

**ESPY 780**  
**Psychoeducational Assessment I: Intellectual**  
**Fall 2006**

Instructor: Deborah Kundert  
Office: 209 Education  
Phone: 442-5072  
Email: dkundert@csc.albany.edu  
Office Hours: M 2:00-4:00  
W 2:00-4:00

**I. Catalog Description:**

Problems of definition and development of a concept of intelligence. Historical and contemporary approaches to the problems of measuring intelligence, with emphasis on the use of current individual assessment techniques. Focus specifically on issues concerning the intellectual functioning of children; students are required to conduct cognitive assessments as a laboratory assignment.

This course will examine the nature of human intelligence/cognitive abilities, its measurement, test bias, and the assessment of individuals of minority status. The course will provide preliminary training and experience in the administration and interpretation of individual intelligence/cognitive abilities tests, as well as the writing of partial psychoeducational reports with appropriate and meaningful interpretation. Throughout the semester, students will: (1) be introduced to the process of standardized assessment; (2) develop skills for administering and evaluating the results of various standardized measures of cognitive and intellectual functioning; (3) evaluate information obtained during the assessment process through empirically-based, psychometrically defensible methods; and (4) present assessment findings in both written and oral formats. Theoretical foundations and recent developments in the field of cognitive assessment will be discussed. A primary goal of this course is to emphasize an empirically-based perspective when collecting, analyzing, and/or presenting assessment data to make educational and clinical decisions. The assessment field is rapidly changing as new models of cognitive abilities and processing, as well as the forces of a market economy, make the transition from theoretical constructs to clinical application. This course emphasizes both 'how to' administer tests of cognitive abilities, and general principles to guide the use and application of assessment tools throughout your professional careers. Specifically, this course emphasizes the acquisition of the technical and clinical skills needed to ethically, reliably, and responsibly administer tests of cognitive abilities. Each student is encouraged to be a critical consumer of these assessments.

Competent administration and interpretation of cognitive measures requires the sophisticated integration of numerous skills. It is the responsibility of every test user to not only administer and score tests accurately, but also to be aware of their strengths and limitations, to be knowledgeable of the technical portions of test manuals, and to be able to make appropriate and meaningful interpretations. These skills cannot simply be acquired during a single semester, as they require years of experience and practice to

hone appropriately. This course is merely the first step in a long series of educational and training experiences that will eventually lead to ethical and competent assessment skills. It is expected that students will be introduced to the theoretical and applied basis of cognitive assessment, and that they will continue to refine these skills throughout their educational and professional careers.

This course is designed as part of a logical sequence of assessment courses and field training experiences that demand an increasingly more sophisticated integration of a variety of assessment techniques and approaches used with children and youth. Clinical interpretation and ethical, professional use of these assessment measures can be assumed only after the information obtained in this course and subsequent courses and field training is integrated with theory and professional experience. As such, students should understand that these skills will be reinforced throughout their training in school psychology and that the taking of this course alone in no way assures competent assessment skills (i.e., it is necessary, but not sufficient). Rather, this is the first in a long line of training experiences focused on the use of assessment data to help summarize patterns of behavior and to develop interventions.

You should be aware of the significant amount of time that will be needed to master the course objectives. Learning will vary from basic rote memory and motor skills (e.g., manipulating test materials) to higher order analysis and synthesis skills (e.g., interpretation, intervention planning). An understanding of basic measurement, research methodology, elementary statistics, development, and abnormal psychology is assumed and necessary for success in the course. Excellent written communication skills (e.g., spelling, grammar, and sentence construction) are also needed.

Course prerequisites: Students must be admitted and enrolled in a professional psychology program (School Psychology, Clinical Psychology, Counseling Psychology). Students must have adequate preparation in experimental design and statistics in order to meet class requirements. In addition, students should have a background and be knowledgeable about human development and human learning.

## II. Course Objectives:

**To guide the implementation of the Program's philosophy, the faculty have adopted Shulman's (1986) framework for conceptualizing training in a clinically focused profession. An effective training program incorporates and integrates three types of knowledge: propositional knowledge, case knowledge, and strategic knowledge.**

**Propositional Knowledge: represents the theoretical and empirical bases for professional practice. Students typically gain propositional knowledge through class lectures and readings.**

**Propositional knowledge goals for this course include:**

*Students will:*

1. Demonstrate knowledge of the historical foundations in assessment as these relate to the assessment of cognitive abilities.

2. Demonstrate knowledge of both the historical and contemporary theories of intelligence/cognitive abilities.
3. Examine critically the theoretical and empirical issues in the assessment of intelligence/cognitive abilities.
4. Demonstrate knowledge of and generate major arguments supporting and limiting the validity of tests of cognitive abilities.
5. Recognize and apply major theories of cognitive abilities and measurement principles when selecting, administering, and interpreting assessment information.
6. Demonstrate an appreciation and awareness of the uses and limitations that intelligence/cognitive abilities tests may have for persons from diverse ethnic, cultural, linguistic, and socioeconomic backgrounds.
7. Demonstrate knowledge of ethical and legal issues in assessment.
8. Develop an appreciation for the scope and limits of various cognitive assessment tools.

**Case Knowledge: reflects the application of propositional knowledge in the context of case exemplars. Shulman identified three types of case knowledge: prototypes (case studies that exemplify theoretical principles), precedents (case studies that communicate practical knowledge), and parables (case studies that demonstrate values and norms).**

**Case knowledge goals for this course include:**

*Students will:*

1. Demonstrate initial skills in interpretation of assessment results through prototypes, precedents, and parables.
2. Demonstrate initial skills in the communication of assessment results and intervention planning in writing through prototypes, precedents, and parables.

**Strategic Knowledge: reflected in professional judgment as one engages in the active decision-making (problem solving) process of professional practice. The application of strategic knowledge relies on propositional and case knowledge relevant to the particular situation.**

**Strategic knowledge goals for this course include:**

*Students will:*

1. Demonstrate responsible test use behaviors through applied experiences required in this course.
2. Complete assignments following ethical standards.

3. Demonstrate appropriate interpersonal attributes and professional relations (commitment to learning, appropriate interpersonal skills, effective communication skills, effective use of time and resources, use of constructive feedback, problem-solving, professional deportment, responsibility, critical thinking, stress management, ethical behavior, client sensitivity, and participation in supervision) across all aspects of the course.
4. Demonstrate initial competency skills in:
  - Handling test materials
  - Administration (standardized, timing)
  - Scoring
  - Interpretation
  - Communication of the results in writing of assessment techniques for various audiences (other professionals, parents, examinees)
5. Formulate a professional philosophy of the role of cognitive assessment in school psychological practice.
6. Demonstrate appropriate and effective use of technology in test scoring and write-ups.

### III. Materials:

#### Required texts:

Flanagan, D. P. & Harrison, P. L. (Eds.). (2005). *Contemporary intellectual assessment: Theories, tests, and issues* (2<sup>nd</sup> ed.). New York: The Guilford Press

Mather, N. & Jaffe, L. E. (2002). *Woodcock-Johnson III: Reports, recommendations, and strategies*. NY: John Wiley & Sons, Inc.

Sattler, J. M. (2001). *Assessment of children: Cognitive applications* (4th ed.). San Diego: Jerome M. Sattler, Publisher, Inc.

Sattler, J.M. & Dumont, R. (2004). *Assessment of children: WISC-IV AND WPPSI-III Supplement*. San Diego: Jerome M. Sattler, Publisher, Inc.

[www.riverpub.com/products/clinical/wj3/resource.html](http://www.riverpub.com/products/clinical/wj3/resource.html) (DONWLOAD ON YOUR OWN)

- [SB5 Assessment Service Bulletin #2: Accommodations on the Stanford-Binet Intelligence Scales, Fifth Edition](#)
- [SB5 Assessment Service Bulletin #3: Use of the Stanford-Binet Intelligence Scales, Fifth Edition in the Assessment of High Abilities](#)

- [SB5 Assessment Service Bulletin #4: Special Composite Scores for the Stanford-Binet Intelligence Scales, Fifth Edition](#)
- ["Technical Brief - Interpretation of SB5/Early SB5 Factor Index Scores" by Gale H. Roid.](#)

<http://harcourtassessment.com/hai/Images/pdf/assessmentReports/AdministrationPractices.pdf>

CHC worksheets from the web

<http://www.wiley.com/WileyCDA/WileyAncillary/productCd-047178401X.html>

Shipmate's Packet

Reserve Readings: (included in the Shipmate's packet)

APA (2002). ETHICAL GUIDELINES 2002 DOWNLOAD FROM  
www.apa.org

American Psychological Association (1993). Guidelines for providers of psychological services to ethnic, linguistic, and culturally diverse populations. *American Psychologist*, 48, 45-48.

Bell, S.M. (no date). Psychoeducational assessment: How to read, understand, and use psychoeducational reports. In *Keys to effective LD teaching practice* (pp. 24-36).

Bracken, B.A. (1988). Ten psychometric reasons why similar tests produce dissimilar results. *Journal of School Psychology*, 26, 155-166.

Braden, J.P. (1999). Straight talk about assessment and diversity: What do we know? *School Psychology Quarterly*, 14, 343-355.

Canter, A. (1998). Understanding test scores: A handout for parents/teachers. In *Helping children at home and school: Handouts from your school psychologist* (pp. 115-121). Bethesda, MD: National Association of School Psychologists.

Dumont, R. & Willis, J. O. (2003). Issues regarding the supervision of assessment. *The Clinical Supervisor*, 22, 159-176.

Elements of sound testing practice.

Establishing rapport (handout)

- Esters, I.G., Ittenbach, R.F., & Han, K. (1997). Today's IQ tests: Are they really better than their historical predecessors? *School Psychology Review*, 26, 211-224.
- Eyde, et al. (1999). The 86 elements of competent test use. In L.D. Eyde et al. *Responsible test use* (pp. 213-215).
- Flanagan, D.P. & Kaufman, A.S. (2004). *Essentials of WISC-IV assessment*. Hoboken, NJ: John Wiley and Sons, Inc.
- Flanagan, D.P. & Ortiz, S.O. (2002). Best practices in intellectual assessment: Future directions. In A. Thomas & J. Grimes (Eds.), *Best practices in school psychology IV* (pp. 1351-1372). Bethesda, MD: The National Association of School Psychologists.
- Flanagan, D.P. & Ortiz, S.O. (2001). Overview. In D.P. Flanagan & S.O. Ortiz, *Essentials of cross-battery assessment* (pp. 1-45). NY: John Wiley & Sons, Inc.
- Flynn, J.R. (1999). Searching for justice: The discovery of IQ gains over time. *American Psychologist*, 54, 5-20.
- Frisby, C.L. (1999a). Straight talk about cognitive assessment and diversity. *School Psychology Quarterly*, 14, 195-207.
- Frisby, C.L. (1999b). Culture and test session behavior: Part I. *School Psychology Quarterly*, 14, 263-280.
- Frisby, C.L. (1999c). Culture and test session behavior: Part II. *School Psychology Quarterly*, 14, 281-303.
- Gearheart, B.R. & Willenberg, E.P. (1980). *Application of pupil assessment information*. Denver: Love Publishing Company.
- Hale, J.B. & Fiorello, C.A. (2001). Beyond the academic rhetoric of 'g': Intelligence testing guidelines for practitioners. *The School Psychologist*, 55, 113-117, 131-135, 138-139.
- Holdnack, J. A. (no date). *Defining the role of intellectual and cognitive assessment in special education*. (downloaded from Harcourt Assessment).
- How to learn and practice administering tests of cognitive abilities (prepared by school psychology faculty)

- Kaufman, A.S., Lichtenberger, E.O., Fletcher-Janzen, E., & Kaufman, N.L. (2005). *Essentials of KABC-II assessment*. Hoboken, NJ: John Wiley & Sons, Inc.
- Kaufman & Woodcock classifications/adjectives for scores
- Keith, T.Z., Fine, J. G., Taub, G. E., Reynolds, M. R., & Kranzler, J. H. (2006). Higher order, multisample, confirmatory factor analysis of the Wechsler Intelligence Scale for Children—Fourth Edition: What does it measure? *School Psychology Review*, 35, 108-127.
- 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.
- McGrew, K.S. & Flanagan, D.P. (1998a). A continuum of progress in psychometric theories and measures of intelligence: From Spearman's *g* to contemporary Gf-Gc theory. In K.S. McGrew & D.P. Flanagan, *The intelligence test desk reference (ITDR)*, (pp. 1-32). Boston: Allyn and Bacon.
- McGrew, K.S. & Flanagan, D.P. (1998b). Gf-Gc theory in perspective: Supporting evidence, relations to academic achievement, occupational outcomes and other traits, and limitations. In K.S. McGrew & D.P. Flanagan, *The intelligence test desk reference (ITDR)*, (pp. 33-50). Boston: Allyn and Bacon.
- Naglieri, J.A. (1999). *Essentials of CAS assessment*. NY: John Wiley & Sons, Inc.
- Ortiz, S.O. & Ochoa, S.H. (2005). Conceptual measurement and methodological issues in cognitive assessment of culturally and linguistically diverse individuals. In R.L. Rhodes, S.H. Ochoa, & S.O. Ortiz, *Assessing culturally and linguistically diverse students* (pp. 153-167). NY: The Guilford Press.
- Read, B.G. & Schrank, F.A. (2003). Qualitative analysis of Woodcock-Johnson III test performance. In F.A. Schrank & D.P. Flanagan, *WJ III clinical use and interpretation*, (pp. 47-73). Boston: Academic Press.
- Reschley, D.J. & Grimes, J.D. (2002). Best practices in intellectual assessment. In A. Thomas & J. Grimes (Eds.), *Best practices in school psychology IV* (pp. 1337-1350). Bethesda, MD: The National Association of School Psychologists.
- Reynolds, C. R. & Kaiser, S. M. (2003). Bias in assessment of aptitude. In C. R. Reynolds & R. W. Kamphaus (Eds.), *Handbook of psychological and*

*educational assessment of children: Intelligence, aptitude, and achievement* (2<sup>nd</sup> edition; pp. 519-562). NY: The Guilford Press.

Roid, G.H. (2003). *Interpretive manual: Expanded guide to the interpretation of SB5 test results*. Itasca, IL: Riverside Publishing Company.

Roid, G.H. & Barram, R.A. (2004). *Essentials of Stanford-Binet Intelligence Scales (SB5) assessment*. Hoboken, NJ: John Wiley & Sons, Inc.

So what's my kid's IQ? (handout prepared by L. Ford)

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

Weiss, L.G., Saklofske, D.H., & Prifitera, A. (2005). Interpreting the WISC-IV index scores. In A. Prifitera, D.H. Saklofske, & L.G. Weiss, *WISC-IV clinical use and interpretation* (pp. 71-89). Boston: Elsevier Academic Press.

#### WJ General Test Observation Checklist

Test kits and protocols: Test kits and protocols are available through Sheila in the School Psych office. Protocol fee for the semester is \$50.00

stopwatch (quiet, silent/nonbeeping type recommended)

3-ring binder (at least 2-inch) for test interpretation notebook

VHS tape (blank to use for each observation conducted)

#### **Course ethics:**

NASP and APA Ethical Guidelines will apply to all aspects of this course. Testing materials in this course are 'secure' tests-sharing the tests or allowing others (e.g., friends, relatives, or coworkers who are not in or have not taken this course) to look at, play with, examine, etc., test materials and manuals violates test security and is a violation of ethical and professional practice. Thus, the names or identities of examinees and parents/guardians are to be kept strictly confidential. Furthermore, no person except the student, protocol reviewer, and instructor are to know the score of any examinee. Under no circumstances should test materials be shared with persons other than the members of this class. Test security is vital. Keep all materials in a safe place. Do not leave them in your car or unattended. You must inform examinees or guardians prior to the assessment process (via memo in Shipmates packet) that the results cannot be disclosed to them. General comments, such as 'she is doing well,' cannot be made. Failure to adhere to this policy will result in a grade of F and recommendation for dismissal from the program.

**IV. Course Requirements:** All class assignments, including readings, test protocols, reports, and exams are to be completed according to the course schedule. I understand that students and examinees become ill or life activities may interfere. **Therefore**, you should plan testing sessions and assignments in advance of the due dates. Although I am understanding, exceptions to the course schedule **will not be made.**

1. Administration of cognitive/intellectual ability measures

Each student will be required to administer and properly score the following number of tests:

WISC-IV .....	3	(1 with child ages 6-10; 1 with child ages 11-16)
WAIS-III .....	2	
KABC-II .....	1	
WJ III GOG....	5	(2 Standard Battery, 2 Extended Batteries, and 1 Diagnostic Supplement; at least 2 protocols with children and 2 protocols with adults)
Other .....	1	(select 1 from: KAIT, RIAS, CAS, DAS, UNIT, Leiter-R, or SB5)

For each test administered, students are expected to submit their protocols, signed permission for assessment, and observation form and notes for review.

- Each protocol is worth a maximum of 20 points.
- Students are expected to demonstrate skill mastery of test administration and scoring. Mastery will be evidenced by at least 80% on each test protocol. Grading will be based on adherence to standardized procedures, with partial credit given where appropriate (protocol evaluation form included in the Shipmate's packet): A=19-20, A-=18, B+=17, B=16, F= $\leq$ 15. **TO PASS THIS COURSE, STUDENTS MUST RECEIVE A RATING OF 16 OR HIGHER ON AT LEAST 9 of the 11 PROTOCOLS; LESS THAN 16 POINTS ON 3 OR MORE PROTOCOLS RESULTS IN AUTOMATIC FAILURE FOR THE COURSE** (this failure is regardless of grades on the other class assignments). Students are allowed to drop the 2 lowest protocol scores from their final grade, though all students are required to administer the 12 measures as outlined above.
- Protocol completion: complete personal information section of the protocol with fictitious information. When administering tests, the student is to record in pencil, AND in full, all of the examinee's responses. Recording must be complete and legible in order for protocol reviewers to check responses and score the protocol. Failure to do so will result in the protocol being returned to the student with a score of 0. In addition to recording the examinee's responses, the student must indicate his/her own questions by using the abbreviation 'Q' to show that he/she questioned the examinee at the point indicated. Everything you do must be noted on the protocol. If you question an examinee on an item and the examinee gives

you a nonverbal or pointing response, you must indicate such. Likewise, you must indicate that sample items have been administered, if appropriate. Students must also identify the basal, starting, and ceiling on each subtest. Finally, students are to record behavioral observations on the protocol for each subtest.

If in reviewing your practice protocols you realize you made a mistake, note the error in the margin of the protocol or on a post-it attached to the protocol and it will not be counted as an error.

- In addition to the completed protocol and permission form, students must complete a form documenting observations during assessment (see Shipmates packet); a different form for each protocol must be used.

Competent administration of cognitive measures requires considerable practice and attention to detail. When scoring ambiguous responses, students are encouraged to seek advice from the instructor and other students.

It is the responsibility of the students to secure the necessary volunteers for their test administrations. Written permission for each subject must be obtained and submitted with the completed protocol. Test administrations are solely for practice purposes, and the validity of the assessment results is suspect. It is important to inform children/parents that all results are completely confidential, and that test results cannot be shared with the parent, child, or anyone else. No feedback can be given to any of the subjects or their guardians. When submitting protocols, do not use the volunteer's actual name, school, address, etc. All identifying information must be fictitious. Actual names may only appear on the permission form. Volunteers must be selected following the guidelines provided in the Shipmate's packet.

Test kits are available through the course instructor, and must be signed out and returned to the instructor. These kits are extremely expensive, so please use them with kindness, care, and respect. Students are allowed to check out up to 2 kits at one time only.

The test kits are quite expensive and are to be treated with care. Replacement costs are as follows:

TEST	COST
WJ III COG	\$742.50
WJ III COG DIAGNOSTIC SUPPLEMENT	\$281.50
WISC-IV	\$875
WAIS-III	\$875
RIAS	\$355
UNIT	\$602
SB-5	\$892.50
LEITER-R	\$850

DAS	\$825
CAS	\$778.50
KAIT	\$689.99
KABC-II	\$724.99

A damage fee will apply to test kits that receive more than ‘routine wear and tear.’ Similarly, you will be required to pay for any missing items from the test kits. Prior to checking out the test kits, it is necessary for you to verify the completeness and overall condition of the kit. **YOU ARE RESPONSIBLE FOR THE KIT THAT YOU SIGN OUT!!!!**

**HIGHLIGHTING OR MARKING OF TEST MANUALS AND MATERIALS IS NOT PERMITTED.** If you wish to highlight or mark materials, then you should purchase the test manual. Prices range from \$50 to \$100, depending on the test.

Final grades will not be released until all materials are returned or reimbursement is made.

**CAUTION:** Wait for feedback on the protocol before you go on to another protocol using the same test. **DO NOT WORK AHEAD** (you do not want to make the same mistake[s]; you might have to test another subject for the assignment; and you have been provided with the correct number of protocols to complete your assignments)

2. Live test administration observations  
Students are required to arrange for 2 testing sessions (1 *WJ III*, 1 Wechsler scale) to be directly observed by the instructor.

*Students will review their taped administration with the test manual and test materials and complete rating form to be compared with instructor’s rating form (WJ III COG form in Shipmates pack, Wechsler forms in Sattler and Sattler and Dumont). In addition, submit a written critique of your administration. Schedule an appointment with the instructor to review your performance. Each observation will be evaluated based on adherence to standardized procedures and level of comfort manipulating the materials.*

3. Sample write-ups  
Each student will write 4 partial psychological reports (intelligence/cognitive abilities section, observations, summary, tentative recommendations) following the outline in the Shipmate’s packet. Each report must be word processed, double-spaced, and is due according to the class schedule. One report must be prepared on each of the following tests: 1 *WJ III* Standard Battery, 1 *WJ III* Extended Battery, 1 Wechsler scale (either *WISC-IV* or *WAIS-III*), and 1 test from the Other Category. When turning in each write-up, you must include the protocol and permission form. Be sure to carefully proofread and edit the write-up before

submitting it. I expect each report to be professionally presented. Errors in grammar, spelling, and punctuation will result in lower ratings.

Often, students put a write-up format on their computer and then insert the examinee name, birthdate, scores, etc. to make the writing the partial report easier. This is acceptable; however, failure to change names, birthdates, pronouns, or scores from one report to the next is considered unacceptable. Such write-ups will be scored).

*The reports will be evaluated on a 3-point scale-see Shipmate's packet. Evaluation will be based on appearance, identifying information, observations, results, interpretation, summary, recommendations, style/usage/spelling and grammar, organization and table. Late reports will receive a failing grade.*

4. Class readings/participation

Weekly readings are assigned from the texts and Shipmate's readings. Students are expected to have read the material and come prepared to participate in class discussions.

*Evaluation of readings and participation will be based on attendance and level of active participation in class discussions, as well as instructor observations of student questions (use of appropriate resources).*

5. In-class Examinations

Class examinations will SAMPLE student knowledge development, comprehension of information, and application of knowledge (it would be impossible to ask a question on every single bit of information students are exposed to in their readings, lectures, and discussions). A midterm and final examination will be developed based on class lectures and readings. These examinations are not cumulative. The format for each examination will be short answer essay questions.

*Essay responses will be evaluated according to the following: organization, style and clarity, content (the degree to which the question is answered correctly), and scholarliness.*

6. Test Interpretation Notebook

Each student is required to obtain a 3-ring binder in which to insert information related to test interpretation for each measure administered. Typical information to include (**at a minimum**):

- Description of the measure
- Description of the scores obtained
- Description of subtests and task demands
- Other information as appropriate

*Interpretation notebooks will be examined for completeness, and graded accordingly.*

## V. Grading:

On all assignments handed in, you must use the last 4 digits of your social security number. All assignments will be reviewed and graded prior to any name being attached to the product to ensure fairness to all students.

The requirements for this course include demonstration of 2 types of knowledge: (a) propositional knowledge (theoretical) and (b) strategic knowledge (skill development). It is required that students demonstrate minimal competence in each of these areas.

Minimal competence is defined as at least 80% mastery on:

- each protocol (Students must receive at least 16 points on EACH protocol in order to pass this course. Failure to meet this criterion results in an automatic FAILURE IN THE COURSE (students may drop the 2 lowest protocol scores, though they must administer all 12 required tests)

**TO PASS THIS COURSE, STUDENTS MUST RECEIVE A RATING OF 16 OR HIGHER ON AT LEAST 10 OF THE 12 PROTOCOLS; LESS THAN 16 POINTS ON 3 OR MORE OF THE PROTOCOLS RESULTS IN AUTOMATIC FAILURE FOR THE COURSE**

- all other assignments

Grading breakdown:

Protocols (10 at a maximum of 20 points each)	200
Observations (maximum of 20 points each)	40
Sample Write-Ups (maximum of 40 points each)	160
Interpretation Notebook (maximum of 50 points)	50
<b>Class attendance and participation (maximum 5 points for each class/lab attended=130 points maximum)</b>	<b>130</b>
Midterm and Final Exams (maximum of 100 points each)	200
<b>TOTAL POSSIBLE</b>	<b>780</b>

The final grade will be calculated as follows:

% of points	# of points	Final Course Grade
≥93	725-780	A
90-92	700-724	A-
87-89	678-699	B+
83-86	647-677	B
80-82	624-646	B-
77-79	600-623	C+
73-76	569-599	C

70-72	546-568	C-
≤69	≤545	F

Typically, student products will be returned within 10 working days from the date received. The exception to this is that the first protocol will be returned within 5 working days of receipt.

**Reasonable accommodations will be provided for students with documented physical, sensory, systemic, cognitive, learning, and psychiatric disabilities. If you believe you have a disability requiring accommodation in this class, please notify the Director of Disabled Student Services (Campus Center 137, 442-5490). That office will provide the course instructor with verification of your disability, and will recommend appropriate accommodations.**

*Academic integrity*

Scholarly inquiry requires discussion and debate if it is to yield valuable knowledge. New ideas must be tested, questioned, analyzed, scrutinized, and challenged before they can be found to be reliable and useful. An erroneous claim—one that is based on faulty interpretation or poor research methods—is undesirable, but it is an accepted part of scholarly debate... everyone makes honest mistakes. A fraudulent claim is never acceptable. The basis of discussion and debate in all learning is trustworthiness. If a researcher lies about data, takes personal credit for others’ ideas or labor, knowingly misrepresents the work of other scholars, or presents the same research repeatedly as if they were the products of new investigations, trust is violated and the whole academic community is damaged. No one has gained in knowledge—indeed, some may be distracted away from important research—and resources (time, funding, awards, etc.) are inappropriately allocated. No one learns and everyone loses.

It is important that we employ principles of academic integrity in this course. Academic dishonesty is not only a failure to learn the content of the course, but a failure to behave according to the fundamental principles of trustworthiness essential to any learning. Depending on the situation, academic dishonesty can be patently unfair to others in the course, especially if it misleads others, distracts them from their own efforts, or diminishes rewards for their more legitimate achievements.

***In essence, any work you present in this course as your own must truly be your own and unique to this course.*** There is no other way to learn but to put forth your best efforts and learn from errors honestly made. Receiving or taking assistance during an examination is a fraudulent representation of your work. Submitting papers written by others or purchased from “paper mills” is a breach of trust. Submitting work that you did elsewhere as if it were new work for this course is unacceptable. Taking large portions of text from a published source or from the Internet without proper citation is an act of academic dishonesty. Even if you take an important idea or paraphrase text written elsewhere, you must provide sufficient citation that allows a reader to find the original source.

In this course, any act of academic dishonesty will yield its appropriate grade, a failure (no points) for that assignment, and I will report the incident to the Office of the Graduate Dean. If I think the offense particularly serious, I reserve the right to give a failing grade for the course and to bring the offending student to University adjudication that may result in dismissal.

Additional information about the University's standards for academic integrity in graduate education is available in the Graduate Bulletin

([http://www.albany.edu/grad/requirements\\_general\\_admissions.html#standards\\_integrity](http://www.albany.edu/grad/requirements_general_admissions.html#standards_integrity)).

Please read the sections on academic integrity and examples of academic dishonesty. You might also review a tutorial on plagiarism offered by the University Library

(<http://library.albany.edu/usered/ncplaga/index.html>) --though it's written with undergraduates in mind. If you have any doubts, questions, or concerns about standards of academic integrity, please bring them to me or raise them in class. It is just as important that we develop a shared sense of trustworthiness in our learning as it is to learn the content of the course itself.

**THERE ARE NO MAKE-UPS OR DEADLINE EXTENSIONS**

## VI. Course Schedule:

DATE	TOPIC	READING	PROTOCOL(S)	REPORTS	OTHER
9/5	Introduction Course Overview Course Requirements				
9/7	<i>Graduate courses in intellectual/cognitive assessment</i> <i>Considerations in testing individuals (e.g., setting, rapport)</i> <i>Use of computers in assessment</i> <i>Overview of WJ III Administration I</i>	*Alfonso *Braden & Alfonso *Oakland article  How to learn and practice administering... <i>WJ III COG manual</i> <i>WJ III General test observations checklist</i>			
9/12	Defining Intelligence Introduction to cognitive assessment Reasons for cognitive assessment Review of basic measurement concepts	F & H 28 S 4, 5 Bracken 1988 Canter, 1998 Elements of sound testing practice Eyde et al., 1999 Hale & Fiorello, 2001 Kaufman & Woodcock classifications			
9/14	<i>Considerations in testing individuals (e.g., setting, rapport)</i> <i>Use of computers in assessment</i> <i>Overview of WJ III Administration II</i>	S 7 <i>Dumont &amp; Willis, 2003</i> <i>Establishing rapport</i> <i>WJ III COG manual</i> <i>Read &amp; Schrank, 2003</i>			
9/19	History and Origins of Intellectual Assessment Theories of Intelligence Past and Present	F & H 1, 3, 4, 5, 6 S 5  So what's my kid's IQ  <i>McGrew &amp;</i>	#1		

DATE	TOPIC	READING	PROTOCOL(S)	REPORTS	OTHER
		<i>Flanagan, 1998 a, b</i>			
9/21	<i>WJ III COG administration &amp; interpretation</i>	<i>F &amp; H 17 WJ III COG manual Mather &amp; Jaffe pp. 3-45</i>			
9/26	Theories of intelligence continued	F & H 7, 8, 9, 10			
9/28	<i>WJ III COG Interpretation</i>	<i>F &amp; H 17 WJ III COG manual Mather &amp; Jaffe pp 3-45</i>			
10/3	CHC Theory Cross Battery Approach Interpreting results of cognitive tests	F & H 2, 12 Flanagan & Ortiz, 2001 Mather & Jaffe McDermott et al. 1990 CHC worksheets So what's my kid's IQ	#2		
10/5	<i>Wechsler administration &amp; interpretation</i>	<i>F &amp; H 14 S 12, 13 S &amp; D 1, 2, 3, 4 WAIS-III &amp; WISC-IV manuals</i>			
10/10	Legal & ethical issues in cognitive assessment	Apa.org web— ethics S 1, 2, 3			<b>OBSERVATION #1 (10/11, 10/12, 10/13, 10/14)</b>
10/12	<i>Wechsler administration &amp; interpretation</i>	<i>F &amp; H 14 S 12, 13 S &amp; D 1, 2, 3, 4 WAIS-III &amp; WISC-IV manuals Weiss et al., 2005 Flanagan &amp; Kaufman, 2004 Keith et al., 2006 Harcourt download</i>			
10/17	<b>MIDTERM EXAM</b>				<b>Review of observation tape 1  Conference with</b>

DATE	TOPIC	READING	PROTOCOL(S)	REPORTS	OTHER
					<b>instructor re: observation 1</b>
10/19	<i>KAIT/KABC-II administration &amp; interpretation</i>	<i>F &amp; H 16 KAIT/KABC-II manuals Kaufman et al. 2005</i>	#3		
10/24	<b>UNIVERSITY HOLIDAY</b>				
10/26	<b>NO CLASS; INSTRUCTOR AT NAN</b>		<b><u>#4 to Sheila by 1:15 pm</u></b>		
10/31	Interpretation & report writing	S 21 Bell Write-Up format Gearheart & Willenberg Mather & Jaffe 47-51	#5		<b>Conference with instructor draft of Report 1</b>
11/2	<i>KAIT/KABC-II administration &amp; interpretation</i>	<i>F &amp; H 16 KAIT/KABC-II manuals</i>		#1	<b>Conference with instructor draft of Report 1</b>
11/7	Cognitive assessment across the lifespan	S 6 Flynn, 1999	#6		<b>OBERVATION 2 (11/8, 11/9, 11/10, 11/11)</b>
11/9	<i>SB5 administration &amp; interpretation</i>	<i>F &amp; H 15 SB5 manual Roid &amp; Barram, 2004 Roid, 2003 Riverside downloads</i>			
11/14	Diversity & cognitive assessment	S 19, 20 Braden 1999 Frisby 1999a	#7		<b>Review of observation tape 2</b>  <b>Conference with instructor re: observation 2</b>
11/16	<i>CAS administration &amp; interpretation</i>	<i>F &amp; H 20 CAS manual Naglieri, 1999</i>		#2	<b>Review of observation tape 2</b>  <b>Conference with instructor re: observation 2</b>
11/21	Issues of bias &	F & H 25	#8		

<b>DATE</b>	<b>TOPIC</b>	<b>READING</b>	<b>PROTOCOL(S)</b>	<b>REPORTS</b>	<b>OTHER</b>
	cognitive assessment	APA 1993 Reynolds & Kaiser, Suzuki & Valencia, 1997			
<b>11/23</b>	<b>THANKSGIVING RECESS</b>				
11/28	Issues of bias & cognitive assessment	Ortiz & Ochoa, 2005 Frisby 1999 b, c	#9 & 10		
11/30	<i>RIAS &amp; DAS administration &amp; interpretation</i>	<i>F &amp; H 18, 21 S 15 RIAS &amp; DAS manuals</i>		#3	
12/5	Cognitive assessment & special populations	F & H 11 S 16	#11		
12/7	<i>Leiter-R &amp; UNIT administration &amp; interpretation</i>	<i>F &amp; H 19, 26 Leiter-R &amp; UNIT manuals</i>		#4	
12/12	Utility of cognitive assessment Future and cognitive assessment	F & H 22, 23, 24, 29 Esters et al. 1997 Reschley & Grimes 2002 Flanagan & Ortiz 2002 Holdnack (no date)	#12		
<b>12/19</b>	<b>FINAL EXAM</b>				

**ESPY 780**  
**Fall 2006**

**SELECTION OF SUBJECTS**

1. The examinee must be a volunteer. For minors, written caregiver permission must be secured. Do not go into a school system, hospital, or any other organization without my authorization.
2. No person, except you, me, and the graduate assistant, are to know the name or scores of the examinee. Caregivers must be provided with the memo stating that this is a training exercise for you and that the results cannot be disclosed to them. Tell the caregivers and the examinee that you are simply learning how to administer the test, and therefore, the results are not reliable. You can emphasize that the sessions will be interesting and challenging, and a learning experience.
3. You are to make no recommendations for psychological or medical treatment to the caregivers on the basis of your evaluation.
4. Professional ethics must be adhered to in selecting your subject. You CANNOT test your own children, spouses, close friends, or relatives (these all represent dual relationships). You could trade with classmates.
5. The material you obtain from your examinee is confidential. You are expected to treat it as such. Do not discuss the examinee or any of the results outside of class. Keep all examinee materials and test kits in safe, secure places.
6. The actual name of the examinee is to appear on ONLY the permission form. Use a pseudonym on all protocols.