Analyzing DAS-II Test Results Using a CHC Framework
Webinar Presented on February 27, 2013

Questions and Answers

Q: Does DAS software make these comparisons between cluster standard scores?
A: Yes. See attached report.

Q: If there are significant differences between clusters, should we list the GCA in our report?
Q: If the cognitive profile varies significantly with nonverbal, verbal, and spatial - do you still report the GCA score? Under what circumstances would you determine an invalid GCA score and just report the strengths/weaknesses?
A: The fact that there is variability in the Cluster scores that comprise the GCA does not make the GCA invalid. If each cluster is a unitary construct, the GCA is an accurate estimate of the child’s overall thinking and reasoning abilities. However, the overall score does not capture the relative cognitive strengths and weaknesses. Therefore, report the GCA, describe the variability in the contributing scores, and describe the abilities measured by each cluster. The attached report of the psycho-educational evaluation for Jim Sample describes the data we presented during the webinar.

Q: How would you interpret the cluster score if the discrepancy among subtests suggests a non-unitary construct?
Q: In your reports, do you talk about the differences in subtest scores. For example, the T-score of Speed of Information Processing and T-score of Rapid Naming. There is a 13 point difference which is probably not significant, but do you address that?
A: In this case, the 13-point difference is significant and unusual. In the attached report, you will note that I reported and described the Processing Speed Cluster score and the subtest scores. I described the significant and unusual discrepancy between the subtest scores and I described what this means in terms of the abilities measured by each of the subtests. The focus on differential performance allows us to generate hypotheses related to the abilities that explain the performance on the two subtests. This contributes to the analysis of “Shared Underlying Processes” for each subtest. This table is in the DAS-II Introductory and Technical Handbook. The attached report describes the data we presented during the webinar.
Q: Is this table in the DAS-II manual? And what are you considering as a significant weakness for subtest analysis - one SD below mean?

A: The statistical significance of the difference is determined by comparing the difference score to the critical value which you can find in the *DAS-II Normative Data Tables Manual*. You can also use the Scoring Software. The table for the Shared Abilities is in the *DAS-II Introductory and Technical handbook*. The report from the software is attached for the data we presented during the webinar.

Q: How do you access different scores under phonological processing?

A: The information to compare the scores for the four tasks on phonological processing is on the record form. You can also generate the information with the scoring software. See attached report.

Q: How does this strength/weakness discrepancy fit into an RTI model?

A: Some school districts use pattern of strengths and weaknesses analysis in conjunction with an RtI model. Even if you are using an RtI model only, it is sometimes helpful to understand why a child continues to struggle with a specific skill despite effective instruction and intervention at Tier 1 and Tier 2. Looking at a cognitive weakness that is theoretically linked to a specific achievement weakness can help us identify appropriate interventions. For example, in the case study we presented, we began by trying to improve phonological awareness. The child made minimal progress in response to this intervention. Once we understood that the child was struggling to integrate the orthographic and phonological word forms, we were able to target the intervention to meet the child’s needs.

If you have further questions, please email gloria.maccow@pearson.com