



Scott Andrews, Ph.D., H.S.P.  
Forensic Evaluation and  
Neuropsychological Testing

Phone: 978-342-4344  
Fax: 617-488-2299  
[sandrews@psychtestingconsultants.com](mailto:sandrews@psychtestingconsultants.com)  
[www.psychtestingconsultants.com](http://www.psychtestingconsultants.com)

## CONFIDENTIAL NEUROPSYCHOLOGICAL and PSYCHO-EDUCATIONAL TESTING EVALUATION

Name:  
Date of Birth:  
Age:  
Gender: Male  
School:

Report Date:  
Examiner: Scott Andrews, Ph.D., H.S.P.  
Test Site: Psychological Testing Consultants  
Evaluation Start Date:  
Grade:

**Reason for Referral:**

\_\_\_\_\_, Name's \_\_\_\_, referred Name to Psychological Testing Consultants for neuropsychological and psycho-educational testing. \_\_\_\_\_ requested testing for Name due to \_\_\_\_\_, as well as to provide updated information on his current cognitive, neuropsychological, and social, emotional, and behavioral functioning.

Additional comments and concerns expressed by \_\_\_\_\_ are below.

The current evaluation will assess Name's neuropsychological, cognitive, social, emotional, and behavioral functioning for indications of sensory information processing deficits, specific learning disorders and nonneurostructural factors affecting his functioning. It will also attempt to clarify his diagnosis and provide recommendations to enhance Name's overall adaptation to the school and home settings.

**Evaluation Procedures:**

**Clinical Observations and Evaluations:**

Diagnostic Interview, PTC:

**Collateral Interviews and Review of Records:**

**Relevant Background Information:**

Name is a \_\_\_\_-year, \_\_\_\_-month boy who is presently living with \_\_\_\_\_ in \_\_\_\_\_. Name is enrolled in the \_\_\_\_ grade at \_\_\_\_\_ in \_\_\_\_\_. Background information was provided by Name's \_\_\_\_\_.

**Observations:**

## **Test Results:**

### **Cognitive Testing**

To assess Name's ability to reason and to solve problems, verbally and nonverbally, the Wechsler Adult Intelligence Scale: Fourth Edition (WAIS-IV) was administered.

#### **Summary of Test Results:**

On the WAIS-IV, Composite scores of 91-109 are considered average, and scaled scores of 8 to 12 are considered average for the individual tasks.

The WAIS-IV results showed that Name's verbal abilities are in the \_\_\_\_ range (Verbal Comprehension Index composite score = \_\_\_, \_\_\_ percentile). Similarly, he functions in the \_\_\_\_ range on nonverbal tasks (Perceptual Reasoning Index composite score = \_\_\_, \_\_\_ percentile). Finally, Name earned a Full Scale IQ score in the \_\_\_\_ range (Full Scale composite score = \_\_\_, \_\_\_ percentile), **suggesting that his overall intellectual level is somewhere in the \_\_\_\_ end to the \_\_\_\_ of the \_\_\_\_ range of functioning for an individual his age.**

On tasks that comprise the Verbal Comprehension Index, Name's performance ranged from the \_\_\_\_ range to the \_\_\_\_ range of functioning. He achieved a score in the \_\_\_\_ range on a task that required him to conceptualize and generalize using language (Similarities scaled score = \_\_\_, \_\_\_ percentile). Like his Verbal Comprehension Index score was Name's \_\_\_\_ score on the Information task (scaled score = \_\_\_, \_\_\_ percentile). Here, his ability to answer factual information questions was evaluated. On another task, the Vocabulary task, he was asked to orally define words. On this task, he earned a scaled score of \_\_\_\_ (\_\_\_\_ percentile) – a score in the \_\_\_\_ range. Overall, Name's Verbal Comprehension Index composite score of \_\_\_\_ (\_\_\_\_ percentile) suggests well developed language comprehension and verbal reasoning skills.

In the Perceptual Reasoning (nonverbal skills) domain, Name's performance was solidly within the \_\_\_\_ range. He showed \_\_\_\_ skills on a task that assessed his ability to analyze abstract visual-spatial material (Block Design scaled score = \_\_\_, \_\_\_ percentile). Here, geometric designs are presented using a picture, and Name recreated the designs using blocks. Next, he was administered a task designed to measure nonverbal reasoning and the ability to analyze and synthesize abstract visual stimuli (Visual Puzzles scaled score = \_\_\_, \_\_\_ percentile). On this task, Name views a completed puzzle and selects three response options that, when combined, reconstruct the puzzle. Next, on a task assessing fluid intelligence, broad visual intelligence, classification and spatial ability, knowledge of part-whole relationships, simultaneous processing, and perceptual organization, he again earned a score in the \_\_\_\_ range of functioning for an individual his age (Matrix Reasoning scaled score = \_\_\_, \_\_\_ percentile). On this task, Name views an incomplete matrix or series and selects the response option that completes the matrix or series. Although not as strong as his verbal comprehension skills, his performance on nonverbal tasks in the Perceptual Reasoning domain suggests that his visuoperceptual skills are adequately developed for an individual his age.

In the Working Memory domain, Name earned an overall score placing within the \_\_\_\_ range (composite score = \_\_\_, \_\_\_ percentile). The first task in this domain involved Name mentally

solving a series of arithmetic problems within a specified time limit. It assesses mental manipulation, concentration, attention, short- and long-term memory, numerical reasoning ability, and mental alertness. It may also assess sequential processing; fluid, quantitative, and logical reasoning; and quantitative knowledge. Name earned a score in the \_\_\_\_\_ range on this task (*Arithmetic* scaled score = \_\_\_, \_\_\_ percentile). On another task, the *Digit Span* task, there are three conditions – *Digit Span Forward*, *Digit Span Backward*, and *Digit Span Sequencing*. For *Digit Span Forward*, Name is read a sequence of numbers and recalls the numbers in the same order. This component of the task involves rote learning and memory, attention, encoding, and auditory processing. He achieved a scaled score of \_\_\_ (\_\_\_ percentile) on *Digit Span Forward* – a score in the \_\_\_\_\_ range for a person his age. For *Digit Span Backward*, Name is read a sequence of numbers and recalls the numbers in reverse order. Notably, cognitive flexibility, and mental alertness are required when shifting from one *Digit Span* task to another. Here, Name earned a score at the \_\_\_\_\_ end of the \_\_\_\_\_ range (*Digit Span Backward* scaled score = \_\_\_, \_\_\_ percentile). This condition of the task involves working memory, transformation of information, mental manipulation, and visuospatial imaging. In the third condition, *Digit Span Sequencing*, Name is read a sequence of numbers and recalls the numbers in ascending order. It measures working memory and mental manipulation. Here, Name earned a score in the \_\_\_\_\_ range (*Digit Span Sequencing* scaled score = \_\_\_, \_\_\_ percentile).

On the Processing Speed Index tasks, which are timed, pencil and paper tasks, Name's overall performance was in the \_\_\_\_\_ range for this Index (composite score = \_\_\_, \_\_\_ percentile). For the *Symbol Search* task, NAME was required to scan symbols and mark symbols that were the same as a target symbol. The task involves processing speed but also involves short-term visual memory, visual-motor coordination, cognitive flexibility, visual discrimination, psychomotor speed, speed of mental operation, attention, and concentration. He earned a scaled score of \_\_\_ (\_\_\_ percentile) on this task – a score at the \_\_\_\_\_ end of the \_\_\_\_\_ range. On another Processing Speed task, Name earned a score in the \_\_\_\_\_ range on a task that assessed his ability to copy symbols in a time efficient manner (*Coding* scaled score = \_\_\_, \_\_\_ percentile). This task has a more substantial motor component than the Symbol Search task and here Name showed adequate speed compared to same aged adults.

The Composite Score Differences analysis table (see table above) shows that Name's \_\_\_\_\_ score is larger, to a statistically significant degree, than his \_\_\_\_\_ Composite Scores. **Moreover, the disparity between Name's performance on the \_\_\_\_\_ domain and his performance on the \_\_\_\_\_ domain is a rare event in the normative sample (base rate = \_\_\_).** Additionally, there was a statistically significant difference between Name's \_\_\_\_\_ Composite Score and his \_\_\_\_\_ Composite Score, favoring \_\_\_\_\_. However, the size of the disparity is not a particularly unusual event in the normative sample. These finding **suggests that Name's cognitive abilities are unevenly developed and that he has weaknesses in the \_\_\_\_\_ domain and a strength in the \_\_\_\_\_ domain. Additionally, Name demonstrated a weakness in his performance on the \_\_\_\_\_ subtest, a weakness in his performance on the \_\_\_\_\_ subtest, and strength on the \_\_\_\_\_ subtext.**

### **Achievement Testing**

To evaluate Name's current level of achievement in several academic subjects, the WIAT-III was administered.

#### **WIAT-III**

#### **Age Based Scores**

SUBTEST SCORE SUMMARY TABLE

SUBTEST SCORE PROFILE GRAPH

SUPPLEMENTAL SUBTEST SCORE SUMMARY TABLE

SUBTEST COMPONENT SCORE SUMMARY TABLE

### **ABILITY-ACHIEVEMENT DISCREPANCY ANALYSIS**

Ability Score: WISC-V FSIQ:

Date of Testing: WISC-V \_\_\_\_\_; WIAT-III \_\_\_\_\_

PREDICTED DIFFERENCE METHOD TABLE

#### *Summary of Test Results:*

On the WIAT-III, standard scores of 85-115 are considered average.

In the Reading domain, Name completed the *Early Reading Skills* subtest. Here, he is asked to name letters, identify the sounds of letters in words, identify rhyming and non-rhyming words, identify words that begin with the same sound, recognize the initial two sounds in words, recognize ending sounds in words, blending sounds, and matching words with sounds. Name achieved a score (standard score = \_\_, \_\_ percentile) in the \_\_\_\_\_ range, which is significantly \_\_\_\_ his expected score of \_\_ (\_\_\_\_ percentile). Moreover, the ability-achievement disparity of \_\_\_\_ standard score points is rare in the normative sample (\_\_\_\_) and has a standard deviation discrepancy  $\geq 1$  SD. Notably, Name's errors involved the following skill areas: \_\_\_\_\_.

To assess reading, the *Word Reading* subtest of the WIAT-III was administered, and here Name was asked to read isolated words, including sight words. His score was in the \_\_\_\_\_ range (standard score = \_\_, \_\_ percentile) and significantly \_\_\_\_ his estimated general intellectual potential (predicted score = \_\_, \_\_ percentile). Additionally, the \_\_\_\_ point standard score discrepancy between ability and achievement is an unusual event in the normative sample (base rate =  $\leq 5\%$ ) and has a standard deviation discrepancy  $\geq 1.0$  SD. On the *Pseudoword Decoding* subtest, no sight words are included. Here, Name used decoding skills to read nonsense words such as "pon" (standard score = \_\_, \_\_ percentile). On this subtest, his score was in the \_\_\_\_\_ range and significantly \_\_\_\_ his predicted score of \_\_ (\_\_\_\_ percentile). Moreover, the size of the disparity between ability and achievement (\_\_\_\_ standard score points) is a rare event in the standardization sample (base rate  $\leq 10\%$ ) and has a standard deviation discrepancy  $\geq 1.0$  SD.

On the *Reading Comprehension* subtest, Name was asked to read several passages silently and was then asked questions about each. Here, he earned a standard score of \_\_\_\_ (\_\_\_\_ percentile) – a score in the \_\_\_\_\_ range for his age. His performance was consistent with his estimated intellectual potential (predicted score = \_\_\_, \_\_\_ percentile). Next, his overall reading skills were shown to be in the \_\_\_\_\_ range of functioning for a child his age (*Basic Reading Composite* standard score = \_\_\_, \_\_\_ percentile) and significantly \_\_\_\_ the level predicted by his overall intellectual ability (predicted score = \_\_\_, \_\_\_ percentile). Additionally, the \_\_\_ point standard score discrepancy between ability and achievement is both a rare event in the normative sample and has a standard deviation discrepancy  $\geq$  1.0 SD. Collectively, the results of testing in the Reading domain **supports a diagnosis of**

In the Written Language domain, Name was asked to write alphabet letters within a 30-second time limit. On this task he received a score in the \_\_\_ end of the \_\_\_ range of functioning for his age (*Alphabet Writing Fluency* standard score = \_\_\_, \_\_\_ percentile). Notably, Name demonstrated a \_\_\_ pencil grip (\_\_\_ grasp), but \_\_\_\_\_.

In the Written Expression domain, Name was also asked to combine two sentences to make one complete sentence that means the same thing. Additionally, he was asked to write sentences using target words such as “until.” His *Sentence Composition* standard score of \_\_\_\_ (\_\_\_\_ percentile) was in the \_\_\_\_\_ range for his age and significantly \_\_\_\_ his predicted score of \_\_\_\_ (\_\_\_\_ percentile). Additionally, the \_\_\_ point standard score disparity between Name’s general ability and his achievement in *Sentence Composition* is a rare event in the normative sample (base rate  $\leq$  10%) and had a standard deviation discrepancy  $\geq$  1 SD.

Name’s performance on the *Spelling* task (standard score = \_\_\_, \_\_\_ percentile) was significantly \_\_\_\_ what would be predicted given his estimated overall intellectual potential (predicted score = \_\_\_, \_\_\_ percentile). Additionally, the ability-achievement disparity of \_\_\_ standard score points is a rare occurrence in the standardization sample (base rate  $\leq$  5%) and it also has a standard deviation discrepancy of  $\geq$  1 SD. Name next wrote an essay about his favorite game and was asked to include three reasons why he likes it. Here, he earned an *Essay Composition* subtest standard score of \_\_\_\_ (\_\_\_\_ percentile) – a score in the \_\_\_\_\_ range of functioning for his age. On the *Essay Composition*: Grammar and Mechanics supplemental subtest, Name received a score that falls in the \_\_\_\_\_ range (standard score = \_\_\_, \_\_\_ percentile). On the other hand, his Word Count (standard score = \_\_\_, \_\_\_ percentile) and Theme Development and Text Organization (standard score = \_\_\_, \_\_\_ percentile) components of the subtest were in the \_\_\_ and \_\_\_ range, respectively. These findings indicate adequate written productivity and adequate ability to develop and organize his ideas in writing.

Overall, Name’s Written Expression composite score of \_\_\_\_ (\_\_\_\_ percentile) fell in the \_\_\_\_\_ range and was significantly \_\_\_\_ his predicted score of \_\_\_\_ (\_\_\_\_ percentile). The difference between his expected score and his obtained score was \_\_\_ standard score points, favoring \_\_\_\_\_. A discrepancy of this size is an unusual event in the standardization sample (base rate  $\leq$  10%) and has a standard deviation discrepancy  $\geq$  1 SD. Collectively, Name’s performance in the Written Expression domain **supports a diagnosis of** \_\_\_\_\_.

In the Oral Language domain, Name was administered the *Listening Comprehension* subtest. He earned a score that places within the \_\_\_\_ range (standard score = \_\_\_, \_\_\_ percentile) - a score \_\_\_\_ with his predicted score of \_\_\_\_ (\_\_\_\_ percentile). Notably, Name achieved a score in the \_\_\_\_ range on the Receptive Vocabulary condition of the *Listening Comprehension* subtest (standard score = \_\_\_, \_\_\_ percentile). Similarly, Name performed \_\_\_\_ end of the \_\_\_\_ range on the Oral Discourse Comprehension condition of the *Listening Comprehension* subtest (standard score = \_\_\_, \_\_\_ percentile). These results **suggest that listening comprehension (receptive language), particularly at the level of oral discourse, is an area of \_\_\_\_ for Name.**

Name next completed the Sentence Repetition component of the *Oral Expression* subtest – a task measuring syntactic knowledge and short-term memory. Here, Name is asked to repeat sentences from the examiner verbatim. On this task, Name earned a score in the \_\_\_\_ end of the \_\_\_\_ range relative to children of comparable age (Sentence Repetition standard score = \_\_\_, \_\_\_ percentile). Additionally, his performance on the Sentence Repetition task was significantly \_\_\_\_ his expected score (standard score = \_\_\_, \_\_\_ percentile). Furthermore, the size of the disparity (\_\_\_\_ standard score points) between ability and achievement is an unusual occurrence in the normative sample (base rate  $\leq 5\%$ ) and has a standard deviation discrepancy  $\geq 1$  SD. On another component of the *Oral Expression* subtest, the Expressive Vocabulary task, Name earned a score in the \_\_\_\_ end of the \_\_\_\_ range of functioning for his age (standard score = \_\_\_, \_\_\_ percentile). This task measures speaking vocabulary and word retrieval.

On a third component of the *Oral Expression* subtest, the Oral Word Fluency task, Name achieved a score in the \_\_\_\_ range for his age (standard score = \_\_\_, \_\_\_ percentile). This task evaluates word retrieval and flexibility of thought processes. Name's overall *Oral Expression* subtest score was in the \_\_\_\_ range (standard score = \_\_\_, \_\_\_ percentile) – a score significantly \_\_\_\_ his predicted score of \_\_\_\_ (\_\_\_\_ percentile). Moreover, the \_\_\_\_ standard score point disparity between ability and achievement is an unusual occurrence in the standardization sample (base rate =  $\leq 10\%$ ) and has a standard deviation discrepancy  $\geq 1$  SD. These findings **support a diagnosis of \_\_\_\_\_**. Finally, Name earned a composite Oral Language score of \_\_\_\_ (\_\_\_\_ percentile) – a score on par with what would be expected given his general intellectual capacity (predicted score = \_\_\_, \_\_\_ percentile).

In another domain, the Mathematics domain, Name completed math problems using pencil and paper (*Numerical Operations*, standard score = \_\_\_, \_\_\_ percentile). His score was in the \_\_\_\_ range for his age and consistent with what would be expected given his overall intellectual ability (predicted score = \_\_\_, \_\_\_ percentile). On another task, the *Math Problem Solving* task, Name was asked to read charts and graphs and to solve word problems. Here, Name achieved a score in the \_\_\_\_ range (*Math Problem Solving* standard score = \_\_\_, \_\_\_ percentile) - a score \_\_\_\_ with his predicted score of \_\_\_\_ (\_\_\_\_ percentile). Finally, Name's overall Mathematics score (Composite Score standard score = \_\_\_, \_\_\_ percentile) placed in the \_\_\_\_ range and was \_\_\_\_ with the score predicted by his global intellectual capacity (predicted score = \_\_\_, \_\_\_ percentile).

In the Math Fluency domain, Name completed three subtests, i.e., *Math Fluency–Addition*, *Math Fluency–Subtraction*, and *Math Fluency–Multiplication*. For each subtest, Name is asked to

complete as many problems as he can within a 60-second time limit. Here, Name achieved an \_\_\_\_\_ Math Fluency-Addition standard score of \_\_\_\_\_ (\_\_\_\_ percentile), an \_\_\_\_\_ Math Fluency-Subtraction standard score of \_\_\_\_\_ (\_\_\_\_ percentile), and an \_\_\_\_\_ Math Fluency-Multiplication standard score of \_\_\_\_\_ (\_\_\_\_ percentile). His overall Math Fluency standard score of \_\_\_\_\_ (\_\_\_\_ percentile) was significantly \_\_\_\_\_ than his predicted score of \_\_\_\_\_ (\_\_\_\_ percentile). However, the \_\_\_\_\_ point standard score discrepancy between Name's overall ability and his achievement in Math Fluency is not a particularly unusual event in the normative sample. It also has a standard deviation discrepancy  $< 1$  SD. The results of testing in the Mathematics and Math Fluency domains contraindicate a diagnosis \_\_\_\_\_.

Name's performance in the Oral Language domain provides clues as to his learning style. His performance **indicates that he is at his best when** \_\_\_\_\_.

### **Neuropsychological Testing**

In order to assess Name's neuropsychological functioning, the Delis Kaplan Executive Function System (D-KEFS) was administered.

#### Trail Making Test

	Raw Score	Scaled Score
<b>Primary Measure: Completion Times</b>		
Condition 1: Visual Scanning		
Condition 2: Number Sequencing		
Condition 3: Letter Sequencing		
Condition 4: Number-Letter Switching		
Condition 5: Motor Speed		

	Sum of Scaled Scores	Composite Scaled Score
<b>Primary Combined Measure: Completion Times</b>		
Combined Number + Letter Sequencing		

	Scaled	Contrast

	Score Difference	Scaled Score*
<b>Primary Contrast Measures: Completion Times</b>		
Switching vs Visual Scanning		
Switching vs Number Sequencing		
Switching vs Letter Sequencing		
Switching vs Combined Number + Letter Sequencing		
Switching vs Motor Speed		
*A low or high contrast scaled score may reflect different cognitive problems		

	Raw Score	Cumulative %ile Rank
<b>Optional Measures: Error Analysis</b>		
Omission Errors: Condition 1 (Visual Scanning)		
Commission Errors: Condition 1 (Visual Scanning)		
Sequencing Errors: Condition 2 (Number Sequencing)		
Sequencing Errors: Condition 3 (Letter Sequencing)		
Sequencing Errors: Condition 4 (Number-Letter Switching)		
Set-Loss Errors Condition 2 (Number Sequencing)		
Set-Loss Errors Condition 3 (Letter Sequencing)		
Set-Loss Errors Condition 4 (Number-Letter Switching)		
Time Discontinue Errors: Condition 2 (Number Sequencing)		
Time Discontinue Errors: Condition 3 (Letter Sequencing)		
Time Discontinue Errors: Condition 4 (Number-Letter Switching)		
Time Discontinue Errors: Condition 5 (Motor Speed)		
All Error Types: Condition 4 (Number-Letter Switching)		*
*Scaled Score		

	<b>Percent Raw Score</b>	<b>Scaled Score</b>
Percent Set-Loss Errors		
Percent Repetition Errors		
Category Switching: Percent Switching Accuracy		

Verbal Fluency Test: Standard Form

	<b>Raw Score</b>	<b>Scaled Score</b>
<b>Primary Measures</b>		
Letter Fluency: Total Correct		
Category Fluency: Total		
Category Switching: Total Correct		
Category Switching: Total Switching		

	<b>Scaled Score</b>	<b>Contrast Scaled Score*</b>
<b>Primary Contrast Measures</b>		
Letter Fluency vs. Category Fluency		
Category Switching vs. Category Fluency		

\*A low or high contrast scaled score may reflect different cognitive problems

	<b>Percent Raw Score</b>	<b>Scaled Score</b>
Percent Set-Loss Errors		
Percent Repetition Errors		
Category Switching: Percent Switching Accuracy		

Design Fluency Test

	Raw Score	Scaled Score
<b>Primary Measures</b>		
Condition 1 Filled Dots: Total Correct		
Condition 2 Empty Dots Only: Total Correct		
Condition 3 Switching: Total Correct		
	Sum of Scaled Scores	Composite Scaled Score
Design Fluency Total Correct		

	Sum of Scaled Scores	Composite Scaled Score
<b>Primary Combined Filled + Empty Dots Measure</b>		
Combined Filled + Empty Dots: Total Correct		

	Scaled Score Difference	Contrast Scaled Score
<b>Primary Contrast Measure</b>		
Switching vs Combined Filled + Empty Dots		
*A low or a high contrast scaled score may reflect different cognitive problems; see examiner's manual.		

	Condition 1 Filled Dots	Condition 2 Empty Dots Only	Condition 3 Switching	Total Raw Score	Total Scaled Score
<b>Optional Measures</b>					
Total Set-Loss Designs					
Total Repeated Designs					
Total Attempted Designs*					

\*Note: Some Repetition Errors are coded also as Set-Loss Errors: each double-coded error counts as only one response for the Total Attempted

				Percent Raw Score	Scaled Score
Percent Design Accuracy					

### Color-Word Interference Test

	Raw Score	Scaled Score
<b>Primary Measures: Completion Times</b>		
Condition 1: Color Naming		
Condition 2: Word Reading		
Condition 3: Inhibition		
Condition 4: Inhibition/Switching		

	Sum of Scaled Scores	Composite Scaled Score
<b>Primary Combined Measure: Completion Times</b>		

Combined Naming + Reading

	Scaled Score Difference	Contrast Scaled Score*
<b>Primary Contrast Measures: Completion Times</b>		
Inhibition vs. Color Naming		
Inhibition/Switching vs. Combined Naming + Reading		
Inhibition/Switching vs. Inhibition		

	Scaled Score Difference	Contrast Scaled Score*
<b>Optional Contrast Measures: Completion Times</b>		
Inhibition/Switching vs. Color Naming		
Inhibition/Switching vs. Word Reading		

Sorting Test: Standard Form

<b>Primary Measures</b>	<b>Card Set 1 Raw Score</b>	<b>Card Set 2 Raw Score</b>	<b>Total Raw Score</b>	<b>Scaled Score</b>
<b>Condition 1: Free Sorting</b>				
Confirmed Correct Sorts				
Free Sorting Description Score				
<b>Condition 2: sort Recognition</b>				
Sort Recognition Description Score				

	<b>Sum of Scaled Scores</b>	<b>Composite Scaled Score</b>
<b>Combined Conditions 1+2</b>		
Combined Description Score		

	<b>Scaled Score Difference</b>	<b>Contrast Scaled Score*</b>
<b>Contrast Measure: Sort Recognition Versus Free Sorting Description Score</b>		
Sort Recognition versus Free Sorting		
* A Low or high contrast scaled score may reflect different cognitive problems		

<b>Optional Measures</b>	<b>Raw Score</b>	<b>Cum. %ile Rank</b>
<b>Screening Pretest</b>		
Word Reading Errors		
Word Comprehension Errors		

	Card Set 1 Raw Score	Card Set 2 Raw Score	Total Raw Score	Scaled Score
<b>Condition 1: Free Sorting Sorting Measures (Optional)</b>				
Confirmed Correct Sorts: Card Set 1		-	-	
Confirmed Correct Sorts: Card Set 2	-		-	
Confirmed Correct Verbal Sorts				
Confirmed Correct Perceptual Sorts				
Confirmed/Unconfirmed Target Sorts				
Repeated Sorts				
Set-Loss Sorts				*
Nontarget Even Sorts				*
Attempted Sorts				
*Cumulative Percentile Rank				

	Percent Raw Score	Scaled Score		
Percent Sorting Accuracy				
	Cum. Sort Time: Both Sets Total Raw Score	Attempted Sorts Total Raw Score	Ratio Raw Score	Scaled Score
Time-Per-Sort Ratio				
* A Low or high contrast scaled score may reflect different cognitive problems				

	Card Set 1 Raw Score	Card Set 2 Raw Score	Total Raw Score	Scaled Score
<b>Condition 1: Free Sorting Description Measures (Optional)</b>				
Free Sorting Description Score: Card Set 1		-	-	
Free Sorting Description Score: Card Set 2	-		-	
Free Sorting Incorrect Descriptions				
Free Sorting Repeated Descriptions				*
Percent Description Accuracy				
*Cumulative Percentile Rank				
<b>Condition 2: Sort Recognition Description Measures (Optional)</b>				
Sort Recognition Description Score: Card Set 1		-	-	
Sort Recognition Description Score: Card Set 2	-		-	
Sort Recognition Incorrect Descriptions				
Sort Recognition Repeated Descriptions				*
*Cumulative Percentile Rank				

	Condition 1: Free Sorting Total	Condition 2: Sort Recog. Total	Combined Raw Score	Scaled Score
<b>Combined Conditions 1+2: Description Measures (Optional)</b>				
Combined Description Score: Verbal Rules				
Combined Description Score: Perceptual Rules				
Combined No/Don't Know Responses				
Combined Noncredit Descriptions				*
Combined Overly Abstract Descriptions				*
*Cumulative Percentile Rank				
			<b>Sum of Scaled</b>	<b>Composite Scaled</b>

	<b>Scores</b>	<b>Score</b>
Combined Incorrect Descriptions		
	<b>Total</b>	<b>Cum.</b>
	<b>Raw</b>	<b>%ile</b>
	<b>Score</b>	<b>Rank</b>
Combined Repeated Descriptions		

### Twenty Questions: Standard Form

	Item 1 Raw Score	Item 2 Raw Score	Item 3 Raw Score	Item 4 Raw Score	Total Raw Score	Scaled Score
<b>Primary Measures</b>						
Initial Abstraction Score*						
*Minimum number of objects that can be eliminated by the first question asked regardless of the yes or no answer						
Total Questions Asked						
Total Weighted Achievement Score						

	Item 1 Raw Score	Item 2 Raw Score	Item 3 Raw Score	Item 4 Raw Score	Total Raw Score	Cum. %ile Rank
<b>Optional Measures</b>						
Spatial Questions						
Repeated Questions						
Set-Loss Questions						

Word Context Test

	Raw Score	Scaled Score
<b>Primary Measures</b>		
Total Consecutively Correct		

	Total Raw Score	Scaled Score
<b>Optional Measures</b>		
Consistently Correct Ratio	*	
	*Percent Raw Score	
Repeated Incorrect Responses		
No/Don't Know Responses		*
Total Correct-to-Incorrect Errors		*
	*Cumulative Percentile Rank	

Tower Test

	Total Raw Score	Scaled Score
<b>Primary Measure</b>		
Total Achievement		

	Ratio Score	Scaled Score
<b>Optional Measures</b>		
Total Rule Violations		
Mean First-Move Time*		
Time-Per-Move-Ratio*		

Move Accuracy Ratio*		
Rule-Violations-Per-Item Ratio*		
*A low or a high ratio scaled score may reflect different cognitive problems; see examiner's manual.		

### Proverb Test

	Raw Score	Scaled Score
<b>Primary Measures</b>		
Total Achievement Score: Free Inquiry		
Total Achievement Score: Multiple Choice		*
*Cumulative Percentile Rank		

	Total Raw	Scaled Score
<b>Optional Measures: Free Inquiry</b>		
Common Proverb Achievement Score: Free Inquiry		
Uncommon Proverb Achievement Score: Free Inquiry		
Accuracy Only Score		
Abstraction Only Score		
No/Don't Know Responses		*
Repeated Responses		*
*Cumulative Percentile Rank		

	Total Raw	Cum. %ile Rank
<b>Optional Measures: Multiple Choice</b>		
Common Proverb Achievement Score: Multiple Choice		
Uncommon Proverb Achievement Score: Multiple Choice		
Total Correct Abstract Choices		
Total Correct Concrete Choices		
Total Incorrect Phonemic Choices		
Total Incorrect Unrelated Choices		
Total Incorrect Phonemic + Unrelated Choices		

Summary of Test Results:

The Delis-Kaplan Executive Function System (D-KEFS) assesses higher-level cognitive functions that are used to generate higher levels of creative and abstract thought. Executive functions are thought to tap into more fundamental or primary cognitive skills, such as attention, language, and perception. This examiner has interpreted the D-KEFS instruments at three general levels: interpretation of achievement measures; integration of D-KEFS findings with results from the entire cognitive test battery; and inferences regarding risk factors for cognitive difficulties, including possible brain dysfunction.

On the D-KEFS *Trail Making Test*, Name was asked to scan pages for numbers (Condition 1: Visual Scanning); connect numbered circles sequentially (Condition 2: Number Sequencing); connect letters in alphabetical order (Condition 3: Letter Sequencing); connect numbered and lettered circles in an alternating, sequential manner (Condition 4: Number-Letter Switching); and connect circles following a trail (Condition 5: Motor Speed). Name's performance placed in the \_\_\_\_\_ range on all conditions.

On the D-KEFS *Verbal Fluency Test: Standard Form*, Name is asked to generate words that begin with a particular letter as quickly as possible – Letter Fluency condition. For the Category Fluency condition, Name is asked to generate words that belong to a designated semantic category as quickly as possible. The third condition, Category Switching, required Name to generate words, alternating between two different semantic categories as quickly as possible. Name was allowed 60 seconds for each trial of each condition. Here, his performance was in the \_\_\_\_\_ range for Letter Fluency (scaled score = \_\_, \_\_ percentile) but within the \_\_\_\_\_ range for Category Fluency: Total Correct (scaled score = \_\_, \_\_ percentile); Category Switching: Total Correct (scaled score = \_\_, \_\_ percentile); and Category

Switching: Total Switching Accuracy (scaled score = \_\_, \_\_ percentile). According to Delis et al., 2001,

**Low scores on this task could be related to deficits in one or more fundamental abilities or higher-level executive functions tapped by the task. Fundamental deficits that can adversely affect performance on this task include (a) limited level of vocabulary, which results in a reduced pool of lexical items from which to draw; (b) poor spelling skills which can diminish an examinee's ability to abide by the orthographic rules of the task; and (c) a basic attention deficit, which can cause the examinee to become distracted or lose the instruction set of the task.**

**If performances on these basic-skills tests and on Letter Fluency are both relatively poor, then the fundamental deficits may sufficiently explain the examinee's difficulty in performing the Letter Fluency task. Individuals with developmental learning disabilities or relatively low premorbid intellectual skills often exhibit such fundamental verbal deficits. However, if performance on the fundamental tasks is relatively strong, then a deficient score on Letter Fluency may be related to impairment in one or more higher-level skills, such as initiation of verbal responses or rapid, systematic retrieval of lexical items.**

A review of Name's *Verbal Fluency Test* Primary Contrast and Optional Measures provided support for the conclusion that his \_\_\_\_\_ performance on Letter Fluency condition of the *Verbal Fluency Test* is \_\_\_\_\_ **a reflection of impairment in the higher-level skill of rapid, systematic retrieval of lexical items.**

Name's overall performance on the *Design Fluency Test* was in the \_\_\_\_\_ end of the \_\_\_\_\_ range for his age (Total Correct scaled score = \_\_, \_\_ percentile). On this task, rows of boxes, with each containing an array of dots, are presented to Name, and he is asked to draw a different design in each box using only four lines to connect the dots. This test assesses an examinee's ability to draw as many different designs as possible in 60 seconds and measures design fluency, response inhibition and cognitive flexibility.

On another task, Name achieved an \_\_\_\_\_ score (scaled score = \_\_, \_\_ percentile) on *Color-Word Interference Test* Condition 1. Condition 1 is a test of the speed with which Name can name high-frequency, repeating stimuli (i.e., color patches). It provides a baseline measure for parceling out basic naming skills. Next, Name earned an \_\_\_\_\_ score on the *Color-Word Interference Test* Condition 2: Word Reading (scaled score = \_\_, \_\_ percentile). This task is a means of evaluating Name's ability to read high-frequency, repeating words as quickly as possible. This condition provides a measure of the fundamental linguistic skill of speed of reading.

Name performed \_\_\_\_\_ on the *Color-Word Interference Test* Conditions 3: Inhibition (scaled score = 11, 63<sup>rd</sup> percentile). This task measured his ability to inhibit the more salient, automatic task of reading words in order to name the dissonant ink colors quickly. Name performed at an \_\_\_\_\_ level on Condition 4: Inhibition/Switching (scaled score = \_\_, \_\_ percentile). This

task demands adequate naming speed, reading speed, verbal inhibition, and cognitive flexibility. Notably, analysis of Name's errors across all four conditions shows that he made \_\_\_ number of Uncorrected errors on the higher level conditions (3 and 4) than on the base line conditions (1 and 2).

The D-KEFS *Sorting Test* is designed for isolating and measuring multiple components of concept- formation and problem-solving abilities. For Condition 1: Free Sorting, Name is presented with six mixed-up cards that display both stimulus words and various perceptual features. Name is then asked to sort the cards into two groups, three cards per group, according to as many different categorization rules or concepts as possible, and to describe the concepts he used to generate each sort. For Condition 2: Sort Recognition, the examiner sorts the same sets of cards into two groups, three cards per group, according to the eight target sorts. After each sort made by the examiner, the examinee attempted to identify the correct categorization rule or concept used to generate the sort. Name showed adequate performance on Condition 1 (Confirmed Correct Sorts scaled score = \_\_, \_\_ percentile and Description Score scaled score = \_\_, \_\_ percentile). However he received a significantly lower description score on Condition 2 than on Condition 1 (Condition 2: Sort Recognition Description Score scaled score = \_\_, \_\_ percentile). Delis et al., 2001, interpreted these results as follows:

**This profile of scores might be obtained by examinees who**

- **are especially vulnerable to distractibility and become mentally derailed by the particular sorts generated by the examiner;**
- **latch on to an early, salient sorting rule employed by the examiner and cannot free themselves from perseverative responding (often by reporting 2-1 descriptions); or**
- **are impaired in both initiation and concept-formation skills; the conceptual reasoning deficit is masked in the Free Sorting condition due to the lack of initiation but is revealed in the Sort Recognition condition where initiation demands are minimized.**

Name generated a mixture of correct and faulty descriptions on both conditions of the *Card Sorting* task. This finding suggests that Name has retained some degree of concept-formation skills that, at times, become **contaminated by distractibility and verbal disinhibition**. As such, it is this examiner's opinion that his disproportionate performance on the Free Sorting Description and Sort Recognition Description Conditions of the *Sorting Test* is primarily a **reflection of distractibility and verbal disinhibition**. Moreover, there are signs that Name's inability to inhibit previous responses undermined his capacity for flexibility of behavior. Name repeated several sorts and offered novel explanations of each repeated sort made. All of his novel descriptions applied to repeated sorts were incorrect and thus reflect **both deficient concept-formation skills and perseverative tendencies**.

Analysis of Name's problem-solving skills in the verbal and nonverbal modalities indicates that Name is \_\_\_ able to decipher conceptual relationships based on perceptual information than on verbal information (Combined Description Score: Perceptual Rules scaled score = 10, 50<sup>th</sup> percentile; Combined Description Score: Verbal Rules = \_\_, \_\_ percentile).

Finally, a review of Name's relative performance on the first versus second set of cards administered within each condition revealed a significantly higher Sort Recognition Description Score: Card Set 1 (scaled score = \_\_, \_\_ percentile) than Sort Recognition Description Score: Card Set 2 (scaled score = \_\_, \_\_ percentile). The decline from Card Set 1 to Card Set 2 **points to Name's difficulty acquiring more effective problem-solving strategies from experience alone – learning to learn.**

Delis et al., 2001, interpreted these results as follows: **A low number of confirmed correct sorts in Condition 1 may be related to an initiation impairment and/or to a concept-formation deficit (e.g., concrete thinking, perseverative tendencies).**

Condition 1: Percent Description Accuracy (scaled score = \_\_, \_\_ percentile)

Condition 2: Sort Recognition Description Score: Card Set 2 (scaled score = \_\_, \_\_ percentile)

On another test, the *Twenty Questions Test*, Name is presented with a stimulus page depicting pictures of 30 common objects. Here, Name is to ask the fewest number of yes/no questions possible in order to identify the unknown target object. His Initial Abstraction Score (scaled score = \_\_, \_\_ percentile) suggests intact categorical processing and abstract thinking. Next, on the *Word Context Test*, Name's ability to discover the meaning of a made-up word (e.g., *prifa*) on the basis of its use in five clue sentences was in the \_\_\_\_\_ range of functioning (*Word Context Test* Total Consecutively Correct scaled score = \_\_, \_\_ percentile). His performance **suggests a \_\_\_\_\_ in deductive reasoning skills in the verbal modality.** Additionally, Name showed a \_\_\_\_\_ number of correct-to-incorrect errors (Total raw score = \_\_, cumulative percentile rank = \_\_ percent) resulting in a \_\_\_\_\_ Consistently Correct Ratio scaled score of \_\_ (\_\_\_\_ percentile).

Finally, the *Tower Test* utilizes five disks that vary in size from small to large and a board with three vertical pegs. Each item begins by the examiner's placing from two to five disks on the pegs in a predetermined starting position and displaying a picture of the tower to be built (i.e., the ending position). Name was asked to move the disks across the three pegs to build the target tower in the fewest number of moves possible. Name's performance on the *Tower Test* was in the \_\_\_\_\_ range for individuals of comparable age.

Overall, D-KEFS results suggest \_\_\_\_\_ in rapid and systematic retrieval of lexical items, verbal inhibition, and concept formation skills. Moreover, Name showed signs of perseverative tendencies on *Card Sorting* task. Collectively, Name's test results **suggest difficulties with the executive functions essential for higher-level skills such as multitasking and divided attention.** Additionally, it is notable that Name's profile **appears more consistent with a brain damage pattern (e.g., possible frontal lobe or diffuse brain dysfunction) than a developmental learning disability or other nonneurostructural factors that might affect his performance on neuropsychological tests.** However, without medical markers of structural change (e.g., positive neuroimaging results), CNS damage cannot be confirmed by neuropsychological test findings alone.

**Emotional, Behavioral and Social Functioning**

To assess Name's emotional, social, and behavioral functioning, scales were administered. The results are below. **Empty boxes in the tables that follow indicate that scores were not clinically significant and, therefore, not entered.**

**Summary and Clinical Formulation:**

**DSM-5 Diagnostic Impression**

**Recommendations:**

It is recommended that the services listed below are initiated as soon as possible.

It was a pleasure to work with Name and we wish him well in his future.

Respectfully submitted,

---

Scott Andrews, Ph.D., H.S.P.  
Developmental Psychologist  
Licensed Psychologist  
Registered Health Service Provider  
Director