ACT Research Report Series 96-7

Predicting the College Grade Point Averages of Special-Tested Students from Their ACT Assessment Scores and High School Grades

Robert L. Ziomek

Kevin M. Andrews

ACT

November 1996

Predicting the College Grade Point Averages of Special-Tested Students From Their ACT Assessment Scores and High School Grades

Robert L. Ziomek
Kevin M. Andrews

Abstract

This study provides information regarding the validity of ACT's regression model, incorporating high school course grades and ACT test scores, for predicting the first-year college GPAs of ACT-tested special-needs students. The sample of special-tested students used in this study was pooled across all postsecondary institutions participating in ACT's prediction research service over a three year period. Special-tested students were analyzed by diagnosed disability, test package, and extended time guideline separately and in combinations of test package and extended time guideline within diagnosis. The results revealed that special-needs tested students' first-year college GPAs were slightly over-predicted. The correlations between predicted and actual GPAs varied by combinations analyzed, and were largest for students diagnosed with Attention Deficit Disorder.

Predicting the College Grade Point Averages of Special-Tested Students From Their ACT Assessment Scores and High School Grades

In 1984 an ACT Research Report (Laing & Farmer, 1984) was published that addressed the predictive validity of student self-reported high school grades and ACT Assessment test scores for predicting college grade point averages (GPA) of students with disabilities. ACT's prediction research data base, containing the first year college GPAs of students from postsecondary institutions participating in ACT's prediction research services across the years, 1978-79 to 1981-82, were screened to locate all ACT special-tested students. A total of 280 examinees with motor (physical and learning) disabilites, 172 with visual disabilites, and 9 with auditory disabilities were found. (Because of the small number of students in this last group the researchers did not undertake any further analyses involving these students.) All special-needs students who register for the ACT Assessment take the tests under various time-extended guidelines as compared to the time limits for regularly tested students. In addition, special-needs students can request an appropriate test package, for example, large print, braille, audio cassette, etc., suitable to their unique needs.

Their analyses revealed the following findings: the correlation between the college reported GPA and the predicted GPA for students with motor disabilites was r=0.39; for students with visual disabilites the correlation between predicted and reported GPAs was r=0.52. Tables 1 and 2, appearing in Appendix A, display the summary statistics for both groups of students as reported by Laing and Farmer in their original report. For purposes of comparison Laing and Farmer referred to a study published by Maxey and Levitz (1980) that examined the predictive validity of ACT's regression model, incorporating self-reported high school grades and ACT test scores, for predicting the college GPAs of regular-tested students. Maxey and Levitz reported a

correlation of r=0.59 between actual and predicted GPAs for this group. Upon inspection of Tables 1 and 2 in Appendix A it can been seen that the predicted GPAs for special-tested students tended to be slightly higher than their actual GPAs; whereas, in the Maxey and Levitz (1980) study, the predicted GPAs of regular-tested students tended to be lower than their actual GPAs.

The prediction model used by ACT was and still is based on student self-reported high school grades in four subject areas, English, mathematics, social studies and science, and the four ACT test scores. However, both the ACT tests and the manner in which the self-reported course-grade information is collected has changed significantly between the time that Laing and Farmer reported their results and the present. Up until 1989 the ACT Assessment was comprised of the following four tests; English, mathematics, natural science and social studies. Beginning in fall 1989, ACT introduced the Enhanced ACT Assessment which retains the English and mathematics tests, but substitutes a reading test and a science reasoning test for the social studies and natural science tests respectively.

All students registering for the ACT Assessment are asked to report the most recent grade they earned, prior to their senior year, in a course in English, mathematics, social studies and natural sciences. Starting with the fall of 1985, ACT introduced a new course/grade data collection instrument for students testing on national test dates which covers over 40 different courses in the four content areas noted earlier. The self-reported grades used in ACT's prediction model for regular-tested students are now based on the average of multiple course grades in each of the four content areas as compared to a single course grade in each subject. Students who are

special-tested continue to report only their most recent grade in each subject area prior to their senior year and these grades are used in the prediction model for those students.

Changes to the ACT Assessment tests, to the manner in which course/grade data are collected, and to testing accomodations provided to the special-tested student population over the last twelve years since Laing and Farmer conducted their study necessitated the present study. The following sections describe the conduct and results of the current study investigating the predictive validity of ACT's prediction model for special-tested students.

Current Study

Data and Analysis

A total of 52,667 students were special-tested from 1992-93 through 1994-95. These three years were selected because the extended time guidelines associated with the administrations of each of the four ACT tests remained consistent across this time period. This data set was subsequently compared to ACT's prediction research data base for the same time period. Over 611,000 student records from 1,006 participating institutions were searched resulting in a total of 2,959 special-tested students matched with valid college GPAs, predicted GPAs, and complete ACT test results. The final sample of students was substantially smaller because not all postsecondary institutions participate in ACT's prediction research service, and of those who do not all submit data on their special-needs students.

All subsequent analyses were based on this total sample pooled across institutions and the three year time frame. The predicted GPAs were based on each institution's unique regression equation. The prediction equations for each institution are calculated using the total student population containing both special-tested and regular-tested students. The resulting regression

weights are applied to the special-tested student data to calculate their predicted GPAs. This process is necessary because there are so few special-tested students in any one institution prohibiting the calculation of institution specific prediction equations for this group of students. The analyses focused upon the errors of prediction (college GPA minus predicted GPA) for three different categories of special-need ACT-tested students: students by diagnosed diability; students by test package (e.g., audio cassette); and students by extended time guidelines.

Three groups of diagnosed disabilities had a sufficient number of students to warrant further analyses: Attention Deficit Disorder (N=480); Dyslexia (N=526); and Learning Disabled (N=1,258). Appendix B provides a copy of the page from ACT's request form for special testing that contains a list of diagnoses/disabilities and available test formats. Note that although Dyslexia is listed under the category Learning Disability, it had a sufficient number of students to treat separately in the analyses. The Learning Disabled category in this analysis refers to the Other Learning Disability category noted in Appendix B which contains all other learning disability diagnoses not explicitly identified on the form.

Likewise, three extended time guidelines had the following number of students: up to double time on each of the English and mathematics tests and up to triple time on each of the reading and science reasoning tests (N=1,127); up to triple time per test (N=476); up to three hours per test (N=1,353). Finally, the two test packages that had a sufficient number of students were regular print (N=1,730) and audio cassette tape with regular print (N=938).

In addition to analyzing each group of students within each of the previously identified categories separately, analyses were also conducted for extended time guideline and test package combinations within diagnosis.

Results

Table 1 presents the summary statistics of prediction errors for the overall group of 2,959 ACT special-tested students, as well as a breakdown of the results for each of the three categories. Tables 2, 3 and 4 summarize the descriptive statistics for predicted GPAs, actual GPAs, ACT Composite scores and correlations between predicted and first-year college GPAs for student groups by diagnosis, extended time guidelines, and test package respectively. Over the three year period from which the special-tested students data were drawn, the average ACT Composite score and standard deviations for the total population of postsecondary prediction research service participants were: 1992-93, 21.3 and 4.26; 1993-94, 21.3 and 4.24; 1994-95, 21.7 and 4.35. Similarly, the average first year college GPAs and standard deviations were: 1992-93, 2.51 and 0.89; 1993-94, 2.51 and 0.91; 1994-95, 2.53 and 0.93. The special-tested student groups have lower average ACT Composite scores and first year GPAs compared to the total prediction research participant population.

The mean error of prediction (-0.04) reported in Table 1 for the total group revealed a small over-prediction bias; i.e., predicted GPAs of special-tested students tended to be slightly higher on average than their actual college GPAs. The correlation of predicted GPAs with reported GPAs for the total group was r=0.42 (refer to Table 2) and the standard error of prediction was 0.75. For comparison purposes, the most recently reported median correlation of predicted with first-year college GPAs across all postsecondary institutions participating in ACT's prediction research service was r=0.53 and the corresponding median standard error of prediction was 0.74 (ACT, 1995).

The correlations of predicted with reported GPAs was highest for students diagnosed with attention deficit disorder (r=0.47) and lower for learning disabled (r=0.37) and dyslexic students (r=0.35). The standard errors of prediction for all three groups are comparable to the standard error for regular-tested students noted above. The mean errors of prediction for the attention deficit (-0.11) and learning disabled (-0.05) groups reveal a slight over-prediction bias while the median values for each group are essentially zero.

Special-needs students who were administered the tests under the extended time guideline defined as up to triple time for each of the four ACT tests had the highest correlation (r=0.49, refer to Table 3) between predicted and reported GPAs, as well as a slight over-prediction bias as noted by the negative mean error of prediction (-0.10) compared to the other two timing guidelines. However, the mean and median errors of prediction for all three groups are negligible (Table 1).

Both testing package groups which had sufficient numbers for analysis have very small negative mean errors of prediction. The standard errors of prediction for both groups are essentially similar to the standard error of prediction for the regular-tested population noted earlier. In addition, the correlation of predicted with college GPAs was higher for the regular print-tested group (r=0.43) compared to the audio cassette/regular-tested group (r=0.35).

Tables 5 and 6 summarize the results of the analyses by extended time guideline and test package within diagnosis. The attention deficit group had the largest "relative" mean errors of prediction for both test package and extended time guideline conditions compared to the other two groups presented in Table 5. This group also had the largest correlation of predicted with reported GPAs of r=0.45. For the other two groups presented in Table 5 the median quantile

TABLE 1

Prediction Error Summary Statistics

Group	N	Mean	SE	Error Quantile Values					r[a]
				Min	Q_1	Q_2	Q_3	Max	
Total	2959	-0.04	0.75	-2.65	-0.50	0.02	0.49	2.59	-0.06
Diagnosis									
Attention Deficit	480	-0.11	0.77	-2.24	-0.58	-0.02	0.40	2.41	0.02
Dyslexia	526	0.00	0.74	-2.65	-0.47	0.02	0.53	1.91	-0.14
Learning Disability	1258	-0.05	0.74	-2.35	-0.51	-0.01	0.46	2.59	-0.10
Extended Time Guidelines									
Double-Triple[b]	1127	-0.03	0.73	-2.65	-0.49	0.02	0.49	1.99	-0.09
Triple[c]	476	-0.10	0.76	-2.35	-0.58	-0.01	0.42	2.41	-0.01
3-Hour[d]	1353	-0.02	0.77	-2.53	-0.49	0.03	0.52	2.59	-0.05
Testing Package									
Regular Print	1730	-0.05	0.74	-2.65	-0.53	0.01	0.47	2.41	-0.06
Audio Cassette plus Regular Print	938	-0.04	0.76	-2.05	-0.52	-0.01	0.44	2.59	-0.10

[a]Correlation between predicted GPAs and errors of prediction.
[b]Up to double time for English and mathematics tests, and triple time for reading and science reasoning tests.
[c]Up to triple time per test.
[d]Up to three hours per test.

TABLE 2

Descriptive Statistics for Groups by Diagnosis

Diagnosis	N	Mean	SD	Min	Max	r[a]
Total	2959					
Predicted GPA		2.23	0.40	1.06	3.85	
College GPA		2.19	0.83	0.10	4.00	0.42
ACT Composite		19.3	4.29	10.0	35.0	
Attention Deficit	480					
Predicted GPA		2.25	0.39	1.24	3.48	
College GPA		2.14	0.87	0.20	4.00	0.47
ACT Composite		21.3	4.17	11.0	35.0	
Dyslexia	526					
Predicted GPA		2.20	0.38	1.06	3.45	
College GPA		2.20	0.78	0.10	4.00	0.35
ACT Composite		18.8	3.92	11.0	32.0	
Learning Disability	1258					
Predicted GPA		2.17	0.36	1.16	3.40	
College GPA		2.13	0.79	0.10	4.00	0.37
ACT Composite		18.5	3.90	10.0	31.0	

[a]Correlation between predicted and actual college GPAs.

TABLE 3

Descriptive Statistics for Groups by Extended Time Guidelines

Timing Condition	N	Mean	SD	Min	Max	r[a]
Total	2959					
Predicted GPA		2.23	0.40	1.06	3.85	
College GPA		2.19	0.83	0.10	4.00	0.42
ACT Composite		19.3	4.29	10.0	35.0	
Double-Triple[b]	1127					
Predicted GPA		2.20	0.37	1.06	3.45	
College GPA		2.17	0.79	0.10	4.00	0.39
ACT Composite		18.9	3.90	10.0	31.0	
Triple[c]	476					
Predicted GPA		2.30	0.43	1.20	3.85	
College GPA		2.20	0.87	0.20	4.00	0.49
ACT Composite		21.3	4.50	11.0	35.0	
3-Hour[d]	1353					
Predicted GPA		2.22	0.40	1.12	3.55	
College GPA		2.20	0.85	0.10	4.00	0.43
ACT Composite		19.0	4.33	11.0	33.0	

[a]Correlation between predicted and actual college GPAs.
[b]Up to double time for English and mathematics tests, and triple time for reading and science reasoning tests.
[c]Up to triple time per test.
[d]Up to three hours per test.

TABLE 4

Descriptive Statistics for Groups by Testing Package

Testing Package	N	Mean	SD	Min	Max	r[a]
Total	2959					
Predicted GPA		2.23	0.40	1.06	3.85	0.42
College GPA		2.19	0.83	0.10	4.00	
ACT Composite		19.3	4.29	10.0	35.0	
Regular Print	1730					
Predicted GPA		2.25	0.40	1.06	3.85	0.43
College GPA		2.20	0.82	0.10	4.00	
ACT Composite		19.7	4.29	10.0	35.0	
Cassette Sets	938					
Predicted GPA		2.13	0.36	1.19	3.43	0.35
College GPA		2.09	0.81	0.10	4.00	
ACT Composite		18.3	3.86	11.0	32.0	

[a]Correlation between predicted and actual college GPAs.

TABLE 5

Prediction Error Summary Statistics by Test Package and Timing Within Diagnosis

Group	N	Mean	SE	Error Quantile Values					r[a]
				Min	Q_1	Q_2	Q_3	Max	
Total	2959	-0.04	0.75	-2.65	-0.50	0.02	0.49	2.59	-0.01
Attention Deficit									
Triple[b]-Regular Print	362	-0.10	0.78	-2.24	-0.58	-0.01	0.43	2.41	-0.01
Three Hours[c]-Cassette	111	-0.13	0.73	-1.72	-0.56	-0.15	0.32	1.79	0.06
Dyslexia									
Double-Triple[d]-Regular Print	249	-0.07	0.76	-2.65	-0.63	-0.06	0.50	1.91	-0.18
Three Hours[c]-Cassette	253	0.06	0.72	-1.61	-0.36	0.07	0.57	1.82	-0.08
Learning Disability									
Double-Triple[d]-Regular Print	744	-0.02	0.70	-2.02	-0.43	0.02	0.47	1.99	-0.06
Three Hours[c]-Cassette	464	-0.08	0.79	-2.05	-0.58	-0.07	0.44	2.59	-0.17

[a]Correlation between predicted GPAs and errors of prediction.
[b]Up to triple time per test.
[c]Up to three hours per test.
[d]Up to double time for English and mathematics tests, and triple time for reading and science reasoning test.

TABLE 6

Descriptive Statistics by Test Package and Timing Within Diagnosis

Diagnosis	N	Mean	SD	Min	Max	r[a]
Total	2959					
Predicted GPA		2.23	0.40	1.06	3.85	
College GPA		2.19	0.83	0.10	4.00	0.42
ACT Composite		19.3	4.29	10.0	35.0	
Attention Deficit						
Triple[b]-Regular Print	362					
Predicted GPA		2.29	0.40	1.34	3.48	
College GPA		2.20	0.87	0.20	4.00	0.45
ACT Composite		21.6	4.41	11.0	35.0	
Three Hours[c]-Cassette	111					
Predicted GPA		2.10	0.32	1.24	3.07	
College GPA		1.98	0.81	0.40	3.70	0.45
ACT Composite		19.9	3.01	13.0	29.0	
Dyslexia						
Double-Triple[d]-Regular Print	249					
Predicted GPA		2.21	0.40	1.06	3.45	
College GPA		2.14	0.80	0.10	4.00	0.33
ACT Composite		19.2	3.92	11.0	30.0	
Three Hours[c]-Cassette	253					
Predicted GPA		2.18	0.35	1.46	3.15	
College GPA		2.24	0.77	0.10	4.00	0.38
ACT Composite		18.4	3.80	12.0	32.0	

TABLE 6 (con't)

Descriptive Statistics by Test Package and Timing Within Diagnosis

Diagnosis	N	Mean	SD	Min	Max	r[a]
Learning Disability						
Double-Triple[d]-Regular Print	744					
Predicted GPA		2.21	0.35	1.16	3.31	0.41
College GPA		2.18	0.77	0.10	4.00	
ACT Composite		18.8	3.95	10.0	31.0	
Three Hour[c]-Cassette	464					
Predicted GPA		2.12	0.36	1.19	3.40	0.27
College GPA		2.04	0.81	0.20	4.00	
ACT Composite		17.9	3.87	11.0	31.0	

[a]Correlation between predicted and actual college GPAs.
[b]Up to triple time per test.
[c]Up to three hours per test.
[d]Up to double time for English and mathematics tests, and triple time for reading and science reasoning tests.

values of the prediction errors were essentially zero, with the exception of the attention deficit students who were administered the cassette version with the three hour time guideline per test. Overall, the interquartile distributions of prediction errors reported in Tables 1 and 5 are quite symmetric across the categories. Furthermore, the normal probability plots of the prediction errors confirmed that the errors were essentially normally distributed with slight departures from normality in the tails due to the ceiling and floor effects of the GPA scale.

Table 6 provides the descriptive statistics for test package by timing within diagnosis for the predicted and actual GPAs and the ACT Composite. The correlations of predicted with actual college GPAs is largest for the attention deficit group regardless of the combination of test package and extended time guideline (r=0.45). The correlation between predicted and actual college GPAs is lowest for students diagnosed as learning disabled who were administered the cassette tape under the three hour per test test timing guideline (r=0.27); whereas, the learning disabled students who were administered the regular print test with up to two hours to complete each of the English and mathematics tests and three hours to complete each of the reading and science reasoning tests had a correlation of r=0.41 between predicted and actual GPAs.

Summary

This study provides the most current information regarding the predictive validity of ACT's prediction model, incorporating course grades and ACT test scores, for predicting college GPAs of ACT-tested special-needs students. The sample of special-tested students used in this study were pooled across all postsecondary institutions participating in ACT's prediction research service over a three year period. The sample was small because special-tested students account for approximately two percent of the annual total tested student volume in any given year, and

because not all institutions participate in ACT's prediction research service. Likewise, of those postsecondary institutions that do participate, not all institutions send information on their special-needs students. The predicted GPAs used in this study were based on each institutions' unique prediction equation. The institutional prediction models were calculated on the total group of students submitted by an institution as opposed to pre-identified student subgroups.

Overall, the results reveal a negligible prediction bias, indicating special-needs tested students first year college GPAs are slightly over-predicted. The average error of prediction was negative for all but one of the conditions analysed -- students diagnosed as dyslexic who were administered the cassette version with up to three hours to complete each test had a mean prediction error of 0.06. Students diagnosed as attention deficit had the largest "relative" over-prediction bias as reported in Tables 1 and 5. However, the correlation between predicted GPAs and errors of prediction for this group was essentially zero, indicating that the errors of prediction did not vary with predicted GPAs in a systematic manner.

The average prediction error for students diagnosed as dyslexic (0.00) or learning disabled (-0.05) are negligible (refer to Table 1). However, although the correlation of predicted GPAs with errors of prediction for students diagnosed as dyslexic (r=-0.14) or learning disabled (r=-0.10) are small in magnitude, they are "relatively" high compared to the correlation for the attention deficit group (r=0.02). The information presented in Table 5 regarding the analysis of test package and extended time guideline within diagnosis sheds some light on these results. The correlation of errors of prediction and predicted GPAs for students with dyslexia, who took the ACT Assessment using the regular print package and extended time guideline, up to double time for each of the English and mathematics tests and up to triple for the reading and science

reasoning tests, was r=-0.18, as compared to a correlation of r=-0.08 for dyslexic students who took the cassette version with extended time guideline, up to three hours per test. Similarly the correlation between prediction errors and predicted GPAs for learning disabled students who took the cassette version with extended time guideline, up to triple time per test, was r=-0.17, as compared to a correlation of r=-0.06 for the learning disabled students who took the regular print version under extended time guideline, up to double-double/triple-triple time for the English, mathematics, reading and science reasoning tests respectively.

These results suggest an interaction of timing guideline and test package difference within diagnosis that needs further study. It should be noted that when special-needs students request special testing, they indicate their diagnosis and request the accomodation or test package they desire. Based upon this combination, ACT authorizes the appropriate extended time guideline for the test administration. The extended time guidelines that have been established by ACT are based on more than 90% of students with the same combination of test package and diagnosis finishing within that time guideline. These results could simply be idiosyncratic, related to a few extreme values in the tails of the GPA distribution that effect the overall results. Note that in Table 5 the dyslexic group with the relatively large negative correlation has the largest negative prediction error minimum value, while the learning disabled group with the relatively large negative correlation has the largest positive maximum error of prediction.

Studies of this nature need to be conducted periodically to increase the pool of special-needs tested student data. Some of the results reported in this study may be impacted by the limited number of cases available for analysis. In addition, it is recommended that the manner in which course/grade information is currently collected for regular-tested students be extended

to special-tested students; or, at the very least, collect information to determine whether the high school courses taken by special-needs students are special education classes which typically differ from regular high school courses in content and coverage. It would also be beneficial to determine what special accomodations are made for special-needs students in their college classes, if any, as well as the type of courses these students typically take compared to the regular college student population. Finally, the results reported in this study are limited to the particular groups investigated and cannot be extrapolated to other special-needs student groups.

References

ACT, Inc. (1995). *Prediction research summary tables: Normative data based on participants in the 1994-95 prediction research service.* Iowa City, IA: Author.

ACT, Inc. (1994). *Prediction research summary tables: Normative data based on participants in the 1993-94 prediction research service.* Iowa City, IA: Author.

ACT, Inc. (1993). *Prediction research summary tables: Normative data based on participants in the 1992-93 prediction research service.* Iowa City, IA: Author.

Laing, J., & Farmer, M. (1984). *Use of the ACT assessment by examinees with disabilities* (ACT Research Rep. No. 84). Iowa City, IA: ACT, Inc.

Maxey, E. J., & Levitz, R. S. (1980, April). *ACT services for the handicapped.* Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Association of Collegiate Registrars and Admissions Officers, New Orleans, La.

Appendix A

Tables Showing Predicted and Earned College GPAs for Specially-tested Examinees with Motor (Physical and Learning) and Visual Disabilities

TABLE A-1

Predicted and Earned College GPAs for Specially-tested Examinees With Motor Disabilities (in Percentages)

Range	Predicted GPA	Earned GPA
3.50-4.00	0	6.9
2.50-3.49	26.6	24.7
1.50-2.49	68.8	43.1
0.50-1.49	4.3	18.9
0.00-0.49	0	6.5
Mean	2.17	1.99
SD	.46	.93
Correlation	.39	
N	280	

Note. Pooled data for 1978-79, 1980-81, and 1981-82.

TABLE A-2

Predicted and Earned College GPAs for Specially-tested Examinees With Visual Disabilities (in Percentages)

Range	Predicted GPA	Earned GPA
3.50-4.00	2.4	10.5
2.50-3.49	48.4	46.3
1.50-2.49	45.9	33.7
0.50-1.49	3.6	11.0
0.00-0.49	0	4.7
Mean	2.44	2.35
SD	.50	.92
Correlation	.52	
N	172	

Note. Pooled data for 1978-79, 1980-81, and 1981-82.

Appendix B

Request Form For ACT Assessment Special Testing

1996–97 REQUEST FORM FOR ACT ASSESSMENT SPECIAL TESTING

(To Be Completed By Supervisor)

Please type or print clearly

INCOMPLETE AND/OR UNSIGNED FORMS WILL BE RETURNED, UNPROCESSED

A. STUDENT INFORMATION

Last Name | First Name | Middle Initial

House Number | Street | Apartment Number

City | State | ZIP Code

Social Security Number | Date of Birth

High School or College Currently Attending

Date of Previous ACT **Special** Testing

B. SUPERVISOR'S MAILING INFORMATION

Name

Your Title

Institution

Street Address and Post Office Box Number

City | State | ZIP Code

Country (if outside U.S.)

Area Code/Telephone Number (daytime) | Fax Number

C. PROPOSED DATE OF TESTING (September 1, 1996–June 30, 1997) _____

A minimum of 60 days must elapse between repeat testings for a student. Requests must be received at least four weeks before proposed test date (6 weeks for students outside the United States) to allow for reviewing of requests and shipping of materials. Requests postmarked after June 1, 1997 will be returned.

D. DIAGNOSIS/DISABILITY (Check all that apply.)

Learning Disability *(01)*

- ☐ (DA) Developmental Arithmetic Disorder
- ☐ (DY) Developmental Reading Disorder (Dyslexia)
- ☐ (DW) Developmental Writing Disorder
- ☐ (LD) Other Learning Disability (explain on side 2)

Psychological/Mental Disability *(03)*

- ☐ (AD) Attention Deficit Disorder
- ☐ (AX) Anxiety Disorder
- ☐ (PD) Other Psychological/Mental Disability (explain on side 2)

Physical/Sensory Disability *(02)*

- ☐ (DF) Hearing Impairment
- ☐ (PH) Motor Impairment
- ☐ (VI) Visual Impairment
- ☐ (TR) Tourettes Syndrome
- ☐ (EP) Epilepsy or Seizures

Other Disability *(07)*

- ☐ (HB) Confined to the home (explain on side 2)
- ☐ (OD) (explain on side 2)

E. TEST FORMAT REQUESTED (Must check one or request will be returned, unprocessed.)

- ☐ (01) Regular Type
- ☐ (02) Large Type
- ☐ (03) Braille (printed copy included)
- ☐ (04) Cassette with Regular Type
- ☐ (05) Cassette with Large Type
- ☐ (06) Cassette with Raised Line/Braille Tables and Illustrations
- ☐ (07) Reader's Script with Regular Type
- ☐ (08) Reader's Script with Large Type
- ☐ (09) Reader's Script with Raised Line/Braille Tables and Illustrations

F. EXTENDED TIME REQUESTED ☐ Yes ☐ No

G. OTHER ACCOMMODATIONS REQUESTED *(Explain)* _____

Note: The authorized timing code and approval/denial of test formats will appear under the student's name on the Test Materials Distribution List.

THIS FORM MAY BE DUPLICATED AS NEEDED.

(Completion of Side 2 required for all requests.)