

**Psych. 760 Assessment**  
**Spring 2006**  
**January 2006**

**Instructor:**

Nan Huai, PhD  
256 Hibbard Hall  
Email: [huain@uwec.edu](mailto:huain@uwec.edu)

Office Hours: Monday 11:00am to 12:00pm or by appointment through email.

**Teaching Assistants:**

Candace Manthei  
E-mail: [manthecm@uwec.edu](mailto:manthecm@uwec.edu)  
Office Hours:

Shelly Schurman  
E-mail: [groenesm@uwec.edu](mailto:groenesm@uwec.edu)  
Office Hours:

**Course Overview:**

This course is a continuation of the course bearing the same number (Psyc 760) in fall 2005. The primary purpose of this course is to teach the administration, scoring, interpretation, and “intelligent” use of individual tests of cognitive abilities and achievement, as well as non-standardized assessment tools for achievement. In addition, students will learn to systematically use behavioral and socio-emotional measures to gather information relevant to children’s functioning and outcomes.

During the first 8 weeks of spring 2006 semester, students will receive direct instruction and supervised practice with the following cognitive and achievement tests: Woodcock-Johnson III Test of Cognitive Abilities (WJ-III COG), Woodcock-Johnson III Test of Achievement (WJ-III ACH.), and Stanford-Binet Intelligence Scale 5<sup>th</sup> edition (SB5). Students will also learn the interpretation of these standardized tests and psychological report writing pertaining to these tests.

In addition to the standardized cognitive and achievement tests, authentic assessments and curriculum-based assessments will be introduced. These assessments are closely associated with the accountability requirement in recent legislations, as well as the scientific practice of psychology (e.g., treatment validity and outcome evaluation). Finally, students will learn systematic approaches to behavioral and socio-emotional assessments. Throughout the instruction of these various assessment tools, students are expected to connect the basic concepts and principals of assessments with specific tools.

**Course objectives**

1. Master the WJ-III COG and WJ-III ACH test administration, scoring, and interpretation;

2. Become familiar with the SB5 test administration, scoring, and interpretation;
3. Establish a solid understanding of alternatives to standardized tests, their administration procedures, utility, and limitations.
4. Master the administration and interpretation of several important and most often used behavioral measures.
5. Develop an understanding of standardized cognitive assessments in school psychology practices, their limitations, and best practices;
6. Develop skills in psychological report writing and oral presentation to effectively communicate testing results to others;

## Course Requirements

Students are evaluated based on several products and aspects of behavior performance. Detailed descriptions of each requirement counted towards the final score are: (a) Protocols for WJ and SB = 25%; Videos of WJ and SB = 10%; Reports of WJ and SB = 15%; (b) Presentation of various assessment instruments = 15%; (c) CBA protocols and summary report = 15%; CBA presentation = 10%; (d) Participation = 5%; and (e) Attendance = 5%.

The Appendices present the evaluation criteria of various products:

Appendix A: Error-Free Protocols Standards and Comments

Appendix B: Video Rating Rubric

Appendix C: Report-writing rubric

Appendix D: Presentation of Various Assessment Instrument Rubrics

***Test Administration Protocols and Video Recordings.*** Students are required to submit 3 protocols of **WJ-III COG**. These protocols should be administered to 3 different individuals. There should be at least one child in the age range of 6-10 years old and one child in the range of 10 – 16. Students should include both genders in their testing practices.

- Choosing among the 3 practice administrations, Students are required to video-tape and submit one test session (along with the corresponding protocol).
- At least 1 of the 3 administrations must include all the subtests in the WJ-III COG (standard and supplemental). On the administration of the entire test, students must score no lower than 9.00 to qualify as reaching the standard.
- Students should strive to reach proficiency goals (see Appendix A) on each administration. If a student attained proficiency on any administration before the 3<sup>rd</sup> practice with a volunteer examinee, the subsequent administrations must score equal to or no less than 1 point lower than the “perfect” protocol. If the student(s) fail to do so, he/ she must administer additional tests, on which the errors had occurred.
- At least one protocol should be free of major errors (see Appendix A).
- The rating of video tape(s) based on the rubric (see Appendix B) should include no more than one rating of 3 points AND it should not include any 2 –point and 1-point rating(s) on the three areas rated.

- If a student is unable to produce an error-free protocol and/ or recording that satisfies the criteria above, he/she must conduct additional practices until the required proficiency level is reached.
- It is recommended that students video tape 2 different testing sessions, as review of the recording may help improve performance. Moreover, the additional recording may serve as “back-up”.

Students are required to submit 2 protocols of **WJ-III ACH**, which should be administered to 3 different individuals. There should be at least one child in the age range of 6-10 years old and one child in the range of 10 – 16. Students should include both genders in their testing practices.

- Choosing among the 2 practice administrations, Students are required to video-tape and submit one test session (along with the corresponding protocol).
- At least 1 of the 2 administrations must include all the subtests in the WJ-III ACH (standard and supplemental). On the administration of the entire test, students must score no lower than 9.00 to qualify as reaching the standard.
- Students should strive to reach proficiency goals (see Appendix A) on each administration. If a student attained proficiency on any administration before the 2nd practice with a volunteer examinee, the subsequent administrations must score equal to or no less than 1 point lower than the “perfect” protocol. If the student(s) fail to do so, he/ she must administer additional tests, on which the errors had occurred.
- At least one protocol should be free of major errors (see Appendix A).
- The rating of video tape(s) based on the rubric (see Appendix B) should include no more than one rating of 3 points AND it should not include any 2 –point and 1-point rating(s) on the three areas rated.
- If a student is unable to produce an error-free protocol and/ or recording that satisfies the criteria above, he/she must conduct additional practices until the required proficiency level is reached.
- It is recommended that students video tape 2 different testing sessions, as review of the recording may help improve performance. Moreover, the additional recording may serve as “back-up”.

Students are expected to practice the administration of at least 3 **Stanford-Binet V (SB5)** in its entirety (i.e. complete scale). One of the practice should be conducted with a peer and the score on this particular peer practice will not be counted in final score.

- Between the 2 administration practices with volunteer examinees, 1 should be conducted with a child under age 10 and another child between 12- 18.
- Between the 2 practice administrations, Students are required to video-tape and submit one test session (along with the corresponding protocol).
- At least one of the practice administration (excluding the peer-administration practice) should reach the proficiency standard (9.5)

- Students should strive to reach proficiency goals (see Appendix A) on each administration. If a student attained proficiency on any administration before the 3<sup>rd</sup> practice with a volunteer examinee, the subsequent administrations must score equal to or no less than 1 point lower than the “perfect” protocol. If the student(s) fail to do so, he/ she must administer additional tests, on which the errors had occurred.
- At least one protocol should be free of major errors (see Appendix A).
- The rating of video tape(s) based on the rubric (see Appendix B) should include no more than one rating of 3 points AND it should not include any 2 –point and 1-point rating(s) on the three areas rated.
- If a student is unable to produce an error-free protocol and/ or recording that satisfies the criteria above, he/she must conduct additional practices until the required proficiency level is reached.
- It is recommended that students video tape 2 different testing sessions, as review of the recording may help improve performance. Moreover, the additional recording may serve as “back-up”.

The video recordings are evaluated using a rubric (see Appendix B). Students complete a self evaluation based on the rubric for each of the recording. The instructor and TAs also evaluate the recorded testing sessions based on the rubric.

***Psychological Reports.*** Students are expected to submit 4 psychological reports: One based on an administration of WJ-III COG; Two based on the synthesized results from both WJ-III COG and WJ-ACH; And 1 based on the administration of SB5.

***Conducting and Presenting Curriculum-Based Assessment.*** Students are expected to select a child enrolled in grades 1-3 and conduct curriculum-based assessments in Reading or Math with the child in a period of no less than 6 weeks. Students may choose to use the Dynamic Indicator of Basic Early Literacy Skills or other approaches suggested by class readings. Students should obtain informed consent from students’ parents and teachers to conduct the curriculum-based assessment to work with the child. By the end of the Spring semester, students are expected to present their CBA cases.

***Presentation of Psychological Assessment Instruments.*** Starting in March, Each students is expected to present at least one assessment instrument. The instruments for selection are provided in Appendix C.

***Attendance.*** Students are expected to attend every class session. Unauthorized absence results in penalty based on department and university regulation.

**Summary of Assignments and Their Contribution to the Final Score**

Test Title/ Assigned Tasks	Due Date	Products Due	Contribution to Final Score	Notes
WJ-III COG	Jan 30 <sup>th</sup>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1<sup>st</sup> WJ-III COG protocol</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Protocols of WJ and SB = 25%</li> <li>Videos of WJ and SB = 10%</li> <li>Reports: 15%</li> </ul>	All protocols, except the peer practice on SB5 are counted in the calculation of the final score.
	Feb 6 <sup>th</sup>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>2<sup>nd</sup> WJ-III COG protocol</li> </ul>		
	Feb 13 <sup>th</sup>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>3<sup>rd</sup> WJ-III COG protocol;</li> <li>Video;</li> <li>One report based on WJ-III COG due</li> </ul>		
WJ-III ACH	Feb 20 <sup>th</sup>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1<sup>st</sup> WJ-III ACH Protocol</li> <li>One report based on synthesis of WJ-III ACH and COG</li> </ul>		
	Feb 27 <sup>th</sup>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>2<sup>nd</sup> WJ-III ACH Protocol</li> <li>Video</li> <li>One report based on synthesis of WJ-III ACH and COG</li> </ul>		
SB5	Mar 6 <sup>th</sup>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1<sup>st</sup> SB5 Protocol</li> </ul>		
	Mar 27 <sup>th</sup>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>2<sup>nd</sup> SB5 Protocol</li> <li>Video</li> <li>One report based on SB5 protocol</li> </ul>		
Presentation of Assessment Instruments	Apr 3 <sup>rd</sup>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Presentations (see sign-up)</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Presentation: 15%</li> </ul>	
	Apr 10 <sup>th</sup>			
	Apr 24 <sup>th</sup>			
	May 1 <sup>st</sup>			
Curriculum- Based Assessments	Apr 10 <sup>th</sup>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Protocols used in the CBA</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>CBA Protocols: 15%</li> <li>Presentation: 10%</li> </ul>	
	May 1 <sup>st</sup>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Presentation of CBA</li> </ul>		
	May 8 <sup>th</sup>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Presentation of CBA</li> </ul>		
Participation	_____	_____	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>5%</li> </ul>	
Attendance	_____	_____	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>5%</li> </ul>	

## Course Policies

1. Students are reminded that UW-Eau Claire policies on academic honesty will be enforced in this class. In addition, appropriate guidelines to maintain the rights of individuals who participate as examinees, including the presentation of written documents and protocols that result from test administrations, will be followed—especially the right of confidentiality and anonymity in any public presentation of behavior or test performance.
2. I want to fully include all students in this class. Any student who has a disability and is in need of classroom accommodations, please contact the instructor and the Services for Students with Disabilities Office in Old Library 2136 at the beginning of the semester. I will respect the confidentiality of the information you share with me.
3. We will work together to help students recruit individuals to participate as “volunteer practice examinees.” Under no circumstances will test scores be shared with parents or examinees. Parents/ legal guardians of all minor volunteer examinees and/ or volunteer examinees themselves must sign a written consent form. You may not administer the same test to the same examinee.

## Grades

Grades will be based on the combined contribution of all the assignments/ requirements on a 100-point scale (see the summary table above). The mean and standard deviation of the entire class will be calculated. Students scoring within 0.5 Standard Deviation of the mean obtain a grade of “A”; Students scoring below 0.5 to 1 standard (including 0.5 and 1) deviation of the mean obtain a grade of “B”; Students scoring below 1 standard to 1.5 standard deviation of the mean obtain a grade of “C”; Students scoring below 1.5 standard deviation of the mean obtain a grade of “D”.

## Required Texts:

Sattler, J. M. (2001). *Assessment of children: Cognitive applications* (4th ed.). La Mesa, CA: Jerome M Satter.

Flanagan, D. P., & Kaufman, A. S. (2004). *Essentials of WISC-IV assessments*. Hoboken, NJ: Wiley & Sons.

Additional readings will be posted on the E-reserve site of the library.

## Miscellaneous

- Checking out/ in test kits: You will each be assigned to a kit. If you kit is one that has to stay at the HDC, you are not allowed to take it out of the building.
- Using the testing room in Human Development Clinic—There will be a calendar in Rm. 156 so make sure you sign-up when you will be using a testing room and which testing room you will be using. Remember that after clinic cases start some of the testing rooms will be busy on Thursdays and Fridays.
- Checking out video camera from the library

- Protocols-The TAs will give you the protocols you need a week before they are due. If you need the protocols earlier than that just contact one of the TAs.

**January 23rd**

Introduction of class objectives, materials, requirements, and timelines  
Course overview (go over syllabus)

Administration of WJ-III COG

Distribute WJ-III COG Kits

**Reading:**

**WJ-III COG manual**

Wasserman, J.D. & Tulsy, D.S. (2005) A history of intelligence assessment. In D.P. Flanagan & P.L. Harrison (Eds.), *Contemporary Intellectual Assessment: Theories, tests, and issues* (pp. 32-47). New York: Guilford.

**January 30<sup>th</sup>**

Interpretation of WJ-III COG  
Review of professional issues pertaining to assessments  
Basic psychometric properties of tests

WJ-III COG Q and A

**Reading:**

**WJ-III COG Manual**

Sattler, J. M. (2001). Ethical, legal, and professional applications of assessment practices. In *Assessment of children: Cognitive applications* (4th ed., Vol. 1, pp. 41-85). CA: La Mesa: Jerome M. Sattler

**Due: 1<sup>st</sup> WJ-III COG protocol**

**February 6**

Interpretation of WJ-III COG  
Review of C-H-C theory

WJ-III COG Q and A

**Reading:**

**WJ-COG manual**

Alfonso, V. C., Flanagan, D. P., & Radwan, S. (2005). The impact of the Cattell-Horn-Carroll Theory on test development and interpretation of cognitive and academic abilities. In D. P. Flanagan & P. L. Harrison (Eds.), *Contemporary Intellectual Assessment: Theories, Tests, and Issues* (2<sup>nd</sup> Ed., pp.185-202). New York, NY: Guilford

**Due: 2<sup>nd</sup> WJ-III COG protocol**

**February 13<sup>th</sup>**

Interpretation of WJ-III COG  
WJ-III ACH Overview

WJ-III COG Q and A  
Distribute WJ-III ACH kits

**Readings:**

**WJ-III COG manual**

Schrank, F., Flanagan, D., Woodcock, R., & Mascolo, J. (2002) How to interpret the WJ-III COG. In Schrank, F., Flanagan, D., Woodcock, R., & Mascolo, J. (Ed.), *Essentials of WJ-III Cognitive abilities assessment*. (pp. 113-115). NY, NY: Wiley & Sons.

**Due: 3<sup>rd</sup> WJ-III COG protocol**  
**One WJ-III COG video and One WJ-III COG report**

**February 20<sup>th</sup>**

Combined use of WJ-III COG and ACH  
Writing synthesized report of WJ-III COG and ACH

WJ-III ACH Q and A

**Readings:**

**WJ-III ACH manual**

Sattler, J. M. (2001). Principles of report writing. In J. M. Sattler (Ed.), *Assessments of children: Cognitive applications* (4th ed., pp. 676-736). La Mesa, CA: Jerome M. Sattler.

**Due: 1<sup>st</sup> WJ-III ACH protocol**

**February 27<sup>th</sup>**

Writing synthesized reports of WJ-III COG and ACH  
Overview of SB5 manual  
WJ-III ACH Q and A  
Distribute SB5 kits

**Readings:**

**WJ-III ACH Manual**

Schrank, F., Flanagan, D., Woodcock, R., & Mascolo, J. (2002) Strengths and weaknesses of the WJ III COG. In Schrank, F., Flanagan, D., Woodcock, R., & Mascolo, J. (Ed.), *Essentials of WJ-III Cognitive abilities assessment*. (pp. 116-119). NY, NY: Wiley & Sons.

**Due: 2<sup>nd</sup> WJ-III ACH protocol**

**Video**

**1<sup>st</sup> report with synthesized WJ-III COG and ACH results**

**March 6<sup>th</sup>**

Scoring and interpretation of SB5

Q and A

**Readings:**

SB5 Manual

**Due: 2<sup>nd</sup> report of synthesized WJ-III COG and ACH results  
SB5 Peer practice**

**March 13th**

Interpretation of SB5

Dynamic Indicators of Early Literacy Skills

Reading:

SB5 Manual

Kaminsky, & Good. (1996). *Dynamic indicators of basic early literacy skills*. Retrieved Feb 17, 2004, from [http://dibels.uoregon.edu/dibels\\_why.php](http://dibels.uoregon.edu/dibels_why.php)

**Due: 1<sup>st</sup> SB5 practice administration with a volunteer**

**March 20<sup>th</sup>: Spring Break, no class**

**Readings:**

SB5 Manual

Kaminsky, & Good. (1996). *Dynamic indicators of basic early literacy skills.*

Retrieved Feb 17, 2004, from [http://dibels.uoregon.edu/dibels\\_why.php](http://dibels.uoregon.edu/dibels_why.php)

**March 27<sup>th</sup>**

Interpretation of SB5

Systematic behavioral assessments revisited

Applying rating scale in behavioral assessments

BASC-2

**Student presentation on various behavioral assessment instruments.**

SB5 Q and A

**Readings:**

Merrell, K. (2000). Informant report: Rating scale measures. In E. Shapiro & T. Kratochwill (Eds.), *Conducting school-based assessments of child and adolescent behavior* (pp. 203-234). NY, NY: Guilford Press.

Elliott, S. N., Busse, R. T., & Gresham, F. M. (1993). Behavior rating scales: Issues of use and development. *School Psychology Review*, 22(2), 313-321.

**Due: One report based on SB5 result**

**April 3<sup>rd</sup>**

Feedback on SB5 report writing

Behavioral assessments: Self-report scales

**3 Student presentation on various behavioral assessment instruments.**

Eckert, T., Dunn, E., Coddling, R., & Guiney, K. (2000). Self-report: Rating scale measures. In E. Shapiro & T. Kratochwill (Eds.), *Conducting school-based assessments of child and adolescent behavior* (pp. 151-169). NY, NY: Guilford Press.

SB5 Q & A

**Due: 2<sup>nd</sup> SB5 protocol**

**Video**

**April 10<sup>th</sup>**

Behavioral assessments: assessments with higher inferences: Roberts-2  
Assessments of adaptive behaviors

**3 Student presentation on various instruments**

**Reading:**

Sattler, J. (2002). Assessment of adaptive behavior. In J. Sattler (Ed.), *Assessment of children: Behavioral and clinical applications* (4th ed., pp. 189-210). La Mesa, CA: Jerome M. Sattler, Publisher, Inc.

Teglasi, H. (2001). Overview. In *Essentials of TAT and other storytelling techniques assessments* (pp. 1-24). NY, NY: Wiley & Sons.

**Due: CBA protocol**

**April 17<sup>th</sup>: April Break, no class**

**Reading:**

Cartledge, G., & Milburn, J. (1995). Assessment and evaluation of social skills. In *Teaching social skills to children and youth: Innovative approaches* (3rd ed., pp. 33-73). Allyn and Bacon: Needham Heights, MA.

**April 24<sup>th</sup>**

Behavioral assessments in specific areas: Social skills  
Assessment of children (suspected) with autism

**2 students' presentations on CBA**

**Readings:**

Marcus, L., Flagler, S., & Robinson, S. (2001). Assessment of children with autism. In R. Simeonsson & S. Rosenthal (Eds.), *Psychological and developmental assessment* (pp. 267-291). NY, NY: Guilford Press.

**May 1<sup>st</sup>**

Behavioral assessments and intervention

**3 students' presentations on CBA**

Readings:

Schloss, P., & Smith, M. (1998e). Using antecedent control techniques. In *Applied behavioral analysis in the classroom* (pp. 54-80). Needham Heights, MA: Allyn & Bacon.

Schloss, P., & Smith, M. (1998b). Increasing appropriate behavior through related personal characteristics. In *Applied behavioral analysis in the classroom* (pp. 81-102). Needham Heights, MA: Allyn & Bacon.

**May 8<sup>th</sup>**

Behavioral Assessments and intervention

**3 students' presentations on CBA**

Schloss, P., & Smith, M. (1998d). Positive approaches to decreasing inappropriate behavior. In *Applied behavioral analysis in the classroom* (pp. 152-170). Needham Heights, MA: Allyn & Bacon.

## Appendix A

### Error-Free Protocol Standards and Comments

**Proficiency Criteria:** Students should strive for a “true” error-free protocol, especially on the WISC-IV and WPPSI-III administrations. An error-free protocol is a protocol that has no administration and/ or scoring errors as described below. However, students who have no more than one error on one protocol AND who self-correct the error prior to submission of the assignment may be exempted from administering additional practice testing. If the student makes more than 1 error, or fails to recognize the error must conduct additional test practices until an error-free protocol criteria are met.

Students are encouraged to self-check and self correct error prior to submission of the protocols. Self-correction, however, should be made in blue colored ink. Students should not ask TAs to conduct pre-check. They could, however, work with a classmate to check their protocols and administrations.

**Definition of Error:** Errors of commission that change a score (i.e., things you do incorrectly) and errors of omission that make it impossible to determine what the correct score should be (e.g., failing to write down a response, failing to get a basal or ceiling). Note: in cases where it is ambiguous whether an error has occurred (e.g., responses that could be legitimately rated 1 or 2 is scored a 2), the performance is not considered an error. Only in cases where it is unambiguous (e.g., a 1 or 2 point response is scored 0; other errors described below) is a protocol considered to have an error.

Listed below are common mistakes that may result in an error on a protocol. Because I cannot anticipate all possible forms of errors, this is not an exhaustive list. However, it should give you a good idea of the major mistakes that are frequently made by learners.

#### Administration Errors:

1. Failure to obtain a basal
2. Failure to obtain a ceiling
3. Failure to query when query is clearly needed
4. Administer query when the examinee clearly gives an incorrect response.

#### Calculation Errors:

1. Calculate chronological age incorrectly
2. Calculate raw scores incorrectly
3. Calculate composite score incorrectly (from subtest/ scaled scores)
4. Use the incorrect conversion table

#### Incorrect Scoring of Items

1. Failure to award full points to items below basal
2. Failure to use appropriate basal
3. Include items above ceiling for credit

4. Incorrect scoring of items (e.g., score incorrect item as correct, incorrectly assigns 0, 1, and 2)

**Other Types of Errors:**

1. Transposes the raw score from a subtest to the cover page or computer incorrectly
2. Written record of responses are insufficient to provide independent scoring
3. Written record of responses is illegible.

## Appendix B Video Rating Rubric

Student:

Test Title:

Self-Evaluation: Y      N

**Please attach self-rated rubric to this form**

**BASAL/CEILING SUCCESS (Administer all times and only those items needed). Check one that applies.**

- Perfect, no detectable errors (5 points)
- Minor error (e.g., gave too many or too few items on a test, but self corrected) (4 Points)
- More than one minor error or one major error (i.e., fails to obtain a basal or ceiling) (3 points)
- More than one major error (2 points)
- Pattern of failure to attend to basal/ ceiling rules (1 points)

**DIRECTIONS/ ADMINISTRATION SUCCESS (give directions/ queries as intended). Check one that applies.**

- Verbatim directions; all directions given exactly as needed, irrelevant directions suppressed (5 points)
- Minor deviation from verbatim direction (minor word substitution, inappropriate queries) (4 points)
- More than one minor error or one major error (e.g., extemporaneous directions for a test) (3 points)
- More than one major errors (2 points)
- Pattern of failure to administer directions as scripted (1 point)

**FLUENCY OF ADMINISTRATION (Efficient, effective, supportive administration).**

**Check one that applies.**

- Fluid administration; comfortable, effective, efficient administration. (5 points)
- Occasional minor deviations from fluency (e.g., gaps or pauses) not due to examinee's behavior (4 points)
- A pattern of minor deviations from fluency not due to examinee's behavior (3 points)
- One major error in administration (e.g., coaching when inappropriate, giving answers, responding differentially to right/ wrong answers when inappropriate) (2 points) (2 points)
- Pattern of failure to adhere to basic administration principles (e.g., failure to establish/maintain rapport, inappropriate use of reinforcement or punishment/ threats) (1 points)

Total Rating: \_\_\_\_\_ / 15 \* 100 (add ratings above to get total)

Proficiency Standard: No ratings of 2 and 1 appear on any of the three areas **AND** no more than one rating of 3 point.

## Appendix C Psychological Report of Standardized Tests Rubrics

T

The psychological reports are evaluated on a 10-point scale:

10 points: Report must satisfy all of the following criteria:

1. Contains complete client's pseudo identification information
2. Contains all the sections of a complete report, including background information, behavioral observation, assessment results, and summary
3. The report is written with appropriate wording, punctuation, organization, and sentence structure.
  
4. Accurately describes the use of the standardized tests and the limitations
5. Accurately present the scores in tables and text
6. Interpret the test scores adequately, including the scale of the scores and their implications.

9 points: Reports fail to meet the one of the first three criteria; but satisfied all the rest criteria.

8 points: Reports fail to meet 2 of the first three criteria; but satisfied all the rest criteria.

7 Points: Reports fail to meet all 3 of the first three criteria OR one of the criteria #4 to #6.

6 points: Reports fail to meet more than 2 or the criteria #4 to #6.

Important: Any reports scored at or below 6 points must be re-written. Please note that the highest points can be awarded to re-written reports is 9. Therefore, please strive to achieve your highest performance possible when completing reports.

## **Appendix D**

### **Rubrics for Presentation of Various Assessment Instruments**

The presentations are evaluated on a 10-point scale. The content of the presentation and style of the presentation contribute equally to the final score. The following areas are the basis for evaluation:

1. Content of the presentation (Maximum possible points: 5 )
  - a. Accurately specify the name, intended use, and age range of the instruments
  - b. Accurately discuss psychometric properties of the instrument: What properties are reported? Do the developers provide adequate information on the instruments' validity and reliability? Based on the validity and reliability and other test-development information, what do you think can be possible problems?
  - c. Application of the instrument: When to use? Whom to administer to? What kind of information can be derived?
  - d. Adequately discuss critiques of the instruments: What are the strengths and weakness of the instruments?
  
2. Style of the presentation (Maximum possible points: 5)
  - a. Make appropriate eye contact
  - b. Address audience' questions
  - c. Involve and encourage audience in discussion
  - d. Use appropriate technology and materials.

10 points: Presentations satisfy all criteria under 1 and 2.

9 points: Presentations satisfy all criteria under 1. but fail to satisfy one of the 2. a. b. c. and d.

8 points: Presentations fail to satisfy one criteria under 1. OR fail to satisfy two criteria under 2. a., b., c., and d.

7 points: Presentations fail to satisfy two criteria under 1. AND satisfy at least three of the 2. a. b. c. and d.

6 points: Presentation fail to satisfy three criteria under 1. AND satisfy at least three of the 2. a. b., c., and d.

5 points: Presentation fail to satisfy all four criteria under 1.

Or, presentations fail to satisfy three criteria under 1. And satisfy less than three of the 2.a, b., c. and d.