Special Education
… A service, not a place.

Identification of Students with Specific Learning Disabilities

State of Washington
Severe Discrepancy Table
WAC 392-172A-03045-03080

Randy I. Dorn
State Superintendent of
Public Instruction

Revised December 2014

IDENTIFICATION OF STUDENTS WITH SPECIFIC LEARNING DISABILITIES

Severe Discrepancy Table

State of Washington WAC 392-172A-03045-03080

Prepared by
John R. Bresko, Program Supervisor

Special Education
Office of Superintendent of Public Instruction
Douglas H. Gill, Ed.D., Assistant Superintendent

Revised December 2014

Table of Contents

I. Introduction

The state of Washington's special education regulations address additional eligibility requirements for determining when a student has a specific learning disability (SLD). The procedures for SLD eligibility determination are in addition to the evaluation/reevaluation process for determining a student with a disability. While the definition of SLD remains unchanged, state special education regulations provided expanded options for determining SLD eligibility in 2007. These regulations address the eligibility determination for SLD (WAC 392-172A-03045 through WAC 392-172A-03080) that provide for the use of:

1. A severe discrepancy between intellectual ability and achievement (WAC 392-172A-03070);
2. A process based upon a student's response to scientific, research-based interventions (WAC 392-172A-03060); or
3. A combination of both within a school district provided that the evaluation process used is the same for all students within the selected grades or buildings within the school district and is in accordance with district procedures (WAC 392-172A-03045).

NOTE: This document is intended to supplement, but does not substitute for the Rules for the Provision of Special Education found at Washington Administrative Code (WAC) Chapter 392-172A.

This guide addresses the requirements for determining whether a student has an SLD when a district uses severe discrepancy, scientific, research-based interventions or a combination of both procedures in making that determination. WAC 392-172A-03045 through 03080 provide for the specific additional procedural documentation required for eligibility determination for students suspected of having specific learning disabilities. This document also contains the discrepancy table (Table 1) for use in applying the severe discrepancy procedures, along with instructions and cautions when using the table. Appendix A provides the severe discrepancy regression formula, and Appendix B contains an updated recommended list of tests and subtests for use within severe discrepancy eligibility determinations.

II. Required Components for Initial SLD Eligibility Determination

Determination of SLD, like any other disability determination, cannot be made using a single criterion (Knudsen, W., 2008). That is, teams may not use one screening assessment score, one observation, or a single assessment score to determine eligibility. The evaluation group must consider a variety of data sources when making an eligibility determination. Ultimately, the evaluation group must decide whether a student has a disability, whether the disability has an adverse educational impact, and whether the student requires specially designed instruction.

Regardless of the process used to determine SLD eligibility (severe discrepancy, research-based intervention, or a combination of both), the following three criteria must be met:

1. **Determination of Underachievement**
   a. The student does not achieve adequately for her/his age or meet state grade level standards when provided with age-appropriate learning experiences and instruction in one or more of the following areas:
      - Oral expression
      - Listening comprehension
      - Written expression
      - Basic reading skills
      - Reading fluency skills
      - Reading comprehension
      - Mathematics calculation
      - Mathematics problem solving

      Note on the Measurement of Reading Fluency Skills: Reading fluency was added as an area of underachievement for determination of SLD in 2004. Fluency comprises accuracy, rate, and prosody (Meisinger, Bloom, & Hynd, 2010). Accuracy refers to the ability to correctly decode words. Rate is the time it takes to decode words, and is typically measured by counting the number of words read correctly in one minute. Prosody is appropriate phrasing and expression. Fluency assessment is important because it is a valid indicator of overall reading competence (Fuchs, Fuchs, Hosp, & Jenkins, 2001), and it may help differentiate subtypes of students with reading difficulties (Meisinger, Bloom, & Hynd, 2010). Evaluation groups are responsible for determining methods and assessment instruments needed to complete a comprehensive evaluation of a student. Test administrators should take care to ensure cluster and/or composite scores for fluency represent relevant components (accuracy, rate, and prosody) and have not been contaminated by subtests or measures that assess aspects of reading that are irrelevant to fluency (Lambert, 2007). Not all available assessments measure all three areas of fluency. Thus, the evaluation group may need to employ more than one assessment as well as curriculum based measurement (CBM) to address all performance areas of reading fluency.

      Please refer to the OSPI/WSASP Questions and Answers about Reading Fluency found at: http://www.k12.wa.us/SpecialEd/pubdocs/SLD_FAQ.pdf

   b. The evaluation group may also consider a pattern of strengths and weaknesses in performance and/or achievement that is determined by the group to be relevant to

the identification of SLD when considering eligibility. Patterns of strength and weakness historically refer to the examination of profiles across different tests used in the identification of children with SLD. However, the consideration of a pattern of strengths and weaknesses is not a stand-alone methodology for determining eligibility under the SLD category. The consideration of a pattern of strengths and weaknesses must be applied in the context of a comprehensive evaluation in WAC 392-172A-03020.

c. The evaluation group determines the student's underachievement is not primarily the result of one of the following:
   - A visual, hearing, or motor disability
   - Intellectual disability
   - Emotional or behavioral disability
   - Cultural factors
   - Environmental or economic disadvantage
   - Limited English proficiency

2. **Determination of Appropriate Instruction (WAC 392-172A-03055)**
   The evaluation group must determine and document that a student's underachievement is not due to lack of appropriate instruction. Data must show that prior to, or as a part of the referral process, the student was provided with appropriate instruction in the general education setting that was delivered by qualified personnel; **and,** that repeated, valid assessments of progress were completed at reasonable intervals to assess the student's academic growth.

3. **Observation (WAC 392-172A-03075)**
   School districts must also ensure that a student suspected of having an SLD is observed in the student's learning environment, including the general education classroom setting, to document the student's academic performance and behavior in the area of difficulty. The evaluation group must: use information from an observation in routine classroom instruction done prior to the referral or have at least one member of the evaluation group conduct an observation of the student's academic performance in a general education setting after referral with parent consent obtained.

III. Requirements for Establishing Eligibility Using the Severe Discrepancy Model

Use of the Discrepancy Table (WAC 392-172A-03065)

If a school district uses a severe discrepancy model to identify students with SLD, it must use the Office of Superintendent of Public Instruction's (OSPI) published table (Appendix A) to determine the presence of a severe discrepancy between intellectual ability and academic achievement (WAC 392-172A-03065). This table was developed on the basis of a regressed standard score discrepancy method developed in 1983 by the United States Department of Education–Office of Special Education Programs (ED-OSEP) work group. Correlations between full scale or composite intellectual ability scores and academic achievement test scores provide the basis for the severe discrepancy formula (Appendix B).

For the purposes of determining a severe discrepancy, the following scores must be used:

- A total or full scale intellectual ability score.
- Academic achievement test score which can be converted into a standard score with a mean of 100 and a standard deviation of 15.

Appropriate Tests for Use with the Discrepancy Table

Tests used to determine underachievement must be valid and reliable measures of one or more of the areas listed in WAC 392-172A-03055(1), and meet the criteria listed above. Intellectual ability tests must include full scale or general conceptual ability scores. Short or abbreviated forms are not permitted. Working with the Washington State Association of School Psychologists (WSASP), OSPI publishes (with periodic updates) a list of tests appropriate for use with the discrepancy table (Appendix C). **However, this is not an exhaustive list of instruments that may be used to determine SLD eligibility.**

Revised tests may be published before OSPI revises this document. In this case, the practitioner should review the assessment's technical manual and test reviews to ensure that it is valid and reliable for the purposes of determining SLD eligibility as specified in WAC 392-172A-03055. When feasible, it is recommended that practitioners use the most current version of tests and norms to determine eligibility.

Cautions

Six cautions must be considered in establishing a severe discrepancy:

1. **Full Scale Intellectual Ability Score**
   The subtests required to obtain a total or full scale score are listed in Appendix C. Requirements for obtaining valid scores for each test are also specified in the test manuals. Use of a short form or an abbreviated cognitive measure is not sufficient to develop a full scale intelligence quotient.

   Where the evaluation results do not appear to accurately represent the student's intellectual ability or where the discrepancy between the student's intellectual ability and academic achievement does not appear to be accurate upon application of the discrepancy tables, the evaluation group, described in WAC 392-172A-03050, may apply *professional judgment* in order to determine the presence of a specific learning disability using the discrepancy model. *Professional judgment may also be utilized in a comprehensive evaluation (see WAC 392-172A-03020) when properly validated tests are unavailable*. Data obtained from formal assessments, reviewing of existing data, assessments of student progress, observation of the student, and information gathered from all other evaluation processes for students being identified for a specific learning disability must be used when applying professional judgment to determine if a severe discrepancy exists. When applying professional judgment, the group shall document in a written narrative an explanation as to why the student has a severe discrepancy, including a description of all data used to make the determination through the use of professional judgment (WAC 392-172A-03070(2).

2. **Minimum Intellectual Ability Level**
   A student must have a total or full scale intellectual ability score above a score which could establish eligibility for special education under the intellectual disability category. An intellectual disability is defined as "significantly sub-average general intellectual functioning, existing concurrently with deficits in adaptive behavior…." (WAC 392-172A-01035(2)(g)). These criteria are more specifically described in the *Washington State Association of School Psychologists Professional Practice Guidelines in Evaluation of Students with Intellectual Disabilities:* http://www.wsasp.org/Resources/Documents/Guidance%20Papers/WSASP%20Position%20Paper_Evaluation%20and%20Identification%20of%20Students%20with%20Intellectual%20Disabilities.pdf.

3. **Test Reliability and Validity**
   Test reliability and validity may vary for students in certain demographic groups. Specifically, caution must be used in assessing students from minority groups and students in the early primary grades, since some tests may not provide valid and reliable measures of the actual achievement or intellectual ability of these students. In these cases, the evaluation group may consider qualifying the student for special education services using professional judgment as specified in WAC 392-172A-03070(2).

4. **Students Below 1st Grade**
   The diagnostic tests and discrepancy table presented in this document are designed to identify students with specific learning disabilities in 1st grade and above. **The application of the severe discrepancy table is inappropriate for students who are not yet enrolled in 1st grade.** Review the test manual for guidance on the use of age based achievement scores for students retained in Kindergarten.

5. **Qualifications**
   All measures used in determining a severe discrepancy must be administered, scored, and interpreted by trained and knowledgeable personnel in accordance with WAC 392-172A-03020(3)(a)(iv).

6. **Linguistically and Culturally Diverse Students**
   Since linguistically and culturally diverse students may be underrepresented in the standardization sample of non-verbal tests, exercise caution when selecting tests and interpreting scores to avoid testing bias and discrimination. Review the test manual to determine that the standardization and norming of the instrument included individuals matching the racial/ethnic/language background of the student, and to determine any suggested administration modification. An analysis of both the pattern of scores (strengths and weaknesses) combined with response to scientific based instruction data over time may provide better information in cases where overall scores lack reliability and validity.

Instructions for Using the Discrepancy Table

1. **Determine the intellectual ability score**
   - Obtain the student's age-based, total or full scale intellectual ability score.
   - All subtests listed under each cognitive instrument (Appendix B), must be administered to determine the total or full scale or composite intellectual ability score in accordance with specifications in the test manual.
   - Use the chronological age of the student at the time of assessment, and be certain to

use age-based norms.

- **Use non-verbal intellectual instruments only with identified non-verbal students and/or English language learners (ELLs).**

2. **Determine the age-based achievement score**
   - Use the student's chronological age at the time of the testing to calculate the student's standard score(s) in achievement.
   - Age-based norms must be used when calculating scores in subtest areas.

3. **Determine the criterion discrepancy score**
   - Determine the criterion discrepancy (cut-off) score using the criterion scores in the Discrepancy Table (Appendix A).
   - Locate the student's full scale or overall composite intellectual ability score on the left column and the appropriate criterion score on the row.

4. **Determine if a severe discrepancy exists**
   - Compare the student's age-based achievement score to the criterion discrepancy score.
   - Where the age-based achievement score is equal to or smaller than the criterion discrepancy score, a severe discrepancy is indicated.
   - Where the evaluation results do not appear to accurately represent the student's intellectual ability or where the discrepancy between the student's intellectual ability and academic achievement does not appear to be accurate upon application of the discrepancy tables, the evaluation group, described in WAC 392-172A-03050, may apply professional judgment in order to determine the presence of a specific learning disability.

IV. Requirements for Establishing Eligibility Using Student's Response to Scientific Research-Based Intervention (WAC 392-172A-03060)

Before using a process based on a student's response to scientific, research-based interventions in the determination if a student has a specific learning disability, the district must adopt policy and procedure to ensure the process includes these elements:

- Universal screening and/or benchmarking assessments at least three times per year.
- High-quality core curriculum within the context of a multi-tiered instructional system.
- Research-based interventions as defined in WAC 392-172A-01165 implemented with fidelity for students identified as at-risk for learning.
- A multi-tiered model developed for delivering both the core curriculum and strategic, intensive scientific research-based interventions in the general education setting.

- Frequent progress monitoring in accordance with the constructs of the multi-tiered delivery system implemented in the school.
- Instructional decisions based on student data that may include curriculum based measures, available standardized assessment data, intensive interventions, and instructional performance level.
- Provide data demonstrating a student's failure to respond to two or more research-based interventions that were implemented with fidelity and sufficient duration to determine effectiveness.

For further information about these requirements, see WAC 392-172A-03060. Additional guidance for using student response to scientific research-based intervention can be found at http://www.rti4success.org/essential-components-rti.

V. References

Fuchs, L.S., Fuchs, D.F., Hosp, M.K., & Jenkins, J.R. (2001). Oral reading fluency as an indicator of reading competence: A theoretical, empirical, and historical analysis. *Scientific Studies of Reading, pp. 5,* 239-256.

Knudsen, W. (2008, June 3). Second Quarter 2008 OSEP Policy Documents on the Education of Infants, Toddlers, Children, and Youth with Disabilities (see Letter to Thomas). Retrieved from http://www2.ed.gov/policy/speced/guid/idea/letters/2008-2/index.html

Lambert, M (2007). *A Guide to Reading Fluency and the Assessment of Specific Learning Disabilities in the Individuals with Disabilities Education Improvement Act of 2004*. Wisconsin Department of Public instruction.

Meisinger, E.B., Bloom, J.S., & Hynd, G.W. (2010). Reading fluency: Implications for the assessment of students with reading disabilities. *Annals of Dyslexia, pp. 60,* 1-17.

National Center on Response to Intervention (2010). *Essential Components of RTI: A Closer Look at Response to Intervention. Retrieved from* http://www.rti4success.org/essential-components-rti

Washington State Association of School Psychologists *Professional Practice Guidelines in Evaluation and Identification of Students with Intellectual Disabilities. Retrieved from* http://www.wsasp.org/Resources/Documents/Guidance%20Papers/WSASP%20Position%20Paper_Evaluation%20and%20Identification%20of%20Students%20with%20Intellectual%20Disabilities.pdf

VI. Appendices

Appendix A: Discrepancy Table

IQ	Criterion Score	IQ	Criterion Score
69	62	97	80
70	62	98	81
71	63	99	82
72	64	100	82
73	65	101	83
74	65	102	84
75	66	103	84
76	67	104	85
77	67	105	86
78	68	106	86
79	69	107	87
80	69	108	88
81	70	109	88
82	71	110	89
83	71	111	89
84	72	112	90
85	73	113	91
86	73	114	91
87	74	115	92
88	75	116	93
89	75	117	93
90	76	118	94
91	76	119	95
92	77	120	95
93	78	121	96
94	78	122	97
95	79	123	97
96	80	124	98
		125	99

This table is intended for use with students in 1st grade and above.

Appendix B: Severe Discrepancy Regression Formula

If a school district uses a severe discrepancy model, it must use OSPI's published table to establish a severe discrepancy between intellectual ability and academic achievement (WAC 392-172A-03065; Appendix A). The table was developed on the basis of the regressed standard score discrepancy formula developed in 1983 by the United States Department of Education–Office of Special Education Programs (ED-OSEP) work group. It considers the following variables:

- The reliability coefficient of the intellectual ability test.
- The reliability coefficient of the academic achievement test.
- An appropriate correlation between the intellectual ability and the academic achievement tests.

The regression formula developed by the ED-OSEP is:

$$Z_{yc} = \left(z_x r_{xy}\right) \left| \left(1.96\sqrt{1-r^2_{xy}}\right) - \left(1.65 \left(\left(\sqrt{1-r^2_{xy}}\right) \left(\sqrt{1 - \frac{\sqrt{r_{yy}+(r_{xx}r^2_{xy}) - (2r^2_{xy})}}{1-r^2_{xy}}} \right) \right) \right) \right|$$

r_{xy} = test to test correlation – IQ to achievement
r_{yy}, r_{xx} = internal consistency reliabilities

Appendix C: Test Information

Appropriate Tests for use with the Discrepancy Table

Tests used to determine underachievement must be valid and reliable measures of one or more of the areas listed in WAC 392-172A-03055(1). Intellectual ability tests must include full scale or general conceptual ability scores. Short or abbreviated forms are not permitted. Working with the Washington State Association of School Psychologists (WSASP), OSPI publishes (with periodic updates) a list of tests appropriate for use with the discrepancy table. However, this is not an exhaustive list of instruments that may be used to determine SLD eligibility.

Revised tests may be published before OSPI revises this document. In this case, the practitioner should review the assessment's technical manual and test reviews to ensure that it is valid and reliable for the purposes of determining SLD eligibility as specified in WAC 392-172A-03055. When feasible, it is recommended that practitioners use the most current version of tests and norms to determine eligibility.

List of Tests for use with the Discrepancy Table

Comprehensive Cognitive Assessments

CAS-2	Cognitive Assessment System II
DAS-II	Differential Ability Scales, 2nd Edition
KABC-II	Kaufman Assessment Battery for Children, 2nd Edition
RIAS	Reynolds Intellectual Assessment Scales
RAIT	Reynolds Adaptable Intelligence Test
S-B5	Stanford-Binet Intelligence Scales, 5th Edition
WAIS-IV	Wechsler Adult Intelligence Scale-IV
WISC-IV	Wechsler Intelligence Scale for Children, 4th Edition
WISC-V	Wechsler Intelligence Scale for Children, 5th Edition
WJ-III	Woodcock-Johnson Tests of Cognitive Abilities-III
WJ-IV	Woodcock-Johnson Tests of Cognitive Abilities-IV
WPPSI-IV	Wechsler Preschool and Primary Scale of Intelligence-IV

Nonverbal Cognitive Assessments

CTONI-2	Comprehensive Test of Non-Verbal Intelligence, 2nd Edition
DAS-II	Differential Ability Scales, 2nd Edition
KABC-II	Kaufman Assessment Battery for Children, 2nd Edition
LEITER-3	Leiter 3rd Edition
TONI-4	Test of Non-Verbal Intelligence, 5th Edition
UNIT	Universal Nonverbal Intelligence Test
WNV	Wechsler Nonverbal Scale of Ability

Academic Assessments

K-TEA-II	Kaufman Test of Educational Achievement 2nd Edition
K-TEA-III	Kaufman Test of Educational Achievement 3rd Edition
KM-3	Key Math, 3rd Edition
OWLS-2	Oral and Written Language Scales 2nd Edition
PAL-II	Process Assessment of the Learner
WIAT-III	Wechsler Individual Achievement Test-III
WJ-III	Woodcock-Johnson Tests of Achievement-III
WJ-IV	Woodcock-Johnson Tests of Achievement-IV

Intellectual Ability Tests and Subtests

For each cognitive measure the core subtests required for calculation of the index, general conceptual ability or full scale IQ scores are identified below. Short form or abbreviated forms may not be used with the discrepancy table. Tests must be individually administered. This listing includes all applicable core subtests based on a review of current testing resources. Some instruments include supplemental subtests. The practitioner should review the technical or administrative manual for the appropriate use of supplement subtests. This list is not a substitute for adhering to test manual instructions, test updates, or revisions. Best practice recommends using tests that have been normed within 10 years of the time of administration.

DAS-II (General Conceptual Ability) Early Years 2.6–8.11 Published 2007	DAS-II (General Conceptual Ability) School Aged 5.0–17.11 Published 2007
Verbal Cluster Verbal Comprehension Naming Vocabulary Nonverbal Reasoning Matrices Picture Similarities Spatial Pattern Construction Copying	Verbal Cluster Word Definitions Verbal Similarities Nonverbal Reasoning Matrices Sequential and Quantitative Reasoning Spatial Recall of Designs Pattern Construction

KABC-II (There are two indexes available: Fluid-Crystallized Index and Mental Processing Index. The manual recommends the Fluid-Crystallized Index for most situations.) Published 2004	
Fluid-Crystallized Index Ages 4:0–6:11	Fluid-Crystallized Index Ages 7:0–18:11
Sequential Processing Number Recall Word Order Simultaneous Processing Conceptual Thinking, Face Recognition Pattern Reasoning, Rover Triangles Learning Ability Atlantis Rebus Knowledge Expressive Vocabulary Riddles	Sequential Processing Number Recall Word Order Simultaneous Processing Block Counting Rover Triangles Learning Ability Atlantis Rebus Planning Ability Pattern Reasoning Story Completion Knowledge Riddles Verbal Knowledge
Mental Processing Index Ages 4:0–6:11	Mental Processing Index Ages 7:0–18:11
Sequential Processing Number Recall Word Order Simultaneous Processing Conceptual Thinking, Face Recognition, Pattern Reasoning, Rover Triangles Learning Ability Atlantis Rebus	Sequential Processing Number Recall Word Order Simultaneous Processing Block Counting Rover Triangles Learning Ability Atlantis Rebus Planning Ability Pattern Reasoning Story Completion

RIAS (Composite Intelligence Index) Ages 3.0–21.11 Published 2003	RAIT (Total Battery Intelligence Index) Ages 10.0–Adult Published 2014
Verbal Intelligence Index Verbal Reasoning Guess What Nonverbal Intelligence Index Odd Item Out What's Missing	Crystalized Intelligence Index General Knowledge Odd Word Out Work Opposites Fluid Intelligence Index Nonverbal Analogies Sequences Quantitative Intelligence Index Quantitative Knowledge Quantitative Reasoning
S-B5 (Full Scale Score) Ages 2.5–Adult (Please note, not all subtests are applicable to all age levels.) Published 2003	WAIS IV-(Full Scale IQ) Age: 16–Adult Published 2008
Nonverbal Fluid Reasoning Object Series/Matrices Nonverbal Knowledge Procedural Knowledge, Picture Absurdities Nonverbal Quantitative Reasoning Quantitative Reasoning Nonverbal Visual-Spatial Processing Form Board, Form Patterns Nonverbal Working Memory Delayed Response, Block Span Verbal Fluid Reasoning Early Reasoning, Verbal Absurdities, Verbal Analogies Verbal Knowledge Vocabulary Verbal Quantitative Reasoning Quantitative Reasoning Verbal Visual-Spatial Processing Position and Direction Verbal Working Memory Memory for Sentences, Last Word	Verbal Comprehension Index Similarities Vocabulary Information Perceptual Reasoning Index Block Design Matrix Reasoning Visual Puzzles Working Memory Index Digit Span Arithmetic Processing Speed Index Coding Symbol Search

WISC-IV (Full Scale IQ) Age: 6:0–16:11 Published 2003	WISC-V (Full Scale IQ) Age: 6:0–16:11 Published 2014
Verbal Comprehension Index Similarities Vocabulary Comprehension Perceptual Reasoning Index Block Design Picture Concepts Matrix Reasoning Working Memory Index Digit Span Letter-Number Sequencing Processing Speed Index Coding Symbol Search	Verbal Comprehension Index Similarities Vocabulary Visual Spatial Reasoning Index Block Design Visual Puzzles Fluid Reasoning Index Matrix Reasoning Figure Weights Working Memory Index Digit Span Picture Span Processing Speed Index Coding Symbol Search
WJ-III (General Intellectual Ability) Standard Battery Ages 2–Adult Published 2001, Normative Update 2007	WJ-IV (General Intellectual Ability) Standard Battery Ages 2–Adult Published 2014
Verbal Ability Verbal Comprehension Thinking Ability Visual-Auditory Relations Spatial Relations Sound Blending Concept Formation Cognitive Efficiency Visual Matching Numbers Reversed	Comprehension-Knowledge (*Gc*) Oral Vocabulary Fluid Reasoning (*Gf*) Number Series Short Term Working Memory (*Gwm*) Verbal Attention Cognitive Processing Speed (*Gs*) Letter-Pattern Matching Auditory Processing (*Ga*) Phonological Processing Long Term Retrieval (*Glr*) Story Recall Visual Processing (*Gv*) Visualization

WPPSI-IV (Full Scale IQ) Ages 2:6–3:11 Published 2012	WPPSI-IV (Full Scale IQ) Ages 4:0–7:7 Published 2012
Verbal Comprehension Receptive Vocabulary Information Visual Spatial Block Design Object Assembly Working Memory Picture Memory	Verbal Comprehension Information Similarities Visual Spatial Block Design Fluid Reasoning Matrix Reasoning Working Memory Picture Memory Processing Speed Bug Search

CAS 2 (Full Scale Score) Ages 5–18.11 Published 2013
Planning Planned Codes Planned Connections Planned Number Matching Simultaneous Nonverbal Matrices Verbal-Spatial Relations Figure Memory Attention Expressive Attention Number Detection Receptive Attention Successive Word Series Sentence Repetition/Questions Visual Digit Span

Nonverbal Intellectual Ability Tests and Subtests

This listing includes all applicable core subtests based on a review of current testing resources. Some instruments include supplemental subtests. The practitioner should review the technical or administrative manual for the appropriate use of supplement subtests. This list is not a substitute for adhering to test manual instructions, test updates, or revisions. Best Practice recommends using tests that have been normed within 10 years of the time of administration.

Comprehensive Test of Nonverbal Intelligence Second Edition (CTONI-2) Core Subtests Ages 6–Adult Published 2009	Test of Nonverbal Intelligence Fourth Edition (TONI-4) Ages 6.0–Adult Published 2010
Picture Analogies Geometric Categories Geometric Analogies Pictorial Sequences Pictorial Categories Geometric Sequences	Total score only (Forms A and B)
DAS-II (Special Nonverbal Composite) Early Years 2.6–8.11 Published 2007	DAS-II (Special Nonverbal Composite) School Aged 5.0–17.11 Published 2007
Recall of Designs Pattern Construction Matrices Sequential and Quantitative Reasoning	Recall of Designs Pattern Construction Matrices Sequential and Quantitative Reasoning
KABC II (Nonverbal Index) Core Subtests Age 6 Published 2004	KABC II (Nonverbal Index) Core Subtests Ages 7–18 Published 2004
Hand Movements Conceptual Thinking Pattern Reasoning Story Completion Triangles	Hand Movements Block Counting Triangles Pattern Reasoning Story Completion

LEITER-3 (IQ Score) Cognitive Scales Ages 3–Adult Published 2013	UNIT (Full Scale IQ) Core Composites Age 6–17.11 Published 1998
Fluid Intelligence Sequential Order Form Completion Classification and Analogies Figure-Ground Matching/ Repeated Patterns-optional	Memory-Core Subtests Symbolic Memory Spatial Memory Object Memory Reasoning-Core Subtests Cube Design Analogic Reasoning Mazes Symbolic-Core Subtests Symbolic Memory Analogic Reasoning Object Memory Non-Symbolic-Core Subtest Cube Design Spatial Memory Mazes
WNV (Nonverbal Scale of Ability) Ages 4.0–21.11; Full Scale Score Conversion Published 2006	RIAS (Nonverbal Intelligence Index) Ages 3.0–21.11 Published 2003
Matrices Coding Object Assembly Recognition Spatial Span Picture Arrangement	Odd Item Out What's Missing
WISC-V (Nonverbal Index) Age: 6:0–16:11 Published 2014	
Block Design Visual Puzzles Matrix Reasoning Figure Weights Picture Span Coding	

Academic Achievement Tests and Subtests

This listing includes all applicable scores that can be used on the discrepancy table based on a review of current testing resources; some are subtest scores, while some are composite scores. Some instruments include supplemental subtests. The practitioner should review the technical or administrative manual for the appropriate use of supplement subtests. This list is not a substitute for adhering to test manual instructions, test updates, or revisions. Best Practice recommends using tests that have been normed within 10 years of the time of administration.

K-TEA II Published 2004	K-TEA III Published 2014
Letter & Word Recognition Reading Comprehension Math Concepts & Applications Math Computation Written Expression Oral Expression Listening Comprehension	Reading Reading Comprehension Decoding Math Math Concepts & Applications Math Computation Math Fluency Written Language Written Expression Oral Language Oral Expression Listening Comprehension
KM-3 Published 2007	PAL-II Published 2007
Applications Area Operations Area	Reading Skills (Part 1) Phonological Decoding Morphological Decoding Silent Reading Fluency Reading-Related Processes (Part 2) Orthographic Coding Phonological Coding Morphological/Syntactic Coding RAN/RAS Verbal Working Memory Writing Skills (Part 1) Handwriting Orthographic Spelling Narrative Composition Fluency Expository Note Taking Report Writing Cross-Genre Composition Expository Writing Math Skills (Part 1) Oral Counting Fact Retrieval Computational Operations
OWLS-2 Published 2011	
Written Expression Oral Expression Listening Comprehension Reading Comprehension	
WIAT-III Published 2009	
Basic Reading Reading Comprehension and Fluency Math Problem Solving Numerical Operations Written Expression Oral Expression Listening Comprehension	
WJ-III Tests of Achievement	

Published 2001, 2007 Normative Update	Place Value Part-Whole Concept Finding the Bug Multi-Step Problem Solving
Basic Reading Skills Reading Comprehension Reading Fluency Skills Math Calculation Skills Math Problem Solving Written Expression	
WJ-IV Tests of Achievement Published 2014	WJ-IV Tests of Oral Language Published 2014
Broad Reading Skills Basic Reading Skills Reading Comprehension Reading Fluency Skills Broad Mathematics Math Calculation Skills Math Problem Solving Broad Written Language Written Expression	Oral Expression Listening Comprehension

Office of Superintendent of Public Instruction
Old Capitol Building
P.O. Box 47200
Olympia, WA 98504-7200

For more information about the contents
of this document, please contact:
John Bresko, OSPI
Email: john.bresko@k12.wa.us
Phone: 360-725-6075

To order more copies of this document,
please call 1-888-59-LEARN (l-888-595-3276)
or visit our website at http://www.k12.wa.us/publications

Please refer to the document number below for quicker service:
14-0097

This document is available online at:
http://www.k12.wa.us/

Office of Superintendent of Public Instruction
Old Capitol Building
P.O. Box 47200
Olympia, WA 98504-7200
2014