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**CONTENT**

**Mather, N., & Jaffe, L. (2016). *Woodcock-Johnson IV: Reports, recommendations, and strategies***(with secret, unique password for a huge website for the book)*.* Hoboken, NJ: Wiley.

There was a glitch at Wiley in getting the website for *Reports, Recommendations, and Strategies* up and running. (A computer glitch? Astounding! Unprecedented!) It is now working so well that even I was able to download the files and save them. A sealed card with instructions and your password is attached to the inside back cover of the book. Be the first kid on your block to get both the book and the downloads.

**1848 intellectual assessment.** Alfred Binet is generally and deservedly credited with beginning the development of modern-style intelligencetests that use questions, puzzles, and other tasks rather than using psychophysical measurements. However, Samuel Gridley Howe's (1848) report of the Massachusetts Commission charged with examining "idiocy" [*sic*] in the state included, along with many physical measurements, observations, and historical data, some measures of cognitive ability, most on an ascending scale in which a rating of 10 indicated parity with persons the same age who had no recognizable disabilities. The cognitive ratings included "Sensibility to Musical Sounds," "Skill in the Use of Language," "Capacity for fixing Sight upon visible Objects" (persons who were blind were marked 0), "Ability to count," "Degree of Ability to support Themselves," and "Teachable, or not" (pp. 97-100).

Howe, S. G. (Chairman of the Commission) (1848). Report made to the Legislature of Massachusetts upon idiocy. Boston, MA: Coolidge and Wiley. Retrieved from <https://archive.org/stream/66450930R.nlm.nih.gov/66450930R#page/n5/mode/2up> (Click on a right-side page to turn the page forward and on a left-side page to turn back.)

<https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Samuel_Gridley_Howe>

**Leiter-3.** School psychologist and super sleuth Beth Sheridan persistently tracked down and kindly sent me a copy of a "**Leiter-3 Updated Proof for Appendices Mailing**" dated June 2014. It includes replacement tables for the Appendix D.1 (Nonverbal IQ Equivalents) and Appendix L (Equating Table for the Conversion of Leiter-R to Leiter-3 with Confidence Intervals) on pp. 238, 278, and 279 of the Manual. The corrections are based on "extensive new analyses."

I cannot find these important corrections on the publisher's website <http://www.stoeltingco.com/psychologicaltesting/intellectual-cognititve/nonverbal/leiter-3-kit-in-rolling-backpack.html> nor at websites of other publishers who carry the test, such as <http://www.mhs.com/(S(jc041fe2effa1iywrxzoit45))/product.aspx?gr=edu&prod=leiter3&id=resources#techInfo> or <http://www4.parinc.com/Products/Product.aspx?ProductID=LEITER-3>, nor by Googling. Apparently, Stoelting mailed the corrections to purchasers of record (such as your business manger's administrative assistant), but is not making it easy for other users of the test to learn about the corrections. This embarrasses me because I keep telling students and workshop participants to keep revisiting publishers' web pages for all the tests they use so they will be able to keep up to date on corrections, product recalls (such as test materials with lead-based paint) and new interpretive information (e.g., <http://www.pearsonclinical.com/psychology/products/100000771/wechsler-intelligence-scale-for-childrensupsupfifth-edition--wisc-v.html#tab-resources>).

If you want a copy of the two corrected tables, please email me at [johnzerowillis@yahoo.com](mailto:johnzerowillis@yahoo.com). If I do not reply within a week, please email me again. I am hopelessly behind on everything.

**Factor Structure of Tests** (unsubstantiated opinion)**.** A great deal of data and opinion (some random examples are listed below) has been published on the subject of cognitive ability tests measuring only a single factor (*g*) with evaluators being admonished not to interpret such tests beyond the total score. In most cases, I respectfully disagree. The fact that factor analysis (by some methods) does not show much statistical support for interpreting factors beyond an overall, first factor, total proxy for *g* does not prove to me that there are no individuals who may show significant and educationally meaningful differences between tested abilities. In the general population (and therefore the norming samples for well-constructed tests) cognitive abilities are highly correlated with each other and therefore with the highest order general factor for a test. This may not be the case for an individual who gets referred for testing.  To take an extreme example, a person who was profoundly deaf and a person who was totally blind would each presumably show significant differences between the verbal and the nonverbal composite scales of cognitive ability tests, no matter how highly the two scales might be correlated for groups of examinees.

For example, a person with a severe weakness in *Gsm* might score much lower on a Working Memory composite of a test battery than on the other scales.  I think that the fact that the norming sample (taken from the general population) demonstrates fairly high correlations between *Gsm* and other abilities actually strengthens the conclusion of weak *Gsm*. Research with samples of persons identified with specific learning disabilities may not be much help, in my opinion, unless the samples differentiate between different types of learning disabilities. For one example, kids with auditory problems might cancel out kids with visual perceptual problems in a sample of students with learning disabilities.

Group data are tremendously important, and I am not quarreling with the arithmetic, but as an evaluator, I have to focus on the individual and how that individual differs from the norm. Magnitude matters, too. A difference between two factor scores of, for example, 30 standard score points is likely to be meaningful, even if the factors are not strong for the standardization sample.

I have long regretted a review I published years ago of an oral language test. I made a snotty comment about the fact that the receptive and expressive language scales were highly correlated with each other and therefore, I wrote, the test was measuring only one general oral language ability. I was wrong. Receptive and expressive language abilities are highly correlated in the general population. That does not mean that any given individual might not have widely discrepant receptive and expressive abilities and did not mean that the test I was maligning would not be useful in finding that disparity. Factor analysis with the scores from the norming sample would yield only one general factor, but a referred student might well demonstrate a valid and educationally meaningful disparity between the two measures.

Consequently, I continue to align myself with the many distinguished authors who have advocated for variations of Alan Kaufman's "intelligent testing" and who recognize that even when abilities are highly correlated in the general population, an individual may demonstrate important variability with instructional implications. The instructional implications are my reason for testing, if not my reason for being.

**Canivez, G. L.,** & McGill, R. J. (2016, January 25). [Factor structure of the Differential Ability Scales–Second Edition: Exploratory and hierarchical factor analyses with the core subtests.](http://www.ux1.eiu.edu/~cfglc/Adobe%20pdf/Publications-Papers/Canivez%20&%20McGill%20(2016)%20DAS-II%20H-EFA%20Core%20Subtests.pdf) Psychological Assessment. Advance online publication. doi: 10.1037/pas0000279

**Canivez, G. L.,** Watkins, M. W., & Dombrowski, S. C. (2015, November 26). [Factor structure of the Wechsler Intelligence Scale for Children–Fifth Edition: Exploratory  factor analyses with the 16 primary and secondary subtests.](http://www.ux1.eiu.edu/~cfglc/Adobe%20pdf/Publications-Papers/Canivez,%20Watkins,%20&%20Dombrowski%20(2015,%20November%2016)%20WISC-V%20H-EFA.pdf) Psychological Assessment. Advance online publication. doi: 10.1037/pas0000238

McDermott, P. A., Fantuzzo, J. W., & Glutting, J. J. (1990). Just say no to subtest analysis: A critique on Wechsler theory and practice. *Journal of Psychoeducational Assessment, 8*, 290-302.

McDermott, P. A., Fantuzzo, J. W., Glutting, J. J., Watkins, M. W., & Baggaley, A. R. (1992). Illusions of meaning in the ipsative assessment of children's ability. *Journal of Special Education, 25,* 504-526.

Nelson, J. M., & **Canivez, G. L.** (2012). [Examination of the structural, convergent, and incremental validity of the Reynolds Intellectual Assessment Scales (RIAS) with a clinical sample.](http://www.ux1.eiu.edu/~cfglc/Adobe%20pdf/Publications-Papers/Nelson%20&%20Canivez%20(2012)%20RIAS%20Validity.pdf) Psychological Assessment, 24, 129-140. doi: 10.1037/a0024878

Nelson, J. M., **Canivez, G. L.,** & Watkins, M. W. (2013). [Structural and incremental validity of the Wechsler Adult Intelligence Scale–Fourth Edition (WAIS–IV) with a clinical sample.](http://www.ux1.eiu.edu/~cfglc/Adobe%20pdf/Publications-Papers/Nelson%20et%20al.%20(2013)%20WAIS-IV%20Validity.pdf) Psychological Assessment, 25, 618-630. doi: 10.1037/a0032086

Watkins, M. W., Glutting, J. J., & Lei, P-W (2007). Validity of the Full-Scale IQ when there is significant variability among WISC-III and WISC-IV Factor Scores. *Applied Neuropsychology*, *14*, (1), 13–20.

Watkins, M. W., & Kush, J. C. (1994). WISC-R subtest analysis: The right way, the wrong way, or no way? *School Psychology Review, 23,* 640-651.

**Upgrading.** For the past four years, University of New Hampshire professor Therese Willkomm has been seeking donations of discarded campaign signs for use in her occupational therapy classes, where students cut up the corrugated plastic to create assistive items ranging from tabletop iPad stands to a clip that can hold a sandwich for someone who can't use his arms. "We noticed that there were tons of election signs all over and they were made of this corrugated plastic material, and we thought, 'Holy cow, we can make tons of assistive technology solutions for people with disabilities. We can get a bumper crop of these signs coming in,'" Willkomm said. "And so we contacted the Democratic Party and the Republican Party and we asked them if they could donate the discarded election signs. We are now up to over 78 items you can make for people with disabilities using these election sign materials."

<http://bigstory.ap.org/article/8d10a794c5214502ba0c1d50f4a1f015/campaign-signs-get-new-life-help-people-disabilities>

**STYLE**

Don’t write merely to be understood. Write so that you cannot possibly be misunderstood.

– Robert Louis Stevenson

It's easy to lie with statistics, but it's hard to tell the truth without them.

– Andrejs Dunkels

**Pat is serviced by the occupational therapist.** According to the *American Heritage Dictionary of the English Language* (5th ed.), "service" does mean "2. To provide services to." However, it also means, "1. To make fit for use, adjust, repair, or maintain: *service a car*," "3. To make interest payments on (a debt)," and "4a. To copulate with (a female animal). Used of a male animal, especially studs. b. *slang* To have sex with." We might want a different verb or verb phrase, such as "receives services from."

**Why do I use stanine classification labels for test scores and encourage my students to pick one classification system and use it for all test scores in a report?**

\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

*Cassandra Prophet Brief Reading Screening page 19*

comprehension was even lower than her scores for oral reading of words and phonetically regular nonsense words. One reason for Cassandra's weak reading comprehension might be her limited oral reading fluency, which is discussed below.

**Oral Reading Fluency**

Cassandra's scaled score for oral reading fluency on the GORT-5 was 5 (percentile rank 5), Poor1,2,3 for her age. Her oral reading fluency may have been diminished by her weak rapid automatized naming (RAN). On the Woodcock-Johnson III (WJ III), Cassandra's standard score for Rapid Picture Naming was 75 (percentile rank 5), Low4 for her age.5 Another factor might be Cassandra's slow visual and visual-motor processing speed. On the Wechsler Intelligence Scale for Children (WISC-IV), Cassandra's standard score for the Processing Speed Index (PSI) was 75 (percentile rank 5), Borderline6 for her age.

To rule out limited oral vocabulary as a factor in Cassandra's Low Rapid Picture Naming on the WJ III, Cassandra was administered the Peabody Picture Vocabulary Test (PPVT-4), on each item of which the examiner names one of four pictures on a page and the student tries to select the correct picture. On this test of receptive oral vocabulary, Cassandra achieved a standard score of 75 (percentile rank 5), Moderately Low for her age.7

Cassandra's difficulties with oral reading fluency become crystal clear when we compare her Poor score on the GORT-51 to her Borderline PSI score on the WISC-IV,5 her Moderately Low score on the PPVT-4,6 and her Low score on the WJ III3 Rapid Picture Naming.

\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

1. Most of Cassandra's other academic achievement test scores in this report are from the Wechsler Individual Achievement Test (WIAT-III), on which a scaled score of 5 would be statistically equivalent to a standard score of 75, which would be classified as Below Average, rather than Poor. Please see the explanation of test scores on p. i of the Appendix to this report.

2. However, we are comparing Cassandra's academic achievement test scores to her intellectual ability scores on the Wechsler Intelligence Scale for Children (WISC-IV). A standard score of 75 on the WISC-IV would be classified as Borderline. Cassandra also took the PPVT-4, on which a standard score of 75 would be classified as Moderately Low. Please see the explanation of test scores on p. i of the Appendix to this report.

3. A Poor classification on the GORT-5 is equivalent to a Borderline score on the WISC-IV, a Moderately Low score on the PPVT-4, a Below Average score on the WIAT-III, or a Low score on the WJ III.

4. The Low classification on the WJ III corresponds to Poor on the GORT-5, Moderately Low on the PPVT-4, Below Average on the WIAT-III, and Borderline on the WISC-IV. Please see the explanation of test scores on p. i of the Appendix to this report.

5. Rapid symbolic naming of letters is a much better predictor of reading achievement than rapid non-symbolic naming of pictures, but this was the only rapid naming subtest in our test closet.

6. The Borderline classification on the WISC-IV corresponds to a Poor score on the GORT-5, a Below Average score on the WIAT-III, a Moderately Low score on the PPVT-4, and a Low score on the WJ III. Please see the explanation of test scores on p. i of the Appendix to this report.

7. The Moderately Low classification on the PPVT-4 corresponds to a Borderline score on the WISC-IV, a Poor score on the GORT-5, a Below Average score on the WIAT-III, and a Low score on the WJ III. Please see the explanation of test scores on p. i of the Appendix to this report.

\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

**Plan B**: Pick or create one verbal classification scheme (e.g., Jerry Sattler's, Cathy Fiorello's, stanines, Woodcock-Johnson, WISC-IV, WISC-V, KTEA-3 10, KTEA-3 15, or some other you like, even if you did not administer the test for which it was developed) and use it with a note (repeated at least once in text and added as a footnote to each table): "In this report, all test scores are described with xxxxx verbal labels. The xxxxx classification labels are illustrated on p. i of the Appendix to this report and the classification labels offered by the publishers of the various tests are explained and illustrated on p. ii." Appended to this issue of *Report Comments* are my pages i and ii for the appendices to my reports. I delete all paragraphs and table rows for tests and types of scores not used with the victim of my current evaluation.

"It is customary to break down the continuum of IQ test scores into categories. . . . other reasonable systems for dividing scores into qualitative levels do exist, and the choice of the dividing points between different categories is fairly arbitrary. It is also unreasonable to place too much importance on the particular label (e.g., "borderline impaired') used by different tests that measure the same construct (intelligence, verbal ability, and so on)." [Roid, G. H. (2003). *Stanford-Binet Intelligence Scales, Fifth Edition, Examiner's Manual*. Itasca, IL: Riverside, p. 150.]

"*Qualitative descriptors are only suggestions and are not evidence-based; alternate terms may be used as appropriate*"[emphasis in original]. [Wechsler, D. (WISC-V Research Directors, S. E. Raiford & J. A. Holdnack) (2014). *Wechsler intelligence scale for children* (5th ed.): *Technical and interpretive manual.* Bloomington, MN: Pearson, p. 152.]

**SCORES USED WITH NAMEXX’S 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.

**STANDARD SCORES** ("quotients" on some tests) 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.

**SCALED SCORES** ("standard scores" on some tests) are standard scores with 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.

*V-***SCALE SCORES** have a *mean* of 15 and *standard deviation* of 3. A *v-*scale score of 16 would also be at the 63rd percentile rank and in Stanine 6. The middle half of *v-*scale scores falls between 13 and 17.

**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.

**BRUININKS-OSERETSKY** (BOT-2) subtest scores have a mean of 15 and standard deviation of 5. The middle half of BOT-2 subtest scores falls between approximately 12 and 18.

**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.

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | There are | 200 **&**s, so |  |  | **&&&&&** |  |  |  |  |
|  | each **&&** | = 1 % |  | **&&&&&&** | **&&&&&&&** | **&&&&&&** |  |  |  |
|  |  |  | **&&&** | **&&&&&&&** | **&&&&&&&** | **&&&&&&&** | **&&&** |  |  |
|  |  |  | **&&&&&&&** | **&&&&&&&** | **&&&&&&&** | **&&&&&&&** | **&&&&&&&** |  |  |
|  | **&** | **&&&&&&&** | **&&&&&&&** | **&&&&&&&** | **&&&&&&&** | **&&&&&&&** | **&&&&&&&** | **&&&&&&&** | **&** |
|  | **&&&&&&&** | **&&&&&&&** | **&&&&&&&** | **&&&&&&&** | **&&&&&&&** | **&&&&&&&** | **&&&&&&&** | **&&&&&&&** | **&&&&&&&** |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| **Stanine** | **1** | **2** | **3** | **4** | **5** | **6** | **7** | **8** | **9** |
|  | **Very** |  | **Below** | **Low** |  | **High** | **Above** |  | Very |
|  | **Low** | **Low** | **Average** | **Average** | **Average** | **Average** | **Average** | **High** | **High** |
|  | 4% | 7% | 12% | 17% | 20% | 17% | 12% | 7% | 4% |
| Percentile | 1 - 4 | 4 – 11 | 11 - 23 | 23 - 40 | 40 - 60 | 60 - 77 | 77 - 89 | 89 - 96 | 96 -99 |
| Standard Score | - 73 | 74 - 81 | 82 - 88 | 89 - 96 | 97 - 103 | 104 - 111 | 112- 118 | 119 - 126 | 127 - |
| Scaled Score | 1 - 4 | 5 6 | 7 | 8 9 | 10 | 11 12 | 13 | 14 15 | 16 - 19 |
| *v*-score | 1 - 9 | 10 11 | 12 | 13 14 | 15 | 16 17 | 18 | 19 20 | 21 - 24 |
| T Score | - 32 | 33 - 37 | 38 - 42 | 43 - 47 | 48 - 52 | 53 - 57 | 58 - 62 | 63 -67 | 68 - |
| BOT-2 subtests | 1 - 6 | 7 8 | 9 10 11 | 12 13 | 14 15 16 | 17 18 | 19 20 21 | 22 23 | 24 - 30 |

Adapted from Willis, J. O. & Dumont, R. P., *Guide to Identification of Learning Disabilities* (3rd ed.) (Peterborough, NH: Authors, 2002, pp. 39-40). Also available at <http://www.myschoolpsychology.com/testing-information/sample-explanations-of-classification-labels/>

**SCORES NOT USED WITH THE TESTS IN THIS REPORT (GIVEN FOR REFERENCE)**

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.

**STANDARD SCORES** ("quotients" on some tests) 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.

**SCALED SCORES** ("standard scores on some tests) are standard scores with 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.

*V-***SCALE SCORES** have a *mean* of 15 and *standard deviation* of 3. A *v-*scale score of 15 would also be at the 50th percentile rank and in Stanine 5. The middle half of *v-*scale scores falls between 13 and 17.

**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.

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  |  | |  | |  | | **&& &&** | |  | |  | |  |
|  | There are | | 200 **&**s. | |  | | **&&&&&& &&&&&&** | |  | |  | |  |
|  | each **&&** | | = 1%. | |  | | **&&&&&& &&&&&&** | |  | |  | |  |
|  |  | |  | | **&&** | | **&&&&&& &&&&&&** | | **&&** | |  | |  |
|  |  | |  | | **&&&&&&** | | **&&&&&& &&&&&&** | | **&&&&&&** | |  | |  |
|  |  | |  | | **&&&&&&** | | **&&&&&& &&&&&&** | | **&&&&&&** | |  | |  |
|  |  | | **&** | | **&&&&&&** | | **&&&&&& &&&&&&** | | **&&&&&&** | | **&** | |  |
|  |  | | **&&&&&&** | | **&&&&&&** | | **&&&&&& &&&&&&** | | **&&&&&&** | | **&&&&&&** | |  |
|  | **& & & &** | | **&&&&&&** | | **&&&&&&** | | **&&&&&& &&&&&&** | | **&&&&&&** | | **&&&&&&** | | **& & & &** |
|  | |  | |  | |  | |  | |  | |  | |  |
| Percent in each | | 2.2% | | 6.7% | | 16.1% | | 50% | | 16.1% | | 6.7% | | 2.2% |
| Standard Scores | | – 69 | | 70 – 79 | | 80 – 89 | | 90 – 109 | | 110 – 119 | | 120 – 129 | | 130 – |
| Scaled Scores | | 1 2 3 | 4 5 | | 6 7 | | 8 9 10 11 | | 12 13 | | 14 15 | | 16 17 18 19 | |
| *V-*Scale Scores | | 1 – 8 | 9 10 | | 11 12 | | 13 14 15 16 | | 17 18 | | 19 20 | | 21 – 24 | |
| T Scores | | – 29 | | 30 – 36 | | 37 – 42 | | 43 – 56 | | 57 – 62 | | 63 – 69 | | 70 – |
| z-scores | | < –2.00 | | –2.00 - –1.34 | | –1.33 - –0.68 | | –0.67 – 0.66 | | 0.67 – 1.32 | | 1.33 – 1.99 | | 2.00 – |
| Bruininks-Oseretsky | | 0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25 26 27 28 | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Percentile Ranks | | – 02 | | 03 – 08 | | 09 – 24 | | 25 – 74 | | 75 – 90 | | 91 – 97 | | 98 – |
| WISC-V  Classification | | Extremely Low | | Very  Low | | Low  Average | | Average | | High  Average | | Very  High | | Extremely High |
| Other Wechsler  Classification | | Extremely Low | | Borderline | | Low  Average | | Average | | High  Average | | Superior | | Very  Superior |
| WRAT4 Classification | | Lower Extreme | | Low | | Below Average | | Average | | Above Average | | Superior | | Upper Extreme |
| DAS & VMI  Classification | | Very  Low | | Low | | Below  Average | | Average | | Above  Average | | High | | Very  High |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| RIAS  Classification | Significantly Below Av. | | Moderately Below Av. | | | | | Below  Average | | | | | | Average | | | | Above  Average | | | | | | Moderately Above Av. | | | | Significantly Above Av. | | | |
| Stanford-Binet Classification | Moder-ately Impaired  40-54 | Mildly Impaired  55-69 | Borderline | | | | | Low  Average | | | | | | Average | | | | High Average | | | | | | Superior | | | | Gifted  130-144 | | Very Gifted 145-160 | |
| Leiter Classification | Mod-erate  Delay  40-54 | Very Low/ Mild Delay  55-69 | Low | | | | | Below  Average | | | | | | Average | | | | Above Average | | | | | | High | | | | Very High/  Gifted | | | |
| Severe Delay =  30 – 39 |
| Woodcock-Johnson Classif. | Very  Low | | Low | | | | | Low  Average | | | | | | Average  (90 – 110) | | | | | High Average  (111 – 120) | | | | | | Superior  (121 – 130) | | | | Very Superior  (131 – ) | | |
| Pro-Ed  Classification | Very  Poor | | Poor | | | | | Below  Average | | | | | | Average | | | | | Above Average | | | | | | Superior | | | | Very Superior | | |
| OWLS-II Classification | Deficient  – 69 | | Below Average 70 – 84 | | | | | | | Average  85 – 115 | | | | | | | | | | | | Above Average  116 – 130 | | | | | | | Exceptional 131 – | | |
| KTEA-3 15-pt.  Classification | Very Low  40-54 | Low 55-69 | Below Average  70 – 84 | | | | | | | Average  85 – 115 | | | | | | | | | | | | Above Average  116 – 130 | | | | | | | High 131-145 | | Very  High  146-160 |
| KTEA-3 10-pt. Classification | Very Low  – 69 | | Low  70 – 79 | | | | Below Average | | | | | | Average  (90 – 109) | | | | | | Above Average | | | | | | High  120 – 129 | | | | Very High  130 – | | |
| WIAT-III Classification | Very Low  <55 | Low  55 – 69 | Below Average 70 – 84 | | | | | | | Average  85 – 115 | | | | | | | | | | | | Above Average  116 – 130 | | | | | | | Super-ior  131-145 | | Very Super-ior 146 – |
| Vineland Adaptive Levels | Low  – 70 | | | Moderately Low  71 – 85 | | | | | | | Adequate or Average  86 – 114 | | | | | | | | | | Moderately High  115 – 129 | | | | | | High  130 – | | | | |
| PPVT-4 Classifications | Extremely Low | | | Moderately Low | | | | | | | Low | | | | | High | | | | | Moderately High | | | | | | Extremely High | | | | |
| Average | | | | | | | | | |
| CELF-4 Classifications | Very Low  – 70 | | | Low  71 – 77 | | Borderline  78 – 85 | | | | | Average  86 – 114 | | | | | | | | | | Above Average  115 – | | | | | | | | | | |
| Stanines | Very Low  – 73 | | | | Low  74 – 81 | | | | Below Average 82 - 88 | | | Low Average  89 – 96 | | | Average  97 – 103 | | High Average  104 - 111 | | | Above Average 112 – 118 | | | High  119 – 126 | | | Very High  127 – | | | | | |

Adapted from Willis, J. O. & Dumont, R. P., *Guide to Identification of Learning Disabilities* (3rd ed.) Peterborough, NH: Authors, 2002, pp. 39-40). Also available at <http://www.myschoolpsychology.com/testing-information/sample-explanations-of-classification-labels/>

**RELATIVE PROFICIENCY INDEXES (RPI)** show the examinee's level of proficiency (accuracy, speed, or whatever is being measured) at the level at which peers are 90% proficient. An RPI of 90/90 would mean that, at the difficulty level at which peers were 90% proficient, the examinee was also 90% proficient. An RPI of 95/90 would indicate that the examinee was 95% proficient at the same level at which peers were only 90% proficient. An RPI of 75/90 would mean that the examinee was only 75% proficient at the same difficulty level at which peers were 90% proficient.

**RPI Proficiency with Age- or Grade-Level Tasks Age- or Grade-Level Tasks will be:**

100/90 Very Advanced Extremely Easy

98/90 to 100/90 Advanced Very Easy

95/90 to 98/90 Average to Advanced Easy

82/90 to 95/90 Average Manageable

67/90 to 82/90 Limited to Average Difficult

24/90 to 67/90 Limited Very Difficult

3/90 to 24/90 Very Limited Extremely Difficult

0/90 to 3/90 Extremely Limited Nearly Impossible

Adapted from Jaffe, L. E. (2009). *Development, interpretation, and application of the* W *score and the relative proficiency index* (Woodcock-Johnson III Assessment Service Bulletin No. 11). Rolling Meadows, IL:Riverside Publishing. <http://www.riverpub.com/products/wjIIIComplete/pdf/WJ3_ASB_11.pdf> and from Mather, N, & Jaffe L. E.(2015). *Woodcock-Johnson IV: Reports, recommendations, and strategies.* Hoboken, NJ: Wiley.

**Sponsored by the Association of Specialists in Assessment of Intellectual Functioning (ASAIF)**

***Care and Feeding of the KTEA-3***

***An ASAIF Shorty***

Presenter: John O. Willis, Ed.D., SAIF

Senior Lecturer in Assessment, Rivier University; Assessment Specialist, Regional Services and Education Center

[johnzerowillis@yahoo.com](mailto:johnzerowillis@yahoo.com) [jwillis@rivier.edu](mailto:jwillis@rivier.edu) <http://www.myschoolpsychology.com>

**Date: Friday 18 March, 2016 Location: Nackey S. Loeb**

**Time: 5:00 p.m. – 8:00 p.m. School of Communications**

**Registration: 4:30 p.m. 749 East Industrial Park Drive**

**Manchester, New Hampshire 03109**

[**http://loebschool.org**](http://loebschool.org) **(603) 627-0005**

**Cost:** ASAIF Members **$35**, Nonmembers **$45**. (Nonmember rate for one's first Shorty of the school year plus $15 [a total of $60] confers membership through 8/31/16.\*) **(Fee includes coffee and other beverages, fruit, cheese, and cookies. Please bring your own supper.)**

**Certificates will be given for 3 clock hours or 3 NASP-approved CPD credits.**

\* MEMBERSHIP: Become a member of ASAIF for $25 per year: swasey@comcast.net (Lisa Swasey, SAIF). ASAIF membership years runs September 1 through August 31.

The KTEA-3 is trademarked and copyrighted by Pearson Education. This is **not** in any way an official Pearson training, merely the observations and opinions of an opinionated practitioner.

This ASAIF Shorty will outline best practices in the administration, scoring, and interpretation of the KTEA-3. Valuable subtests from other instruments will be mentioned where their special characteristics and unique features might recommend them as supplements to the KTEA-3.

**Objectives.** Participants will be able to:

* (with supervised practice if unfamiliar with the test) administer, score, and interpret the KTEA-3
* (if familiar with the test) refine administration, scoring, and interpretation of the KTEA-3
* select and interpret additional subtests or tests to supplement the KTEA-3
* develop meaningful interpretations of achievement test results
* develop helpful recommendations based on results of achievement testing (within the participant's range of expertise in instructional methods and materials)
* avoid common pitfalls and horrendous errors in assessment of academic achievement and not become a horrid example for some future workshop.

**Recommended Reading:**

<http://www.myschoolpsychology.com>

Breaux, K.C., & Lichtenberger, E. O. (in press). *Essentials of WIAT-III and KTEA-3 assessment.*  Hoboken, NJ: Wiley.

Dumont, R., & Willis, J. O. (in press). Strengths and weaknesses of the KTEA-3 and WIAT-III. In K. C. Breaux & E. O. Lichtenberger. *Essentials of WIAT-III and KTEA-3 assessment.*  Hoboken, NJ: Wiley.

Farrall, M. L. (2012). *Reading assessment: Linking language, literacy, and cognition.* Hoboken, NJ: Wiley.

Flanagan, D. P., Ortiz, S. O., & Alfonso, V. C. (2013). *Essentials of Cross-Battery Assessment* (3rd ed.). Hoboken, NJ: Wiley. See also <http://www.crossbattery.com/>.

Flanagan, D. P., Ortiz, S. O., & Alfonso, V. C. (2015). *Cross-Battery Assessment Software System (X-BASS) access card*. ISBN: 978-1-119-05639-3. <http://www.wiley.com/WileyCDA/WileyTitle/productCd-111905639X.html> See also <http://www.crossbattery.com/>

# Flanagan, D. P., Ortiz, S. O., Alfonso, V. & Mascolo, J. T. (2006). *Achievement test desk reference (ATDR-3): A guide to learning disability identification* (2nd ed.). New York, NY: Wiley.

Kilpatrick, D. A. (2015). *Essentials of assessing, preventing, and overcoming reading difficulties.* Hoboken, NJ: Wiley.

Lichtenberger, E. O., Mather, N., Kaufman, N. L., & Kaufman, A. S. (2004). *Essentials of assessment report writing.*  New York, NY: Wiley.

Mather, N., & Jaffe, L. E. (2016). *Woodcock-Johnson IV: Reports, recommendations, and strategies* (with password for web site)*.* Hoboken, NJ: Wiley.

Mather, N., & Wendling, B. J. (2015). *Essentials of WJ IV tests of achievement.* Hoboken, NJ: Wiley.

Mather, N., Wendling, B. J., & Roberts, R. (2nd ed.) (2009). *Writing assessment and instruction for students with learning disabilities* (2nd ed.). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Willis, J. O., & Dumont, R. P. (2002). *Guide to identification of learning disabilities* (3rd ed.). Peterborough, NH: authors. Available from authors: print copy from johnzerowillis@yahoo.com or CD from [dumont @fdu.edu](mailto:dumont@mailbox.fdu.edu).

*Opportunities for questions, comments, and dissent can be anticipated.*

Registrations will be accepted through Monday 14 March **if we get sufficient enrollment by Friday 11 March in order to hold this workshop,** so **please let us know by March 11 if possible!** We are unable to provide refunds for cancellations after March 11 unless this event is cancelled by ASAIF.

**There will be no confirmation letter. Only those who cannot be accommodated will be contacted.**

For further information, dietary needs, and accommodations for participants with disabilities, please email

[gingermentel@gmail.com](mailto:gingermentel@gmail.com)

Please copy and return this form with payment to: Lisa Zack-Swasey

(We cannot accept credit cards.) 42 Ole Gordon Road

Brentwood, NH 03833

[swasey@comcast.net](mailto:swasey@comcast.net)

Name: \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_ School/Affiliation\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

Email Address: \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_ Telephone\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

Are you available at this email address the evening before the workshop, in case of last-minute cancellation? (e.g., Snow, Ice, or Flood Day) Yes \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_ No \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

**Alternate Email or Telephone for Evening Contact** ***(Essential!!)*** \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

KTEA-3 Shorty. 3.18.15

Sponsored by the Association of Specialists in the Assessment of Intellectual Functioning (ASAIF)

Educational Assessment of Phonological Skills:

Test of Phonological Processing, Second Edition (CTOPP-2) and Other Tests

An ASAIF Shorty

Presented by John O. Willis, Ed.D., SAIF

Date: **Fri**day 1 April 2016 Location: Nackey S. Loeb

Time: 5:00 p.m. – 8:00 p.m. School of Communications

Registration: 4:30 p.m. 749 East Industrial Park Drive

Manchester, NH 03109

http://www.loebschool.org/

(603) 627-0005

Cost: ASAIF Members $35, Nonmembers $45.  (Nonmember rate for one's first Shorty of the school year plus $15 [a total of $60] confers membership through 8/31/14.\*)  (Fee includes coffee and other beverages, fruit, cheese, and cookies. Please bring your own supper.)

Certificates will be given for 3 clock hours or 3 NASP-approved CPD credits.

[*Please* register early!]

\* MEMBERSHIP: Become a member of ASAIF for $25 per year: swasey@comcast.net (Lisa Swasey, SAIF). ASAIF membership years runs September 1 through August 31.

The CTOPP-2 is trademarked and copyrighted by Pro-Ed, Inc. This is **not** in any way an official Pro-Ed training, merely the observations and opinions of an opinionated practitioner.

This Shorty presents the new and expanded Comprehensive Test of Phonological Processing, Second Edition (Richard K. Wagner, Joseph K. Torgesen, Carol A. Rashotte, & Nils A. Pearson, Pro-Ed, 2013, <http://www.proedinc.com/customer/productview.aspx?id=5187>). We will review administration and scoring, the slightly expanded content, interpretive options, threshold effects in the predictive validity of phonological awareness for reading, the strengths and weaknesses of and errors in the CTOPP-2, and suggestions for incorporating the CTOPP-2 into an academic, psychological, or speech and language assessment. This is not an official Pro-Ed workshop, but a discussion from the viewpoint of a practitioner. We will also discuss other tests of phonemic and phonological processing.

Each participant will be given a CD containing background information and reporting forms that might somehow prove useful.

Learning Objectives: Following this Shorty, participants will be able to . . .

* follow the necessary additional steps to master administration and scoring of the CTOPP-2,
* determine when to include the CTOPP-2 in an educational, psychological, or speech and language evaluation,
* consider other tests to supplement or supplant the CTOPP-2
* clearly present and explain the results of an assessment,
* interpret phonological test results clearly, coherently, and usefully, and
* offer recommendations based in part on phonological test results.

Suggested Reading:

<http://www.myschoolpsychology.com>

Farrall, M. L. (2012). *Reading assessment: Linking language, literacy, and cognition.* Hoboken, NJ: Wiley.

Flanagan, D. P., Ortiz, S. O., & Alfonso, V. C. (2013). *Essentials of Cross-Battery Assessment* (3rd ed.). Hoboken, NJ: Wiley. See also <http://www.crossbattery.com/>.

Flanagan, D. P., Ortiz, S. O., & Alfonso, V. C. (2015). *Cross-Battery Assessment Software System (X-BASS) access card*. ISBN: 978-1-119-05639-3. <http://www.wiley.com/WileyCDA/WileyTitle/productCd-111905639X.html> See also <http://www.crossbattery.com/>

Kilpatrick, D. A. (2012). Not all phonological awareness tests are created equal: Considering the practical validity of phonological manipulation vs. segmentation. *Communiqué, 40*(6), 31–33.

Kilpatrick, D. A. (2014). Tailoring interventions in reading based on emerging research on the development of word recognition skills. In J. T. Mascolo, D. P. Flanagan, & V. C. Alfonso (Eds.), *Essentials of planning, selecting and tailoring intervention: Addressing the needs of the unique learner* (pp. 123-150)*.* Hoboken, NJ: Wiley.

Kilpatrick, D. A. (2015a). *Essentials of assessing, preventing, and overcoming reading difficulties.* Hoboken, NJ: Wiley.

Kilpatrick, D. A. (2015b). *Equipped for reading success: A comprehensive, step-by-step program for developing phonemic awareness and fluent word recognition*. Syracuse, NY: Casey & Kirsch.

Lichtenberger, E. O., Mather, N., Kaufman, N. L., & Kaufman, A. S. (2004). *Essentials of assessment report writing.*  New York, NY: Wiley.

Willis, J. O., & Dumont, R. P. (2002). *Guide to identification of learning disabilities* (3rd ed.). Peterborough, NH: authors. Available from authors: print copy from johnzerowillis@yahoo.com or CD from [dumont @fdu.edu](mailto:dumont@mailbox.fdu.edu).

Registrations will be accepted through Monday 28 March, **but only if** we get sufficient enrollment by Friday 25 March in order to hold this Shorty, so please let us know by Friday 25 March, if possible! We are unable to provide refunds for cancellations after 25 March unless this event is cancelled by ASAIF.

There will be no confirmation letter. Only those who cannot be accommodated will be contacted.

For further information, dietary needs, and accommodations for participants with disabilities, please email [gingermentel@gmail.com](mailto:gingermentel@gmail.com)

*--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------*

Please copy and return this form with payment to: Lisa Zack-Swasey

(We cannot accept credit cards.) 42 Ole Gordon Road

Brentwood, NH 03833

[swasey@comcast.net](mailto:swasey@comcast.net)

Name: \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_ School/Affiliation\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

Email Address: \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_ Telephone\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

Are you available at this email address the evening before the workshop, in case of last-minute cancellation? Yes \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_ No \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

Alternate Email or Telephone for Evening Contact (Essential!!) \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

CTOPP-2 Shorty 4/1/16

**Sponsored by the Association of Specialists in the Assessment of Intellectual Functioning (ASAIF)**

Woodcock-Johnson**®**, Fourth Edition (WJ IV):

ASAIF Full Day Workshop

Presented by Jill A. Hartmann, M.Ed., SAIF, & John O. Willis, Ed.D., SAIF

**Date: May 2016 Location: Nackey S. Loeb**

**Time: 8:30 a.m. – 3:30 p.m. School of Communications**

**Registration: 8:00 a.m. 749 East Industrial Park Drive**

**Manchester, NH 03109**

**http://www.loebschool.org/**

(603) 627-0005

**Cost:** ASAIF Members **$150**, Nonmembers **$175**.  (Nonmember rate confers membership through 8/31/16 upon request.)  **(Fee includes continental breakfast and bag lunch.)**

**Certificates will be given for 6 clock hours or 6 NASP-approved CPD credits.**

The WJ IV is trademarked and copyrighted by Riverside Publishing/Houghton Mifflin Harcourt. This is **not** in any way an official Riverside Publishing/Houghton Mifflin Harcourt training, merely the observations and opinions of two practitioners.

This presentation is designed to give an in-depth examination of the new WJ IV. Participants may or may not be familiar with the WJ III. The WJ IV (<http://www.riversidepublishing.com/wj-iv>) has been redesigned to provide more comprehensive data on a child’s abilities. It is administered in a paper and pencil format.

Learning Objectives: Following this workshop, participants will be able to . . .

* Take the steps needed to gain proficiency in administering and scoring the WJ IV;
* Describe and explain the WJ IV subtests and composites;
* Score the WJ IV efficiently and accurately;
* Determine when the WJ IV is an appropriate choice for a student's evaluation;
* Use the various scoring and interpretive options;
* Make reasonable interpretations of evaluation results; and
* Communicate findings clearly and sensitively.

Our Presenters: **Jill Hartmann** is a Specialist in Assessment of Intellectual Functioning in SAU 24 and Director of the Hartmann Learning Center ([www.hartmannlearning.com](http://www.hartmannlearning.com)) in Chester, NH. She is an experienced teacher, tutor, and educational evaluator and has been directly involved in the field of education for 15 years. She has taught most grade levels from 1st grade through 8th grade and holds multiple certifications. With experience teaching Math, Language Arts, Social Studies, Special Education, and Gifted programs, she has a wealth of knowledge to bring to her students. As an educational evaluator, Jill has worked with children of all ages to help recognize their academic strengths and weaknesses. By recognizing academic strengths and weaknesses, educational experiences can be tailored to promote individual learning. Making the connection between evaluation results and appropriate educational interventions is a priority for Jill. She has worked with some leading test publication companies as a field researcher and participated in the norming process of several evaluation tools including the KTEA-II, KABC-II, and KeyMath 3. She is currently working as a field researcher on projects scheduled to be published in 2015. Jill's certifications include Elementary Education (K-8), Specialist in the Assessment of Intellectual Functioning, General Special Education, Intellectual and Developmental Disabilities, and Specific Learning Disabilities in New Hampshire, and Elementary Education (1-6), Mathematics (5-8), and Moderate Disabilities (PreK-8) in Massachusetts. Jill is a doctoral candidate in the Leadership and Learning program at Rivier University.

**John Willis** began in special education as a volunteer in 1962. He is a Senior Lecturer at Rivier University, where he has taught part-time since 1980 and coordinated the SAIF Certification Program since 1984. Since 1969, he has been an Assessment Specialist and occasional administrator at the at the Crotched Mountain School, Greenfield, NH, Regional Services and Education Center, Amherst, NH.. John is author or co-author of several chapters, encyclopedia entries, articles, and books and co-author of chapters in *Essentials of WJ IV Assessment* (Mather & Wendling, 2015) and *WJ IV Clinical Use and Interpretation* (Flanagan & Alfonso, in preparation). He has been presenting workshops in the United States and Canada since 1976, with constant updates but no obvious improvement.

Suggested Reading:

<http://www.myschoolpsychology.com>

Mather, N., & Jaffe, L. (2016). *Woodcock-Johnson IV: Reports, recommendations, and strategies* (each copy with unique pin and link to the web site for the book)*.* Hoboken, NJ: Wiley.

Mather, N., & Wendling, B. J. (2015). *Essentials of WJ IV tests of achievement.* Hoboken, NJ: Wiley.

Schrank, F. A., Decker, S., & Garruto, J. (in preparation). *Essentials of WJ IV cognitive abilities assessment.* Hoboken, NJ: Wiley.

Registrations will be accepted until Wednesday before the conference, **but only if** we get sufficient enrollment by the previous Monday in order to hold this workshop, so please let us know as sooon as possible. We are unable to provide refunds for cancellations after the registration deadline unless this event is cancelled by ASAIF.

There will be no confirmation letter. Only those who cannot be accommodated will be contacted.

For further information, dietary needs, and accommodations for participants with disabilities, please email [gingermentel@gmail.com](mailto:gingermentel@gmail.com)

***-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------***

***Please copy and return this form with payment made out to ASAIF to:*** Lisa Zack-Swasey

(We cannot accept credit cards.) 42 Ole Gordon Road

***or*** Brentwood, NH 03833

***We also accept Purchase Orders (POs)*** [swasey@comcast.net](mailto:swasey@comcast.net)

Name:\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_ School/Affiliation\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

Email Address: \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_ Telephone\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

Are you available at this email address the evening before the workshop, in case of last-minute cancellation? Yes \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_ No \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

**Alternate Email or Telephone for Evening Contact** ***(Essential!!)*** \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

WJ IV May 2016