


I'm not robot  reCAPTCHA

I'm not robot!

Unfortunately, few of the instruments either a) were adaptations from English into Spanish or b) had information on whether they were translated or adapted into Spanish from English.

IV. Spanish-Speaking Norms

This category has to do with whether, or not, the normative data was gathered from a Spanish-speaking population. For the purposes of making a determination on the selection of instruments, preferential treatment (or weight) was given to the Spanish version of instruments which were standardized on the type of sample of children. Unfortunately, only three (3) instruments met these criteria.

V. Reporting System (Friendly Recommendations)

The fifth category of the matrix was tools with parent/teacher-friendly reporting systems. This category was critical because sometimes instruments which are child-friendly fail to provide usefulness to the parent or teacher. Given at the young age of our preschool population and the current trend to work with the child before any referral can be made, the instruments with useful reporting systems were preferred over others.

VI. Date Published

The cut-off date of publication was 1990. Instruments that were developed before this time, though perhaps reviewed, were not even considered for the original list. The more recent instruments were preferred because since their norming samples were more current, they were generally more representative of the populations being tested today.

VII. Examiner Characteristics

This criterion was based on the examiner minimum qualifications as prescribed by the test publishers. The final eleven (11) instruments had examiner qualifications which ranged from that of a broad continuum (e.g., professional to paraprofessional) to being very narrow and specific in focus (e.g., licensed school psychologists only). There was no predetermined preference; the decision depended on the instrument.

VIII. Administration

This category had a specific cut-off point: specifically, \leq thirty minutes. Assessments with administration times less than thirty minutes - most of which were screeners - were given favorable ratings in the matrix, those with times over the thirty minutes were not given favorable ratings, unless the other criteria could justify doing so. Keeping this in mind, few tools with administration times over thirty minutes were able to meet criteria. The rationale for establishing this low cut-off point was to meet the intention of the ELCMEM for 2007; in other words, to reduce the assessment time in order to increase the time in which to implement interventions.



Google Scholar Hopkins, W. G. (2002). A scale of magnitudes for effect statistics. In A new view of statistics. Retrieved July 14, 2005, from Horn, J. L., & Cattell, R. B. (1966). Refinement and test of the theory of fluid and crystallized intelligence. *Journal of Educational Psychology*, 57, 253-270.CrossRef PubMed Google Scholar Janske, J. J. (1978). A critical review of some developmental and predictor precursors of reading disabilities. In A. L. Benton & D. Pearl (Eds.), *Dyslexia: An appraisal of current knowledge* (pp. 412-516). New York: Oxford University Press. Google Scholar Jenkins, J. R. (2003, December). Candidate measures for screening at-risk students. Paper presented at the national research center on learning disabilities responsiveness-to-intervention symposium, Kansas City, MO. Retrieved April 3, 2006, from Jenkins, J. R., Hudson, R. G., & Johnson, E. S. (2007). Screening for service in an RTI framework: Candidate measures. *School Psychology Review*, 36, 582-599. Google Scholar Jensen, A. R. (1980). Bias in mental testing. New York: Free Press. Google Scholar Jodoin, M. G., & Gierl, M. J. (2001). Evaluating type I error and power rates using an effect size measure with the logistic regressions procedure for DIF detection. *Applied Measurement in Education*, 14(4), 329-349.CrossRef Google Scholar Johnson, E. S., Jenkins, J. R., Petscher, Y., & Catts, H. W. (2009). How can we improve the accuracy of screening instruments? *Learning Disabilities Research and Practice*, 24(4), 174-185.CrossRef Google Scholar Kingslake, B. J. (1983). The predictive (in)accuracy of on-entry to school screening procedures when used to anticipate learning difficulties. *British Journal of Special Education*, 10, 24-26. Google Scholar Levin, M. D. (1978). *Developmental variation and learning disorders*. Cambridge, MA: Educators Publishing Service. Google Scholar Nunnally, J. S., & Bernstein, I. H. (1994). *Psychometric theory* (3rd ed.). Baltimore: Williams & Wilkins. Google Scholar Park, S. H., Goo, J. M., & Jo, C. H. (2004). Receiver operating characteristic (ROC) curve: Practical review for radiologists. *Korean Journal of Radiology*, 5(1), 11-18.CrossRef PubMed Google Scholar Pepe, M. S. (2003). The statistical evaluation of medical tests for classification and prediction. New York: Oxford. Google Scholar Plante, E., & Vance, R. (1994). Diagnostic accuracy of two tests of preschool language. *American Journal of Speech-Language Pathology*, 4, 70-76.CrossRef Google Scholar Plante, E., & Vance, R. (1995). Diagnostic accuracy of two tests of preschool language. *American Journal of Speech-Language Pathology*, 4, 70-76.CrossRef Google Scholar Rathvon, N. (2004). *Early reading assessment*. New York: Guilford Press. Google Scholar Reynolds, C. R., & Kamphaus, R. (2003). *Reynolds intellectual assessment scales*. Lutz, FL: Psychological Assessment Resources. Google Scholar Reynolds, C. R., Livingston, R. G., & Willson, V. (2009). *Measurement and assessment in education* (2nd ed.) Boston: Allyn & Bacon. Google Scholar Rosenthal, R. (1994). Parametric measures of effect size. In H. Cooper & L. V. Hedges (Eds.), *Handbook of research synthesis* (pp. 231-244). New York: Sage. Google Scholar Salvia, J., Ysseldyke, J. E., & Bolt, S. (2013). *Assessment in special and inclusive education* (12th ed.). Australia: Wadsworth Cengage Learning. Google Scholar Spearman, C. E. (1923). *The nature of intelligence and the principles of cognition*. New York: Macmillan. Google Scholar Swaminathan, H., & Rogers, H. J. (1990). Detecting differential item functioning using logistic regression procedures. *Journal of Educational Measurement*, 26, 55-66. Google Scholar Swets, J. A. (1996). *Signal detection theory and ROC analysis in psychology and diagnostics: Collected papers*. Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates. Google Scholar U. S. Bureau of the Census. (2007). *Statistical abstract of the United States* (126th ed.). Washington, DC: Author. Google Scholar Wood, F., Flowers, L., Meyer, M., & Hill, D. (2002, November). How to evaluate and compare screening tests: Principles of science and good sense. Paper presented at the meeting of the International Dyslexia Association, Atlanta. Google Scholar Zumbo, B. D. (1999). *A handbook on the theory and methods of differential item functioning* (DIF). Ottawa, OH: Directorate of Human Resources Research, Department of national Defense. Google Scholar