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Abstract

This study surveyed the perceptions of school psychologists and learning disabilities teachers (LD teachers) on the frequency of use and usefulness of the following assessment procedures: Standardized tests, curriculum based measures (CBMs), classroom observations, interview with general education teachers, and analysis of class assignments for initial placement of a child, instructional planning, and evaluation of student progress. Further, this study investigated how proficient the two groups felt in administering each of the five assessment procedures. Fifty four school psychologists and 32 LD teachers completed the questionnaire. Results indicated that school psychologists and LD teachers agreed on the frequency of use and perceived usefulness for initial placement, educational planning, and evaluation of progress with the exception of school psychologists rating standardized tests as significantly more useful for initial placement decisions. School psychologists also reported using standardized tests significantly more often for designing educational programs than LD teachers. Likewise, LD teachers rated Curriculum Based Measures (CBMs) and observations and error analysis significantly more useful for initial assessment and for evaluating student progress, respectively. The findings also suggested that the two groups feel proficient in administering the five assessment procedures, although LD teachers reported feeling significantly more proficient in administering CBMs.
Ratings of Assessment Procedures by Learning Disabilities

Teachers and School Psychologists

Assessment is used for a variety of purposes, such as screening, categorizing for placement, and determining curricular needs (Mardell-Czudnowski, 1982). There exist several methods of assessment, some of which are used much more frequently and consistently than others. Since learning disabilities teachers (LD teachers) and school psychologists are both deeply involved in the assessment process and in making educational decisions based on assessment results, it is important to determine whether or not they differ in their views of various assessment procedures. More specifically, it is important to determine if they differ in their ideas about the usefulness and frequency of use of various assessment procedures in initial placement, instructional planning, and evaluation of progress, and whether they differ in their perceived proficiency in administering assessment procedures. On a quest to compare the views of LD teachers and school psychologists, it is best to begin with a review of the literature.

Closely related to the investigation at hand is the Lopez-Reyna, Bay, and Patrikakou (1996) study. Their study investigated LD teachers' perceptions of standardized tests, curricular-based measures, classroom observations, interviews with general education teachers, and error analysis of class assignments. These five assessment procedures were explored in terms of their frequency of use and perceived usefulness in relation to initial placement, instructional planning, and evaluation of student progress. Further, LD teachers' level of proficiency in administering each assessment method was sought (Lopez-Reyna et al., 1996). Results of
this study indicated that the vast majority of LD teachers felt proficient to very proficient in administering all five of the assessment procedures (Lopez-Reyna et al., 1996). More intriguing, however, were the results that suggested LD teachers use standardized tests most frequently in assessment even though they do not necessarily view standardized tests as the most useful assessment procedure for placement, instructional planning, and evaluation of progress (Lopez-Reyna et al., 1996). Similar results were found in a study comparing LD teachers' acceptability ratings of published, norm referenced tests and curricular based assessment (Eckert, Shapiro, & Lutz, 1995). This study suggested that although LD teachers find standardized tests reliable in predicting academic success and are more likely to use standardized tests in assessment, they view the alternative method as somewhat more acceptable (Eckert, Shapiro, & Lutz, 1995).

These findings lead to two important questions. First, why is there a discrepancy between the frequency of use of assessment procedures and their perceived usefulness? Second, are the findings of Lopez-Reyna et al. (1996) study unique to LD teachers or do their findings reflect a general pattern seen in other professionals involved in assessment, such as school psychologists?

There are a variety of explanations that answer the first question. Standardized tests have been in use for a long time, are fairly well known to the general public, and people expect them to be used (Maudus, 1993). This may relate to Wolf's idea of social validity. According to Wolf, 1978, in order for something to be considered useful, it needs to be valid in the eyes of society. One can determine social validity by asking three
questions: "Are the specific behavioral goals really what society wants?"; "Do the participants, caregivers, and other consumers consider the treatments [or in this case assessment] acceptable?"; and finally "Are the consumers satisfied with the results?" (Wolf, 1978). Since standardized tests are objective, have a long history of use, and are well known by the consumer, perhaps they are more socially valid and thus seen as the most acceptable assessment tool to use. Further, P.L. 94-142 requires that fair and adequate assessment procedures be used to meet the needs of students. Standardized tests are often viewed to meet that requirement (Prasse, 1990). Thus, the law regarding assessment of children often translates into the use of standardized tests (Lopez-Reyna et al., 1996). For example, a learning disability is defined by law as a discrepancy between ability and achievement, which is commonly demonstrated through the use of standardized tests.

In order to answer the second question pertaining to whether the results obtained by Lopez-Reyna et al. (1996) would generalize to school psychologists, school psychologists' perceptions of standardized tests need to be investigated. School psychologists are a group of professionals who are greatly immersed in the assessment process. In a national job analysis survey, 76.2% of school psychologists identified assessment as "extremely important" (Batsche cited in Curtis & Batsche, 1991). This is perhaps related to the fact that school psychologists spend anywhere from 50% to 75% of their time in assessment (Fagan & Wise, 1994; Wilson & Reschly, 1996) and school psychology training programs place great emphasis on assessment (Curtis & Batsche, 1991). From the great amount of time school psychologists spend in assessment and from the intense
assessment training they receive, it is apparent that they should be quite familiar with the various assessment methods and their use. It is therefore expected that school psychologists would rate themselves as proficient in the administration of the various assessment procedures, as did the LD teachers.

School psychologists' frequent use of standardized tests has been reported in a number of studies. In 1982, Thurlow and Ysseldyke conducted a survey in which school psychologists were to list the ten data collecting procedures (assessment procedures) that they used most often in planning instructional programs for students with disabilities. Results indicated that over 70% of the listed procedures were standardized tests (Thurlow & Ysseldyke, 1982). The three standardized tests listed most consistently were the Wechsler Intelligence Scale for Children (WISC), the Bender Gestalt, and the Wide Range Achievement Test (WRAT) (Thurlow & Ysseldyke, 1982). Fifteen years later, the WISC was still listed as the most utilized assessment instrument followed by the Bender-Gestalt (Wilson & Reschly, 1996). From these studies, it is apparent that standardized tests are still used most often by school psychologists. It is also apparent that both groups of professionals use standardized tests more often than other assessment procedures. This could be because both groups are subjected to the same social validity issues and state and federal laws.

Based on the previously cited research, it was hypothesized that if school psychologists and LD teachers were given a series of survey questions asking about how frequently they use various assessment measures and how useful they perceived these different assessment tools to be in relation to initial placement, instructional planning, and evaluation of progress,
both groups of professionals would have similar responses. Further, if asked to indicate how proficient they feel in administering each of the five assessment procedures, both would have similar levels of perceived proficiency. That is, school psychologists and LD teachers would both feel proficient to very proficient in their administration of all five assessment procedures due to their extensive experience with these measures. Furthermore, because of their social acceptability and existing laws, standardized tests would be rated by both groups of professionals as the most commonly used assessment method although other assessment methods (e.g., curriculum based measurements) may be perceived as more useful in assessing children.

To test these hypotheses, a study modeled after the Lopez-Reyna et al. (1996) study was proposed. As with the Lopez-Reyna et al. study, this study investigated a variety of assessment procedures in terms of how frequently they were used and how useful they were perceived to be in the initial placement of children, instructional planning, and evaluation of progress. Further, the level of perceived proficiency for each assessment procedure was determined. The proposed study utilized variables similar to those used in the Lopez-Reyna et al. (1996) study. There were three independent variable. The first independent variable was "users," which was LD teachers and school psychologists. The second independent variable was "assessment procedures." The assessment procedures used include standardized tests, curriculum based measures, classroom observations, interviews with classroom teachers, and error analysis of classroom assignments. These five assessment procedures were chosen because they are the most commonly used assessment tools (Wilson & Reschly, 1996; Thurlow...
& Yssledyke, 1981) and because they were the assessment procedures examined in the Lopez-Reyna et al. (1996) study. The third independent variable was "usage," which signifies the purpose for which the assessment was conducted. Usage included initial placement, instructional planning, and evaluation of progress. In addition, there were three dependent variables; perceived usefulness, frequency of use, and perceived proficiency. These independent and dependent variable are defined in Appendix A.

The variables in this study were measured using three Likert-type scales that were given to both LD teachers and school psychologists. It was expected that when the users, the five assessment procedures, and usage are examined together, similar results would be seen in their frequency of use and perceived usefulness by LD teachers and school psychologists. Further, it was anticipated that when the users and the assessment procedures were examined together, there would be similar ratings of perceived proficiency by LD teachers and school psychologists.
Method

Participants

Participants were 100 randomly selected school psychologists from the Illinois School Psychologists Association membership list and 100 LD teachers. Because names of LD teachers could not be obtained through an organization, the school psychologists were asked to deliver the questionnaire to a LD teacher working within their district.

Instrument

A 7-item questionnaire, on a Likert-type scale, was used to obtain information on perceived usefulness of, frequency of use of, and proficiency in giving or utilizing the following tests or procedures: Standardized tests, curriculum based tests, classroom observation, classroom teacher interviews, and error analysis on class assignments (Appendix B). This instrument was an adaptation of the scales used in the Lopez-Reyna et al. (1996) study. The Likert-rating scales used in this study differed from the rating scales used in the Lopez-Reyna et al. study (1996) in that participants in their study rated perceived usefulness and proficiency nominally and were asked to rank order the assessment procedures based on how frequently they were used. In this study frequency, perceived usefulness, and perceived proficiency were rated on a Likert-type scale. Further, the Lopez-Reyna et al. (1996) study only used LD teachers as their participants.

The first item of the questionnaire dealt with perceived usefulness of tests and procedures. Participants were asked to rate on a scale of 1 ("never") to 7 ("always") the degree to which they felt each of the five assessment procedures was useful for initial placement decisions, for
designing educational programs, and for evaluating student progress.

On the second item, participants were asked to rate how often they used each assessment procedure for initial placement, designing educational programs, and evaluating student progress (a rating of 1 signified "never used" and a rating of 7 "always used").

On the third item participants rated how proficient they felt in administering each of the five assessment procedures (1 indicated "not proficient" and 7 indicated "very proficient").

The last part of the questionnaire dealt with such demographic information as level of education and gender. Finally, in order that all of the participants define the five assessment procedures the same way, a list of definitions was provided (see Appendix A).

Procedure

Two hundred questionnaires were sent to school psychologists (100 to be completed by school psychologists and 100 to be forwarded to LD teachers to complete.)

The questionnaire included a cover letter explaining the study and asking for input, a list of definitions, a stamped and self-addressed envelope for returning the completed questionnaire, and a note card that the participants could write their name and address on if they wished to receive a summary of the findings. Both groups received the same materials with the exception of the cover letter. Although the cover letters were similar for the two groups, the letter to the school psychologists asked for help in distributing the questionnaires to the LD teachers (see Appendix C). The envelopes were coded so that the names of the participants could be checked off upon the return of the questionnaire. Participation
was voluntary and confidential. The procedure used for mailing the surveys was based on Dillman's model (1978). This involved mailing the questionnaire early in the week so that it would arrive at its destination by the end of the week. Participants were instructed to return the completed questionnaire in the enclosed self addressed and stamped envelopes within a week. A short time frame for returning surveys is believed to increase return rates by encouraging participants to fill out the questionnaires rather than having them set aside and forgotten (Dillman, 1978). Finally, a week after the questionnaires were sent, a postcard was mailed to each school psychologist as a thank you for returning the completed questionnaire and as a reminder for those who had not done so yet.

Unlike that suggested by Dillman (1978), the questionnaires used in this study were folded in thirds rather than made into a booklet form. Further, those individuals who did not return their surveys were not mailed an additional set of survey material.
Results

There were 86 participants in this study: thirty six female and 15 male school psychologists with one missing data point and 29 female and 3 male LD teachers with two unidentified data points. This is a 51% return rate for school psychologists and a 32% return rate for LD teachers. Tables 1, 2, and 3 present participants' age, level of education, and work experience in a school setting, respectively.

As seen in Table 1, there were age differences between school psychologists and LD teachers. Although the mean ages of the two groups were similar, with the school psychologists having a mean age of 46 and the LD teachers having a mean age of 41, the school psychologist group contained more individuals 51 and over. The majority of participants in both groups had a Masters Degree. Table 2 shows these data. Twenty-nine percent of LD teachers had a Bachelors degree as their highest degree whereas none of the school psychologists held a Bachelors degree. This reflects the necessity of school psychologists to have at minimum a Masters degree in order to practice in the state of Illinois. The majority of respondents have had 10 or more years of experience in the school setting. There were very few new professionals (0 to 5 years working) who took part in this study. Those participants who have been working 16 or more years represented 76.9% of the school psychologists sample and 55.9% of the LD teacher sample. Table 3 presents these data.

A series of 2x5 ANOVAs were conducted using the Bonferroni correction for multiple comparisons. The data for perceived usefulness of the five assessment procedures for initial placement, educational planning, and evaluation of progress are presented in Tables 4A and 4B.
There was a significant difference between school psychologists and LD teachers' view of standardized tests and curriculum based measures for initial placement. School psychologists rated standardized tests as more useful for initial placement decisions than did the LD teachers, \( F(1,80) = 5.78, p < .05 \), whereas LD teachers saw curriculum based measures as significantly more useful in initial assessment than did school psychologists, \( F(1,79) = 4.83, p < .05 \). However, both school psychologists and LD teachers viewed classroom teacher interviews as the most useful assessment procedure for initial assessment (\( M = 6.37, SD = .91 \)).

An examination of perceived usefulness in designing an educational program did not result in any significant differences between the two groups of professionals over the five assessment procedures. When designing educational programs, school psychologists and LD teachers perceived classroom teacher interviews as most useful (\( M = 6.13, SD = 1.05 \)) and standardized tests as least useful (\( M = 4.73, SD = 1.56 \)).

Regarding perceived usefulness of the five assessment procedures for evaluating student progress, LD teachers indicated only classroom observations to be significantly more useful than school psychologists, \( F(1,80) = 6.71, p < .05 \). No other significant difference was found. Both groups considered curriculum based measures as the most useful (\( M = 6.18, SD = 1.27 \)) and standardized tests as the least useful procedure (\( M = 4.75, SD = 1.84 \)). Tables 5A and 5B show the frequency of usage of the five assessment procedures in initial placement decisions, designing educational programs, and evaluating student progress. No significant differences were found between the two groups on the frequency of usage of the assessment procedures for initial placement. School psychologists and
LD teachers used standardized tests most often (M = 6.40, SD = 1.84) and error analysis of class assignments least often (M = 4.31, SD = 1.84) for initial placement decisions.

When designing an educational program, school psychologists reported using standardized tests significantly more often than LD teachers, F(1, 84) = 6.91, p < .05. Classroom teacher interviews received the highest mean score for frequency of use in designing educational programs by school psychologists (M = 5.87, SD = 1.19). LD teachers gave classroom teacher interviews and curriculum based measures the highest mean scores for frequency of use in designing educational programs (M = 5.71, SD = 1.58; M = 5.71, SD = 1.62 respectively).

Finally, when evaluating student progress, classroom teacher interviews appears to be used most often (M = 5.83, SD = 1.38) and standardized tests least often (M = 4.76, SD = 1.87). Learning disabilities teachers use error analysis of classroom assignments significantly more often than school psychologists F(1, 84) = 5.97, p < .05.

The data in Tables 6A and 6B suggest that both groups felt proficient in administering all of the assessment procedures (standardized tests M = 6.74, SD = .80; curriculum based measures M = 5.56, SD = 1.67; classroom observations M = 6.69 SD = .62; classroom teacher interview M = 6.71, SD = .63; error analysis of class assignments M = 5.42, SD = 1.84). However, LD teachers felt significantly more proficient than school psychologists in administering curriculum based measures, F(1, 84) = 4.08, p < .05.
Discussions

It was hypothesized that school psychologists and LD teachers would rate the frequency of use and perceived usefulness for initial placement, educational program planning, and evaluation of progress similarly for the five assessment procedures. The results of this study support that hypothesis with a few exceptions: School psychologists rated standardized tests as significantly more useful for initial placement decisions and as used significantly more often for designing educational programs than did LD teachers. Likewise, LD teachers rated curriculum based measures as significantly more useful for initial assessment, classroom observations as significantly more useful for evaluating student progress, and error analysis of class assignments as used significantly more often for evaluating student progress than school psychologists. These differences may be due to the varying roles of school psychologists and LD teachers. LD teachers tend to work directly and repeatedly with the same children, emphasizing their need for assessment measures that allow for continuous evaluation of progress and that help to establish appropriate educational programs. School psychologists, on the other hand, are often tied to the role of assessing children for placement decisions, which leads to more frequent use and a better understanding of standardized tests.

It was also hypothesized that because of their extensive training, both groups would feel proficient in administering all five assessment procedures. This hypothesis was also supported. However, LD teachers reported feeling significantly more proficient in administering curriculum based measures than school psychologists. This finding may be a function of training. Almost 54 percent of participants have had 21 years or more
work experience, and because curriculum based measurement was then being introduced it might not have been included in their training. It could not be determined from this study if school psychologists with fewer years work experience would have rated curriculum based measures differently. The familiarity that LD teachers appear to have with curriculum based measures may explain why they felt that curriculum based measures were more useful in making initial placement decisions. Based on this finding, school psychology training programs may want to place more emphasis on curriculum based measures and school psychology associations may want to organize workshops on the topic for practicing school psychologists.

As expected, both groups rated standardized tests as most frequently used for initial placement decisions. Although school psychologists rated standardized tests as fairly useful for this purpose, LD teachers rated standardized tests as one of the least useful for this purpose. This indicates that even though some professionals do not feel that standardized tests are useful in determining a child's placement into special education, it appears to be the means by which eligibility is determined. This finding may be the result of special education laws and social validity issues that school psychologists and LD teachers deal with. Alternative methods of assessment may need to be considered by law makers.

Finally, both groups rated teacher interviews as frequently used for initial placement decisions, educational planning, and monitoring educational progress. Further, both groups rated interviews as useful for these purposes. This finding implies that the input of the teacher who works directly with a student is a valuable source of information.

The findings of the current study were consistent with the Lopez-Reyna
et al. study (1996). In that study it was found that LD teachers felt proficient to very proficient in administering the five assessment procedures and LD teachers indicated that they use standardized tests most frequently even though they do not necessarily view them as the most useful assessment procedure. The present study supports those findings.

There were several limitations to this study. Because names of LD teachers could not be obtained for direct mailing, it was anticipated that the return rate from these teachers would be lower than that of the school psychologists. This was indeed the case: Thirty five percent more school psychologists than LD teachers participated in the study. A larger sample size of LD teachers might have resulted in a more accurate representation of their views. Sending survey material directly to the LD teachers is likely to result in greater return rates.

An additional limitation to this study may be the fact that participants' ages and years of work experience in a school setting was negatively skewed for the school psychologist group. That is, the largest age group was 51 years and older followed by the 46 to 50 age group and then the 40 to 45 age group. There were only eight participants between the ages of 30 and 40 and none in the 20 to 30 age group. Similarly, most participants had 21 or more years work experience followed by 16 to 20 years. There were only 12 participants who had worked in schools between 6 and 15 years and no one less than 5 years. Although there appears to be an over representation of older school psychologists in this study, the numbers may have actually reflective of the profession nationally. In a study by Reschly and Wilson (1995), the mean age of school
psychologists was found to be 41.4 years old. This study also revealed that from 1986 to the 1991-92 period the median age of school psychologists increased by 2 years, suggesting a "graying" of school psychologists (Reschly & Wilson, 1995). However, it would be interesting to investigate whether a difference exists between the older and younger school psychologists' perceptions of the various assessment procedures.

Finally, similar to the original Lopez-Reyna et al. (1996) study, the questionnaire used in this study was not standardized. Therefore, the reliability and validity of the survey is unknown. The fact that the survey used a Likert-type scale is also problematic in that Likert-type scales tend to be subjective. There is no way to determine how the participants perceived the value of the various numbers on the scale and the differences between these numbers. Future research may focus on developing a questionnaire that can more accurately measure professionals' perceptions of various educational assessment procedures.
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Appendix A
Definitions
Standardized Tests - Commercially available measures or tests which are norm-referenced or criterion-referenced.

Teacher Based Measures - Tests constructed by the teacher to evaluate a student's mastery of a particular area. More specifically, a curriculum-based measurement refers to any approach that uses direct observation and recording of a student's performance in the local school curriculum as a basis for gathering information to make instructional decision.

Classroom Observation - Observation that is conducted for initial data gathering of particular targeted behaviors. It may consist of frequency or duration data (ex: child is up from seat three times during the first minute of observation).

Interview with General Education Teacher - Discussions or "information gathering" sessions which may occur between the child's mainstream teacher and you, concerning the child's educational needs.

Error Analysis of Class Assignments - Procedure of identifying patterns in the types of errors made by the student in a particular content area for the purpose of gaining a more qualitative understanding of the student's achievement.

Initial Placement for Academic Problems - ex: a student has been referred because of poor achievement and is being assessed for possible special education services.

Instructional Planning for Academic Problems - ex: development of an instructional program for a student who has been placed in special education because of poor achievement or learning difficulty.

Evaluation of Student Progress - ex: for end-of-year evaluation.
Appendix B

Perceived Usefulness

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Never</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Useful</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seldom</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sometimes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Always</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. In your opinion, to what degree is each of the following assessment procedures useful for initial assessment decisions? Please Circle One

1.1 Standardized tests: 1 2 3 4 5 6 7
1.2 Curriculum Based Measures: 1 2 3 4 5 6 7
1.3 Classroom Observation: 1 2 3 4 5 6 7
1.4 Classroom Teacher Interview: 1 2 3 4 5 6 7
1.5 Error Analysis of Class Assignments: 1 2 3 4 5 6 7

2. In your opinion, to what degree is each of the following assessment procedures useful for designing an educational program? Please Circle One

2.1 Standardized Tests: 1 2 3 4 5 6 7
2.2 Curriculum Based Measures: 1 2 3 4 5 6 7
2.3 Classroom Observation: 1 2 3 4 5 6 7
2.4 Classroom Teacher Interview: 1 2 3 4 5 6 7
2.5 Error Analysis of Class Assignments: 1 2 3 4 5 6 7

3. In your opinion, to what degree is each of the following assessment procedures useful for evaluating student progress? Please Circle One

3.1 Standardized Tests: 1 2 3 4 5 6 7
3.2 Curriculum Based Measures: 1 2 3 4 5 6 7
3.3 Classroom Observation: 1 2 3 4 5 6 7
3.4 Classroom Teacher Interview: 1 2 3 4 5 6 7
3.5 Error Analysis of Class Assignments: 1 2 3 4 5 6 7
4. In your opinion, how often do you use each of the following for initial placement decisions? 

Please Circle One

4.1 Standardized Tests:  
1  2  3  4  5  6  7

4.2 Curriculum Based Tests:  
1  2  3  4  5  6  7

4.3 Classroom Observation:  
1  2  3  4  5  6  7

4.4 Classroom Teacher Interview:  
1  2  3  4  5  6  7

4.5 Error Analysis of Class Assignments:  
1  2  3  4  5  6  7

5. In your opinion, how often do you use each of the following assessment procedures for designing an educational program? 

Please Circle One

5.1 Standardized Tests:  
1  2  3  4  5  6  7

5.2 Curriculum Based Measures:  
1  2  3  4  5  6  7

5.3 Classroom Observations:  
1  2  3  4  5  6  7

5.4 Classroom Teacher Interview:  
1  2  3  4  5  6  7

5.5 Error Analysis of Class Assignments:  
1  2  3  4  5  6  7

6. In your opinion, how often do you use each of the following assessment procedures for evaluating student progress? 

Please Circle One

6.1 Standardized Tests:  
1  2  3  4  5  6  7

6.2 Curriculum Based Measures:  
1  2  3  4  5  6  7

6.3 Classroom Observation:  
1  2  3  4  5  6  7

6.4 Classroom Teacher Interview:  
1  2  3  4  5  6  7

6.5 Error Analysis of Class Assignments:  
1  2  3  4  5  6  7
Proficiency

| +---------+---------+---------+---------+---------+---------+ |
| 1        | 2        | 3        | 4        | 5        | 6        | 7        |
| Not Proficient | Somewhat Proficient | Proficient | Very Proficient |

7. To what degree do you feel proficient in administering the following assessment procedures? Please Circle One

7.1 Standardized Tests: 1 2 3 4 5 6 7
7.2 Curriculum Based Measures: 1 2 3 4 5 6 7
7.3 Classroom Observation: 1 2 3 4 5 6 7
7.4 Classroom Teacher Interview: 1 2 3 4 5 6 7
7.5 Error Analysis of Class Assignments: 1 2 3 4 5 6 7

Demographic Information

8. Sex: M F

9. Degree Level (circle): BA MA Specialist
   Doctoral Other

10. Age (circle): 20-25 26-30 31-35 36-40
    40-45 46-50 51+

11. Number of Years Spent Working in a School Setting:
    0-5 6-10 11-15 16-20 21+

12. Comments:__________________________________________

____________________________________________________
Dear Learning Disabilities Teacher,

Educational assessment is undoubtedly an important component in maximizing the education of children. Since learning disabilities teachers and school psychologists are both deeply involved in the assessment process, it is interesting to determine whether they differ in their views and usage of various assessment procedures.

As part of my school psychology training program at Eastern Illinois University, I am preparing a thesis investigating how school psychologists and learning disabilities teachers compare in their ratings of various assessment procedures. In order to gather this information, it would be greatly appreciated if you would take a few minute to complete the following survey and return it in self-addressed and stamped envelope by March 24, 2000. By filling out this survey, you will be contributing to the literature on educational assessment. Your confidentiality is assured and participation is voluntary. The envelope is coded so that your name can be checked off upon return of the completed questionnaire.

If you would like a summary of the findings, please put your address on the enclosed card. If you have any questions or concerns, please feel free to contact me at (217)581-2130.

Thank You,

Raquel A. Williams
#7 University Apts.
Charleston, IL 61920
March 14, 2000

Dear School Psychologist,

Educational assessment is undoubtedly an important component in maximizing the education of children. Since school psychologists and learning disabilities teachers are both deeply involved in the assessment process, it is interesting to determine whether they differ in their views and usage of various assessment procedures.

As part of my school psychology training program at Eastern Illinois University, I am preparing a thesis investigating how school psychologists and learning disabilities teachers compare in their ratings of various assessment procedures. In order to gather this information, it would be greatly appreciated if you would take a few minutes to complete the following survey and return it in self-addressed and stamped envelope by March 24, 2000. By filling out this survey, you will be contributing to the literature on educational assessment. Your confidentiality is assured and participation is voluntary. The envelope is coded so that your name can be checked off upon return of the completed questionnaire.

Further, enclosed you will find an additional survey and self-addressed and stamped envelope. I would be grateful if you would pass the additional material on to a learning disabilities teacher in your district.

If you would like a summary of the findings, please put your address on the enclosed card. If you have any questions or concerns, please feel free to contact me at (217)581-2130.

Thank You,

Raquel A. Williams
### Table 1
**Participants' Age**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age</th>
<th>School Psychologist</th>
<th>LD Teacher</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>20 - 25</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26 - 30</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>8.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31 - 35</td>
<td>7.8%</td>
<td>11.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36 - 40</td>
<td>7.8%</td>
<td>14.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41 - 45</td>
<td>19.5%</td>
<td>23.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46 - 50</td>
<td>21.6%</td>
<td>26.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51+</td>
<td>43.1%</td>
<td>14.7%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Table 2
**Participants' Level of Education**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Degree</th>
<th>School Psychologist</th>
<th>LD Teacher</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bachelors</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>29.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Masters</td>
<td>44.2%</td>
<td>64.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Specialist</td>
<td>34.6%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doctoral</td>
<td>21.1%</td>
<td>5.9%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Table 3
**Participants' Work Experience in a School Setting**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age</th>
<th>School Psychologist</th>
<th>LD Teacher</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0 - 5</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>5.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 - 10</td>
<td>9.6%</td>
<td>20.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11 - 15</td>
<td>13.5%</td>
<td>17.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16 - 20</td>
<td>23.1%</td>
<td>23.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21+</td>
<td>53.8%</td>
<td>32.4%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 4A  
Means and standard deviations for perceived usefulness by school psychologists

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Initial Placement</th>
<th>Educational Planning</th>
<th>Progress</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>M</td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Standardized Tests</td>
<td>*6.00</td>
<td>1.17</td>
<td>4.96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Curriculum Based Measures</td>
<td>5.58</td>
<td>1.33</td>
<td>6.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Classroom Observations</td>
<td>6.16</td>
<td>.96</td>
<td>5.76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher Interview</td>
<td>6.43</td>
<td>.84</td>
<td>6.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Error Analysis</td>
<td>5.35</td>
<td>1.23</td>
<td>5.73</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Significantly higher score for the school psychologists
Table 4B

Means and standard deviations for perceived usefulness by LD teachers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Initial Placement</th>
<th></th>
<th>Educational Planning</th>
<th></th>
<th>Progress</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>M</td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Standardized Tests</td>
<td>5.33</td>
<td>1.32</td>
<td>4.39</td>
<td>1.73</td>
<td>4.36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Curriculum Measures</td>
<td>6.18</td>
<td>.98</td>
<td>6.06</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>6.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Classroom Observations</td>
<td>6.42</td>
<td>.83</td>
<td>6.06</td>
<td>1.06</td>
<td>*6.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher Interview</td>
<td>6.27</td>
<td>1.01</td>
<td>6.18</td>
<td>1.01</td>
<td>6.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Error Analysis</td>
<td>5.67</td>
<td>1.45</td>
<td>5.91</td>
<td>1.61</td>
<td>6.03</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Significantly higher score for the learning disabilities teachers
Table 5A

Means and standard deviations for frequency of use by school psychologists

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Initial Placement</th>
<th>Educational Planning</th>
<th>Progress</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>M</td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Standardized Tests</td>
<td>6.58</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>*5.35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Curriculum Based Measures</td>
<td>4.63</td>
<td>1.83</td>
<td>4.87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Classroom Observations</td>
<td>6.08</td>
<td>1.22</td>
<td>5.56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher Interview</td>
<td>6.31</td>
<td>1.08</td>
<td>5.88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Error Analysis</td>
<td>4.31</td>
<td>1.79</td>
<td>4.52</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Significantly higher score for the school psychologists
Table 5B

Means and standard deviations for frequency of use by LD teachers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Initial Placement</th>
<th>Educational Planning</th>
<th>Progress</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>M</td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Standardized Tests</td>
<td>6.12</td>
<td>1.53</td>
<td>4.32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Curriculum Based Measures</td>
<td>4.47</td>
<td>1.83</td>
<td>5.26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Classroom Observations</td>
<td>6.24</td>
<td>0.92</td>
<td>5.59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher Interview</td>
<td>6.06</td>
<td>1.18</td>
<td>5.85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Error Analysis</td>
<td>4.30</td>
<td>1.94</td>
<td>5.26</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Significantly higher score for the learning disabilities teachers
Table 6A

Means and standard deviations for school psychologists' perceived proficiency

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Proficiency</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Standardized Tests</td>
<td>6.87</td>
<td>.84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Curriculum Based Measures</td>
<td>5.27</td>
<td>1.79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Classroom Observations</td>
<td>6.77</td>
<td>.51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher Interview</td>
<td>6.81</td>
<td>.44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Error Analysis</td>
<td>5.21</td>
<td>1.96</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Significantly higher score for the school psychologists
Table 6B

Means and standard deviations for LD teachers' perceived proficiency

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>M</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Standardized Tests</td>
<td>6.55</td>
<td>.71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Curriculum Based Measures</td>
<td>*6.00</td>
<td>1.37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Classroom Observations</td>
<td>6.56</td>
<td>.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher Interview</td>
<td>6.55</td>
<td>.83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Error Analysis</td>
<td>5.74</td>
<td>1.60</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Significantly higher score for the learning disabilities teachers