

University of Montana

## ScholarWorks at University of Montana

---

University of Montana Course Syllabi

Open Educational Resources (OER)

---

Fall 9-1-2018

### PSYX 525.01: Psych Evaluation I

Gregory R. Machek

*University of Montana - Missoula*, [greg.machek@umontana.edu](mailto:greg.machek@umontana.edu)

Follow this and additional works at: <https://scholarworks.umt.edu/syllabi>

**Let us know how access to this document benefits you.**

---

#### Recommended Citation

Machek, Gregory R., "PSYX 525.01: Psych Evaluation I" (2018). *University of Montana Course Syllabi*. 8330.

<https://scholarworks.umt.edu/syllabi/8330>

This Syllabus is brought to you for free and open access by the Open Educational Resources (OER) at ScholarWorks at University of Montana. It has been accepted for inclusion in University of Montana Course Syllabi by an authorized administrator of ScholarWorks at University of Montana. For more information, please contact [scholarworks@mso.umt.edu](mailto:scholarworks@mso.umt.edu).

# Syllabus

## Psyx525: Psychological Evaluation I

Fall 2018

### Meeting Location and Times:

Skaggs 246

Mon: 9:30-10:50

Wed: 9:30-10:50

“Optional” Q&A/Hands On Lab: Time & place TBA

**Instructor:** Greg Machek, Ph.D.

**Email:** [greg.machek@umontana.edu](mailto:greg.machek@umontana.edu)

**Office:** Skaggs Bldg 240

**Office Hours:** Monday: 11:00-12:00, Wednesday: 11:00-12:00, and by Appointment

**Teaching Assistant:** Emily Hattouni, Skaggs 368

**Email:** [emily.hattouni@umconnect.umt.edu](mailto:emily.hattouni@umconnect.umt.edu)

**Office Hours:** By Appt.

**Mailbox:** In the grad student mailboxes in student computer lab. Please note, however, that actual assignments will be handed into a designated box in the main psych office.

### Required Texts:

Sattler, J.M., (2018). *Assessment of Children: Cognitive Foundations and Applications, 6<sup>th</sup> Edition*. San Diego, CA: Jerome M. Sattler, Publisher, Inc.: La Mesa, CA

Sattler, J.M. & Ryan, J.J. (2009). *Assessment with the WAIS-IV*. Jerome M. Sattler, Publisher, Inc.: La Mesa, CA

### Additional Readings (Moodle):

Additional readings – or other material- will be available on Moodle.

### Recommended Texts:

Weiss, L.G., Saklofske, D.H., Holdnack, J.A., & Prifitera, A. (2016). *WISC-V Assessment and Interpretation: Scientist-Practitioner Perspectives*. London: Elsevier, Inc.

Lichtenberger, E. O., & Kaufman, A. S. (2009). *Essentials of WAIS-IV Assessment*. New York: Wiley.

Barram, R. A. & Roid, G. H. (2004). *Essentials of Stanford-Binet Intelligence Scales (SBV) Assessment*. Hoboken, NJ : Wiley.

## **Purpose and Rationale**

The main objective of this course is for students to develop competency in the use, scoring, interpretation, and write-up of commonly used tests of cognitive abilities. Students will further develop initial competence and familiarity with other cognitive measures that they may be asked to administer in professional settings.

## **Learning Goals:**

1. Acquire skill in the competent administration, scoring, and interpretation of several individual tests of cognitive functioning
2. Understand the history of intelligence testing
3. To understand the legal issues related to the administration and interpretation of intelligence tests
4. Understand practical uses of intelligence testing, including their limitations
5. Exhibit proficiency in relaying assessments results
6. To train practitioners who use a scientific approach to evaluation and who understand the theoretical and empirical underpinnings of the construct of intelligence
7. To understand issues in administration and interpretation when assessing members of minority groups and exceptional populations
8. Understand intelligence test terminology; sources of error in intelligence testing, psychometric properties, standardization of intelligence tests, and appropriate uses of measures of intelligence

## **Materials:**

You will need:

1. Large manila envelopes in which to hand in assigned reports, consent forms (see end of syllabus), protocols, and videotapes due to the confidential nature of the material.
2. Flash drives will be needed to record video and audio of some of your administrations.
3. A stopwatch is needed for some testing applications. Please find one that is quiet and unobtrusive. I have actually opened up digital ones and disconnected the little electronic speaker. Some (most?) people now just use their smartphones. Either way, make sure that the timer is as silent as can be, and is also visually unobtrusive/non-distracting.

## **Optional:**

4. Some people prefer to use clipboards for their protocols.
5. With young children, it is often nice to give small tokens of your appreciation. These can also be used when the child seems to lose interest. Stickers usually work well. If you use candy, make sure to ask a parent if it is okay.

**A Note on Academic Misconduct:**

All students must exercise academic honesty. Academic misconduct is subject to an academic penalty by the course instructor and/or disciplinary sanction by the University. All students need to be familiar with the Student Conduct Code. [The Code is available online at the Dean of Students' website.](#)

Additionally, I should point out that it would be entirely possible for you to fabricate a non-videotaped protocol. In other words, you could just supply your own answers, score them, etc. Don't do it. It is unethical and would lead to a failure of the class, and possibly and ultimately, dismissal from the program. It is not worth it. This class is intensive in terms of its demands, and these demands come at a point in your graduate experience when it may be difficult to juggle all of your obligations. If you are having trouble meeting all of your obligations, talk to your advisor, the chair, another departmental faculty with whom you can confide and take guidance from, etc. But don't consider shortcuts that would undermine your chosen profession and your future in it.

**Students with Disabilities:**

If you are a student with a disability and wish to discuss reasonable modifications for this course, contact me privately to discuss the specific modifications you wish to request. Please be advised I may request that you provide a letter from Disability Services for Students verifying your right to reasonable modifications. If you have not yet contacted Disability Services, located in Lommasson Center 154, please do so in order to verify your disability and to coordinate your reasonable modifications. For more information, visit the [Disability Services website](#) .

**Withdrawal from Course:**

The 15<sup>th</sup> day of class is usually the last day to drop the course with a full refund (although, always check the Registrar's site for specific dates). For the next two weeks, students can drop with instructor and advisor signature. Dropping after that point requires a petition.

**COURSE REQUIREMENTS:****Basic:****Attendance & Participation:**

Attendance is required. Lectures and class activities will be important to the overall learning experience and cannot be made up. You are expected to contribute to the class through discussion and questions. In some instances, I may have you prepare something for a future class. For example, I may give you specific questions to consider for

subsequent readings. I generally expect that you will have done so and will be prepared to discuss.

If absence is unavoidable, please let me know ahead of time. *Unexcused absences may certainly impact your progress in the class and your final grade.*

### **Testing**

You will administer and score seven (7) assessments, broken down as follows:

#### **CHILD FOCUS:**

**School Psychology students and Clinical Students with a professed career interest in working mainly with child (and/or child & family) clients:**

**4\* Wechsler Intelligence Scale for Children, Fifth Edition (WISC-V).** 1 of the administrations may be on an adult (pretending to be a child; this could be a cohort member). 3 must be on students 6-16 years of age. ***Do not videotape sessions of the WISC-V for which you use an adult.***

\*(One (1) of these four will be your "FINAL": 3+1)

**2 Wechsler Adult Intelligence Scale, Fourth Edition (WAIS-IV)**

**1 Stanford-Binet Scale of Intelligence, Fifth Edition (SB:V)**

#### **ADULT FOCUS:**

**Clinical Students with a professed career interest in working mainly with adult clients:**

**\*4 Wechsler Adult Intelligence Scale, Fourth Edition (WAIS-IV).** Two of the administrations may be on your cohort members or other Psychology Graduate students (but please do not share results- better yet, have the cohort member "fake it"). Two must be on adults outside of the program. Many times, you will be able to access U of M students through the Psychology Subject Pool, using SONA- more later). ***Do not videotape sessions of the WAIS-IV for which you use other students in the Psychology Graduate program.***

\*(1 of these four will be your "FINAL": 3+1)

**2 Wechsler Intelligence Scale for Children, Fifth Edition (WISC-V).**

**1 Stanford-Binet Scale of Intelligence, Fifth Edition (SB:V)**

**For GRADING purposes, these administration requirements more specifically break down as follows:**

**\*6 ("Non-Final") Protocols (60 points; 15 points for each protocol- only 4 of these are calculated into your final grade):**

Your protocols will be evaluated on a 15-point scale (15 = no major errors, 1 point loss for each major error; .33 points for each minor error). Of these six

“non-final” scores, your two lowest administration scores will be dropped, so the rest add up for a total of 60 (4x15) points possible.

*Please note that you can review all of your own protocols for scoring and administration accuracy to catch your mistakes, before turning them in, except on your final administration. If you catch the mistake it will NOT count against you. Simply provide a brief, but clear, note regarding the mistake and your awareness of what you should have done otherwise. Again, however, this does NOT apply to your Final Administration (see below).*

**First videotape (your second videotape will be your “Final”):** ONE (1) of these “non-final” administrations must be videotaped and it must be with the Wechsler scale of your emphasis (e.g. the WISC-V for School Psych students, the WAIS-IV for adult-oriented clinical students). See schedule for deadline to turn in this first videotape.

**\*Written Reports (6 points each: 18 points possible):**

3 of your “non-Final Administration” submissions will have an accompanying brief report (as noted in the schedule).

**\*1 Final Administration (35 points; this will include the protocol, report (worth 10 out of the 35 points), and videotape of the administration).**

This administration also has to be on your Wechsler scale of emphasis (e.g. the WISC-V for School Psych students and clinical-child students; the WAIS-IV for adult-focused students).

***The scoring rubric for this one will include major and minor values twice (2x) that for the other administrations.*** For example, each Major error will count 2 pts, and each minor error, .66 points. You will want this to be one of your best examples. Students encountering seven (7) or more points in deductions on the administration (i.e., not the report) will need to redo the administration and may risk taking an “incomplete” in the course (actually, since this is so late in the semester, the student will almost certainly need to take an incomplete to give them time to redo an administration).

In general, it is **strongly suggested** that all students give multiple practice assessments to anyone who will sit still before attempting assessments for a grade. Perhaps you can cajole some of your classmates into this (plying them with free food and drink often works).

### Class Presentations:

These are relatively open in terms of content, though it will need to be something not covered “in depth” during the class. Topics must be relevant to the course. Some ideas include:

- Presenting on an instrument of cognitive ability not covered in class (we have a couple in the test closet, such as the Wechsler Memory Scales, KABC, etc.- please ask);
- Presenting on a research topic of personal interest (e.g. assessing gifted students, cultural bias in IQ testing, use of standardized IQ tests in the assessment of LD, expanding on a particular *theory* of intelligence).
- **Please see larger list of possible topics at the end of the syllabus.**

If done individually, these should take about 25 minutes. You may partner up to do these presentations, though I will expect you to take about 50 minutes if two people are presenting. ***Each presentation should be done using visual aids, such as PowerPoint, and should be accompanied by appropriate hardcopy handouts.***

**Topics for presentation must be submitted by October 1st.** We can talk further about format and content during the semester and I will provide a handout of content areas to cover if you are presenting on another test battery. If you are covering another issue (e.g. giftedness assessment), then I would encourage you to set up a time to discuss your presentation content with me.

**Again, please be aware of the time limit and plan accordingly. It does not take too many slides/information to cover 25 minutes, or so, of time.**

***Deadlines.*** Protocols, reports, and observed assessments are to be conducted across the course of the semester. Please see the class schedule for times in which test protocols/reports are due. Lateness will be penalized at a rate of 10% per day late. However, if there are dire circumstances that preclude you from getting them in on time, please talk to me AS SOON AS YOU ARE AWARE OF IT, and we can try to work something out. **You may turn in protocols, reports, and videos early as well.**

***Subjects.*** You will need to locate your own testing subjects. These cannot be children or adults who are being evaluated for services OR receiving services. Friends, neighbors, children of friends, and university students are all possible resources. Do NOT test the same person more than once with the same test. Do NOT use your own child for one of the videotaped (including final) versions. Also, as mentioned earlier, do NOT use a class peer (or any other psych graduate student) for any of the videotaped administrations, please. BEFORE testing subjects, you must secure their permission, or, in the case of minors, of their parents or legal guardian(s). Consent forms are on Moodle. Additionally, there is a “letter to parents” on Moodle. It is a letter from me to any prospective parent of a child you test. Please make copies of those. Do not try to recruit subjects at any institution (e.g. hospital, school).

**Special Note:** For WAIS-IV administrations, Psyx100 students can be accessed. You will need to sign up to the SONA system to advertise and to give the undergraduate student credit. The TA for this course will go over this in more depth, soon.

**Confidentiality of subjects:** Please note that consent/permission forms need to be handed in a separate envelope from the one in which you hand in the report/protocol/video. On both packets/envelopes, make sure that you write the type and number of test, and your name (Mary Whipple, WISC-V #3). This way, we can make sure that every test had the proper consent/permission form handed in with it.

Additionally, all reports and protocols should be de-identified. That is, only pseudonyms (fictitious names) should be used.

**Result:** *No results generated from testing requirements for this class are to be disseminated to anyone other than the instructor and graduate assistants (this includes any portion of a written report).* Because this course is a skill development course, it is probable that many, even most, of the test administrations will have some errors and, thus, limited reliability and validity. Therefore it is imperative that these reports NOT be used for decision-making purposes. Violations of this practice will be considered a serious breach of professional ethics. Curious parents or examinees can be told that it is being done only for training purposes and that you are not allowed, by policy, to give results. However, you can tell caregivers that the experience is meant to be a positive one, and tell possible subjects that the experience will be interesting, challenging, and maybe fun!

**Grading:**

Best 4 scores from your first 6, Non-Final, Protocols/administrations: **60 points**

3 "Non-Final" Written reports: **18 points**

Presentation: **20 points**

Final Administration Protocol, Report, & Videotape: **35 points**

Participation: **15 points**

---

**Total: 148 points**

A = 94 – 100%

A- = 90-93%

B+ = 87-89%

B = 84 - 86%

B- = 80-83%

C+ = 77-79%

C = 74 -76%

C- = 70-73%

Etc. .

**Projected Timeline:** (please note that this timeline is subject to change, as are specific readings. I will try to give ample forewarning if this happens):

### Course Schedule

<b>Date</b>	<b>Topic</b>	<b>Reading</b>	<b>Due</b>
8/27	Introductions/Syllabus	Syllabus	
8/29	The Assessment Process Introduction; History & Theories	Sattler Ch 1, 2, & 7	
<b>9/3</b>	<b>Labor Day – NO Class</b>		
9/5	History & Theories, CONT.	Sattler, Ch. 7, CONT.; Gardner (1995); Frazier & Youngstrom (2007); Carroll (Ch. 4; 2005); Jie-Qi, J & Gardner, H. (2012); Horn & Blankson (2012)	
9/10	General Administrative Considerations; WISC-V Use	Sattler Ch. 6; Start to look over: Weis et al. (Ch 1; 2016) & Wahlstrom, Weiss, & Saklofske (Ch. 2; 2016)	<b>Likely lab week</b>
9/12	WISC-V Use, CONT.	Continue last week's Sattler, Chs. 9, 10, 11	<b>Likely lab week</b>
9/17	WISC-V Practice		<b>Likely lab week</b>
9/19	WISC-V Practice; Selected Statistical Concepts	Start reading Sattler, Ch. 4	<b>Likely lab week</b>
9/24	WISC-V Scoring & Analysis; Continue Selected Statistical Concepts	Sattler, Ch. 4, cont.	<b>Likely Lab Week</b>
9/26	WAIS-IV Use	Sattler & Ryan Chs 2 & 3	
10/1	WAIS-IV, CONT.		<b>Likely Lab Week</b>
			<b>Presentation Topics Due</b>

<b>Date</b>	<b>Topic</b>	<b>Reading</b>	<b>Due</b>
10/3	WAIS scoring & Analysis; Wechsler Interpretation Basics	Sattler & Ryan Ch 4; Beal et al. (Ch 3, 2016); Sattler, Ch. 4	
10/8	Wechsler Interpretation: Critical Considerations	Beal et al. cont. (Ch 3, 2016); Watkins, Glutting & Youngstrom (Ch. 12; 2005); Hale & Fiorello (NASP Communique,; 2002); Watkins, Glutting & Lei (2007); Gresham and Witt, (1997); Mather & Wendling (Ch. 23; 2012); Rogers, et al. (2011); Flanagan, Alfonso, & Ortiz (Ch 19, 2012; Especially Table 19.5)	<b>1<sup>st</sup> Protocol Due (WISC)</b>
10/10	The GAI(?) WISC-V/WAIS-III Report Writing	Sattler Ch 18; Kamphaus, Ch. 18;	
10/15	Report Writing Continued	Continue report writing readings from previous class;	
10/17	SB:V Overview, Technical Issues, and Administration	Sattler, Ch. 15	
10/22	SB:V Practice	Sattler, Ch. 15	<b>2<sup>nd</sup> Protocol Due (W/ report)</b>
10/24	Heated Issues: Issues Pertaining to Race and IQ (& Gender Differences); Malleability of Intelligence	Sattler, Ch. 5 & 8; Suzuki & Valencia (1997); Halpern (1997); Ceci and Williams, (1997); Sternberg (1996); Williams (2013); Nisbett, et al. (2012)	
10/29	Heated Issues (cont.- if needed); Ethical guidelines	Sattler Ch. 3; Please look up, and bring to class, both NASP and APA ethical guidelines regarding assessment  American Psychological Association (APA) Ethical Principles (see here for pdf format: <a href="https://www.apa.org/ethics/code/principles.pdf">https://www.apa.org/ethics/code/principles. pdf</a> )  National Association of School Psychologists (NASP) Professional Conduct Manual – find link to it here: <a href="https://www.nasponline.org/standards-and-certification/professional-ethics">https://www.nasponline.org/standards-and- certification/professional-ethics</a>	
10/31	Ethics, cont.		

<b>Date</b>	<b>Topic</b>	<b>Reading</b>	<b>Due</b>
11/5	Presentation of WJ-IV Cog		<b>3<sup>rd</sup> Protocol (W/ Video - NO Report)</b>
11/7	Assessing MR & LD	Kamphaus (Ch. 20; 2005); Spruill, Oakland & Harrison (Ch. 9; 2005); Machek & Nelson (2007); Fiorello, Hale, & Wycoff (Ch. 20, 2012); Tanaka, et al. (2011); Shaywitz et al. (Ch. 9, 2016)	
11/12	<b>NO CLASS: Veteran's Day</b>		
11/14	Assessing MR & LD, cont.	Kamphaus (Ch. 20; 2005); Spruill, Oakland & Harrison (Ch. 9; 2005); Machek & Nelson (2007); Fiorello, Hale, & Wycoff (Ch. 20, 2012); Tanaka, et al. (2011); Shaywitz et al. (Ch. 9, 2016)	<b>4<sup>th</sup> Protocol (W/ Report) due</b>
11/19	<b>Presentations/Meetings</b>		<b>5<sup>th</sup> Protocol (NO Report) Due</b>
11/21	<b>Thanksgiving Holiday</b>	<b>NO Class</b>	
11/26	<b>Presentations/Meetings</b>		
11/28	<b>Presentations/Meetings</b>		<b>6<sup>th</sup> Protocol (W/ Report) Due (By end of Tuesday, 25<sup>th</sup>)</b>
12/3	<b>Presentations</b>		
12/5	<b>Presentations</b>		<b>Final (7<sup>th</sup>) Due (W/ video, and report)</b>
12/12	<b>Wrap-up; Presentations</b>		

**Please note that this syllabus is subject to change at the instructor's discretion.**

### **Scoring Rubric (Subject to Modifications)**

#### **Majors Errors**

1. Inappropriate basal or ceiling
2. Incorrect computation(s) (e.g. summation of scaled scores or raw scores, incorrect computation of CA, incorrect transformation of standard scores, etc.)
3. Omission of Query/Prompt **when indicated**
4. Omission of subtests (and make-up of subtest)

5. Incorrect transformation of standard scores
6. Administering wrong subtest (E.g.: Coding A/B)
7. Failure to give example or sample item where required
8. (administration of samples must be recorded on protocol)
9. Failure to use stimulus book if required (be careful of this, especially with Vocabulary)
10. Administering items or subtests in wrong order.
11. "Other" obvious situations that break from standardization, such as:
  - Not consistently reading the standardized instructions, teaching items, prompts, etc.
  - MAJOR or MINOR, depending on severity: Poor physical set-up, such as too much extraneous noise/distractions, or severe deviation from physical set-up mentioned in administration manual.
  - (I take into consideration that same things will be beyond your control, and that we will not always have the perfect environment)

### **Minors Errors**

1. Judgment, i.e., assignment of inappropriate credit or failure to give appropriate credit on items (Similarities, Vocab., Comp.)
2. Omission of Query
3. Wrong starting level
4. Misreading chart in recording percentiles
5. Time not recorded when necessary
6. Failure to appropriately record examinee's responses
7. Failure to provide all proper verbatim instructions (This is commonly encountered on L-NS on the WISC)
8. Doing ipsative analysis on "Overall" mean when there is a PRI-VCI discrepancy (stat. sig. AND low Base Rate), and vice versa.
9. "Other" basic administration errors, such as:

- a. -incorrect base rates, percentiles, etc
- b. -failure to present Block Design blocks properly, or failure to scramble blocks after each administration.
- c. Consistently administering Digit Span items too quickly or too slowly.

This is likely not an exhaustive list. Errors encountered that do NOT accurately fit the above categories will be evaluated at the instructor and TA's discretion.

**Note:** If in reviewing your practice protocols you realize you made a mistake, note the error in the margin of the protocol and it will not be counted against you. This applies to all protocols except the final.

### **Possible Presentation Topics**

Assessment of Learning Disabilities: Past and present practices and related debate  
This would be an excellent choice for a school psych student.

Assessment of the deaf and hard of hearing

Assessment of the visually impaired or blind

The presentation of an individually administered intelligence test not covered in this class

The Universal Nonverbal Intelligence Test (UNIT)

The Wechsler Preschool and Primary Scale of Intelligence, Third Edition (WPPSI-III)

The Wechsler Abbreviated Scale of Intelligence (WASI)

WJ-IV Test of Cognitive Abilities

KABC

Assessment of cognitive giftedness

Ceiling effects and other issues specific to the testing of intellectually gifted students

Issues in the intellectual testing of NA students

Emotional Intelligence

The use of individual norm-referenced tests of intelligence in the determination of specific learning disabilities

A look at cultural bias in intelligence testing: evidence for and against

Best Practices in using IQ tests with culturally and/or linguistically diverse populations

Issues in assessing Preschoolers with IQ tests

Cognitive changes throughout the lifespan

A thorough presentation on a specific theory of intelligence

Gardner's Multiple Intelligences

Sternberg's Triarchic theory

PASS (Planning, Attention, Simultaneous, Successive) Theory

CHC (Cattell-Horn-Carroll) Theory of cognitive abilities

Nature vs. Nurture in intelligence

An elucidation on historical perspectives and influences not covered in class

**Note: I have texts, articles, or chapters, for most of these subjects. So, please inquire into these to help get you started.**

### **Bibliography of Readings**

Beal, A. L., Holdnack, J. A., Saklofske, D. H., & Weiss, L. G. (2016). Practical considerations in WISC-V interpretation and intervention. In Weiss, L. G., Saklofske, D. H., Holdnack, J. A. & Prifitera, A. (Eds.) *WISC-V Assessment and Interpretation*. Academic Press: London.

Carroll, J. (2005). The Three Stratum theory of cognitive abilities. In Flanagan, D. P., & Harrison, P. L. (Eds.). *Contemporary Intellectual Assessment--Theories, Tests, and Issues* (2nd ed.). New York: Guilford Press

Ceci, S. J., & Williams, W. M. (1997). Schooling, intelligence, and income. *American Psychologist*, 52 (10), 1051-1058.

Fiorello, C. A., Hale, J. B., & Wycoff, K. L. (2012). Cognitive Hypothesis Testing: Linking test results to the real world. In Flanagan, D. P., & Harrison, P. L. (Eds.). *Contemporary Intellectual Assessment--Theories, Tests, and Issues* (3<sup>rd</sup> ed.). New York: Guilford Press.

Flanagan, D. P., Alfonso, V. C., & Ortiz, S. O. (2012). The cross battery assessment approach: An overview, historical perspective, and current directions. In Flanagan, D. P., & Harrison, P. L. (Eds.). *Contemporary Intellectual Assessment--Theories, Tests, and Issues* (3<sup>rd</sup> ed.). New York: Guilford Press.

Frazier, T.W., & Youngstrom, E.A. (2007). Historical increase in the number of factors measured by commercial test of cognitive ability: Are we overfactoring? *Intelligence*, 35, 169-182.

Gardner, H. (1995). Reflections on multiple intelligences. *Phi Delta Kappan*, 77(3), 200-208.

Gresham, F.M., & Witt, J.C. (1997). Utility of intelligence tests for treatment planning, classification, and placement decisions: Recent empirical findings and future directions. *School Psychology Quarterly*, 12, 249-267.

Hale, J. B. & Fiorello, C. A. (2002). Beyond the academic rhetoric of g: Intelligence testing guidelines for practitioners. *The School Psychologist*, 55(4) 113-139.

Horn, J. I. & Blankson, A. N. (2012). Foundatiopns for better understanding of cognitive abilities. In Flanagan, D. P., & Harrison, P. L. (Eds.). *Contemporary Intellectual Assessment--Theories, Tests, and Issues* (3<sup>rd</sup> ed.). New York: Guilford Press.

Jie-Qi, J & Gardner, H. (2012). Assessment of Intellectual Profile: A perspective from multiple-intelligences theory. In Flanagan, D. P., & Harrison, P. L. (Eds.). *Contemporary Intellectual Assessment--Theories, Tests, and Issues* (3<sup>rd</sup> ed.). New York: Guilford Press.

Kamphaus, R. (2005). *Clinical Assessment of Child and Adolescent Intelligence*. New York: Springer.

Machek, G. R., & Nelson, J.M. (2007). How should reading disabilities be operationalized?: A national survey of school psychologists. *Learning Disabilities Research and Practice*, 22, 147-157.

Machek, G. R., & Nelson, J. M. (2010). School Psychologists' Perceptions Regarding the Practice of Identifying Reading Disabilities: Cognitive Assessment and Response to Intervention Considerations. *Psychology in the Schools*, 47(3), 230-245.

Mather, N., & Wendling, B. J. (2005). Linking cognitive assessment results to academic interventions for students with learning disabilities. In Flanagan, D. P., & Harrison, P. L. (Eds.). *Contemporary Intellectual Assessment--Theories, Tests, and Issues* (2nd ed.). New York: Guilford Press.

Nisbett, R. E., Aronson, J., Blair, C., Dickens, W., Flynn, J., Halpern, D.F., & Turheimer, E. (2012). Intelligence: New findings and theoretical developments. *American Psychologist*, 67, 2, 130-159.

Rogers, M., Hwang, H., Toplak, M., Weiss, M., & Tannock, R. (2011). Inattention, working memory, and academic achievement in adolescents referred for attention deficit/hyperactivity disorder (ADHD). *Child Neuropsychology*, 17:5, 444-458.

Sattler, J.M., (2008). *Assessment of Children: Cognitive Foundations, 5<sup>th</sup> Edition*. San Diego, CA: Jerome Sattler Press.

Shaywitz, B. A., Weiss, L. G., Saklofske, D. H., & Shaywitz, S. E. (2016). Translating scientific progress in dyslexia into the twenty-first century diagnosis and interventions. In Weiss, L. G., Saklofske, D. H., Holdnack, J. A. & Prifitera, A. (Eds.) *WISC-V Assessment and Interpretation*. Academic Press: London.

Spruill, Oakland, & Harrison (2005). Assessment of mental retardation. In Prifitera, A, Saklofske, D. H., & Weiss, L. G. (Eds.) *WISC-IV Clinical Use and Interpretation*. Burlington, MA: Elsevier Academic Press.

Sternberg, R. (1996). Myths, countermyths and truths about intelligence, *Educational Researcher*, Vol. 25, No. 2, pp.11-16.

Suzuki, L., & Valencia, R. R. (1997). Race-ethnicity and measured intelligence: Educational implications. *American Psychologist* 52, 1103–1114.

Tanaka, H., Black, J., Hulme, C., Stanley, L., Kesler, S., Whitfield-Gabrieli, S., Gabrieli, J., Hoeft, F. (2011). Brain Basis of Phonological Deficit in Dyslexia is Independent of IQ. *Psychological Science*. 22, 1442-1451

Wahlstrom, D., Weiss, L. G., & Saklofske, D. H. (2016). Practical Issues in WISC-V administration and scoring. In Weiss, L. G., Saklofske, D. H., Holdnack, J. A. & Prifitera, A. (Eds.) *WISC-V Assessment and Interpretation*. Academic Press: London.

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, 13-20.

Watkins, M. W., Glutting, J. J., & Youngstrom, E. A. (2005). Issues in subtest profile analysis. In Flanagan, D. P., & Harrison, P. L. (Eds.) *Contemporary Intellectual Assessment--Theories, Tests, and Issues* (2nd ed.). New York: Guilford Press

Weiss, L. G., Saklofske, D. H., & Holdnack, J. A. (2016). WISC-V: Advances in the assessment of intelligence. In Weiss, L. G., Saklofske, D. H., Holdnack, J. A. & Prifitera, A. (Eds.) *WISC-V Assessment and Interpretation*. Academic Press: London.

Williams, R. L. (2013). Overview of the Flynn effect. *Intelligence*. 41, 753-764.

**Other Readings to Consider:**

Neisser, U. (1997). Rising scores on intelligence tests. *American Scientist*, 85, 440-447.