

EDS 741: Psycho-educational Evaluation of Children with Learning Problems

Rubric for Reviews of Five Tests (Total: 35 points)

Each test review is evaluated according to the 14 criteria below.

- Each review is worth up to **7 points**.
- Students must complete **five reviews** ($5 \times 7 = 35$ points).
- Credit is given for **specific, accurate, and well-interpreted information**.
- Avoid vague statements; always provide details (with examples when available) and explain their **meaning for practice in special education**.

Rubric Criteria (per Test Review)

1. Learning Areas / Subtests (0–0.5 points)

- *Excellent*: Identifies all domains/subtests and explains what each measures (e.g., comprehension, problem-solving). Interprets focus (academic, cognitive, functional).
- *Partial*: Lists domains but without explanation.
- *Minimal*: Missing or inaccurate.

2. Age Range (0–0.5 points)

- *Excellent*: Provides exact age/grade span and developmental stage; explains relevance (e.g., why it is suitable for early childhood vs. adolescents).
- *Partial*: States only general range.
- *Minimal*: Not addressed.

3. Purpose (0–0.5 points)

- *Excellent*: Clearly explains intended construct and practical use (screening, diagnosis, monitoring, etc.), with examples of when a teacher/psychologist would use it.

- *Partial:* Mentions purpose without context.
- *Minimal:* Not explained.

4. Examiner Qualifications (0–0.5 points)

- *Excellent:* Identifies required training/licensure and why it matters (e.g., why graduate-level expertise is necessary).
- *Partial:* Mentions qualifications but not interpreted.
- *Minimal:* Omitted.

5. Available Scores (0–0.5 points)

- *Excellent:* Identifies types of scores (standard, percentile, etc.), includes examples, and explains interpretation.
- *Partial:* Mentions only score types.
- *Minimal:* Omitted.

6. Technical Qualities: Reliability, Validity, Norms (0–1 point)

- *Excellent:* Provides **specific statistics** (e.g., overall reliability .94, subtest .75) and interprets what those mean for decision-making. Discusses validity evidence and norm sample. Explains whether technical data support use with diverse learners.
- *Partial:* General statements (e.g., “It is reliable”) without numbers or meaning.
- *Minimal:* Missing or vague.

7. Suitability for Culturally & Linguistically Diverse Students (0–0.5 points)

- *Excellent:* Discusses norming diversity, translations, accommodations, and possible bias, with specific examples.
- *Partial:* Mentions diversity in passing.
- *Minimal:* Not addressed.

8. Administration Procedures (0–0.5 points)

- *Excellent:* Describes clarity of directions and practicality, with examples of whether examiners find it straightforward or confusing.

- *Partial:* Mentions clarity only.
- *Minimal:* Omitted.

9. Administration & Scoring Time (0–0.5 points)

- *Excellent:* States specific administration time and scoring method, and evaluates whether this is reasonable in schools.
- *Partial:* Provides only time or method.
- *Minimal:* Missing.

10. Suitability for Students with Disabilities (0–0.5 points)

- *Excellent:* Explains available accommodations, accessibility features, and fairness, with examples (e.g., visual aids, extended time).
- *Partial:* Mentions limited accommodations.
- *Minimal:* Not addressed.

11. Scoring Procedures (0–0.5 points)

- *Excellent:* Describes clarity, objectivity, tools/software, and potential for scoring error.
- *Partial:* Mentions scoring but little evaluation.
- *Minimal:* Omitted.

12. Strengths (0–0.5 points)

- *Excellent:* Identifies multiple strengths with examples (e.g., “Clear scoring guide reduces subjectivity,” “Large norming sample improves generalizability”).
- *Partial:* Lists strengths without explanation.
- *Minimal:* Missing.

13. Weaknesses (0–0.5 points)

- *Excellent:* Identifies specific weaknesses (e.g., “Some subtests show only moderate reliability, which reduces confidence in those areas”) and explains implications.

- *Partial:* Mentions weaknesses vaguely.
- *Minimal:* Omitted.

14. Summary & Commentary (0–1 point)

- *Excellent:* Provides a **balanced, specific conclusion** with clear recommendations or cautions (e.g., “I recommend using this test for initial screening but not for placement decisions due to weaker subtest reliabilities”). Summarizes how well the test meets its purpose and in what settings.
- *Partial:* Provides a summary but without specific recommendations or cautions.
- *Minimal:* Missing or superficial.

Performance Levels (per Review)

- **Outstanding (6.5–7 points):** All criteria addressed with detailed, specific examples and clear interpretation.
- **Proficient (5–6 points):** Most criteria addressed with adequate detail; some lack of depth.
- **Developing (3.5–4.5 points):** Several criteria vague or missing; little interpretation.
- **Beginning (0–3 points):** Minimal coverage; lacks accuracy or specificity.

-
-  **Total Assignment Score: 35 points**