



Case Studies Workshop Outcomes

1. Jaden Outcome

A hearing impairment was identified and a Language Modifier was put in place.

This is a rare and exceptional arrangement, the AARA calls it ‘an adjustment of the last resort’ – other adjustments should be considered first, and be found to be unusable/unworkable. In Part 1 of Form 8 we see that a reader was trialled but didn’t work well for Jaden. We don’t see this in the materials, but modified language papers were also trialled and were not sufficient on their own.

Extra time was also granted to use Language Modifier (must be applied for).

Before the Hearing Impairment was identified, Jaden found strategies for coping (for example, misbehaving to avoid demand) but a receptive vocabulary weakness developed.

The hearing impairment probably accounts for the low Exact scores, as well as WRAT 5 spelling and TOMAL 2 ACI as they all involve being able to hear the audio/spellings/prompts.



2. Matthew Outcome

25% extra time for reading.

Would need samples of internal tests/mocks showing successful application of 25% extra time (Part 1 of Form 8 indicates already begun this) and also comments/observations from teachers on how extra time is used.

GORT 5 – above average fluency, below average comprehension can be explained because on GORT 5 candidates are required to answer comprehension questions without the reading passage in front of them (it is taken away by the assessor).

Matthew needs to refer back to the text to be able to respond accurately to comprehension questions. He did ok (83) on SPaRCS as he can refer back to text.

Ties in with his relatively weak working memory (TOMAL 2 ACI 88) – he can't remember what he has read very well.

In an exam he would be able to read the text back to himself, just needs extra time to do this. His reading fluency is fine, he just can't remember what he's read.

For some candidates it can be particularly important to assess for reading comprehension speed and not just reading speed. How long does it take a candidate to fully comprehend what they have read? i.e. do they need extra time to re-read the text before comprehending it?



3. Susan Outcome

25% extra time based on her cognitive processing/fluency scores.

Susan could also have a computer reader/reader but she has refused this previously, and reports that her eyes hurt after reading off a screen for too long.

Susan's untimed and timed single word reading skills are in the average range (WRAT 5 Single Word Reading: 102 and TOWRE 2 Sight Word Efficiency: 90) but her decoding lacks automaticity. She was unsure of many of her responses: Susan made several attempts at sounding out some words and made a guess at some others. Reading new words is not a wholly automatic task for her (seen in Part 1 of Form 8).

Her untimed reading comprehension skills are in the high average range (Access Reading Tests: 114) but her reading speed is much slower than you therefore might expect (Exact Reading Comprehension Speed: 86). Her timed non-word reading is below average (TOWRE 2 Phonemic Decoding Efficiency: 84), and Susan has clear difficulties with phonological awareness (CTOPP 2 Phonological Awareness Composite: 71).

Susan has difficulties with processing written information efficiently, both accurately and at speed, when she has to read aloud.



supporting special needs in education

4. Ronan Outcome

A word processor and/or a scribe - the DASH 2 Total Standard Score (78) can be used.

For most subjects, a word processor (spell check off as although the WRAT 5 spelling score is below average, it's not necessarily due to incorrect and unrecognisable spellings but because of illegible writing) is sufficient.

For subjects like Maths or Science where it can be harder to use a word processor, a human scribe would be beneficial.

Squared paper in Maths.

If the DASH 2 Total Standard Score composite wasn't below average, you could go down this route to apply for a scribe for illegible handwriting:

AARA 7.5.11

“In some cases, the candidate's writing is illegible or grammatically incomprehensible but improves significantly when a scribe is used. If these difficulties are not evidenced by a below average standardised spelling accuracy score, or a below average standardised score for writing speed, Access Arrangements Online will not approve the application. The SENCo may then decide to refer the application to the awarding body/bodies.”