TEST SCORE Descriptions TEXT A sample of how test score descriptions can be conveyed in reports.

TEST SCORE Descriptions Computer Template A Template for displaying test scores

DAS Report A sample report that includes the Differential Ability Scales (DAS), the Test of Memory and Learning (TOMAL), and several other evaluation tools

Inconsistent Report An actual report with what we considered to be fairly significant discrepancies, inaccuracies, and poor judgment.

Inconsistent Report (Response) The response sent to the evaluator of the report linked above.

PSYCHO-BABBLE? A letter sent to a school to provide information about a particular student. Unfortunately the writer did not get the point across clearly.

The most unbelievable report ever seen. Please, if you have a real report that equals this one, please send it to us. dumont@fdu.edu

An Excellent Example of a Comprehensive Report Because of its size, it may take a few seconds to load. be patient, it is worth it.
Below is a few examples of the way in which test scores can be described. John Willis has kindly supplied a complete downloadable copy of these test descriptions. Scroll to the bottom of the page to download a copy.

This file must be viewed in Microsoft Word™ Page Layout View. That's why they call it "view."

Please feel free to adapt and alter these forms in any way you wish. If I am using stanines in the report, I use the first statistics explanation, delete the second, and keep the "Scores Not Used" explanation at the end. If I am not using stanines, I delete the first statistics explanation, keep the second, and delete the "Scores Not Used" because they were used. There are several additional statistics explanations at the end.

Obviously, I never would use all the tests listed! It is just easier to delete than to paste.

Everything here is, except where noted, my own, twisted opinion, which may well be wrong. Neither inclusion nor omission of any test should be taken as an endorsement or lack thereof. I do use other tests, not listed here, and some tests are included only because I have been forced to use them by a legal agreement regarding re-evaluation.

SCORES USED WITH NAMEXX’S TESTS

[These are not Namexx’s own scores, just the scoring systems for the tests.]

When a new test is developed, it is normed on a sample of hundreds or thousands of people. The sample should be like that for a good opinion poll: female and male, urban and rural, different parts of the country, different income levels, etc. The scores from that norming sample are used as a yardstick for measuring the performance of people who then take the test. This human yardstick allows for the difficulty levels of different tests. The student is being compared to other students on both difficult and easy tasks. You can see from the illustration below that there are more scores in the middle than at the very high and low ends.

Many different scoring systems are used, just as you can measure the same distance as 1 yard, 3 feet, 36 inches, 91.4 centimeters, 0.91 meter, or 1/1760 mile.

PERCENTILE RANKS (PR) simply state the percent of persons in the norming sample who scored the same as or lower than the student. A percentile rank of 63 would be high average – as high as or higher than 63% and lower than the other 37% of the norming sample. It would be in Stanine 6. The middle half of scores falls between percentile ranks of 25 and 75.
Wechsler STANDARD SCORES have an average (mean) of 100 and a standard deviation of 15. A standard score of 105 would also be at the 63rd percentile rank. Similarly, it would be in Stanine 6. The middle half of these standard scores falls between 90 and 110.

Wechsler SCALED SCORES have an average (mean) of 10 and a standard deviation of 3. A scaled score of 11 would also be at the 63rd percentile rank and in Stanine 6. The middle half of these standard scores falls between 8 and 12.

T-SCORES have an average (mean) of 50 and a standard deviation of 10. A T-score of 53 would be at the 62nd percentile rank, Stanine 6. The middle half of T-scores falls between approximately 43 and 57.

STANINES (standard nines) are a nine-point scoring system. Stanines 4, 5, and 6 are approximately the middle half of scores, or average range. Stanines 1, 2, and 3 are approximately the lowest one fourth. Stanines 7, 8, and 9 are approximately the highest one fourth. Throughout this report, for all of the tests, I am using the stanine labels shown below (Very Low, Low, Below Average, Low Average, Average, High Average, Above Average, High, and Very High), even if the particular test may have a different labeling system in its manual.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Stanine</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Very</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Below</td>
<td>1 - 4</td>
<td>4 - 11</td>
<td>11 - 23</td>
<td>23 - 40</td>
<td>40 - 60</td>
<td>60 - 77</td>
<td>77 - 89</td>
<td>89 - 96</td>
<td>96 - 99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentile</td>
<td>- 73</td>
<td>74 - 81</td>
<td>82 - 88</td>
<td>89 - 96</td>
<td>97 - 103</td>
<td>104 - 111</td>
<td>112 - 118</td>
<td>119 - 126</td>
<td>127 - 130</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Standard Score</td>
<td>1 - 4</td>
<td>5 6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>11 12</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scaled Score</td>
<td>1 - 4</td>
<td>5 6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>11 12</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>14 15</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

SCORING SYSTEMS USED WITH THE TESTS IN THIS REPORT

[These are not the student’s own scores, just the scoring systems for the tests.]
When a new test is developed, it is *normed* on a *sample* of hundreds or thousands of people. The sample should be like that for a good opinion poll: female and male, urban and rural, different parts of the country, different income levels, etc. The scores from that norming sample are used as a yardstick for measuring the performance of people who then take the test. This human yardstick allows for the difficulty levels of different tests. The student is being compared to other students on both difficult and easy tasks. You can see from the illustration below that there are more scores in the middle than at the very high and low ends.

Many different scoring systems are used, just as you can measure the same distance as 1 yard, 3 feet, 36 inches, 91.4 centimeters, 0.91 meter, or 1/1760 mile.

**PERCENTILE RANKS (PR)** simply state the percent of persons in the norming sample who scored the same as or lower than the student. A percentile rank of 50 would be Average – as high as or higher than 50% and lower than the other 50% of the norming sample. The middle half of scores falls between percentile ranks of 25 and 75.

Wechsler **STANDARD SCORES** have an average (mean) of 100 and a *standard deviation* of 15. A standard score of 100 would also be at the 50th percentile rank. The middle half of these standard scores falls between 90 and 110.

Wechsler **SCALEDS SCORES** have an average (mean) of 10 and a *standard deviation* of 3. A scaled score of 10 would also be at the 50th percentile rank. The middle half of these standard scores falls between 8 and 12.

**T-SCORES** have an average (mean) of 50 and a *standard deviation* of 10. A T-score of 50 would be at the 50th percentile rank. The middle half of T-scores falls between approximately 43 and 57.

**STANINES** (standard nines) are a nine-point scoring system. Stanines 4, 5, and 6 are approximately the middle half of scores, or average range. Stanines 1, 2, and 3 are approximately the lowest one fourth. Stanines 7, 8, and 9 are approximately the highest one fourth.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Classification</th>
<th>Very Low</th>
<th>Low</th>
<th>Below Average</th>
<th>Average</th>
<th>Above Average</th>
<th>High</th>
<th>Very High</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Low</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Differences among Namexx's Wechsler Intelligence Scale Total and Factor Scores**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Performance (nonverbal)</th>
<th>Perceptual Organization Factor</th>
<th>Working Memory Factor</th>
<th>Processing Speed Factor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Verbal Total</strong></td>
<td>vqx – pqx = p</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>f</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Verbal Comprehension Factor</strong></td>
<td>vcx – pox = p</td>
<td></td>
<td>vcx – wmx = p</td>
<td>vcx – psx = p</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>f</td>
<td></td>
<td>f</td>
<td>f</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Perceptual Organization Factor</strong></td>
<td>pox – wmx = p</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>f</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Working Memory Factor</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>wmx – psx = p</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>f</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes:

$p$ is the probability of a difference that large or larger occurring by chance when there is no real difference between the abilities measured by the two scores. A probability of less than 15 in 100 ($p < .15$) means that such a large difference is unlikely to occur by chance alone, although it may not be uncommon. A probability of more than 15 in 100 is large enough that the difference might have occurred by chance.
$f$ is the frequency of differences that large or larger among the students in the test's norming sample. A frequency of more than 25% ($f > 25\%$) is extremely common. A frequency of less than 25% ($f < 25\%$) is moderately unusual, but not really uncommon. A frequency of less than 10% ($f < 10\%$) is unusual and noteworthy.

These data are taken from one or more of these sources:


To [download template press here.](#)

Please [send me an email](mailto:) if you download the template. I will be happy to answer any questions you may have. Please do not distribute the template to anyone else.

*Content on these pages is copyrighted by Dumont/Willis © (2001) unless otherwise noted.*
The sheets in this Template are meant to be used as an aid to test score descriptions.

The conversion of Scaled Scores and Standard Scores to Percentiles Ranks, Stanines, and Classifications is based on a normalized curve and may not match exactly the specific test.

Users need only enter the tests obtained score and the template will calculate all other results.

Each sheet contains one test. Users enter data into cells color coded yellow: Using the TAB key will move you from cell to cell.

Each page is formatted for printing

The Template is protected to prevent users from inadvertently over-writing cells that contain formulae.

The Template is provided free by Ron Dumont and John Willis. We assume no responsibility for how the template is utilized. As with all test materials and test results, users must apply moral, ethic, and legal guidelines regarding test interpretation.

An example from the DAS sheet is presented below.
### DAS Scores in Percentile Rank and Stanines for Age

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Zachary</th>
<th>Verbal Subtests</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Test Score</td>
<td>Percentile Rank</td>
<td>Stanine</td>
<td>Classification</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>68</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>Average</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Verbal Comp.</strong></td>
<td><strong>55</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Naming Vocab.</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Below average</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nonverbal Subtests</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Picture Simul.</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Below average</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Copying</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Average</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Pattern Constr.</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Below average</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Early Number Concepts</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diagnostic Subtests</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Recall of Digits</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Recall of Objects-Immed.</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>Below average</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Recall of Objects-Delayed</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>Average</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Matching Letter Like Forms</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>Average</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Rec. of Pictures</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>Average</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Scores</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Verbal Score</strong></td>
<td>87</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>Below average</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Nonverbal Score</strong></td>
<td>84</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>Below average</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>General Conceptual Ability Score</strong></td>
<td>82</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>Below average</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

To [download template press here](http://alpha.fdu.edu/psychology/test_score_descriptions_computer.htm).

Please [send me an email](mailto:your_email_address) if you download the template. I will be happy to answer any questions you may have. Please do not distribute the template to anyone else.

Content on these pages is copyrighted by Dumont/Willis © (2001) unless otherwise noted.
Sample Test Report

Name: Peter Dumont  DOB: 05/03/79

School: Memorial School  DOE: 11/93

Grade: 8th  Age: 14-6

Reason for referral:

Peter was referred for testing as part of a special educational reevaluation. Peter had been tested a number of times in the past by various examiners. He is presently identified as being educationally handicapped due to a learning disability.

Mr. Dumont requested that the school consider adding to Peter's current educational identification, the following special education labels: Seriously Emotionally Disturbed (SED), Other Health Impaired due to an Attention Deficit Hyperactive Disorder (ADHD), and Learning Disability due to "dyslexia."

This particular portion of the evaluation was done in an attempt to make differential diagnosis of the disorders raised by Mr. Dumont's letter. A meeting was held prior to testing during which each assessment tool was discussed and explained to Mr. and Mrs. Dumont.

Test behaviors:

Peter came willingly from his classroom to the three testing sessions. Each session varied in length from 45 minutes to 1 hour and 15 minutes. He was administered various tasks of attention and vigilance in one setting, the Test of Memory and Learning (TOMAL) over two sessions, and the Differential Ability Scales in one session. The TOMAL was the only test broken by session. This test has a number of core subtests and delayed recall subtests as well as tests called Supplementary. During one session, Peter was administered the 4 core subtests, followed by their delayed recall. During the second session he was administered the remaining subtests. This examiner had spoken with the test author (Cecil Reynolds, personal communication, 11/93) about the feasibility of such an administration and was told that this approach was "highly acceptable."

Peter typically came to the sessions appearing annoyed at having been called out of his class. Once in the testing room though, he became talkative and willing to try the tests. It was often necessary for the examiner to begin each session with some rapport building conversation.
This is very typical of children of Peter’s age and should not be viewed as affecting the results. He appeared comfortable during the evaluation, showing no signs of apprehension about the testing or his own performance on the tests with the exception of some comments made about his own ability on the memory tasks. He displayed adequate perseverance on all tasks, even those he found most difficult. He was friendly and cooperative throughout the session, talking openly about himself and school and making jokes about himself.

Some of Peter's behaviors during the session were annoying but it was felt that most were done without any real malicious purpose. For example, during the first session, Peter was administered the Trails A & B tasks which resemble a dot to dot task. Peter was to draw a line from one circle to another following a set rule. After completing this, he was administered subtests of the TOMAL. One showed him a card with black dots placed on a page. He was to watch the examiner point to specific dots and then remember the sequence and location of the dots. Peter took his pencil and drew lines connecting the dots. This was inappropriate but Peter did not seem to realize that he had done it until it was pointed out to him.

**Test results**

**Intellectual assessment:**

Peter has been assessed a number of times in the past. In 1984, using the McCarthy scale, he was found to have a General Cognitive score of 54. On three successive administrations of the WISC-R (1986, 1987, and 1989) he obtained respective Full Scale Scores of 70, 92, and 87. On a WISC-III short form in 1992 he obtained a score of 84. The Differential Ability Scales (DAS) was used for this evaluation. This tool was chosen for a number of reasons. Besides its excellent technical characteristics, the DAS is made up of three clusters measuring diverse abilities. These clusters, although similar to the WISC scores of Verbal and Performance, also allow for the examination of Nonverbal reasoning skills. Each cluster is examined to assess how Peter is able to demonstrate his intellectual ability.

**Differential Ability Scales (DAS) Cluster Scores:**

(Each has a mean of 100 and a standard deviation of 15)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scale</th>
<th>Score</th>
<th>Range</th>
<th>Classification</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Verbal</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>(74-94)</td>
<td>Low/Average</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nonverbal Reasoning</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>(58-77)</td>
<td>Very Low/Low</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spatial</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>(82-99)</td>
<td>Below Average/Average</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General Conceptual Ability</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>(70-83)</td>
<td>Low/Below Average</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

On this particular administration of the DAS, Peter obtained a Verbal cluster score in the range of 74 to 94, a Nonverbal Reasoning score in
the range of 58 to 77, and a Spatial cluster score in the 82 to 99 range, which resulted in an obtained General Conceptual Ability score (GCA) of 76. Scoring better than approximately 5% of the children his own age, Peter's true ability is most likely (95% chance) in the range of 70 to 83. Using the DAS classification system, this would identify Peter's present level of cognitive ability as being in the Very Low to Below average range. The scores that he obtained on this administration of the DAS are very consistent with the scores he obtained on the earlier administration of the WISC-R and the WISC-III Short form. Because the DAS assesses ability across many different domains or clusters, each must be compared to the overall score to determine if they better describe individual skills than does the overall GCA. On this administration of the DAS a significant difference was found between the Nonverbal Reasoning Cluster, and the Spatial cluster score when they are compared to the GCA. This suggests that Peter is able to demonstrate his intelligence differently, depending upon the demands of the task presented. Peter was able to demonstrate his abilities best through complex visual spatial processing rather than when asked to demonstrate ability through acquired verbal concepts and knowledge or nonverbal inductive reasoning. The differences between the global scores on the DAS are found to occur in between 10 and 25% of the population. They are not, in and of themselves, indicative of pathology or disability, but may help to understand how Peter processes and learns information. Because of the significant differences between Peter's ability, the overall GCA is considered an inaccurate representation of Peter's ability. Although when compared to others his own age, the GCA is an accurate measure, within Peter there are such differences in ability that the focus of attention should be on the individual cluster scores. They probably best describe how Peter functions, and they help to determine the current strengths and weaknesses that Peter displays.

Cluster analysis

Subtests by cluster

(subtests have a mean of 50 and a standard deviation of 10)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Verbal</th>
<th>Nonverbal Reasoning</th>
<th>Spatial</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Word Definitions</td>
<td>Matrices</td>
<td>Recall of Designs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>37</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Similarities</td>
<td>Seq.&amp;Quant. Reas.</td>
<td>Pattern Construction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>43</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recall of Digits</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recall of Objects</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Diagnostic Subtests: (not used in the computation of the ability score):

Recall of Digits
Recall of Objects

Most of Peter's subtest scores grouped about his own mean with a few exceptions. There was a statistical strength on the Recall of Designs subtest while weaknesses on the Matrices and the Recall of Digits subtests.

The Verbal cluster is made up of the Word Definitions and Similarities subtests. Peter was found to be functioning in the Low to Average range on the cluster. There was no significant difference between Peter's scores on this cluster. The cluster itself is a measure of complex,
verbal mental processing which includes acquired concepts, verbal knowledge, and reasoning. Peter's expressive language skills appeared to be evenly developed in that he was able to utilize his verbal skills to describe word meanings in long descriptive sentences as well as to correctly assign 3 different words into one meaningful classification or category using typically a single word.

The Nonverbal Reasoning cluster is made up of the Matrices and Sequential & Quantitative Reasoning subtests. The cluster is a measure of nonverbal, inductive reasoning requiring complex mental processing. It required Peter to identify elements in a stimuli, to form and test hypotheses about relationships and to apply the relationship to new material. Here Peter was found to be functioning in the Very low to low range. Peter demonstrated a significant difference between the two subtests. He had most difficulty on the abstract problems of the Matrices subtest. The use of multiple choice answers on the Matrices subtest did not appear to be very helpful for Peter. He seemed not to grasp the patterns required of the problem because of the very abstract nature of the visual patterns. He did do slightly better on the Sequential and Quantitative Reasoning subtest. Here he was able to recognize patterns that involved simple number concepts. In fact, the errors that he made were logical. Although he understood the math process (for example: add, subtract, multiply), his errors were in computation. On a problem in which the correct answer is obtained by subtracting a certain number, Peter was able to discover the number difference, but when he gave his answer, he added the number instead of subtracting it.

Peter did best on the Spatial cluster. This cluster is made up of Recall of Designs and Pattern Construction scores. This cluster is a measure of complex visual spatial processing. It requires the ability to perceive and to remember spatial relationships. The first subtest is a paper and pencil task that involves a short term memory component while the second has no memory aspect but involved timed performance. For Peter, the scores showed no significant difference, but overall, his Recall of Designs score was his best. On these simple designs, Peter aided himself in his recall by trying to name each item. This form of verbal compensation, helped him to remember the designs. On other tests administered to him, he used this form of compensation to help himself.

Peter was also administered two diagnostic subtests to assess his memory for both meaningful and non meaningful stimuli. On the Recall of Digits subtest he was read a series of increasingly longer non related numbers and asked to repeat them back to the examiner. Read at a rate of 2 per second so that he could not compensate by repeating the numbers to himself, he was able to remember easily a string of up to 4 numbers but became inconsistent on any longer string. He was able to correctly remember only 1 out of 5 number string for items involving 5 numbers. He either simply forgot (could not encode) the numbers, or when he did remember them, they were out of sequence. For example, 23746 became 23764. On the meaningful, visual memory task of Recall of Objects, he was shown a page with 20 objects and asked to remember all that he could. Given 3 trials, he was able to correctly recall 27 items (8, 10, 9 items on each trial) and after a 15 minute delay was able to recall 6 items. His scores on these subtest suggested that his memory skills are aided when a visual component is added, and, like most, his memory skills are best when the information to remember has some meaning or is placed in some meaningful concept. The lower Recall of Digits also may suggest some difficulty with the sequential nature of the task. Having to remember something, but also to keep the items in the proper sequence was more difficult for Peter.

Memory

To assess Peter's memory, the Test of Memory and Learning (TOMAL) was chosen. This tool assesses a number of memory domains and allows for quantitative as well as qualitative analysis. Both immediate and delayed memory is measured.

Test of Memory and Learning (TOMAL)
On the TOMAL, Peter obtained a Composite Memory Index (CMI) of 79, which, when placed at 95% confidence, has a range of 74 to 84. This would identify Peter's overall memory skills as being in the Deficient to Below Average range. This description of Peter's abilities should be viewed with caution, since the individual memory scales of the TOMAL showed diverse abilities. The TOMAL measures memory not only globally, but in two more distinct realms, Verbal and Nonverbal memory. For Peter, the Verbal memory index (VMI) was significantly below that of his Nonverbal memory index (NMI). His VMI was found to be in the Very Deficient to Deficient range while his NMI was in the Below Average to Average range. Although many people show differences in their particular memory abilities, the size of the difference shown by Peter (30 points) is considered abnormal since it is expected in only about 4% of the population. Rather than focus on the global score (CMI), analysis of memory should focus on the diversity of Peter's ability.

Overall, Peter had average ability on all those memory tasks that presented material, both meaningful and abstract, with a visual format. On some of the nonmeaningful stimuli, Peter introduced meaning by verbally naming the abstract design. On those tasks that involved memory for things presented orally without some visual cueing, Peter did much worse. Only one verbal subtest, Word Selective Reminding, was in the average range. Within the Verbal Memory grouping, this subtest was a strength for Peter. He was read a list of words and asked to repeat the list to the examiner. He could repeat them in any order that he wanted, and at the end of his repeating he was told each item he had missed. He used his memory to categorize the items into certain groups and to repeat them back within the group. He remembered things as groups of fruits, groups of table items, and groups of animals. Peter was aware of his method, noting to the examiner "I'm doing them in categories." In contrast to his skill on this task, he was also shown pictures of 15 items and asked to remember them. After each trial, he was shown the pictures again, but each trial presents them in a different order. He is not reminded of errors. He had trouble with this task since each time he was presented with the pictures they had changed in the order he remembered them.

Peter's Delayed recall index (DRI) was also within the average range but also offers some clues to how Peter encodes and remembers. This index is made up of 4 subtests that are repeated after a 30 minute delay. When administered a second time they are not retaught, Peter is asked to simply recall all that he could remember. Two of the subtests, Memory for Stories Delayed and Facial Recognition Delayed were below average while the other two, Word and Visual Selective Reminding Delayed were average or above. He appeared to have stored into retrievable memory much more data on those two subtests that had repeated trials. This repetition of stimuli aided in both the storage and later retrieval of that material. On a subtest (Memory for Stories) in which he is read a short story and asked to repeat back all that he could remember, Peter showed the ability to recall only small bits of the verbal information and most importantly, when he tried to recall the material, he did so in a very random and haphazard manner. Although aspects of the story were encoded, his retrieval of the information was badly mis-sequenced.

Overall, in terms of memory storage and retrieval, this and other tests, suggests that Peter has difficulty with storing information that is purely verbal in its presentation and which requires him to retain large amounts of data in a sequential way. Under these circumstances, he retains information in bits and pieces and for those portions that he has remembered, he is only able to recall correctly smaller parts of the data. In contrast, Peter remembers (encodes) best when information is logically sequenced; when it is visual presented either alone or in concert with oral presentation; when the remembering task involves repetition as opposed to a "one shot" presentation; and when the information to remember is meaningful or has been placed into some meaningful context. These memory skills are fairly common to most. The difference for Peter is that while others may also be able to remember data that is unstructured, has little meaning, and is presented through many different channels, Peter can not do so on a level commensurate with his other skills. Retrieval of information may also appear difficult for Peter, but this too was enhanced by aids, both visual and verbal. Having "learned" a number of items by having them repeated to him over a number of trials, when he was asked to remember them after a delay, his recall was enhanced by presenting him with both verbal and visual
cues. Although at first he could not remember certain items, prompted with the first sound of a missing item ("br" for bread) he was able to recall the items. Similarly, when shown pictures of 3 items, one of which he had not remembered freely, the addition of the visual cueing resulted in his remembering every item. Retrieval was also best when the demand for sequence was not added. Asked to recall items in any order he wished, he performed in the average range. Asked to recall items in the same sequence in which they were presented, he performed well below average.

Attention and vigilance:

To aid in the assessment of attention and vigilance, a number of laboratory measures was used. Trails A & B, the Stroop Color Word Task, and the Mesulam Continuous Performance task were used. These were chosen because of the way they assessed the various skills. Teachers were also asked to complete the Conners rating scale.

Trails A: This task, with the teaching sample shown below, asked Peter to draw a line from one circle to another by connecting the circles depending on the number in each one. He was able to quickly, easily, and correctly trace the path from 1 to 15.

Trails B: This task is much like the first but forces Peter to alternate between the numbers and letters in each circle. Instead of simply tracing the path from 1 to 2 to 3, he much cognitively shift his attentions from 1 to A to 2 to B, etc..

Trails B: Peter had great difficulty making the cognitive shift and maintaining the correct sequence. He was able to complete all items but only after self correcting a number of mental lapses and taking a considerable amount of time. The difference between his success on the first part and his difficulty on the second part may imply some difficulty on sequential tasks that are multi-stepped and complex. He has difficulty making quick and accurate shifts in mental process.

Stroop Color/Word Task: This task asked Peter to do three things: First read a list on words (green, blue, red) as quickly and accurately as he could. Second, name a list of colored XXXX's as quickly and accurately as he could. Finally, shown a word (RED) printed in a different color (Green) he was to suppress the urge to read the word and to simply name the color of the word. From the scores on the first two trials, a prediction is made about how many 'color-words' he should name, and an 'interference' score is calculated. When his results are calculated using age corrected scores, there was no significant difference found between his scores. He obtained an interference score of 1 (mean 0, sd ±10). This suggests that Peter's ability to make a cognitive shift was heightened when he did not have some time imposition. Adding the pressure of time, as in the Trails task, may lead to some internal anxiety that adversely effects Peter's ability. Although his scores are nonsignificant, he did have difficulty maintaining proper sequence while "reading" on each trial. He would often jump ahead of himself when he made a mistake and need to return to the proper place in the list.

Mesulam Continuous Performance task: These tasks consists of two pages with the letters of the alphabet printed in uppercase. On one page (Ordered), the letters are placed in neat, orderly rows and columns, while on the second page (Random), the letters are placed in a haphazard fashion, with no order imposed. On both pages, 60 A's are placed among the other letters. Regardless of the page, the A's are in the same location, with approximately 15 in each of the 4 quadrants. Children are asked to simply scan the page and "find all the A's." This is an untimed task and Peter was asked to do it until he felt he had discovered all items. He was administered the ordered page first and the random second. Below is a sample from the ordered page. The circles are the A's that Peter circled, while the black marks are the A's Peter missed and were marked by the examiner for scoring.
His approach to this task was consistent, no matter what page. He scanned the page quickly, but without imposing any order to the search. He went from left to right, and top to bottom, but not in any real order. Consequently, when he said he was through, he had missed 6 A's on the ordered page and 3 on the random. Compared to 502 children similar his own age (11 to 15), the total number of errors (9) was significantly high (Total Error mean 1.5 sd 2.3). He performed like only about 4 percent of the standardizing population. This would imply some deficit in visual, sequential scanning and in proper organization of tasks.

Conners Teacher Rating Scales: This widely used rating scale provides measures for identifying a variety of behavioral problems in children. This particular version contains 6 factors: Hyperactivity, Conduct problems, Emotional overindulgence, Anxious/Passive, Asocial, and Daydreaming-attendance problem. Symptoms are rated on a 4 point scale (0-3) and raw scores are transformed into T scores (mean 50 sd 10). T scores 2 or more standard deviations above the mean may be considered problem areas.

Six teachers completed the scales. Of the six areas assessed, only 1, the Hyperactivity index, was rated as being elevated, and with only 2 raters approaching the 2 standard deviation score, while 3 found some elevation and 1 found none. The second highest rated areas for Peter, although not rated high enough to be considered a true problem area, was that of Asocial problems.

Visual Spatial task:

The Rey Osterrieth Complex Figure task was administered to Peter. Here he shown a picture of a fairly complex design and asked to copy it from the model. After he has completed his drawing, he again draws the figure, this time simply from memory. Scores are dependent on accurately and placement of the distinct portions of the design. Analysis of organization and approach to the task are noted.

Rey Osterrieth Complex Figure: Peter's approach to this tasks was similar in nature to his approach on the other tasks of visual scanning and planning. He drew the image by breaking it down into smaller component parts, but did non impose any successful organization to the design. His final result was a close reproduction of the original but one in which his lack of organization resulted in disjointed and misplaced lines. Peter was also asked to reproduce the complex design from memory. When he did, his recall showed many forgotten parts. It suggests that complex visual material does not become encoded well by Peter possibly because of a lack of self imposed organization.

Original Recall

Social Emotional issues:

Peter's father had raised the issue of whether Peter currently fits the educational handicapping category of Seriously Emotionally Disturbed (SED). Peter had first had that label applied to him in 1986, although at that time Mr. Dumont felt that it was an inappropriate label for Peter's difficulties. The school district in 1989, after a recommendation by this examiner, and with agreement from Mr. and Mrs. Dumont, removed the SED label because it was felt to be inappropriate for Peter at that time. In order for a child to be SED, a 'condition' of emotional disturbance must be present and that condition must meet at least one of 6 characteristics. Once those qualifying conditions are present, they must also meet the requirement of being "to a marked degree", "over a long period of time", and "adversely effect education." To assess the appropriateness of this label, Peter's teachers and parents were asked to fill out behavior checklists. A parent interview and home visit was done, and Peter was interviewed at school.
Behavioral assessment: As noted above, teachers had rated Peter using the Conners rating scale and found the area called Asocial to be slightly higher than others. Peter's teachers completed the Burks' Behavior rating scales. Here, 110 descriptions of behavior are rated on a scale of 1 to 5 for their presence and severity. The items are then grouped together into 19 areas of behavior and the results are compared to children his own age. When the teachers ratings were compared for agreement, 11 were rated as Nonsignificant, while 7 were Significant and 1 Very Significant. The areas most typically rated as being Significant to Very significant were: Poor ego strength, Poor intellectuality, Poor academics, Poor attention, Excessive aggressiveness and Excessive resistance. There was little variation in how the individual teachers saw Peter, with most rating the same areas as places of concern. These results seem to be consistent with those found on the Conners scale. These results are also fairly consistent with the levels of concerned rated by teachers using this same scale in 1989. They suggest some concerns with Peter's behavior, but not to a level that this examiner would consider pathological or necessarily indicative of an emotional disturbance.

Among the descriptors that Peter's teachers rated as highest were:

- Satisfied with inferior job
- Little self confidence
- Depreciates and distrusts
- Trouble remembering
- Is sarcastic
- Does things his own way

Peter's parents were also asked to complete the Achenbach's Child Behavior Checklist. Here, 113 behavioral descriptions are ranked and placed into 1 of 9 behavioral domains. These are then compared to normative data. Peter's parents rated Peter's behavior to be significantly elevated in the 6 of the 9 areas: Withdrawn; Anxious/Depressed; Social Problems; Thought Problems; Attention Problems; and Aggressive Behaviors. Of the 113 descriptions, Mr. and Mrs. Dumont rated 35% as being Very True to Often true, the highest rating. This is a very high level of response for these descriptions and suggests some overriding concerns of the parents about Peter's behaviors.

Formulation

Learning disability: Peter has been identified as a learning disabled child by his school for some time. Given the difficulties he displayed on this evaluation in the areas of Nonverbal Reasoning (DAS), visual perceptual organization (Rey Osterrieth), and memory, in particular memory unaided by repetition, and memory that requires sequential responses (TOMAL Verbal memory), it is felt that, coupled with the low achievement in at least one area (Mathematics), Peter continues to manifest the symptoms of a learning disabled child.

Speech and Language Disorder (Auditory perception): There was nothing on this evaluation to suggest any difficulties in the areas of auditory perception. While some subtle issues were highlighted in the behavioral observations of past evaluations, there was never any "recurrent theme." On the present evaluation, Peter showed no errors in his ability to adequately perceive any oral stimuli. When errors were made in oral presentation it appeared to be the result of inattention as opposed to language processing.

Attention Deficit Hyperactive Disorder (ADHD): Peter has had a history of being identified as Attention Deficit with Hyperactivity Disorder (ADHD). Although the definition and understanding of this disorder has changed over the years, Peter still continues to have a
number of symptoms of the disorder, although the classic signs of hyperactivity have decreased. He often fails to give close attention to
details and makes careless mistakes; he has difficulty sustaining attention in tasks; he has difficulty organizing tasks; and he avoids tasks that
require sustained mental effort. It is extremely difficult to determine where one's frustration caused by a learning disability leads to inattention
and activity. For Peter, the two disorders seem inextricably entwined. Given that he was diagnosed previously, that symptoms are reported as
being present both in school and at home, and that the disorder causes significant distress in social and academic functioning, it is this
examiner's opinion that the diagnosis of Attention Deficit/Hyperactivity Disorder, Predominately Inattentive Type (DSM-IV 314.00) is an
appropriate classification.

**Serious Emotional Disturbance (SED):** Although Peter may present with many symptoms of a behavior disorder, the etiology of his
symptoms seem based most appropriately in the learning, memory, and attentional disturbances that Peter has. His father mentioned, during
the home visit and interview, that Peter was a very disturbing child. This examiner agrees, but makes a distinction between a disturbing and a
disturbed child. Peter's behaviors, feelings about himself and others, and his ability to cope with his settings, are very closely tied to his other
difficulties. The Diagnostic and Statistical Manual (DSM) makes a point to psychologists to differentiate between disorders so that a clear
case can be made for each. Under each definition of disorder (ADHD, Mood, Anxiety, and Personality Disorders), the psychologist is
cautioned to make a distinction about what does and does not account for each disturbance. If Peter was found to be emotionally disturbed,
that may account for his attentional issues. If he is found to have an Attention deficit, that might account for his 'emotional' disturbance. This
examiner believes that only a very weak case can be made for a true mental disturbance. No evidence of any thought or mood disorders was
noted during the evaluations. None of Peter's behaviors were considered bizarre or unprovoked. Although there is no doubt that Peter has
behavioral difficulties, these have typically been dealt with differently than those created by an emotional disturbance. The laws and
definitions created by the federal government asks schools to make a clear distinction between an emotional and a behavioral disorder. In
Peter's case, most of his behavioral/social problems are better accounted for by his history of learning and attentional difficulties. This
examiner suggests that the code of SED is still an inappropriate label for Peter.

____________________

L P Farr Ed.D.; NCSP

Director of Psychological Services

*Content on these pages is copyrighted by Dumont/Willis © (2001) unless otherwise noted.*
Below is an actual test report sent to a public school by an independent evaluator. Names are changed to protect the innocent. Nothing else has been changed (any errors or inconsistencies are left in the report).

**PSYCHOLOGICAL EVALUATION**

**PRELIMINARY DATA**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>School</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Kate Dumont</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Address: Any Town USA</td>
<td>DOE: Oct./Nov./Dec.1992</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CA: 9-10</td>
<td>DOB: 12/22/82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Examiner: Dr. Weksler Certified Psychologist</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**REASON FOR REFERRAL**

Kate was referred for psychological evaluation by Dr. Strauss for differential diagnosis of ADD and to better understand why Kate is not doing well in school.

**BACKGROUND INFORMATION**

Background information was obtained through interviews with mother. Current family constellation include Mr. and Mrs. Dumont. They have three children, Biff (9); Buffy (8); and Blake (4). Father works as a pharmacist. Mother is a homemaker. Family history is positive for allergies and attentional problems.
Mrs. Dumont remembers Kate's development as being normal. Health and development histories were unremarkable with the exception of ear infections through first grade.

Psycho-educational evaluation was conducted by Joe Moe, MA, School Psychologist in December 1990 at the parents' request. The following scores were obtained on the Wechsler Scales (WISC-R) Verbal IQ 106, Performance IQ 112, and Full Scale IQ 109. This would place her global level of intelligence within the average range.

Educational evaluation disclosed scores ranging from Kindergarten to the fifth grade level. Memory for names was a particular weakness. Report cards from school disclose attentional difficulties even in the first grade. Kate is currently in Chapter I reading and math programs, which is a federal program for underprivileged children working below grade level. Kate has visual tracking concerns and was prescribed eye tracking exercises by Dr. D. However, Dr. D believed her problem with reading was due to a learning disability more than strictly an oculomotor problem and referred the parent for further evaluation of an undifferentiated attentional deficit and learning disability. Recent Occupational Therapy evaluation (11/92) indicated that Kate requires repetition of instructions and that Kate completes assignments without fully understanding the expectations. Further Speech/language evaluation was recommended. Kate has a lisp.

**TESTS ADMINISTERED**

- Wechsler Intelligence Scale for Children III
- Emotional and Behavior Problem Scale
- Conner's Teachers Rating Scale
- Juvenile Sentence Completion
- Diagnostic Interview
- California Test of Personality
- Personality Inventory for Children
- Wechsler Individual Achievement Test

**TEST BEHAVIOR AND OBSERVATIONS**

Kate was accompanied to this evaluation center by her mother. Kate separated readily and was generally cooperative and friendly. As the session progressed, Kate became aloof and easily distracted. This behavior was most prevalent during the administration of the academically related material. Attention span was short and concentration was limited. She was easily distracted.

**TEST SCORES AND CLINICAL INTERPRETATIONS**

The following scores were obtained on the Wechsler Intelligence Scale for Children III. Scaled scores of 9-11 would be considered average.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Test</th>
<th>Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Information</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Picture Completion</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Verbal Comprehension 117 (87%) High Average

Perceptual Organization 93 (32%) Average

Freedom From Distractibility 90 (25%) Average

Processing Speed 93 (32%) Average

The Wechsler Intelligence Scale for Children III was administered to assess Kate's cognitive skills and how she processes information. Her Verbal IQ was 111 (High Average), Performance IQ was 93 (Average), and Full Scale IQ of 102 (Average). These scores would place her average range. Significant strengths were noted in Verbal comprehension, crystallized intelligence, and extent of outside reading. Kate's verbal concept formation, verbal conceptualization, and reasoning skills are in the superior range.

Significant weaknesses were noted in short-term auditory memory, attention, and concentration. Additional weaknesses were noted in sequential learning, memory, convergent production, auditory memory, simultaneous processing, nonverbal reasoning, visual motor coordination, trial and error learning, and working under time pressure. Factor analysis suggests weaknesses in Freedom from Distractibility, perceptual organization, and processing speed. The WISC-II ACIDS Profile indicate index scores of 90 to 91.

The Emotional and Behavior Problem Scale and Conner's Teacher Rating Scale was completed by Kate's teachers. The results do not suggest severe overt, aggressive behaviors. Rather Kate presents with organizational deficits, short term/long-term memory deficits, lack of preparation for assignments and homework, difficulty with abstract concepts and reading comprehension, as well as the need for drill. Additionally, Kate seems to display some nervous habits (nail biting, etc.) and is easily upset by constructive criticism. These characteristics are consistent with the diagnosis of Undifferentiated Attention Deficit Disorder.

The Juvenile Sentence Completion was administered as a projective device. Kate's responses had themes low self-esteem, a need to move on from her current class/grade, normal sibling rivalry (brother), and a pervasive feeling that if she were smarter she would do better in school.
During the Diagnostic Interview Kate's responses were very brief. She wanted nothing more than to be free. She fears being hated or shunned by others. When asked for three wishes, Kate wanted a lifetime supply of candy and a mansion (spelled mengen). The rest of her spelling was so poor her writing was illegible. Her favorite age was 11, so she could play soccer at school.

The California Test of Personality was administered to assess Kate's overall life adjustment which is a balance between social and personal security. Kate's personal adjustment is at the 60th percentile, meaning she perceives her adjustment as being average. Kate's social adjustment is at the 40th percentile, and her overall adjustment at the 50th percentile. These scores suggest Kate perceives her social and personal adjustment to be average.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subtests</th>
<th>%ile</th>
<th>Subtests</th>
<th>%ile</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Self-reliance</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>Social Standards</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal Worth</td>
<td>80%</td>
<td>Social Skills</td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal Freedom</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>Anti-social Tendencies</td>
<td>90%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feeling of Belonging</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>Family Relations</td>
<td>40%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Withdrawal Tendencies</td>
<td>90%</td>
<td>School Relations</td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nervous Symptoms</td>
<td>90%</td>
<td>Community Relations</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Strengths were noted in feelings of self-esteem, denial of withdrawal tendencies, and freedom from nervous symptoms or anti-social tendencies. Weaknesses were noted in community relations, self-reliance, and social standards. Meaning that she is dependent on others and has difficulty subordinating her needs to the desires of the group.

The Personality Inventory for Children was completed by her mother. (See the attached print-out.) The following profile is suggested: Parents and teachers are likely to be concerned about the child's limited academic achievement. Classroom performance reflects poor study skills, distractibility, and difficulty completing assignments. As preadolescents the majority of these children receive special education services and are likely to be classified as learning disabled. Diagnostic criteria suggest specific developmental disorders and adjustment disorder.

The Wechsler Individual Achievement Test was administered to assess Kate's achievement levels. The following scores were obtained.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subtests</th>
<th>Standard Score</th>
<th>Percentile</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Basic Reading</td>
<td>109</td>
<td>73%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
These scores suggest weaknesses in oral expression and written language. When compared to her FSIQ of 102, written language is a significant weakness at the .05 level of significance.

**SUMMARY AND FORMULATION**

Kate is a nine year old youngster who was referred for evaluation by her physician to evaluate for differential diagnosis of ADD as well as to assess her current abilities.

Psychometric evaluation disclosed average intellectual ability with strengths in verbal concept formation, verbal comprehension, reasoning, and conceptualization. Weaknesses were noted in short-term auditory memory, attention, and concentration. Additional weaknesses were not in working under time pressure, sequential learning, visual motor coordination, trial and error learning, retention ability, simultaneous processing, and memory. The ACIDS profile was at the 25%ile (Index 90). Factor analysis suggests weaknesses in Freedom from Distractibility, Perceptual Organization, and Processing Speed. Academic testing suggests weaknesses in oral expression and written language.

Personality testing suggest adequate personality development with mild, transitory, reactive stressors such as change of classroom teacher, although they function well within their families and within special education programs. Cognitive deficits, hyperactivity, poor school achievement, and immature .social skills manifest during elementary school. Problems may be associated with genetic influences. Basically these findings are consistent with Attention Deficit Disorder and Specific Developmental Disorders.

**Diagnosis:**

- Undifferentiated Attention Deficit Disorder
Inconsistent_report

* Adjustment Disorder with Conduct
* Specific Developmental Disorder NOS (organization and planning, written language, and oral expression)

**RECOMMENDATIONS**

1. These results should be shared with the school personnel in designing a special education program. Hence, this report should be shared with the school to insure a comprehensive treatment plan.

2. Consultation with Kate's pediatrician regarding treatment of an attention deficit. In view of her parent's objection to medication, other treatment modalities should be evaluated first (e.g., Cognitive Behavioral).

3. Continued individual counseling focusing on low self-esteem, understanding her learning disability, and problem solving skills.

4. The following educational modifications may aid Kate's teachers to better deal with her attentional problems in school:

   a. Preferential seating within close proximity of where the teacher provides most of the class lessons.

   b. Peer tutoring and/or the Buddy system within the classroom.

   c. A behavioral system should be implemented to reward completion of classroom work within allotted time periods. Classroom rules and expectations should be clearly defined and consequences should be immediate and reasonable.

   d. Time management and other organizational strategies should be implemented in her classroom regime.

   e. Timing and pacing of activities of varying length and difficulty.

   f. Homework notebook should be used.

   g. Reinforcers for completion of assignments at home. Due to her low self esteem participation in extracurricular activities should not be made contingent on completion of homework.

   h. Praise and encouragement for work completed.

   i. Praise and encouragement for work completed.

   j. Do not criticize erasures or spelling/grammar errors.

   k. Cueing Kate before presentation of new information will ensure that she is receiving the information committing it to long-term memory. Cues could be auditory or touch or maintaining eye contact.
1. Social reinforcers for on-task behaviors will increase Faith's attention span.

m. Quiet, contemplative activities such as chess, checkers, reading, card or board games will improve her attention span.

n. Independent reading will reap benefits in the areas of vocabulary and sustained attention, at home and in school.

o. Learning carrel or quiet area will help in cutting down on extraneous stimuli interfering with Kate's learning style.

p. Fatigue is likely to increase versus decrease activity level, hence, Kate should be well rested.

Certified Psychologist

Addendum Page

While the PIC program has selected the child's most characteristic type using a branching tree procedure, other profile types may also be similar. Similarity indexes matching the child's clinical T-score profile to all types for which similarity can be computed are provided below. Type showing similarity values close to or higher than the one given for this child's selected type should be considered in diagnostic hypotheses. Brief descriptions of all types are given on the sheet provided with the PIC program disk.

Similarity

Type 3 .22 ............. Type 8 .08
Type 4 .35 ............. Type 9 - .24
Type 5 .66 ............. Type 10 - .22
Type 6 .69 ............. Type 11 - .28
Type 7 - .27 ..........Type 12 .12

CLASSROOM PLACEMENT ANALYSIS

PLACEMENT/INTERVENTION PROGRAM SIMILARITY INDEX

- Regular Classroom -.32
- Regular Classroom with Counseling -.30

SPECIAL EDUCATION
Emotionally Impaired .07

- Learning Disabled, Mainstreamed with Teacher Consultant .42
- Learning Disability Self-contained classroom .75
- Educable Mentally Impaired .88
- Trainable Mentally Impaired .85

In this analysis the child's profile is compared for similarity to seven average profiles obtained from groups of elementary school children found in regular classrooms, receiving counseling, or placed into one of five special education classifications. The index of similarity calculated is comparable to a correlation coefficient, in that larger values indicate those groups with whom this child has the greatest similarity. The table above may be of value in suggesting those educational placements that are the most and the least appropriate.
RESPONSE TO INCONSISTENT REPORT

Below is a copy of the actual response sent to "Dr. Weksler"

Dear Dr Weksler

Thank you so much for your thorough evaluation of Kate X. We have read over the report and have just a few teensi questions to ask of you. One request as well: Please forward to us copies of her protocols (WISC-III and WIAT) as well as the work sheets from the WIAT. I would especially like to see the Written expression subtest from the WIAT. With so many difficulties described in your report, without that data we could not fully understand and help Kate. She is certainly a unique individual. Also, "In god we trust, all others forward the protocol."

WISC-III:

You note significant strengths in quite a few areas as well as significant weaknesses in just as many areas. Some examples:

- Significant strength in verbal comprehension, crystallized intelligence, and extent of outside reading, verbal concept formation, verbal conceptualization, and verbal reasoning.

Could you please delineate the difference between each of these. How is verbal comprehension different from crystallized intelligence? How is verbal concept formation different from verbal comprehension; verbal conceptualization; crystallized intelligence. Might these each just different names for the same thing? How can we use these 'strengths' to aid Kate in her classroom?

Significant weaknesses were noted in short term auditory memory, attention, and concentration.

Where was this noted on the WISC-III? Was it the Arithmetic subtest, or the Digit Span subtest, or a combination of the two? Were there any behavioral indicators to support this weakness. Please define the difference between attention and concentration. Are they the same or different. Does Kate have a weakness in one or two areas or both? Memory as measured by the Digit Span (9) was 'average' by your own definition. Other areas of weakness are identified as being in sequential learning, memory (as opposed to short term auditory memory?) convergent production (please define) auditory memory (as opposed to short term auditory?) simultaneous processing, non verbal reasoning, visual motor coordination, trial and error learning, and working under time pressure. Could you please define each of these, and explain what subtests make them up. Also, isn't this again calling the same thing by a different name.
You go on to enumerate more weakness based on factor analysis. Weaknesses in Freedom from Distractibility, perceptual organization, and processing speed. Weaknesses with scores all in the average range (90 to 93)? Weakness when compared to what. Other children? Surely not with standard scores of 90’s. Weakness when compared to Verbal ability? Maybe, but might she have no weaknesses and simply some wonderfully developed verbal ability. Since Processing speed is new to the WISC-III, could you please define it for me? I’m having a hard time understanding what it is really measuring. Could you also tell us if her score on the Symbol Search was obtained by sacrificing speed for accuracy or accuracy for speed. How many errors were there in her raw score of 23? What was the breakdown for digits forward vs. digits backwards?

You note that

"The WISC-II ACIDS Profile indicate index scores of 90 to 91."

So? Is this another areas of weakness. What does ACIDS mean anyway. Is she reading disabled? Is she anything more or less than average with scores of 90 to 91. Is this the WISC-II or WISC-III?

Thank you for forwarding the WISC-III printouts you apparently used to interpret the test. Some questions:

Is it appropriate to play IQ roulette with different index scores. You chose to take strengths and weaknesses from Bannatyne, Guilford, Horn, Dean, and Kaufman. Which conceptualization of intelligence do you espouse and why? Would you please give explanations of each of these conceptualizations of intelligence. You seem to have determined strengths and weaknesses by simply looking at lowered scores. Are they compared to any other score to determine significant differences. At what level of confidence did you determine the strength and weakness? 68%? as indicated by the printout. Do you accept that you are probably wrong 1 out of 3 times. Should we make educational and remedial decisions and be wrong 33% of the time? What does Kate's profile look like at the more appropriate 90 or 95% confidence? Could you please reexamine her in this light? What mean was she compared to. If she has such a large difference between her verbal and performance IQ scores, which mean should we compare her to? The verbal, the performance, or the full scale?

Based on the printout that listed a whole lot of 'index' scores, how did you choose which to pick for strengths and weaknesses. You included as a weakness Auditory memory with a standard score index of 90. Why then did you not include Symbolic content with a standard score of 88. Why not visual motor speed with a standard score of 88?

Emotional and behavioral scales filled out by her teachers were interesting. They indicated problems in a number of areas including abstract concepts and reading comprehension. Can you explain the difference between the teachers perceptions and the results of your testing. Specifically, difficulty with abstract concepts: Kate's highest scaled score on the WISC-III was on the Similarities subtest. Reading comprehension? Your WIAT has standard scores of 109, 105, and 107 for the reading subtests and composite.

Speaking of the WIAT, her lowest score was on the written expression subtest. A raw score of 9. Could you please forward a copy of her writing sample and your scoring page. We wish to analyze the elements of her style. Was her difficulty in Ideas and development, Vocabulary, Grammar and usage, etc. Your recommendations at the end of your report list nothing about her 'disability.' If there is a disability in the area of written expression, why are there no remediations listed?
Her second lowest score was on Oral Expression. How does this jibe with a child you identified as having strengths in verbal comprehension, crystallized intelligence, extent of outside reading, verbal concept formation, verbal conceptualization, and verbal reasoning. Again the protocol may help us to understand your interpretations. Might it be that you forgot to add in the 10 points allotted for items 1-10 on that subtest? Might it be that item 15 on the protocol does not give room to place the correct number of scores?

You diagnosis lists under Specific developmental disorder NOS, oral expression. Her oral expression score was not significantly different from her predicted score? Again, how does this coincide with the verbal strengths that you identified from the WISC-III? Also, is 'organization and planning' a developmental disorder listed in DSM-IV?

The scales also highlighted some other areas of concern (organizational deficits, lack of preparation for assignments and homework, short term/long term memory deficits). You conclude that these characteristics are consistent with undifferentiated attention deficit disorder. Could you explain this in more detail. According to DSM-IV, in order to 'qualify' as ADD, a child must meet at least a certain number of characteristics. You have described 3.

You note that the Juvenile sentence completion suggested themes of low self esteem. Can you explain how this fits with the descriptions from the California Test of Personality:

"Strengths were noted in feelings of self esteem, denial of withdrawal symptoms, and freedom from nervous symptoms or anti social tendencies."

Overall you report that her profile

"suggests that Faith perceives her social and personal adjustment to be average."

Can you explain the apparent contradictions from your summary that "poor school achievement, and immature social skills manifest during elementary school."? Is this a complete sentence or just a mistake when transferring from the computer printout?

In the area described as the Diagnostic interview, you note that

"The rest of her spelling was so poor her writing was illegible."

Was her spelling poor, her writing poor, or both? The spelling subtest of the WIAT had a standard score of 99? Below average (?) What happened? Which is the most valid measure of her ability?

The Personality Inventory for Children reflected poor study skills, distractibility and difficulty in completing assignments. Is this the 180 question short form, the 200+ question intermediate form or the 420 question long form.

You did include in the packet page 7 of the PIC printout. Could you provide the rest of the printout. What personality type was she anyway. From your write up (or should I say your copying of the PIC printout) I could not tell what type Kate was. She appeared from page 7 to match
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closely the personality of type 5 and 6 (.66 and .69 respectively). Why or how were these personality types discounted.

Please explain in writing how we are to put faith in a computer printout that has identified Kate as most closely resembling children placed in classrooms for the Educable mentally retarded and the trainable mentally retarded. You had noted that this may be related to Kate's difficulty in socialization. Could you expand on this poor socialization. According to the body of your report, there is nothing to suggest poor socialization. According to the California Test of Personality, "Kate's social adjustment is at the 40th percentile and her overall adjustment at the 50th percentile."

What was the t score for the L and F scales on the PIC. Maybe they were elevated?

In your summary you again highlight that the ACIDS profile was at the 25%ile. What is this indicating?

In the paragraph that starts with "Personality testing suggests adequate personality development....." you write

"they function well within their families and within special education programs."

Who are "they?"

In the recommendations,

1: you note that these findings should be shared with the school in designing a special education program. Did you check with the school to see what is being offered now, whether Kate is having any difficulty in school, and what her current achievement is?

3: "Continued individual counseling focusing on low self esteem....." This for a child who in the report is described as having "adequate personality development" and a "strength" noted "in feelings of self esteem"???

4.g: Again the comment about low self esteem. We need some clarification please.

4.h & i: oops. same recommendation

4.l: Who is Faith?

4.n: Independent reading. Does she need to reap benefits in the area of vocabulary? Your WISC-III Vocabulary score was one of her highest?

4.p: "Fatigue is likely to increase versus decrease activity level, hence, Kate should be well rested." Nice suggestion, but where is this from. Nowhere in the report did I read of any mention of fatigue, etc.? Again enlighten us please.
Copy of a real letter received by the school. This evaluator was trying to communicate something worthwhile to the school but no one really knew what that was.

Ms. Diane Hirley
Case Coordinator

Re: Kate Dumont

Dear Ms. Hirley:

Mr. and Mrs. Dumont have asked me to prepare a few general psychological insights regarding Kate that might be useful for the school in its efforts to meet her academic needs, and, perhaps, attune and adjust specific approaches to accommodate such awareness.

Kate has made considerable progress in therapeutic endeavors and, in general, social displays and behaviors are more age-appropriate and acceptable than ever before. However, these adjustments tend to be superficial in that they are results of conditioning and are not truly expressions of incorporated behavior. In essence, Kate’s social responses are essentially rote ones and the internalizing is rather minimal.

The implication is of appropriate performance and functioning related to significant maturational lags. Thus, when confronted with marked stress, especially-when the situation is not routinized and prosaic, regressive responses and reactions will be readily manifest.

The fundamental approaches to her, therefore, might take this into account. Since the effort would be to facilitate and enhance maturation, the focus would be on stabilizing a nurturing, supportive atmosphere, tutorial but avoiding as much as possible, criticism and authoritative expression.

Were the presentation toward her be couched in alliance terms, with approaches pervasive with feelings of mutual acceptance and shared goals of her mastering her world, minimizing the criticizing and authoritarian aspects toward her responses would make her more amenable to behavioral change and facilitate incorporation.

The creation of an acceptance-alliance relationship is more easily created and sustained by having her limit her negotiations to just a few tutorial figures who would, in addition, act as advocates.
I would, of course, be available for feedback, guidance, insight, etc. as these approaches toward Kate become operational.

Please contact me if you have any questions.

Sincerely,
This is an actual test report. The names were obviously changed and the person evaluated is only called Person. Nothing else has been changed so any spelling errors are real. The saying at the very bottom of the page was found on every page of the report. This was one of the first court cases I (RD) was involved with in which I was asked to refute the expert. It was an easy case! If this weren't a real case it would be too unbelievable for words. How many errors can you find? Where did those IQ scores come from?

TESTING REPORT

Name: Person Date of Testing:

Age: 26 Date of Birth:

Occupation: Examiner:

REASON FOR TESTING

Person was referred for counseling and evaluation by the court as a result of voyerism and exhibitionism.

TESTS ADMINISTERED

WISC-R

Minnesota Multiphasic Personality Inventory (MMPI)

Thematic Apperception Test (TAT)

TEST BEHAVIOR

Person arrived on time for testing. He was dressed casually, and appeared friendly and pleasant during the introduction.

As testing began he appeared nervous, and it was observed that his hands were trembling slightly. When he did not have to use his hands he would usually have them crossed in front of him. In between questions and subtests he was observed gazing out the window as if to avoid looking at the examiners.

His nervousness was also evident as he asked a number of questions about the nature of the test. For example he asked, "What kinds of things does
Horror Evaluation

this test measure?” During Picture Arrangement he asked if this tested for social intelligence.

Test Results:

WISC-R RESULTS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>VERBAL</th>
<th>PERFORMANCE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Information</td>
<td>Picture Completion 14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Digit Span</td>
<td>Picture Arrangement 8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vocabulary</td>
<td>Block Design 9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arithmetic</td>
<td>Object Assembly 10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comprehension</td>
<td>Digit Symbol 9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Similarities</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

VERBAL SCORE 74 PERFORMANCE SCORE 50

VERBAL IQ 128

PERFORMANCE IQ 104

FULL SCALE IQ 120

Person scored a full-scale IQ of 120, derived from a Verbal IQ of 128 and a Performance IQ of 104. He is functioning at a superior level of intelligence. His Verbal IQ was significantly higher than his Performance IQ demonstrating a 24 point spread. This may indicate an obsessive compulsive tendency since he is unable to solve problems quickly under time pressure as is indicated by his low Performance scores.

On the Verbal scale his highest score was in Comprehension which may indicate a highly developed conscience or punishing superego. In life this would mean he may suffer intense guilt when he experiences failure or loss.

Inconsistent with his high score in Comprehension and Vocabulary, his lowest score was on Information which indicates he is unable verbalize everything he knows and to put into words all that he feels.
On the Performance scale his highest score was in Picture Completion which is the most basic subtest for visual projection and memory. His strength in this subtest suggests he is good at creating visual memories which he also evidences in the TAT where he creates a number of fantasies and does some daydreaming. He also made a number of attempts in his responses, indicating that he tends to be impulsive. The trial and error approach on other Performance tests confirms impulsivity, demonstrating that he show weakness in his capacity to strategically work out a plan and implement it or starts things and doesn't finish.

On the Picture Arrangement subtest, which measures general intelligence in social situations, he made incorrect attempts on 4 out of 10. On one picture (#6 Escape) he arranged the cards in the following order: the person is running from the police, then he hides behind a bush, then he sees a girl swimming in a pond and her clothes are on shore, he hides behind the tree and and changes his clothes. This arrangement seems to reflect an exhibitionism situation.

On picture #10 Taxi, he could not arrange the pictures to tell a story. When asked to explain he said “Someone is probably jealous because one person has a real person and the other person, who is missing, only has a bust”. This projective interpretation may indicate some insecurity about himself, feeling jealous that he cannot have a full-blown woman and other men can.

TAT

On the TAT, the characteristics of the hero portrayed in the pictures took on two personality types. The most common description was of a child, ranging in age from 9-19, very cultured and from a good bloodline. The other character was described as foreign, evil, dangerous to others, and overdosed on drugs or alcohol. However, things most often turned out good for them when they received help.

The motives of the characters described were usually positive: to resolve sadness, get help, to find inner peace, to get rid of inner conflict and pain, and to live fully and have a happy home.

His feelings towards himself were not as positive. He described himself in discouraged and depressed terms such as feeling mentally exhausted, mad at himself, and to upset to help himself. His inner turmoil is described as a war going on in his mind, an evil spirit hovering over him, a feeling of imbalance, and physical pain and suffering. It should also be noted that at times he felt nothing at all which indicates problems with repression or denial of his emotions.

To end the pain he is seen as attempting suicide (#18) and overdosing on alcohol or drugs (#13mf and #19). Attributes which were not projected were destruction and dominance; however his most prominent attribute was passivity as he describes his environment with warm climates, country settings, babbling rivers, and prayerful thoughts. This is also the time that he describes himself as daydreaming or fantasizing.

His passivity seems rather extreme especially during #12bg where he is lying in a boat daydreaming and a bird flies by and defecates on his knee. His reaction is to wipe it off, which indicates a lack of affect. In 13g he sees himself leaving home on an ocean liner where he stands at the rail looking back at his homeland for 4 hours. Again there is no affect as he rethinks about his home. In picture #18bm, he gets beaten up and thrown into the street to be run over by a car. He doesn't mention defense or any emotion on his part.

This depressed and dejected state is reinforced by #3 where Person cries for 3 hours because his dog dies of rabies.

A number of reoccurring responses were recorded throughout testing: doctors, peaceful settings and daydreaming, and a persistence to do good and achieve.

Overall, Person expresses a masochistic need to punish himself and to be able to take punishment. However he also feels he needs professional
care, to know where he's really at, and rest from this exhausting mental battle he is putting himself through.

Emotionally he feels angry, depressed, withdrawn, contemptuous, rejected, and remorseful. He would like to feel good about himself and more cheerful inside.

He views his environment as competitive, hard on him, lonely, lacking purpose, unfair, and attacking him.

His prevalent themes were: if you don't pay for the wrong you've done then you die, you cannot undo death or sin, but if you work hard you will win. This demonstrates the degree to which Person punishes himself when he feels guilty and how he handles his guilt is to fun away or repress his feelings and try harder to please others.

Person seems quite motivated to help himself since most of the outcomes of his stories were positive and successful. He sees himself as; being cured from his disease, working out his past, and doing what he is suppose to do. However, he continues to avoid his problem when he mentions helping others in order to forget about his own problem.

Overall, Person seems to be having difficulty dealing with guilt feelings which he projects onto imaginary characters or denies. Judging from the content analysis and the young age of the characters it may be surmised that Person may have some unresolved Oedipus issues.

Although he makes himself out to be a survivor, he is not at peace with himself. Rather he seems to fear expressing his own feelings of aggression, and deals with this fear through repression, projection, and denial. Eventually the aggression builds-up and is released impulsively in the most emotionally repressed form - sexually. Upon release of this emotion he feels extreme guilt and works harder to repress and deny his feelings in order to maintain control.

MMPI

Person's profile on the MMPI appears to be valid. His scatter of scores all fell within the mean except for the K scale, which represents guardedness and defensiveness, and the Mf scale which measures masculine-feminine identity.

His T score of 37 on the K scale indicates a lack of normal defensiveness which is often associated with poor self-concept, acute pathology, malingering, or "a cry for help." Usually the person's defenses are not functioning adequately, and he has a poor degree of emotional and behavioral controls. Adolescents often score low, indicating openness and a certain degree of self-criticism centered around a search for identity and a close examination of their personal values.

His T score of 78 on the Mf scale indicates a conflict over sexual identity. Individuals within this range are basically passive, and there is frequently a history of marital problems due to difficulty in assertively fulfilling their partners' needs. In some situations, a person in this range or higher may develop a reaction formation against passivity in which they may display an exaggerated expression of masculinity.

INTERPRETATION

Person emerges as an intelligent young man who has a strong conscience. Due to his lack of impulse control he probably suffers intense guilt and hates himself when he does lose control.

In his perceptual process he is likely to have difficulty due to his early environmental background. Since he is so brilliant he is able to manipulate his environment and others to get what he needs. However, his repressed feelings of a sexual nature continue to cause him to have anxious feeling about
himself and fears about how he is perceived by others. His low self-esteem is continually being fed by his inability to come to grips with his true feelings.

In order to compensate for his inability to deal with social situations appropriately, he tends block his own feelings and approach situations in a way he believes is right. If unsuccessful, he may become very frustrated and feel guilty. When his frustration and guilt level become too overwhelming an impulsive act may serve to release some of this repressed and cooped up anxious energy.

Suggestions:

1. Individual Therapy
   a. To deal with sexual issues
   b. To learn how to reduce anxiety
   c. Work on repressive issues and get in more touch with his feelings so that he will be able to manage them rather than act them out.

2. Marital Therapy
   a. To gain more understanding of Person and her needs
   b. To discuss sexuality with Person and Person’s wife

3. Improve non-verbal skills
   a. Focus on visual learning
   b. Reinforce persistence
   c. Improve scanning techniques and learn strategy planning
   d. Work on organizational skills

"Except a man be Born Again, he cannot see the Kingdom of God"

"For God so loved the world that He gave His only begotten Son, that whosoever believed in Him should not perish but have everlasting Life"
DIAGNOSTIC EDUCATIONAL EVALUATION

Name: John Schmidt
Parents: Mary & Ralph Schmidt
Address: 16 Bacque Road, Mossboro, NH
School: Mossboro Elementary School
Examiner: Marge N. O’Verra, M.Ed., S.A.I.F.

Test dates: 9/4/96 9/12/96
Birth date: 2/13/87
Age: 9-7
Grade: 4.0

BACKGROUND

Referral

John was referred by the Mossboro Elementary School Evaluation/Placement Team for educational evaluation. The referral asked, "Is John educationally disabled? Does he require special education services? If so, what programs/modifications would benefit John?"

History

John lives at home with his parents, older brother, Sam, and twin, younger brothers, Billy and Bob. They are living in a trailer while building a new house. John’s father is a mechanical engineer, and his mother is a part-time accountant. John reportedly has highly developed physical abilities and reached developmental milestones for motor development early. He continues to demonstrate excellent mechanical abilities and can easily visualize a physical solution to a problem. John is very helpful to his parents, volunteering to carry out physical tasks.

John had many episodes of fluid in his ears (serous otitis media) from age six months to about four years. He still occasionally has fluid buildup. He was much later developing speech and language skills than motor skills, but an audiological evaluation at age 3 revealed normal hearing. John also passed pure tone, 25 decibel hearing screenings at school in second and third grade. John’s vision was tested at 20/20 in each eye in second grade, but 20/30 in each eye in third grade. He told me he will soon be receiving corrective lenses, which he says he needs.
John dislikes school and is only beginning to respond to demands for homework. He has attended first, second, and third grades in Mossboro. His third grade teacher described him as "an average oral reader, but comprehension is very weak. Math concepts are weak. Attention and motivation [are] poor." John often did not complete assignments, and had difficulty following directions. His behavior was "immature." He was a "good thinker when focused."

John’s first grade report cards indicated adequate progress in basic reading, writing, and math skills, but difficulty staying on task and some "incidents" in the classroom and in the playground. John’s second grade teachers reported that his "work and social habits have improved a great deal this year. He has good ideas, but we’d like to see him writing more and putting more effort into his written work." However, there was "a big improvement in John’s writing" during the year. "He has been reading well also, but his test scores are still inconsistent. He has done very well in math with trading (borrowing)."

In third grade, John continued to have difficulty staying on task, completing assignments, and listening effectively to instructions and information. "Behavior during special classes and ‘following rules’ continue to be issues." His teacher noted inconsistent work that did not appear to be up to his ability. "John has grown a great deal this year in language areas. Math concepts need practice. The issue of his behavior, attention, and responsibility needs to be addressed," which is being done through the present evaluation and a referral to Dr. Marion Haste for assessment of possible Attention-Deficit/Hyperactivity Disorder (ADHD). ¹

John completed levels 8 and 9 in the Silver Burdett reading series during third grade. Better oral reading than reading comprehension was again noted in his reading record.

John’s current, fourth grade teacher, Ms. Taken, reported that John moved around in the classroom a great deal and that he twisted, pulled, and poked his skin on all parts of his body and pulled his lips over his face. He frequently licked his fingers and chewed his nails whenever his hands were not otherwise occupied.

PRESENT TESTING

Tests Used

Appended to this report are a list of the names and brief descriptions of the tests that John took, an explanation of the scoring system used, and tables of John’s test scores. Please note that, throughout the report, I am reporting test scores as percentile ranks and stanines as described

¹ Confusingly, the Diagnostic and Statistical Manual of the American Psychiatric Association (DSM-IV) calls both the Predominantly Inattentive and Predominantly Hyperactive-Impulsive Types, as well as the Combined Type, Attention-Deficit/Hyperactivity Disorder (ADHD).
The verbal labels of the stanines are not necessarily the same classification labels supplied with the tests (please see p. vii). The different tests use many different scoring systems, so the same scores may be called different things, hence my translation of all test scores into a single system.

Test Conditions

John and I worked together for two sessions of about 100 minutes each in the Conference Room, kindly made available to us by I. M. Shirley Wright and the staff who would otherwise have been using the room. Physical conditions were good. Light, air, and temperature were comfortable. The table and chair were a little high for John, but did not appear to cause him discomfort. Outside noise was minimal except during one class change, during which John and I just conversed.

John told me that both his mother and his teacher had explained to him that my job is to help teachers and that his parents and Ms. Taken wanted me to recommend better ways of teaching him. He understood that the testing was not to "test" him, but to give me information so I could offer suggestions to his parents and teachers.

John was friendly and cheerful and completely cooperative with all of the tests. He chatted with me about a variety of topics, including the new eye glasses he would be getting after the evaluation, the family’s moves from a house to a trailer to a new house, his nationwide travel during the past summer vacation, his dogs, and his tree house. John’s stories sometimes interrupted tests, but he was always willing to be redirected to the work at hand.

John was an attractive, sturdy boy of about average height for his age with a very short crewcut and a mobile, expressive face. His nails were deeply chewed.

John spoke slowly, as if he were sometimes searching for the words he needed. His mother told us that he seemed to have similar word-finding difficulty at home. He worked very slowly on nonverbal tasks, especially on paper-and-pencil tests, but usually paid good attention and worked steadily when he did not interrupt himself with a story.

John was persistent on the tests, giving up only reluctantly on items that were too difficult for him. He tended to be a little impulsive on items that seemed easy. John was physically restless and became more so toward the end of each session, which lasted 90 and 105 minutes. His attention was used up by the end of each session, but we quit before his test performance could deteriorate. John did not twist his skin or pull his lips as was described in the referral, but toward the end of each session, he began contorting his very mobile features into funny faces.

I confirmed that the purpose of the evaluation was to help John’s teachers learn more about the best ways to teach John. Everyone is better at some things than at others, and the tests could help determine which were which for John. I also warned John that there would be some items that would be too easy (basal items), designed primarily for younger students, and some that would be much too difficult (ceiling items), designed primarily for older students. Those items are included to make sure we do not miss any extreme strengths or weaknesses.

John’s scores appear to be reasonably valid indications of his current educational functioning levels. His occasional lack of attention to too-easy items did not make much difference in his scores.
John said he needed the glasses for seeing far-point material, such as the chalkboard. He did not seem to have any difficulty seeing the test materials. He commented once that the print was small for the common fractions on the math computation test, but he read all the digits accurately.

John's health record indicates that his height has been about average (50th to 60th percentile) and his weight slightly greater for his age (60th to 75th percentile).

Most tests progress from lower, easier items to higher, more difficult ones, with different starting points depending on the student's age or grade. "Basal" rules allow us to omit items below a specified number of consecutive passed items and "ceiling" rules require stopping after a certain number of consecutive errors. These rules focus testing on the student's functioning level and limit time and stress. The assumption, based on research, is that most students would have been able to pass all items below the basal and none above the ceiling. This assumption may not hold for students with unusual patterns of strengths and weaknesses.

**Test Findings**

John’s scores are all compared to the scores of other students of his age or grade, which automatically compensates for the varying difficulty levels of the tests. Therefore, John might score higher, compared to other students, on a difficult test than on an easier one.

John’s scores compared to scores of other students of the same age are very slightly lower than his scores compared to other students in the same grade. According to norms published by Developmental Learning Materials, the average student of age 9-7 is placed in grade 4.3, and the average age of students in grade 4.0 is 9-4.

The various tests we used come with their own, peculiar systems of test statistics and verbal labels (e.g., "average") for test scores. Rather than use several different systems, in which the same score might have two or more different labels, I have taken the liberty of additionally translating all of the scores into stanines as described on p. i of the appendix. Please note that these are not necessarily the verbal labels furnished by the test publishers.

**Reading**

On an ascending, nine-point scale similar to stanines, John rated his own reading ability as a high average 6, but his enjoyment of reading as a very low 1, compared to other students in the same grade. He did not name any books or magazines he particularly enjoyed reading on his own, but said he enjoyed "some books we are finishing up" such as *The Best Worst School Year Ever*. John said he enjoyed making things, such as models and an elaborate tree house, which he described in some detail. He told me he had taken apart a big wheelbarrow and that he had painted the house while his father was working on it. He talked about working in the family garden. John’s mother said he was talented at taking things apart and reassembling them correctly.

John read words aloud from the WIAT list with good accuracy for his age. He relied more on instant recognition of familiar words than on strategies to attack unfamiliar words, but his automatic reading vocabulary was strong, yielding a High Average score, the same as his self-rating. He did try to sound out some unfamiliar words, e.g., "course" for *coerce*, and "rune" for *ruin*. His errors suggested he could use a little
more work on sounds spelled with two vowels.

5 These 1977 norms are old and are national averages. In school systems making frequent use of "readiness" or "transition" or "pre-first" placements or retention in grade, the average age of students in a given grade will be higher. However, these norms fairly closely reflect the relationships between ages and grade placements for students in the tests’ norming samples.

6 The numbers in the first column of each table are the standard scores, scaled scores, or T scores from the tests. The numbers in the second column are the percentile ranks corresponding to those scores. The final columns are the stanine equivalents for those scores. What differ from the test manuals are the verbal labels (e.g., "Low Average") given with the stanine scores. The last page of the Appendix shows the verbal labels used with scores from the Wechsler, Woodcock-Johnson, and Differential Ability Scales.

7 Please see pp. iv-vii of The Appendix for full names and brief descriptions of the tests John took.

John’s reading comprehension score was not as strong as his accuracy in reading words aloud from a list. The 22-point difference between his High Average oral reading and Low Average reading comprehension scores was statistically significant. He understood and recalled straightforward facts from what he read, but had difficulty making inferences from what he had read.

The WIAT listening comprehension subtest is very similar to the reading comprehension subtest, except that the examiner reads the paragraph aloud to the student before asking the comprehension questions. John’s score for listening comprehension fell between his oral reading score and reading comprehension score, which suggested that the process of comprehending and organizing the language of a paragraph, selecting relevant information, and making inferences to answer questions was slightly difficult for John even when listening rather than reading for himself. John might profit from direct instruction in reading comprehension strategies.

8 These "test scores" are the scaled scores or standard scores that are used with the various tests. Please see p. i of the Appendix for explanations of these different statistics. The various systems are not directly comparable to one another. The percentile ranks and stanines in the next two columns are provided to offer a common
system that is consistent across all of the tests.

9 Test scores are never perfectly accurate, so differences between scores can occur by chance even when the tested abilities really are about equal. "Statistically significant" means that the difference between scores was too large to be likely to occur by accident unless there were a true difference between the two abilities being tested.

Writing

On the ascending, nine-point scale, John rated his spelling as an average 5, his handwriting as a very high 9, his ability in writing stories or papers as an average 5, and his enjoyment of writing as a high average 6.

Just as he had rated it himself, John’s spelling score on the WIAT was Average for his age. Most of his errors were phonetically reasonable: his spellings could be pronounced correctly as the intended words, e.g., "senchuries," "exsitement," "absints," and "patients." John consistently spelled the sound ight as "igth." He occasionally failed to double consonants, e.g., "aparintly" and "asistance."

10 For example, if "senchuries" doesn't spell centuries, then what does it spell?

John was asked to make up and write a story about a picture of an outer-space scene. His spelling in the story was 88% accurate, which is a little low for spontaneous writing, but his errors were reasonable for his grade level. The Franklin Language Master 4000 was able to come up with the correct words for all six of John’s spelling errors. For three of them ("wierd," "sourt," and "fuond"), the correct word was the first choice offered by the machine. For the other three ("gys," "somthing," and "mystereis,") the correct word was offered, but not as the first choice. The Microsoft Word for Windows 95™ spelling checker did even better for John: the correct word was the first alternative offered for five of the misspelled words and the second choice given for "mystereis." The Microsoft Word for Windows 95™ spelling checker would apparently be very helpful for checking John’s already fairly accurate spelling.

John spent 12 of the permitted 15 minutes writing a relatively brief, 51-word story in 7 fairly short sentences or sentence fragments. He wrote slowly with apparent effort and omitted one word. John used a variety of punctuation, which gave him an Average score for punctuation used, but also omitted some necessary punctuation, which lowered his language conventions score to Below Average. Although disorganized, his story was a good effort to create on short notice an interesting plot with dialogue and action.
These "test scores" are the scaled scores or standard scores that are used with the various tests. Please see p. i of the Appendix for explanations of these different statistics. The various systems are not directly comparable to one another. The percentile ranks and stanines in the next two columns are provided to offer a common system that is consistent across all of the tests.

John’s spelling was, as discussed above, fairly accurate, but six misspelled words left only 51 correctly spelled words in the story, and the TOWL-2 scoring is based on the number, not the proportion, of correct spellings. The percentage accuracy score, unlike the spelling score, counts both misspellings of “weird.”

Math

On the ascending, nine-point scale, John rated his math ability as an above average 7 and his enjoyment of math as a very high 9. John had earlier that math was the subject he liked least, simply because it was math, but when he marked the 9 on the Self-Rating Scale, John said, "Never mind what I said before. I like math."

John added whole numbers with carrying and subtracted with borrowing, although he tended to miss the minus sign and add subtraction problems. He also mistook the multiplication sign for a plus sign. If John had correctly performed the correct operations on three problems, his math computation score would have been High Average instead of Average, about the same as his math applications score.

John did short multiplication and short division without remainders. He added and subtracted both denominators and numerators when working with common fractions. John’s paper-and-pencil math computation was very slow and laborious. He became restless while working on the fairly brief, 24-item, math computation subtest.
John had no difficulty with verbally-framed math applications problems presented to him both orally and in writing. As long as he had the necessary computational skill, he understood the problems and attacked them correctly. Multiplying $3 \times 23$, John set up the problem inefficiently and began working from the left.

On the WISC-III, John was also asked to solve math applications problems, but those problems were read aloud to him without a written copy, and he had to solve them without scratch paper. John had no difficulty doing problems at his skill level in his head, scoring High Average for his age, as he had done with the WIAT problems with visual aids and scratch paper.

These "test scores" are the scaled scores or standard scores that are used with the various tests. Please see p. i of the Appendix for explanations of these different statistics. The various systems are not directly comparable to one another. The percentile ranks and stanines in the next two columns are provided to offer a common system that is consistent across all of the tests.

Cognitive Abilities

John demonstrated ample intellectual ability for school work. His total score on the WISC-III was solidly Average for his age. However, there were some noteworthy areas of strength and weakness among his subtest scores.

Oral, verbal abilities. Within his overall High Average\(^{14}\) verbal total, John did better on subtests emphasizing acquired verbal knowledge, or the application of learned verbal skills and knowledge to familiar types of problems, than he did on the verbal subtests requiring flexible reasoning with new and unfamiliar verbal problems.

\(^{13}\)These "test scores" are the scaled scores or standard scores that are used with the various tests. Please see p. i of the Appendix for explanations of these different statistics. The various systems are not directly comparable to one another. The percentile ranks and stanines in the next two columns are provided to offer a common system that is consistent across all of the tests.

\(^{14}\) Please remember I am using stanine classifications for these WISC scores.
John scored Above Average on the crystallized verbal ability subtests of general information quiz questions (e.g., "Who was the first President of the United States?" or "When is Thanksgiving?") and vocabulary definitions (e.g., "What does ‘revision’ mean?") and High Average on the oral math applications problems without scratch paper.

In contrast, John scored Low Average on the more unfamiliar, verbal reasoning subtests of explaining how two different things (e.g., cat and mouse) or concepts (e.g., hope and fear) could be alike and answering questions of social and practical understanding (e.g., "What is the ting to do if you accidentally break a friend's toy?" or "Tell me two reasons for reading a daily newspaper."). John also found it difficult to repeat series of dictated digits. He inconsistently managed to repeat five digits in the order they were dictated and three in correct, reversed order, which was Low Average for his age.

15 These "test scores" are the scaled scores or standard scores that are used with the various tests. Please see p. i of the Appendix for explanations of these different statistics. The various systems are not directly comparable to one another. The percentile ranks and stanines in the next two columns are provided to offer a common system that is consistent across all of the tests.

Nonverbal, visual and visual-motor abilities. Within his overall Average total on the nonverbal, visual and visual-motor subtests, John scored High on the holistic, spatial nonverbal subtests of identifying missing parts of pictures, copying geometric designs with patterned cubes, and assembling puzzles of cut-apart objects. He demonstrated excellent visual, spatial reasoning abilities, which is consistent with his mother’s report of his skill in mechanical activities. His scores would have been slightly higher if he had earned more time bonuses for working quickly. His deliberate working speed cost him a few bonus points.
However, John worked extremely slowly on the paper-and-pencil processing speed tests of marking rows of digits with different symbols according to a digit-symbol code and scanning rows of symbols and marking "yes" or "no" to indicate whether he found matching symbols in each row. John appeared to be working as fast as he could, but these subtests of clerical speed and accuracy were extremely challenging for John, and he did not seem to be able to work any faster.

On the remaining nonverbal subtest, putting cartoon pictures into the correct sequences to tell stories, John worked accurate, but very slowly. His score was Low for his age, but, if we could count items he completed correctly beyond the time limits, his score would have been High Average. Evidently, John’s speed of processing visual data was extremely slow, although generally accurate. John’s slow processing speed on those WISC-III tests was reminiscent of his slow struggle with paper-and-pencil math calculations and writing.

Interview

John told me that this was, so far, his favorite year in school, because, "I like Ms. um, ah, and, ah, and, ah, ah, yeah, I don’t know." His favorite subject was, "Ah, Science, I mean Social Studies." John’s apparent word-finding difficulties were particularly evident with such open-ended questions. He said he did best in school when, "Ah, I was thinking and not playing and stuff,", and that he did not do well in school when, "I’m either playing or got detentions, which I got detention about every day last year, but not a single one this year!" John said he learned best when, "I listen," and that it was hardest for him to learn when, "I’m playing." Teachers are particularly helpful when, "They till you directions if there’s no directions to a paper." It makes it hard when teachers, "Give you a detention."

On the ascending, nine-point scale, John rated his enjoyment of Science, Social Studies, Art, Physical Education, and sports as very high 9s. Music was an above average 7. John thought he got along well with most teachers (7) and than teachers liked him (8). He indicated he learned pretty well in school (6) and did well on tests and quizzes (7). He believed he paid good attention (7) and tried very hard (9) in school. However, he did not like school (1).

CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Conclusions

John is a bright boy who demonstrated excellent thinking abilities, but very slow processing of data, especially with paper-and-pencil tasks, but also other tasks, including formulating oral language. He tended to do better with visual, spatial thinking and with application of acquired verbal knowledge than with verbal reasoning with unfamiliar problems. His math, except for a tendency to misread operations signs, was strong. His writing skills were mixed. As reported in the referral, John’s oral reading skills were stronger than his reading comprehension and listening comprehension.

John’s high activity level, his need for extra time processing data, especially for paper work, and his relative weaknesses in some verbal skills make school a challenging and sometimes unrewarding environment for him, despite his good intelligence.

The referral asked, "Is John educationally disabled? Does he require special education services? If so, what programs/modifications would
benefit John?" These are decisions to be made by the team, including John's parents. However, John's reading comprehension and some of his writing skills are substantially lower than his levels of intellectual ability, and there is some evidence that these discrepancies are the result of his relative weaknesses in some verbal abilities and of his need for extra processing time. Specific program recommendations are offered below.

**Recommendations**

The following recommendations were developed by all of the participants in the post-evaluation conference. The selection and presentation of these preliminary recommendations are mine, so nothing here would be binding on anyone unless and until it were approved by John’s parents and by the Mossboro Elementary School Evaluation/Placement Team or were otherwise legally ordered. *The recommendations are, of course, only my personal opinions.*

1. John demonstrated a strong sight vocabulary and some word attack skills. He could be helped by some additional work on syllable patterns spelled with Consonants and two Vowels (VV), e.g., CVVC (e.g., *bait*), CCVVC (e.g., *bleak*), CVVCC (e.g., *beast*), and CCVVCC (*sleigh*). If he practices spelling those patterns as well as reading them, both his reading and spelling will be strengthened. John should have a review of spelling the *ight* sound and doubling rules for consonants.

2. The Microsoft Word for Windows 95™ spelling checker would apparently be very helpful for checking John’s already fairly accurate spelling. Writing is a slow, difficult process for John. He would eventually profit from learning keyboarding skills now so that he could use a word processor for lengthy writing assignments in a couple of years. Word processing will not have any appeal for him until he becomes a reasonably proficient typist, so it might be helpful to have him start now with a computer typing tutorial game.

3. John accurately reported high average reading skills, but very low enjoyment of reading. It would be worthwhile to try to work with him to identify reading materials that would really interest him. He enjoys outdoor activities, yard work, and taking things apart and rebuilding them. It might be worthwhile to bring home a wide variety of magazines and take out subscriptions to any that John seemed to enjoy.


5. A speech and language evaluation would be prudent. John’s slow processing and possible difficulty with word finding suggest that there might be subtle language issues which could be evaluated and for which recommendations might be made. Please see the attached paper on Post-Otitis Auditory Dysfunction (POAD).

6. Visual aids appear to be very helpful for John. Teachers can help by making special, additional efforts to use charts, diagrams, models, time lines, globes, maps, illustrations, gestures, facial expressions, drama, and movement to help convey information to him. *Allow him time to process the visual information.* He appears to take in visual information slowly, but very well. Give John chances to use his artistic ability.

7. John might do better in another location in the classroom. It would be worthwhile to talk with him about the advantages and disadvantages of different places in the room and to work with him on trying different seats. It would be tactful to move other students at the same time.
8. Frequent, brief breaks, as Ms. Taken has been providing, give John a chance to refocus his attention. Between breaks, it seems to be important to keep John as active as possible so he does not have time to twist his skin, pull his lips, or do whatever his current mannerism might be.

9. John reportedly follows the lead of attentive, hard-working students in class. He should be given opportunities to do so. Again, the seating arrangement could be used to enhance this process.

10. John is very responsive to success. Make opportunities to show him how new approaches to tasks, organization, or planning "pay off" and encourage the good results that come from those efforts.

11. It is much easier to form and stick with a good habit than to try to make new plans for a frequent activity each time the need arises. Once a useful habit has been formed, you do not need to keep making conscious efforts to carry out the task. For example, if you keep losing your appointment book, you might pick one pocket (one that is part of all garments you usually wear) and learn always to keep the book in that one pocket. You could teach yourself to return the book to your pocket the instant you are finished using the book and to transfer the book to the same pocket in your new garment each time you change clothes. For another example, lost homework might be saved by developing a habit of leaving the bookbag in one place (perhaps the knob of the door through which you exit for school or work in the morning) and never removing more than one task from the bag at a time. The current task would have to be returned (regardless of whether it was completed) before another could be removed. Those examples may not be relevant to John, but when recurring problems become apparent, you could sit down with him, discuss the problem, and try to brainstorm a good habit that might solve the problem. John’s ability to visualize a physical solution to a problem would be an asset in that process. After trying the new habit for a couple of days, you could sit down again to refine the plan and then settle down to building the new approach into a firmly established habit.

12. It may be necessary to work out a plan for ensuring timely completion of homework. One possibility is to institute a class, grade, or school rule that homework must be completed before leaving the building on the day that the work is due. Larry Lieberman suggests a school-wide plan for homework.

13. Clear structure and consistent routines seem to be helpful for John.

14. Most skills can be learned by small steps. If you can begin by providing all necessary help to John to complete a task, you may be able to withdraw the help by very gradual steps until he is fully independent. Often the best way is to begin at the end, allowing the student to carry though the very last mini-step independently and then very gradually work back toward the beginning. Attention span can often be increased by beginning with tasks short enough for completion in one burst of attention, consistently praising and rewarding the completion of the task, and then very gradually increasing the length of the tasks, always ready to fall back to shorter intervals on a bad day. The goal is to try to build so slowly that John almost always finishes the task in a single burst of attention.

15. John is scheduled for an evaluation by Dr. Marion Haste. It would be helpful to share this evaluation with Dr. Haste also to discuss with him John’s skin-twisting, lip-pulling, and other mannerisms.

I hope that John’s parents and teachers will feel free to contact me at 555-1212 to arrange for further discussion of these findings and
recommendations. Please leave an evening as well as a daytime telephone number.

Marge N. O’Verra, M.Ed., S.A.I.F.
Assessment Specialist
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