

WKU Psychology Training Clinic
Confidential Psychological Evaluation

Name: Jane Smith
Date of Birth: 5/1/83
Age: 21 years
Date of Report: 3/5/05

Dates of Evaluation: 2/18/05, 2/25/05
Education Level: College Senior
Race/Sex: Caucasian/Male
Examiner: Ima Gradstudent, B. S.

Notes on writing style:

- For identifying clients, if the client is older than 18, use Mr. or Ms. and the client's last name; if the client is younger than 18, use the client's first name
- In the Background Information section, use the words *stated*, *reported*, *indicated*, *said*, and *revealed* in every sentence that asserts something
- Use APA style numbers. That is, except for numbers that represent scores on tests, write out numbers nine and under and use Arabic numerals for numbers 10 and over
- Throughout the Background Information section, use past tense, as the interview happened in the past, not present tense.
- Watch your use of commas and semi-colons.
- Use "who" when referring to people (clients who), not that (clients that)
- Avoid using the word did (e.g., The client did report) as it is redundant; you can simply omit it (e.g., The client reported)

REASON FOR REFERRAL:

Information needed in this section:

- Description of the client (age, gender, race)
- Reason for referral

BACKGROUND INFORMATION:

Information needed in this section:

- Any important information about the client, including home town, relationship with family, psychological symptoms, and alcohol/drug use

Behavioral Observations

Information needed in this section:

- Height, weight, build
- Attire, including jewelry and other accoutrements
- Grooming and hygiene, including tattoos, hair style, facial hair, scars or other skin blemishes, and fingernails
- Posture and ambulation
- Eye contact
- Cooperation
- Handedness
- Note abnormal behaviors or lack thereof
- Other behavioral observations of note
- Rapport
- Orientation
- Note abnormal emotions or lack thereof
- Note abnormal cognitions or lack thereof
- Note hallucinations/delusions of lack thereof
- Motivation for evaluation
- Statement about validity of testing

PSYCHOLOGICAL EVALUATION:

Information needed in this section:

- Provide a list of the tests administered in alphabetical order

INTELLECTUAL FUNCTIONING:

Information needed in this section:

- Provide the name of the test administered
- List Full Scale, Index, and Subtest scores
- In the first paragraph, describe the intellectual assessment, including information about scaled scores and how to interpret them.
- In the second paragraph, provide the FSIQ and Index scores, including percentile ranking, 95% confidence interval, and placing the score in a range. At the end of the second paragraph, discuss any significant differences among the Index scores and interpret the differences.
- In the third paragraph, discuss any relative (compared to the person's other abilities) and/or normative (compared to other people) strengths and weaknesses found in the subtests. Be careful not to say that the person's scores showed a difference; instead say an analysis of the scores showed a difference.

SUMMARY:

Information needed in this section:

- Begin with a statement describing the client and the referral question
- Review and summarize the findings from the clinical interview that support each of your diagnoses in turn
- Review and summarize the results of the tests that support each of your diagnoses in turn
- Better summaries integrate the first two components
- If IQ testing was administered and not noted above, interpret IQ testing
- If you are not going to diagnose what the client was referred for, provide an explanation as to why your diagnoses better explain the client's problems or provide a rationale for your diagnoses
- Add in other important information
- Remember, the Summary is a place to synthesize and provide your opinions; you should not add new information in the Summary

Thank you for this referral.

Ima Gradstudent, B.S.
Clinical Psychology Graduate Student

Frederick G. Grieve, Ph.D.
Licensed Psychologist, KY #129368

WKU Psychology Training Clinic
Confidential Psychological Evaluation

Name: Jane Smith
Date of Birth: 5/1/83
Age: 21 years
Date of Report: 3/5/05

Dates of Evaluation: 2/18/05, 2/25/05
Education Level: College Senior
Race/Sex: Caucasian/Female
Examiner: Ima Gradstudent, B. S.

REASON FOR REFERRAL: Ms. Smith is a 21-year-old Caucasian female who agreed to complete an intellectual assessment in order to help a graduate student in training..

BACKGROUND INFORMATION:

Ms. Smith reported that she is a junior at Western Kentucky University (WKU). She indicated that she is majoring in Psychology and denied having any problems in school. Ms. Smith. Ms. Smith revealed that she is from Louisville, Kentucky. She denied any issues in her family of origin. She said that she has good relationships with her parents, and indicated that she visits them once a month and talks to one of them via cell phone or text almost every day.

Behavioral Observations

Ms. Smith is of average height and weight, with a thin build. She was casually attired in a t-shirt and jeans. She displayed good grooming and hygiene. She displayed good posture and showed no difficulty with walking, willingly following the examiner to the examination room. Ms. Smith had good eye contact, displayed a good level of cooperation, and wrote with her right hand. Ms. Smith had no difficulty establishing rapport and willingly shared information. She displayed no abnormal behaviors or emotions during the evaluation and did not fidget. She appeared relaxed and willing to participate in the evaluation. She did not appear to become overly frustrated with failure. Ms. Smith spoke in a normal tone with a normal volume and rate. She appeared to have no difficulty with enunciation or word choice. She used a simple vocabulary throughout the evaluation, and English is her primary language. She provided good answers to questions, and spontaneously elaborated on her answers. Ms. Smith was oriented to person, place, time, and purpose, and there was no evidence of hallucinations or delusions. She appeared motivated for the evaluation, and, because of this motivation, testing is considered to be a valid indicator of her psychological and intellectual functioning.

PSYCHOLOGICAL EVALUATION:

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

INTELLECTUAL FUNCTIONING: Ms. Smith was administered the WAIS-IV and obtained the following results:

<u>VCI Subtests</u>	<u>Scaled Score</u>	<u>PRI Subtests</u>	<u>Scaled Score</u>
Similarities	10	Block Design	13
Vocabulary	9	Matrix Reasoning	8
Information	11	Visual Puzzles	12

<u>WMI Subtests</u>	<u>Scaled Score</u>	<u>PSI Subtests</u>	<u>Scaled Score</u>
Digit Span	9	Symbol Search	15
Arithmetic	9	Coding	13

VCI = 99 PRI = 114 WMI = 97 PSI = 120 Full Scale IQ = 106

The WAIS-IV groups an individual's ability into four global areas: Verbal Comprehension Index (VCI), which measures verbal ability; Perceptual Reasoning Index (PRI), which involves the manipulation of concrete materials or processing of visual stimuli to solve problems nonverbally; Working Memory Index (WMI), which measures short-

Confidential Psychological Evaluation 4
Smith, Jane

term memory; and Processing Speed Index (PSI), which measures cognitive processing efficiency. All of the indexes have standard scores with a mean score of 100, with the scores of 90 to 110 falling into the Average range. Each of the four Indexes has subtests that comprise the Index score. All of the subtest scaled scores have a mean score of 10, with the scores of 7 to 13 falling into the Average range.

Ms. Smith obtained a Full Scale IQ (FSIQ) score of 106 (66th percentile), which places her intellectual functioning in the Average range. There was a 95% confidence interval of 102 to 110, which means that if she were tested 100 times, 95 of them would fall in this range. Ms. Smith obtained a Verbal Comprehension Index (VCI) score of 99 (47th percentile), with a 95% confidence interval of 94 to 104, which places her verbal ability in the average range. She obtained a Perceptual Reasoning Index (PRI) score of 114 (82nd percentile), with a 95% confidence interval of 106 to 120, which places her nonverbal ability in the high average range. She obtained a Working Memory Index (WMI) score of 97 (46th percentile), with a 95% confidence interval of 90 to 102, which places her memory in the average range. She obtained a Processing Speed Index (PSI) score of 120 (90th percentile), with a 95% confidence interval of 114 to 130, which places her processing speed in the high average range. Significant differences were noted among her index scores. Ms. Smith's PSI score was higher than her WMI score, meaning that her processing speed is better developed than her memory. A difference of the magnitude found in Ms. Smith's profile occurred in 2% of the standardization sample, making this an uncommon and meaningful difference. Her PSI score was higher than her VCI score, indicating that her processing speed is better developed than her verbal abilities. A difference of the magnitude in Ms. Smith's profile occurred in 3% standardization sample, making this an uncommon and meaningful difference. Ms. Smith's PRI score was higher than her VCI score, meaning that her nonverbal and reasoning abilities are better developed than her verbal abilities. A difference of the magnitude in Ms. Smith's profile was seen in 11% of the standardization sample, making this a common difference.

An evaluation of Ms. Smith's subtest scaled scores revealed a relative (compared to her own abilities) strength in the Block Design subtest, which assesses spatial ability, perceptual organization, mental processing skills, and visual-motor coordination. A strength of this magnitude occurred in 5% of the standardization sample, making this uncommon. There were no normative (compared to others) or relative weaknesses or normative strengths.

SUMMARY: Begin with a statement that describes the client and why she was referred: Ms. Smith is a 21-year-old Caucasian female who was referred for an intellectual assessment. Her FSIQ was 106, which falls in the average range of functioning. There were some differences among her index scores. Her nonverbal and reasoning abilities and processing speed is better developed than her verbal abilities and memory.

Thank you for this referral.

Ima Gradstudent, B.S.
Clinical Psychology Graduate Student

Frederick G. Grieve, Ph.D.
Licensed Psychologist, KY