Special Education
… A service, not a place.

Identification of Students with Specific Learning Disabilities

State of Washington
Severe Discrepancy Table
WAC 392-172A-03055-03080

Randy I. Dorn
State Superintendent of
Public Instruction

Revised December 2011

IDENTIFICATION OF STUDENTS WITH SPECIFIC LEARNING DISABILITIES

Severe Discrepancy Table

State of Washington WAC 392-172A-03055-03080

Prepared by
David Anderson, Program Supervisor

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

Randy I. Dorn
State Superintendent of Public Instruction

Ken Kanikeberg
Chief of Staff

Bob Harmon
Assistant Superintendent, Special Programs, Secondary Education, School Improvement & Federal Accountability

---

Revised December 2011

Table of Contents

Introduction

The state of Washington's special education regulations address eligibility requirements for determining when a student has a specific learning disability (SLD). 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-03055 through WAC 392-172A-03080) and allow **two** procedures for identification of students with SLD:

1. Use of the discrepancy table (Table 1) to determine a severe discrepancy between intellectual functioning and academic achievement (WAC 392-172A-03070); and

2. A process based upon a student's response to research-based interventions (WAC 392-172A-03060), commonly known as Response to Intervention (RTI).

This guide addresses the requirements for determining whether a student has an SLD when a district uses either severe discrepancy or RTI procedures in making that determination. It has been updated to reflect changes to evaluation procedures and provides information on the required components of SLD eligibility procedures. This document also contains the discrepancy table (Table 1), 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 procedures

Required Components for SLD Eligibility Determination

Determination of SLD, like any other disability determination, cannot be made using a single criterion. 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 to make academic progress. Regardless of the process used to determine eligibility (severe discrepancy or RTI), the following three processes must occur.

1. **Determination of Underachievement (WAC 392-172A-03055)**
   a) The student does not achieve adequately for his/her 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 et al., 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.

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.

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 (formerly known as mental retardation)
    - 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. If an observation has already been conducted as part of an instructional intervention process such as RTI, that observation may be used to meet this requirement and the individual who conducted the observation must be a member of the evaluation team.

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 (Table 1) 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 A).

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

- A full scale or overall composite intellectual ability score.
- Academic achievement score on a test that has 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 B). 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 full scale or composite score are listed in Appendix B. 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.

   If the evaluation group determines that the full scale score or overall composite score does not accurately reflect the student's intellectual ability, then a data-based professional judgment must be made regarding the existence of severe discrepancy using the procedures described under WAC 392-172A-03070(2). Applying professional judgment to determine a severe discrepancy should include data obtained from a number of sources such as formal assessments, reviews of existing data, assessments of student progress, and observations. When applying professional judgment, the evaluation group must 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)]. Also

see *Washington State Association of School Psychologists Professional Practice Guidelines in the use of Professional Judgment in Determining Eligibility for Special Services* (http://www.wsasp.org/pdf/position/professional.pdf).

2. Minimum Intellectual Ability Level
   A student must have a full scale or overall composite intellectual ability score above a score which could establish eligibility for special education under the intellectual disability category (formerly known as mental retardation). 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 and Identification of Students with Mental Retardation* (http://www.wsasp.org/pdf/position/mental.pdf).

   Students with reliably measured scores below this minimum level do not meet state severe discrepancy requirements for SLD eligibility. If the obtained full scale or composite score is not considered a valid estimate of the student's intellectual ability, professional judgment may be used to determine the existence of a severe discrepancy.

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). Also see *Washington State Association of School Psychologists Professional Practice Guidelines in the use of Professional Judgment in Determining Eligibility for Special Services* (http://www.wsasp.org/pdf/position/professional.pdf).

4. Students Below Grade 1
   The diagnostic tests and discrepancy table presented in this document are designed to identify students with specific learning disabilities in Grade 1 and above. **The application of the severe discrepancy table is inappropriate for students who are not yet enrolled in first grade.**

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)(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 the pattern of scores (strengths and weaknesses) combined with RTI 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, full scale or overall composite intellectual ability score.
   - All subtests listed under each cognitive instrument (Appendix B), must be administered to determine the 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 Table 1.
   - 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.
   - If the age-based achievement score is equal to or smaller than the criterion discrepancy score, a severe discrepancy is indicated.

Requirements for Establishing Eligibility Using RTI (WAC 392-172A-03060)

The National Center on Response to Intervention (NCRTI) defines RTI as a framework that "integrates assessment and intervention within a school-wide, multi-level prevention system to maximize student achievement and reduce behavior problems." Students at risk for learning difficulties are provided with a series of increasingly intensive, individualized, and research-based interventions, and data are collected to assess progress over time. Interventions are delivered by general educators working in collaboration with other school staff including psychologists, special educators, English language or Title I teachers, or other related service providers. The intervention process includes systematic monitoring of progress, and students who demonstrate persistent nonresponse may be considered for referral to special education (NCRTI, 2010, p.2).

It should be noted that RTI relies on a high-quality general education core curriculum that provides all students with the opportunity to increase learning. In addition, districts must implement the following procedures when using RTI to establish SLD eligibility:

- 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 implemented with fidelity for students identified as at-risk for learning.
- Ongoing progress monitoring.

- Instructional decisions based on student data.
- 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 developing RTI procedures may also be found in *Using Response to Intervention for Washington's Students* (http://www.k12.wa.us/RTI/Resources/RTIManual.aspx).

.

REFERENCES

Bracken, B. A. & McCallum, R. S. (1998). *Universal Nonverbal Intelligence Test.* Itasca, IL: Riverside Publishing.

Carrow-Woolfolk, E. (1995). *Oral and Written Language Scales.* Circle Pines, MN: AGS Publishing.

Connolly, A. J. (2007). *Keymath-3. Diagnostic Assessment Manual,* Pearson, Inc.

Elliott, C.D. (1990). *DAS administration and scoring manual.* San Antonio: The Psychological Corporation.

Elliott, C.D. (2007). *Differential Ability Scales–Second Edition,* Hartcourt Assessment Inc.

Flanagan, D., McGrew, K., & Ortiz, S. (2000). *The Wechsler Intelligence Scales and gf-gc Theory*. Needham, MA: Allyn and Bacon.

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.

Hammil, D.D., Pearson, N.A., & Wiederholt, J.L. (1997). *Comprehension Test of Nonverbal Intelligence.* Austin, TX: Pro-Ed.

Kaufman, A. S. & Kaufman, N. L. (2004). *Kaufman Assessment Battery for Children: Second Edition*. Circle Pines: AGS Publishing.

Kaufman, A. S. & Kaufman, N. L. (2004). *Kaufman Test of Educational Achievement: Second Edition.* Circle Pines: AGS Publishing.

Kaufman, A. S. & Kaufman, N. L. (1993). *Kaufman Adolescent and Adult Intelligence Test*. Circle Pines: AGS Publishing.

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.

Markwardt, F.C., (1997). *Peabody Individual Achievement Test-Revised.* Circle Pines, MN: AGS Publishing.

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.

Naglieri, J.A. & Das, J.P. (1997). *Cognitive Assessment System.* Itasca, IL: Riverside Publishing.

National Center on Response to Intervention (2010). *Essential Components of RTI: A Closer Look at Response to Intervention. Retrieved from* http://www.rti4success.org/images/stories/pdfs/rtiessentialcomponents_051310.pdf.

Rasinski, T.V. (2004). *Assessing Reading Fluency* Pacific Resources for Education and Learning. Available at http://prel.org/products/re_/assessing-fluency.htm.

Roid, G. H. & Miller, L. J. (1997). Leiter International Performance Scale-Revised. Wood Dale, Il Stoelting.

Roid, G. H. (2003). *Stanford-Binet Intelligence Scales: Fifth Edition.* Itasca, IL: Riverside Publishing.

Sattler, J. M. (2001). *Assessment of children: clinical applications (*4th ed.) San Diego: Jerome M. Sattler, Publisher.

The Psychological Corporation, (2001). *Wechsler Individual Achievement Test-Second Edition.* San Antonio: The Psychological Corporation.

Washington State Association of School Psychologists Professional Practice Guidelines in Evaluation and Identification of Students with Mental Retardation (http://www.wsasp.org/pdf/position/mental.pdf).

Washington State Association of School Psychologists Professional Practice Guidelines in the use of Professional Judgment in Determining Eligibility for Special Services (http://www.wsasp.org/pdf/position/professional.pdf).

Wechsler, D. (1997). *Wechsler Adult Intelligence Scale–Third Edition*. San Antonio: The Psychological Corporation.

Wechsler, D. (2004). *Wechsler Intelligence Scale for Children–Fourth Edition*. San Antonio: The Psychological Corporation.

Wechsler, D. & Naglieri, J.A. (2006). *Wechsler Nonverbal Scale of Ability,* Harcourt Assessment, Inc.

Woodcock, R. W., McGrew, K.S., & Mather, N. (2000). *Woodcock-Johnson III Tests of Cognitive Abilities.* Itasca, IL: Riverside Publishing.

Woodcock, R. W. (1998). *Woodcock Reading Mastery Tests-Revised.* Circle Pines MN: American Guidance Service.

TABLE 1

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 Grade 1 and above.

APPENDIX A

SEVERE DISCREPANCY REGRESSION FORMULA

If a school district uses a severe discrepancy model, it must use the OSPI's published table to establish a severe discrepancy between intellectual ability and academic achievement (WAC 392-172A-03065; Table 1). 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:

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

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

APPENDIX B

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 (Appendix B). 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.

TEST INFORMATION

List of Tests for use with the Discrepancy Table

CAS	Cognitive Assessment System
CTONI-2	Comprehensive Test of Non-Verbal Intelligence, 2nd Edition
DAS-II	Differential Ability Scales, 2nd Edition
KAIT	Kaufman Adolescent and Adult Intelligence Test
KABC-II	Kaufman Assessment Battery for Children, 2nd Edition
K-TEA-II	Kaufman Test of Educational Achievement 2nd Edition
KM-3	Key Math, 3rd Edition
LEITER-R	Leiter-Revised
OWLS	Oral and Written Language Scales
PIAT-R/NU	Peabody Individual Achievement Test-Revised/Normative Update
PAL-II	Process Assessment of the Learner
RIAS	Reynolds Intellectual Assessment Scales
S-B5	Stanford-Binet Intelligence Scales, 5th Edition
TONI-3	Test of Non-Verbal Intelligence, 3rd Edition
TONI-4	Test of Non-Verbal Intelligence, 4th Edition
UNIT	Universal Nonverbal Intelligence Test
WAIS-III	Wechsler Adult Intelligence Scale-III
WAIS-IV	Wechsler Adult Intelligence Scale-IV
WIAT-II	Wechsler Individual Achievement Test-II
WIAT-III	Wechsler Individual Achievement Test-III
WISC-IV	Wechsler Intelligence Scale for Children, 4th Edition
WJ-III	Woodcock-Johnson Tests of Cognitive Abilities-III and Woodcock-Johnson Tests of Achievement-III
WNV	Wechsler Nonverbal Scale of Ability
WRMT-R/NU	Woodcock Reading Mastery Test – Revised/Normative Update
WPPSI-III	Wechsler Preschool and Primary Scale of Intelligence-III

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. 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.

CAS (Full Scale Score) Core Subtests Ages 5–17.11	**DAS-II (General Conceptual Ability)** Early Years 2.6–8.11

Planning
Matching Numbers
Planned Codes
Planned Connections

Attention
Expressive Attention
Number Detection
Receptive Attention

Simultaneous
Nonverbal Matrices
Verbal-Spatial Relations
Figure Memory

Verbal Cluster
Word Definitions
Similarities
Comprehension
Naming Vocabulary

Nonverbal Reasoning
Matrices
Sequential and Quantitative Reasoning
Picture Similarities

Spatial
Recall of Designs
Pattern Construction
Copying

DAS-II (General Conceptual Ability) School Aged 5.0–17.11	**RIAS (Composite Intelligence Index)** Ages 3.0–21.11

Verbal Cluster
Word Definitions
Similarities
Comprehension
Naming Vocabulary

Nonverbal Reasoning
Matrices
Sequential and Quantitative Reasoning
Picture Similarities

Spatial
Recall of Designs
Pattern Construction
Copying

Verbal Intelligence Index
Verbal Reasoning
Guess What

Nonverbal Intelligence Index
Odd Item Out
What's Missing

KABC-II (There are two indexes available: **Fluid-Crystallized Index** and **Mental Processing Index**. The manual recommends the Fluid-Crystallized Index for most situations.)

Fluid-Crystallized Index Core Subtests Ages 4–6	**Fluid-Crystallized Index** Core Subtests Ages 7–18
Sequential Processing Number Recall Word Order	**Sequential Processing** Number Recall Word Order
Simultaneous Processing Conceptual Thinking, Face Recognition Pattern Reasoning, Rover Triangles	**Simultaneous Processing** Block Counting Rover Triangles
Learning Ability Atlantis Rebus	**Learning Ability** Atlantis Rebus
Knowledge Expressive Vocabulary Riddles	**Planning Ability** Pattern Reasoning Story Completion
	Knowledge Riddles Verbal Knowledge

Mental Processing Index Core Subtests Ages 4–6	**Mental Processing Index** Core Subtests Ages 7–18
Sequential Processing Number Recall Word Order	**Sequential Processing** Number Recall Word Order
Simultaneous Processing Conceptual Thinking, Face Recognition, Pattern Reasoning, Rover Triangles	**Simultaneous Processing** Block Counting Rover Triangles
Learning Ability Atlantis Rebus	**Learning Ability** Atlantis Rebus
	Planning Ability Pattern Reasoning Story Completion

KAIT (Composite IQ) Core Subtests Ages 11–Adult	**WJ-III (General Intellectual Ability Score)** Core Subtests Ages 2–Adult
Crystallized Scale Auditory Comprehension Double Meanings Definitions **Fluid Scale** Rebus Learning Mystery Codes Logical Steps	**Standard Battery** **Verbal Ability** Verbal Comprehension **Thinking Ability** Visual-Auditory Relations Spatial Relations Sound Blending Concept Formation **Cognitive Efficiency** Visual Matching Numbers Reversed

S-B5 (Full Scale Score) Core Subtests Ages 2.5–Adult (Please note, not all subtests are applicable to all age levels.)	WISC-IV (Full Scale Score) Core Subtests Age: 6:0–16:11

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
Comprehension

Perceptual Reasoning Index
Block Design
Picture Concepts
Matrix Reasoning

Working Memory Index
Digit Span
Letter-Number Sequencing

Processing Speed Index
Coding
Symbol Search

WAIS-III (Full Scale Score) Core Subtests Age: 16–Adult	**WAIS IV-(Full Scale Score)** Core Subtests Age: 16-Adult
Verbal IQ Subtests Information Comprehension Arithmetic Similarities Digit Span Vocabulary **Performance IQ Subtests** Digit Symbol-Coding Picture Completion Block Design Picture Arrangement Matrix Reasoning	**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

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.

Comprehensive Test of Nonverbal Intelligence Second Edition (CTONI-2) Core Subtests Ages 6–Adult	**Test of Nonverbal Intelligence Third Edition (TONI-3)** Ages 6.0–Adult	**Test of Nonverbal Intelligence Fourth Edition (TONI-4)** Ages 6.0–Adult Released 2010
Picture Analogies Geometric Categories Geometric Analogies Pictorial Sequences Pictorial Categories Geometric Sequences	Total score only (Forms A and B)	Total score only (Forms A and B)

KABC II (Nonverbal Index) Core Subtests Age 6	**KABC II (Nonverbal Index)** Core Subtests Ages 7–18
Hand Movements Conceptual Thinking Pattern Reasoning Story Completion Triangles	Hand Movements Block Counting Triangles Pattern Reasoning Story Completion

LEITER-R (Full IQ) Core Subtests Ages 2–20 (Note, not all subtests are applicable for all age groups.)	**UNIT (Full Scale IQ)** Core Composites Age 6–17.11
Visualization and Reasoning Battery Classification Repeated Patterns Matching Figure-Ground Form Completion Sequential Order Design Analogies Picture Context Paper Folding Figure Rotation	**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	**RIAS (Nonverbal Intelligence Index)** Ages 3.0–21.11
Matrices Coding Object Assembly Recognition Spatial Span Picture Arrangement	Odd Item Out What's Missing

DAS-II Early Years 2.6–8.11	**DAS-II** School Aged 5.0–17.11
Recall of Designs Pattern Construction Matrices Sequential and Quantitative Reasoning	Recall of Designs Pattern Construction Matrices Sequential and Quantitative Reasoning

Academic Achievement 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.

K-TEA II Basic Reading (Subtest 2 Letter & Word Recognition), Reading Comprehension (Subtest 6 Reading Comprehension),
Math Reasoning (Subtest 3 Math Concepts & Applications), Math Calculations (Subtest 5 Math Computation),
Written Expression (Subtest 7 Written Expression), Oral Expression (Subtest 10 Oral Expression), and Listening Comprehension (Subtest 9 Listening Comprehension).

KM-3 Operations Area
Applications Area

OWLS Written Expression
Oral Expression
Listening Comprehension

PIAT-R/NU Reading Recognition, Reading Comprehension. Mathematics, and Written Expression (Level II only).

PAL-II ***Reading Skills (Part 1)*** – Phonological Decoding (subtest scores), Morphological Decoding (composite score), Silent Reading Fluency (subtest scores).

Reading-Related Processes (Part 2) – Orthographic Coding (composite score), Phonological Coding (composite score), Morphological/Syntactic Coding (composite score), RAN/RAS (composite score), Verbal Working Memory (composite score).

Writing Skills (Part 1) – Handwriting (subtest summary scores), Orthographic Spelling (subtest scores), Narrative Composition Fluency (subtest scores), Expository Note Taking and Report Writing (subtest scores), Cross-Genre Composition and Expository Writing (subtest scores).

Math Skills (Part 1) – Oral Counting (subtest score), Fact Retrieval (subtest scores), Computational Operations (composite score), Place Value (composite score), Part-Whole Concept (composite score), Finding the Bug (subtest score), Multi-Step Problem Solving (subtest score).

WIAT-II Basic Reading (Word Reading), Reading Comprehension, Numerical Operations, Mathematics Reasoning, Written Expression, Listening Comprehension, and Oral Expression.

WIAT-III Basic Reading (Word Reading and Pseudo Word Decoding), Reading Comprehension and Fluency (Reading Comprehension and Oral Reading Fluency), Numerical Operations, Math Problem Solving, Written Expression (Sentence Composition, Essay Composition and Spelling), Listening Comprehension, and Oral Expression.

WJ-III Basic Reading Skills (Letter-Word Identification and Word Attack), Reading Comprehension (Passage Comprehension and Reading Vocabulary), Reading Fluency Skills (Letter-word Identification, Word Attack, and Reading Fluency),Oral Expression (Story Recall and Picture Vocabulary), Listening Comprehension (Understanding Directions and Oral Comprehension), Math Calculation Skills (Calculations and Math Fluency), Math Reasoning (Applied Problems and Quantitative Concepts), and Written Expression (Writing Samples and Writing Fluency).

WRMT-R/NU Basic Reading Skills

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:
David Anderson, OSPI
E-mail: speced@k12.wa.us
Phone: (360) 725-6075

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

Please refer to the document number below for quicker service:
11-0015

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
2011