

## Alabama A & M University

## **Communicative Sciences and Disorders Clinic**

P.O. Box 357 Normal, Alabama 35762 (256) 372-5541 or (256) 372-4044

Name of Client: RM.	<b>Date of Birth:</b> 9/3/00		
Clinician's Signature:	Clinician's Initials: CD		

Clinician's Signature: Clinician's Initials: CD								
DATES		INITIALS						
	PROGRESS NOTES S:							
9/27/10	Therapy was not held this day due to client cancellation.							
9/29/10	The client arrived on time and appeared eager to begin therapy.							
	0:		CD					
9/29/10	The clinician adn Processing (CTC	l						
	Subtest	Raw	Age	Grade	Percentile	Standard		
		Score	Equivalent	Equivalent		Score		
	Elison	6	6-9	1.7	5	5		
	Blending Words	13	8-6	3.4	37	9		
	Memory for Digits	11	6-6	1.4	16	7		
	Rapid Digit Naming	31	11-0	6.0	50	10		
	Nonword Repetition	8	5-6	k.4	16	7		
	Rapid Letter Naming	52	7-6	2.4	9	6		
	These subtests represent the composites of phonological awareness, phonological memory, and rapid naming. When gathered into these composites, the results are as follows:							
	Composites		Percenti	le C	Composite Scores		-	
	Phonological Av	12%		82		Á		
	Phonological Memory		12%		82		-	
	Rapid Naming		21%		88		_	
	RM's phonologic 85-115 points) w this date, presen her standard sco	hich puts h ts with a m	er in the 12 <sup>th</sup> ild phonologi	percentile for cal awarenes	her age. The s delay as inc	e client, on dicated by		

Name of Client: RM	Date of Birth: 9/3/00		
Clinician's Signature:	Clinician's Initials: CD		

DATE	PROGRESS NOTES (continued)	INITIALS
	82, which indicates a mild delay in the area of phonological memory as well.  In the rapid naming portion of the test, RM obtained a composite standard score of 88 (average range being 85-115 points) which puts her at the 21 <sup>st</sup> percentile for her age range and is indicative of typical development, putting her within normal limits for rapid naming of letters and digits.	
9/29/10	A: The client presented on this date as exhibiting a mild deficit in both phonological awareness and phonological memory. In both areas her test age-equivalence puts her at 2(+) years behind her actual age. The client presented as being within normal limits for rapid naming of letters and digits.	CD
9/29/10	P: The clinician will continue the diagnostic process until all formal testing is completed.	CD

Client: RM Week of: 9/27/10 Page 2 of 2