Purpose:
The LRS is not a test per se, but rather is structured as a rating-based counseling- and decision-making tool (based on review of literature of a multitude of factors associated with retention) to assist school personnel in making grade retention decisions.

Provides:
A Total Score obtained and is comprised of 19 separate “factors” or “categories:” Sex of Student, Student’s Age, Knowledge of English Language, Physical Size, Present Grade Placement, Previous Grade Retentions, Siblings, Parental School Participation, Experiential Background, Transiency, School Attendance, Estimate of Intelligence, History of Learning Disabilities, Present Level of Academic Achievement, Student’s Attitude About Possible Retention, Motivation to Complete School Tasks, Immature Behavior, Emotional Problems, and History of Delinquency.

Standardization Issues:
No standardization.

Reliability and Validity Issues:
No reliability evidence, and validity-evidence based on review of around 200 cited studies on the topic of grade retention.

Additional Points:
The scale is intended to provide guidance and a vehicle for discussion to school teams and should never be used as the sole criterion in retention decisions.

While the scale provides a format for teams to weigh “pros-and-cons” of retention along a good number of considerational-dimensions, it doesn’t alone provide sufficient in-depth information into “etiology” (i.e., the “cause” for school failure). Teams will need to more specifically isolate the cause(s) for school failure and address the overriding questions of, “will retention provide the ‘missing element(s)’ that are presumably at the root of the child’s school failure?” and “What will be ‘different’ for the student with another year in the same grade?”
• A criticism of the scale was that it somewhat implies or “assumes” that there will be a retention and then proceeds to determine whether there is sufficient evidence to “reject” the presupposed assumption.

• The rating-format and resulting “classifications” give the impression that the scale has actual psychometric support. The considerable research citations in the manual certainly support the constructs themselves (content validity) as points for consideration, but there is no supporting, “formal” (statistical) evidence presented related to other forms of validity, reliability, actual scale-value derivations, descriptors or “levels” for each factor, or interpretive guidelines.

• Early studies by Sandoval (1980, 1982) and Vasa, Wendel, & Steckelberg (1984)—all published in Psychology in the Schools from the period, suggested the scale as not reliable and lacking in concurrent and predictive validity.