

LD Test Selection Committee

Minutes of Meeting of April 24, 2009
(Corrected & Approved 12/17/09)

Present: Janet Gibbs, Vickey Carleson, Mary Griffin, Tony Loveless, Pam Plant, Fulvia Franco, Dick Baer

WJ-III COG

Dick had a call from an individual in a public school who wanted to know why some of the cognitive subtests from the WJ-III were not included in the Estimator program. Tony reminded the committee that GIA incorporates a variety of subtest scores but that the authors describe the GIA as the best measure of g. It was also reiterated that administration of the WJ-III COG requires appropriate training; interpretation requires appropriate graduate level training.

The caller made reference to learning from UPDC that Estimator/severe discrepancy provides a limited analysis of student abilities and that intra cognitive patterns provided more information. Dick reviewed some of the issues related to patterns – no general agreement on what patterns indicate a learning disability, lower reliability of subtest scores, lack of research on what and whether processes measured by subtests are related to learning disabilities and whether they are remediable, etc.

LDA

Dick reported that LDA's conference will be held in Baltimore next February. The deadline for presentation proposals is in May. Dick asked if anyone would like to present with him. Janet reported she had already submitted a proposal. The rest of the committee did not want to attend the conference. Dick will submit a proposal.

Web Based Estimator

The web based Estimator will be up and running on May 1, 2009. The committee reviewed and edited an email to go to district special education directors describing how users can log onto the website and set up an account giving them access to the Estimator program.

Committee members reviewed the Estimator web page and made suggestions for changes:

1. Under the section on request to add a test some of Janet's contact information is wrong;

- Zip code should be 84114-4200
 - Phone number should be 538-7716
 - Also add email address, janet.gibbs@schools.utah.gov
2. In the statement, “Be aware that the following tests have been reviewed and determined **not** appropriate for inclusion in the Estimator program;” bold the word “not.”
 3. The correct title is “Mathematical (not mathematics) Problem Solving
 4. On the first, “Estimator Test List,” screen include the messages:
 - Some tests are not approved for all ages. This is generally because the reliability of the test at unapproved ages was low, or the standardization sample size was small.
 - In keeping with Utah State Board of Education Special Education Rules(2008), Rule IIF (p 22-24), tests included in the list meet the criteria for technically sound instruments.
 - All tests and scores approved for learning disabilities assessment in Utah are included in the list. Other tests and scores should not be entered into the ESTIMATOR program because results based on such scores will likely not be valid.
 5. For articles and presentations include complete APA citations:
 - Articles
 - Baer, R., Keene, R. D. & Althouse, B. (1998). Consumer evaluation of estimator: Software for LD discrepancy calculation. CPD News, 21 (4) 1-8.
 - Baer, R. D., Griffin, M., Franco, F., Fast, P., Loveless, T., Carleson, V., Keene, R. & Brown, G. (2006). Integrating response to intervention and severe discrepancy in specific learning disabilities determination: The best of two worlds. Utah Special Educator, 26 (4), 66-71.
 - Baer, R. D. (2000). Issues in severe discrepancy measurement: A technical assistance paper for special educators. Logan, UT: DB Enterprises.
 - Presentations
 - Baer, R. D. (2009). Integrating response to intervention and severe discrepancy: Best practices assessment model. Salt Lake City UT: Learning Disabilities Association 46th Annual Conference.
 - Note: Janet is uncomfortable with this presentation being on the website because some of the statements may not be consistent with USOE rules and policies. We should hold off putting it on the website until as decision is made about how to cite it.
 6. Edit the introductory part of the committee’s standards document to make it current.
 7. Pull the, “Committee Practices,” out and organize into one document.
 8. Add Janet Gibbs to list of committee members.
 9. Specify degrees for committee members:
 - Richard D. Baer, Ph.D
 - Vickey Carleson, CCC-SLP

- Phil Fast, M Ed., NCSP
- Fulvia Franco, Ph.D
- Janet Gibbs, M Ed.
- Mary Griffin, M Ed.
- Tony Loveless, MA
- Pamela S. Plant, Ph.D., NCSP
- Richard Keene, ??? [Richard, what is your degree?]

Bracken Basic Concept Scale: Third Edition – Receptive (BBCS-3R)

Tony reviewed the BBCS-3R. It was standardized on a national sample of children ages 3:0 to 6:11 that reflected the 2003 census estimates. 100+ subjects were included at each age level. Split-half reliabilities for the Receptive Total Composite score ranged from .97 - .99.

Tony moved and Fulvia seconded that the BBCS-3R Receptive TC Composite Score be approved as a measure of listening comprehension for ages 3:0 – 6:11. The motion passed.

Bracken Basic Concept Scale: Third Edition – Expressive (BBCS-3E)

Tony reviewed the BBCS-3E. It was standardized on the same group of subjects as the BBCS-3R. Split-half reliabilities for the Expressive Total Composite score ranged from .94 - .98.

Tony moved and Pam seconded that the BBCS-3E Expressive TC Composite Score be approved as a measure of oral expression for ages 3:0 – 6:11. The motion passed.

BBCS-3R and BBCS-3E Spanish

The author states that the Spanish versions of the tests are considered criterion referenced tests.

Articles

There was brief discussion of an article by Reynolds and Shaywitz that took Fletcher and Vaughn to task for wanting to change the definition LD from unexpected underachievement intrinsic to the child to unexpected underachievement in relation to teaching. There was also brief discussion of an Oregon School Psychologists Association of article on patterns of strengths and weakness in identification of LD.

Age Equivalent

Dick shared material from Jerome Sattler's 1990 book on assessment regarding weaknesses of age equivalent scores. The committee will discuss it at its next meeting. Fulvia promised to get the latest edition of Sattler's and compare the age equivalent score discussion in it with the 1990 edition.

Test to Review

There are new versions of the Test of Written Language and the Test of Reading Comprehension. Vickey also mentioned seeing several new tests. She will check her sources and send us a list to be reviewed.

Next Meeting

The next meeting is scheduled for May 29, 2009.