

Considerations for Language Impairment

This worksheet can be used by IEP teams in considering whether a student meets criteria for a speech or language impairment. For each item, circle the item that best represents the student's performance. Students must demonstrate the presence of a delay in communication skills that also has an **educational impact** in order to meet the criteria for a speech or language impairment in Wisconsin. When a valid comparison to a normative sample cannot be made or a student has significant impairments, consider completion of the [Functional Communication Summary](#) worksheet.

	Academic Activities (e.g., writing samples, reading running record, observations in natural settings, records)	Academic Tests and Measurements (e.g., districtwide and statewide assessments, curriculum benchmarks)	Speech-Language Pathology Probes (e.g., language sample, intelligibility, stimulability, dynamic assessment, play-based assessment, interviews, case history)	Speech-Language Pathology Norm-Referenced Tests and Measurements (e.g., norm-referenced assessments with appropriate sensitivity and specificity)
No Apparent Impact	Performs similarly to peers in most areas	Performs similarly to peers in most areas	May indicate differences from Standard American English Demonstrates improvements during dynamic assessment	1 or 2 composite scores* at or above: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • mean to -1 SD • > 85 SS # • >17th percentile
Minimal Impact	Evidence of struggle with one or more areas when compared to peers Evidence of occasional difficulty with 'meta' skills	Evidence of struggle with one or more areas when compared to peers	May indicate differences from Standard American English Demonstrates improvements during dynamic assessment Occasional difficulty with pragmatic, semantic or syntax- morphological skills	1 or 2 composite scores* documenting: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • -1 to -1.5SD • 84 to 77 SS # • 16th-7th percentile
Moderate Impact	Evidence of struggle in most areas when compared to peers Evidence of difficulty with 'meta' skills	Evidence of struggle in most areas when compared to peers	Demonstrates limited improvement during dynamic assessment Frequent difficulty with pragmatic, semantic or syntax- morphological skills	1 or 2 composite scores* documenting: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • -1.5 to -2 SD • 76-70 SS # • 6th -3rd percentile
Substantial Impact	Evidence of very limited ability in most areas Evidence limited or absence of 'meta' skills	Evidence of very limited ability in most areas	Demonstrates very limited improvement during dynamic assessment Extensive difficulty with pragmatic, semantic or syntax- morphological skills	1 or 2 composite scores* documenting: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • -2 or greater SD • 69 or below SS # • below 3rd percentile

*These scores should be composite scores from the full battery of subtests, not individual subtest scores.

August 2021

The individual test's cut score should be considered during the process of determining eligibility. This example assumes a mean of 100 and standard deviation of 15 points.

Adapted from *Speech-Language Pathology Services in Schools: Guidelines for Best Practice* ©2018 by the Commonwealth of Virginia Department of Education. All rights reserved. Reproduced by permission. Use of these materials by Wisconsin Department of Public Instruction does not represent an endorsement or review of the product by the Virginia Department of Education.