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The reason for assessment?

- What is it?
- Why do we do it?
- How do we do it?
3 prongs to eligibility

• A disability
  – Standard testing can help
• Negative impact on academic achievement or functional performance
  – Curriculum based…. measures support this
• The need for specially designed individualized instruction
  – Curriculum based measure support this too
A variety of assessment tools

- Standard instruments
- Observations
- Teacher made tests
- Interventions (RTI)
- Benchmark testing
- Probes
- Check lists
Standardized testing...

- It is often not educationally relevant
- Inconsistent in what constitutes a disability
- Sensitivity
- Specificity
- Takes time to administer

- Intended as a binary decision
- There IS a correlation between poor scores and prognosis
- Control groups for reliability and validity may not include the child’s population or any language impaired children 36 or 45 examined by Spaulding did, (intellectual disability)
- May not include cut off scores for severity rating, mild, moderate, severe (if you are looking for that)
Discussing Sensitivity and Specificity

• Does the test examine what is says it does
• How well does it examine that?
• All this information is found in the examiners manual
• What else that the items supposedly do not test do they actually test in a non-standard way?
• What else does a subtest REALLY test
• What biases does any given test have? (WISC old)
Table 2. Summary of score differences for language-impaired and normative or control groups.

<1 Standard Deviation

- ALL
- CASL
- CREVT-2
- DELV
- EVT
- FLT-AT
- PPVT 3
- TOLD-I3
- UTLD-4

Table 2. Summary of score differences for language-impaired and normative or control groups

**Between 1 and 1.5 SD difference**

- BLT-2
- BOEHM-3
- CELF-P
- LPT-R
- OWLS
- PLAAI-2
- TACL-3
- TELD-3
- TOLD-P#
- TOPS-R
- TOSS-P
- TOWK
- TOWL-3
- TLT-R

Table 2. Summary of score differences for language-impaired and normative or control groups

>1.5 SD difference

- CELF-4
- ELT
- OWLS-WE
- PLS-4
- TEGI
- THT
- TLC-E
- TNL
- TWT-A
- TWT-R

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Test</th>
<th>Identification accuracy</th>
<th>Cutoff score&lt;sup&gt;c&lt;/sup&gt; (standard score)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CELF-4</td>
<td>87%</td>
<td>70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CELF-P</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td>85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CELF-P&lt;sup&gt;d&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>80%</td>
<td>96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DELV&lt;sup&gt;e&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>64%</td>
<td>96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EVT&lt;sup&gt;f&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>71%</td>
<td>97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EOWPVT&lt;sup&gt;f&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>71%</td>
<td>96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PEST</td>
<td>49%</td>
<td>90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PEST&lt;sup&gt;g&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>90%</td>
<td>59.95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PLS-4</td>
<td>80%</td>
<td>85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PPVT-3&lt;sup&gt;f&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>74%</td>
<td>104</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TEGI&lt;sup&gt;h&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>81%</td>
<td>95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ROWPVT&lt;sup&gt;f&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>77%</td>
<td>97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SPELT-3&lt;sup&gt;i&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>90%</td>
<td>95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SPELT-P&lt;sup&gt;d&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>83%</td>
<td>76.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TEEM&lt;sup&gt;g&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>90%</td>
<td>75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TLC-E</td>
<td>90%</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Norm-Referenced VS Criterion Referenced Tests

• Norm-Referenced scores are compared to a group of scores obtained by the standardized sample

• Criterion-Referenced scores are compared with scores that are referred to as criterion levels, cut-offs, or performance standards

  (Stein-Rubin & Fabus 2012)
Non-standard assessment

- Curriculum Based
- Classroom work samples
- Checklists
- Benchmark testing
- Teacher/clinician made assessments
- Language Samples
- Teacher probes
- Writing samples
- Play samples
Curriculum Based

– Authentic: Evaluates the actual behaviors professionals want students to do.
– Dynamic: Focus on learning process rather than product

Classroom Observation Form
Checklists
Benchmark Testing
Classroom Literacy Assessment Example
Example of Speech & Language Evaluation Report
Summary

- SLPs can use non-standard assessment information that already exists to provide the most educationally relevant intervention for students and use this information when making IEP team decisions.
References


