a comprehensive dyslexia evaluation for individuals ages 6–89, or grades 1 through adulthood. It is individually administered and builds upon the TOD-S scores to assess three key areas: reading and spelling, linguistic processing, and vocabulary and reasoning.

TOD-C Indexes

Dyslexia Diagnostic Index (DDI): The DDI combines results from eight different assessments (RSI + LPI) to generate a standard score reflecting the likelihood of dyslexia. This score provides one of the strongest indicators of whether dyslexia may be present. In this case, the standard score fell in the **Well Below Average** range, reflecting **very limited** performance across foundational literacy skills and further indicating a **very high** probability of dyslexia.

Reading and Spelling Index (RSI): The RSI combines results from four assessments to evaluate key foundational reading skills, including letter/word knowledge, reading fluency, irregular word spelling, and pseudoword decoding. This index is included in the Dyslexia Diagnostic Index (DDI) but can also be used on its own to provide a snapshot of reading and spelling abilities. The obtained standard score fell in the **Well Below Average** range, indicating **very limited** performance in basic reading and spelling tasks.

Linguistic Processing Index (LPI): The LPI is based on four assessments that evaluate key aspects of linguistic processing, including phonemic awareness, rapid automatized naming, orthographic knowledge, and working memory—skills that are essential for developing foundational reading abilities. While the LPI contributes to the overall Dyslexia Diagnostic Index (DDI), it can also be considered on its own to assess linguistic processing risk factors. In this case, the standard score fell in the **Average** range, reflecting **average** performance on measures of linguistic processing.

TOD-C Composites

Reading and Spelling Composites

- Sight Word Acquisition Composite: This composite evaluates word recognition skills and includes Irregular Word Reading (11C) and Rapid Irregular Word Reading (20C). These tasks require the student to identify and read aloud words containing irregular spelling patterns under untimed and timed conditions. Orthographic knowledge also supports accurate word

recognition and spelling. The obtained standard score fell in the **Below Average** range, suggesting **limited** ability to accurately read words that contain irregular elements.

- Phonics Knowledge Composite: This composite assesses the application of phonics skills and includes Pseudoword Reading (7C) and Rapid Pseudoword Reading (19C). These tasks require the student to read aloud phonically regular nonsense words under both untimed and timed conditions. The obtained standard score fell in the **Below Average** range, indicating **limited** ability to apply phonics skills to decode unfamiliar words.
- Basic Reading Skills Composite: This composite evaluates two key aspects of word reading: applying phonics and recognizing words with irregular patterns. It includes Pseudoword Reading (7C) and Irregular Word Reading (11C). These tasks require reading aloud phonically regular pseudowords as well as words containing irregular elements. The obtained standard score fell in the **Below Average** range, indicating **limited** ability with foundational reading skills.
- Decoding Efficiency Composite: This composite assesses the automaticity of basic word reading skills and includes Rapid Pseudoword Reading (19C) and Rapid Irregular Word Reading (20C). Both tasks are timed and require the student to read aloud quickly—first phonically regular pseudowords, then words containing irregular patterns. The obtained standard score fell in the **Below Average** range, indicating **limited** ability for fluent decoding of both nonsense words and words with irregular elements.
- Spelling Composite: This composite evaluates orthographic knowledge and includes Irregular Word Spelling (5C) and Regular Word Spelling (15C). These tasks require the student to spell words containing irregular elements as well as words that follow standard English spelling rules. The obtained standard score fell in the **Significantly Below Average** range, indicating **extremely limited** spelling ability and orthographic knowledge.
- Reading Fluency Composite: This composite evaluates reading accuracy and rate and includes Word or Question Reading Fluency (3S) and Oral Reading Efficiency (12C). Both tasks are timed, requiring the student to read and answer questions silently as well as read a grade-level passage aloud. The obtained standard score fell in the **Below Average** range, indicating **limited** reading accuracy and speed.
- Reading Comprehension Efficiency Composite: This composite measures both reading speed and comprehension and includes Word or Question Reading Fluency (3S) and Silent Reading Efficiency (16C). It evaluates the student's ability to read passages silently and answer comprehension questions efficiently, reflecting how well they extract meaning from text under timed conditions. The obtained standard score fell in the **Average** range, indicating **average** reading comprehension efficiency.

Linguistic Processing Composites

- Phonological Awareness Composite: This composite evaluates four key phonological awareness skills—blending, segmenting, substitution, and deletion—and includes Phonological Manipulation (4C), Blending (13C), and Segmenting (14C). The obtained standard score fell in the **Average** range, indicating **average** phonological awareness abilities.
- Rapid Automatized Naming Composite: This composite assesses naming speed and includes Rapid Letter Naming (6C) and Rapid Number and Letter Naming (17C). Both tasks are timed and require quickly retrieving and naming confusable letters as well as a mixed sequence of numbers and letters. The obtained standard score fell in the **Below Average** range, indicating **limited** ability with rapid automatized naming (RAN) skills.

- **Auditory Working Memory Composite:** This composite evaluates the ability to hold information in immediate memory and manipulate it and includes Word Memory (9C) and Letter Memory (18C). Both tasks require listening to a sequence of words or letters and then repeating them in reverse order. The obtained standard score fell in the **Average** range, indicating **average** auditory working memory abilities.
- **Orthographic Processing Composite:** This composite evaluates the ability to quickly recognize common English spelling patterns and includes Letter and Word Choice (2S) and the timed task Word Pattern Choice (8C). These tasks require selecting the correct letters or spelling of a word and identifying letter groups that resemble real English words. The obtained standard score fell in the **Below Average** range, indicating **limited** orthographic knowledge.
- **Symbol to Sound Learning Test (21C):** This assessment measures paired-associate learning, requiring the student to remember new associations between symbols and sounds and then blend them to form real words. The obtained standard score fell in the **Above Average** range, indicating **advanced** ability to learn and retain symbol-sound associations—an important skill for early reading development.

Vocabulary and Reasoning Composites

- **Vocabulary Composite:** This composite assesses receptive vocabulary and includes Picture Vocabulary (1S) and Listening Vocabulary (22C). The tasks require selecting the picture that best represents a spoken word and listening to a question to choose the correct answer from four options. The obtained standard score fell in the **Below Average** range, indicating **limited** ability with receptive vocabulary and listening.
- **Reasoning Composite:** This composite evaluates the ability to solve novel problems and includes Picture Analogies (10C) and Geometric Analogies (23C). These tasks require understanding the relationships between images and shapes to correctly complete the analogies. The obtained standard score fell in the **Above Average** range, indicating **advanced** reasoning skills.
- **Vocabulary and Reasoning 2 Composite:** This composite assesses both receptive vocabulary and reasoning skills and includes Picture Vocabulary (1S) and Picture Analogies (10C). The tasks require selecting a picture that best represents a spoken word and identifying the relationship between pictures to complete an analogy. The obtained standard score fell in the **Average** range, indicating **average** receptive vocabulary and reasoning abilities.
- **Vocabulary and Reasoning 4 Composite:** This composite provides a broad measure of receptive vocabulary, listening skills, and reasoning ability, and includes Picture Vocabulary (1S), Picture Analogies (10C), Listening Vocabulary (22C), and Geometric Analogies (23C). The tasks require selecting a picture that represents a spoken word, listening to a question and choosing the correct answer from four options, and understanding relationships between pictured items and shapes to solve analogies. The obtained standard score fell in the **Average** range, indicating **average** receptive vocabulary, listening skills, and reasoning abilities.

TOD-C Parent and Self-Rating Scales

The TOD-C Rating Scales are standardized forms completed by a parent or caregiver and, when applicable, the student. They provide a broader picture of how reading and language difficulties show up in everyday life.

TOD-C Parent/Caregiver Rating Scale

The Parent/Caregiver Rating Scale gathers information about family history of reading or spelling difficulties, early speech and language development, and the student's current ability

to read, spell, listen, and speak. It also captures the caregiver's impressions of the student's abilities compared to same-age peers, the student's attitude toward reading, and the level of support needed for homework and organization.

The results revealed major difficulties in **basic reading skills**, with some degree of difficulty with **verbal comprehension, phonological processing, orthographic processing, memory, reading fluency, reading comprehension, spelling, motivation for reading, and attention**. The ratings for this assessment yielded a *T*-score of **65** and a percentile of **93**, indicating a **High Risk** for dyslexia.

TOD-C Self-Rating Scale

The Self-Rating Scale reflects the student's own perception of their reading, spelling, comprehension, and oral language abilities, as well as their attitude toward reading.

The results revealed **no** major difficulties, with some degree of difficulty with **phonological processing and spelling**. The ratings for this assessment yielded a *T*-score of **51** and a percentile of **54**, indicating a **Low to Moderate Risk** for dyslexia.

Score Details

The scores in this report are expressed as standard scores scaled to a mean of 100 and a standard deviation of 15, using **age-based** norms. A score of 100 represents the average, with most students scoring between 90 and 109. Each score is paired with a color-coded descriptor for quick reference. Subtests are listed first, followed by indexes and composites — which are calculated from combinations of those subtests and reflect broader skill areas.

Well Above Average	120 and above
Above Average	110-119
Average	90-109
Below Average	80-89
Well Below Average	70-79
Significantly Below Average	69 and below

Tests of Dyslexia – Screener (TOD-S)

Test Number	Subtest	Standard Score	%ile Rank	Descriptive Range
1S	Picture Vocabulary	79	8	Well Below Average
2S	Letter and Word Choice	61	0.5	Significantly Below Average
3Sb	Question Reading Fluency	91	27	Average
Dyslexia Risk Index (DRI)		73	4	At-Risk

Tests of Dyslexia – Comprehensive (TOD-C)

Test Number	Subtest	Standard Score	%ile Rank	Descriptive Range
4C	Phonological Manipulation	86	18	Below Average
5C	Irregular Word Spelling	63	1	Significantly Below Average
6C	Rapid Letter Naming	83	13	Below Average
7C	Pseudoword Reading	80	9	Below Average
8C	Word Pattern Choice	112	79	Above Average

9C	Word Memory	97	42	Average
10C	Picture Analogies	107	68	Average
11C	Irregular Word Reading	88	21	Below Average
12C	Oral Reading Efficiency	72	3	Well Below Average
13C	Blending	97	42	Average
14C	Segmenting	102	55	Average
15C	Regular Word Spelling	70	2	Well Below Average
16C	Silent Reading Efficiency	104	61	Average
17C	Rapid Number and Letter Naming	90	25	Average
18C	Letter Memory	108	70	Average
19C	Rapid Pseudoword Reading	82	12	Below Average
20C	Rapid Irregular Word Reading	88	21	Below Average
21C	Symbol to Sound Learning	111	77	Above Average
22C	Listening Vocabulary	87	19	Below Average
23C	Geometric Analogies	123	94	Well Above Average

Composite	Standard Score	%ile Rank	Descriptive Range
Sight Word Acquisition	87	19	Below Average
Phonics Knowledge	80	9	Below Average
Basic Reading Skills	82	12	Below Average
Decoding Efficiency	84	14	Below Average
Spelling	65	1	Significantly Below Average
Reading Fluency	82	12	Below Average
Reading Comprehension Efficiency	97	42	Average
Phonological Awareness	93	32	Average
Rapid Automatized Naming	85	16	Below Average
Auditory Working Memory	103	58	Average
Orthographic Processing	83	13	Below Average
Vocabulary	80	9	Below Average
Reasoning	118	88	Above Average
Vocabulary and Reasoning 2	91	27	Average
Vocabulary and Reasoning 4	98	45	Average

Index	Standard Score	%ile Rank	Descriptive Range
Dyslexia Diagnostic Index (DDI)	76	5	Well Below Average
Reading and Spelling Index (RSI)	70	2	Well Below Average
Linguistic Processing Index (LPI)	92	30	Average
Probability of Dyslexia based on DDI			Very High

TOD-C Parent/Caregiver Rating Scale

Category	No Difficulty	Minor Difficulty	Some Difficulty	Major Difficulty
Verbal Comprehension			X	
General Reasoning		X		
Phonological Processing			X	
Orthographic Processing			X	
Memory			X	
Basic Reading Skills				X

Reading Fluency			X	
Reading Comprehension			X	
Spelling			X	
Motivation for Reading			X	
Attention			X	
Risk Level for Dyslexia			High	

TOD-C Self Rating Scale

Category	No Difficulty	Minor Difficulty	Some Difficulty	Major Difficulty
Verbal Comprehension		X		
General Reasoning		X		
Phonological Processing			X	
Orthographic Processing		X		
Memory		X		
Basic Reading Skills		X		
Reading Fluency		X		
Reading Comprehension		X		
Spelling			X	
Motivation for Reading		X		
Attention		X		
Risk Level for Dyslexia			Low to Moderate	

Summary

Child is a hardworking and cooperative 12-year-old student experiencing significant reading and spelling difficulties. His performance on the TOD-S yielded a Dyslexia Risk Index (DRI) in the At-Risk range, indicating Below Average performance across foundational reading skills and a moderate to significant risk for dyslexia. He was subsequently administered the TOD-C for a more comprehensive evaluation.

Child's score on the Dyslexia Diagnostic Index (DDI) fell in the Well Below Average range, indicating a Very High Probability of Dyslexia. His Well Below Average performance on the Reading and Spelling Index (RSI) reflects significant weaknesses in foundational reading and spelling skills. Although the overall Linguistic Processing Index fell within the Average range, performance across linguistic processing tasks was uneven, with notable weaknesses in rapid automatized naming, orthographic processing, and phonological manipulation.

It is important to note that Child has received structured literacy intervention prior to this evaluation. This history is clinically relevant when interpreting his results. Structured literacy instruction directly targets the foundational skills assessed in this evaluation, and some scores — particularly in areas such as phonological awareness and decoding — may reflect gains made through intervention rather than a baseline profile. As a result, the true severity of his underlying difficulties may be greater than some scores alone suggest. The persistent weaknesses identified across multiple areas, even with the benefit of prior intervention, underscore the significance of his reading and spelling challenges.

Subtest performance revealed Below Average scores across phonological manipulation, pseudoword reading, irregular word reading, and rapid letter naming, with Significantly Below Average performance noted on irregular word spelling and regular word spelling. These findings

indicate weaknesses in phonological processing, decoding, orthographic mapping, and spelling automaticity — hallmark characteristics of dyslexia. Oral reading efficiency also fell in the Well Below Average range, reflecting significant difficulty reading connected text accurately and fluently under timed conditions.

Reading and spelling composite scores further confirmed these weaknesses. Performance fell in the Below Average range across Sight Word Acquisition, Phonics Knowledge, Basic Reading Skills, Decoding Efficiency, and Reading Fluency, with Significantly Below Average performance on the Spelling Composite. Taken together, these results indicate significant weaknesses across all areas of foundational reading and spelling. This profile lacks the accuracy, fluency, and automaticity needed to support long-term academic success — particularly given that these weaknesses persist despite prior structured literacy support. Notably, Reading Comprehension Efficiency was a relative exception, falling in the Average range. This pattern suggests that stronger reasoning abilities may be helping support comprehension despite persistent word-level weaknesses.

Linguistic processing composites presented a more mixed picture. While the overall LPI fell in the Average range, the Rapid Automatized Naming Composite fell in the Below Average range — driven particularly by weakness in rapid letter naming — a meaningful finding, as slowed naming speed directly impacts reading rate and fluency development. Performance across orthographic tasks was inconsistent. While Word Pattern Choice fell in the Above Average range, Letter and Word Choice fell in the Significantly Below Average range, suggesting uneven development of orthographic processing skills overall. Phonological Awareness and Auditory Working Memory, however, fell within the Average range, indicating relative strengths in these underlying processing areas. These relatively stronger scores in phonological awareness may reflect the positive impact of structured literacy instruction on skill development in this area.

Of particular note, performance on the Symbol to Sound Learning test fell in the Above Average range, indicating a strong ability to learn and retain new sound-symbol associations. This is an encouraging finding and a positive indicator for continued response to structured literacy instruction.

Vocabulary and reasoning measures revealed an important strength-weakness contrast. While the Vocabulary Composite fell in the Below Average range — reflecting limited performance on receptive vocabulary and listening tasks — the Reasoning Composite fell in the Above Average range. Geometric Analogies, in particular, revealed well above average abstract reasoning skills, with Picture Analogies also falling within a solid average range. Overall Vocabulary and Reasoning composites fell in the Average range, indicating that Child's cognitive reasoning abilities are meaningfully stronger than his literacy skills reflect — a pattern that is highly consistent with dyslexia. The weakness in receptive vocabulary and listening, however, suggests the possibility that additional language-based factors may be contributing to the broader profile beyond dyslexia alone.

Parent ratings on the TOD-C Parent/Caregiver Rating Scale are consistent with the testing profile, with overall ratings yielding a T-score of 65 and a percentile of 93, indicating a High Risk for dyslexia. The caregiver identified major difficulties in basic reading skills, with some degree of difficulty across verbal comprehension, phonological processing, orthographic processing, memory, reading fluency, reading comprehension, spelling, motivation for reading, and attention. These observations provide strong supportive evidence of the challenges identified during formal testing.

On the TOD-C Self-Rating Scale, Child identified no major difficulties, though he noted minor difficulty across several reading and language-related areas, with some degree of difficulty specifically in phonological processing and spelling. His ratings yielded a T-score of 51 and a percentile of 54, indicating a Low to Moderate Risk for dyslexia. This lower self-rating is not uncommon in students who have developed coping strategies over time or who may not have full awareness of the degree of their difficulties relative to same-age peers.

In summary, the results of this evaluation are highly consistent with a diagnosis of dyslexia, a Specific Learning Disability (SLD). Additionally, given the Below Average performance noted across receptive vocabulary and listening measures, a comprehensive evaluation by a Speech-Language Pathologist is strongly recommended to determine whether broader language-based difficulties may also be present and contributing to this student's overall profile.

Recommendations

1. According to the International Dyslexia Association, Structured Literacy is the recommended approach for helping students with dyslexia be able to decode words in an explicit and systematic manner. (<https://dyslexiaida.org/effective-reading-instruction/>). It is recommended that Child **continues** receiving structured literacy instruction.
2. In addition to explicit instruction, it is best for Child to spend time listening to audiobooks on his grade level to help increase his vocabulary knowledge and have access to grade-level content.
3. Provide Child with decodable texts in line with his structured literacy program to help solidify decoding skills.
4. Allow Child to use speech to text accommodations for lengthy writing assignments in order to provide practice in the process of writing and eliminate the roadblocks that come with spelling difficulties.
5. Allow Child to have extended time on standardized testing.

Christina Ables, MS, SLDS, IMC
Structured Literacy Dyslexia Specialist (C-SLDS)
FL DOE Certified ESE, Elementary Ed, Reading
FL DOE #1008972, CERID ID #E180799