

**Final Exam**

18. The statement given below the question is true in part. To make the statement correct in whole requires that you identify the "subtest" as "performance subtests" and that these include Picture Completion and Symbol Search subtests as well.
19. The measure of cognitive ability most probably used in schools for elementary ages is the WISC-III. Each of the other measures have their own problems as an applicable measure. The Stanford-Benet IV is based on age norms and not age equivalents as most other measures and may cause confusion. The K-ABC requires its administration by a school psychologist and as such limits the application versus other tests. The Woodcock-Johnson Tests of Cognitive Ability-Revised has the drawback of being overly comprehensive in result regarding the large number of scores and profiles produced and requiring excessive time to administer the test.
20. Initially the various discrepancy analysis models for assessing possible learning disability could be broken down into three classifications; Years Below Grade Level, Expectancy Formulas and Standard Score. While each model has its proponents and advantages, each has its own identifiable problem. The Years Below Grade Level format involves subtracting the grade score from the current grade placement. If the resulting discrepancy exceeds 2 years the position for a learning disability was assumed. The problem with this analysis is that it assumes "average" grade placement and is based on grade equivalents which are not equal-interval scores. Due to these problems in the methodology, this model has fallen out of favor. Expectancy Formulas require the subtraction of 5 years from standard measure mental age. The resulting figure is the expectant grade level assumed. An achievement instrument is then used to assess the student and an analysis is done comparing the expected grade level with the assessed grade level. The major limitation is that the current achievement is in grade equivalents, and is not an equal interval score. Furthermore, this method does not consider reliability of the instruments used. The third method is the Standard Score. In this method an achievement test is administered and the standard score is subtracted from the standard score of an IQ test taken by the client. The resulting difference is then compared to the standard deviations of both tests. There are two primary problems with this methodology; this method does not take into account measurement error in either or both instruments and two, the higher the correlation between the tests the lower the reliability of the discrepancy outcome. At present none of these methods are recommended nor is there current agreement on which to use. Newer measures of ability and achievement have built in procedures for discrepancy analysis. Some of these measures come with computer programs to assist with scoring and discrepancy analysis. In the future self contained computer analysis may be the preferred method of discrepancy analysis.
21. When addressing the needs of a student who is culturally and linguistically diverse, the assessment tool needs to be in the students primary language in the first place. The instrument should be norm balanced to reflect the cultural background of the student. Students

- with differing cultural backgrounds have different approaches and references to questions and information presented in problems. At the same time, an instrument that is not normed, age appropriate, to the student will be useless even if it does address the student's unique cultural, ethnic and linguistic background.
22. Both intellectual performance and adaptive behavior of the subject student must be addressed to ascertain a student's current learning aptitude. When assessing the possibility of a mental retardation disability both of these factors must be addressed. A student's adaptive behavior at adequate or below average coupled with average range intellectual performance may indicate either a learning or behavioral disorder. With both Intellectual performance and adaptive behavior below average, an assessment of mental retardation disability becomes a real possibility. Only with an assessment of learning aptitude can these determinations be made.
  23. In both the assessment of visual and auditory perceptual abilities the physical impairment of either sight or hearing can be determined through concrete testing. The student can see or cannot see, can hear the sound or cannot hear the sound. In most instances a mechanical device can be used to effect a correction of the impairment. An assessment of educational achievement is usually compared against a norm reference group and is subjective within a projected range of reliability.
  24. Assessment of perceptual abilities traditionally has been concentrated on either auditory or visual perception. Special education by definition addresses a student as a whole entity. An individual with interlocking and interrelating causes and effects. There is no one cause for a special education finding. Assessment teams need to examine the whole student, from cultural background to learning ability, to IQ, to adaptive behavior. To limit assessment of perceptual abilities to auditor or visual perception denies that other aspects of perceptual abilities may have impact on how a student may learn and function. All aspects of perceptual abilities must be explored to determine their impact on how a student processes information.
  25. The most important thing that a special education teacher should be aware of is that the student or client is a human being, not a lab rat. The minute we forget that we are dealing with a living sentient being and we start treating that individual like an "it" we lose sight of the fact that we are there to serve that individual and provide assistance to them. Any assessment we administer, is only valid for that instance. The instrument provides us with a snapshot of the individual at that moment. The individual can be affected by emotional turmoil, reacting to the physical setting, misunderstanding the material or be in less than perfect physical health. All these variables effect how the individual does in the assessment. Likewise how we interpret the results will have a major bearing on what we assess the individual as being or having. All of this means that the "snapshot" of the client may have been valid at that instance. But that snapshot is not the client. The client is a living, breathing human being whose very being is as fluid and variable as all the factors influencing them. Assessment is not a concrete fact, it is an

ESE 517

12/10/02

Assessment of Mild/Moderate Disabilities

David C. Pearson

interpretation of collected information and our function is to assist and help the client, not judge them.