

NIAGARA UNIVERSITY
Department of Education
Fall 2005
Wednesdays 4:20 – 7:05 pm
DN210

Dr. Kristine Augustyniak
e-mail: kma@niagara.edu

Office Telephone (716) 286-8548
Office Hours: Tues. 11 a.m-1:00 p.m.
Weds. Noon - 2:00 p.m.
Thur. 11 a.m-1:00 p.m.

A. Course Number and Title:

EDU 800: Intelligence Theory and Assessment

B. Course Description:

This lab/seminar course provides students with a framework for understanding the historical development and theoretical underpinnings of intelligence assessment. To adequately prepare professionals, exposure is given to a broad range of topics such as controversies in the field of assessment, individual differences, culturally and linguistically diverse populations, measurement constructs, ethics, and the complex relationship of genetic and environmental influences on human intelligence. Through lab experiences and actual case studies, students will benefit from hands-on experience with state-of-the art assessment instrumentation.

C. Number of Credit Hours:

3 credit hours

D. Methods of Instruction: Classes will include an instructional period and a lab portion. Teaching methods are designed to meet a variety of learning styles and will include methods such as lecture, large group discussion, small group activities, and case analyses. The lab segment of each class will allow students to apply and rehearse skills in standardized assessment. Students will also individually apply their psychometric knowledge and skills through in-vivo practice cases, peer review, and synopsis examinations.

E. Course Objectives:

Students will:

1. Increase appreciation for and understanding of the complex influences on human intelligence.
2. Develop understanding of major theories of human intelligence and their surrounding controversies.
3. Develop a conceptual framework for best-practice models of assessment.
4. Develop and utilize an understanding of multicultural issues in psychological assessment.

5. Demonstrate familiarity and understanding of the validity, reliability, technology, utility and limitations of current assessment instruments and procedures.
6. Demonstrate basic skills in conducting and interpreting psychological evaluations.

F. Course Outline and Assignments:

<u>Date</u>	<u>Topic</u>	<u>Assignment</u>
1. 8-31	Intro to the assessment process	Chp. 1&2
2. 9-07	Ethics, Laws, Forensics Video – IDEA	Chp. 3
3. 9-14	Statistical & Measurement Concepts *Bring calculator to class hereafter Interview Assignment Due	Chp. 4
4. 9-21	Theories of intelligence APA video – Sattler/Reschley	Chp. 5
5. 9-28	Mid-term exam Measurement and change of intelligence	Chp.6
6. 10-05	Examiner characteristics And skills	Chp. 7
7. 10-12	WISC-IV & Wechsler lab (room:_____) *Bring stopwatch to class hereafter	Chp 8 -10
8. 10-19	WAIS -III Wechsler lab (room:_____)	Chp 11 & 12
9. 10-26	Differential Ability Scales DAS lab (room:_____)	Chp. 14 & 15 protocol 1 due
10. 11-02	Specialized Measures UNIT video UNIT lab (room:_____)	Chp. 16 protocol 2 due
11. 11-09	WJ-III labs	protocol 3 due

(room: _____)

Linguistic and cultural considerations Chp 19 & 20

***Bring cassette player to class
Student demonstration lab**

- | | | |
|-----------|----------------------------------|----------------------------|
| 12. 11-16 | Report writing | Chp 21 |
| | Student demonstration lab | protocol 4 due |
| 13. 11-23 | No Class - Happy Thanksgiving! | |
| 14. 11-30 | Final Exam | |
| | Student demonstration lab | protocol 5 due |
| 15. 12-07 | Exam review/course debrief | Assessment write-up |
| | Student demonstration lab | due |
| 16. 12-14 | Course Debrief | |

*This date is reserved for overflow of scheduled presentations and, if needed, will be considered a mandatory lab session.

Note: This is a tentative schedule which is subject to change.

G. Requirements of Course:

Required text:

Sattler, J.M. (2001). *Assessment of Children: Cognitive Applications (4th Ed.)*. LaMesa, CA: Author.

Required equipment:

Calculator – standard
Stopwatch – preferably silent
Portable Audio cassette player - standard

Evaluation Process:

Lab Participation (Pass/Fail):

Students' home reading assignments are essential to the development of assessment skills and the success of the weekly classes. Classes will be structured based on the assumption that students have read the material assigned for each class. To maximize learning, it is expected that students will be active participants in all classes and will apply their knowledge and rehearse skills in class. Learning outcomes will be

evaluated, in part, through this class participation. Each class, students' participation will be assessed in the following manner:

3= demonstrates mastery of content / high level of engagement / active participation, contributes positively to the learning environment.

2 = demonstrates mastery of content to a minimal level / somewhat passive participation.

1 = mastery is not demonstrated / lacks participation (not acceptable) / absent from class.

Students assessed at a level "1" for any lab session will be permitted to demonstrate mastery of content via repetition or alternate means such as submitting a written analysis of the topic in question (minimum two typed pages).

Achievement of a level "2" for **every** lab session (Pass) is required for completion of this course.

Demonstration lab (10 points)

Each student will be assigned one assessment battery which they must administer to a peer in class. Classmates will observe and critique the student's adherence to standardized administration procedures, psychometric skill, and facility in building rapport and encouraging optimal performance.

5 test protocols (7 points each/ 35 total):

The student will complete 5 different cognitive profiles, at least three of which with non-classmates. At least one administration must be with a) an adult (over 18) b) a school-age child. All protocols must be scored correctly and evidence appropriate adherence to standardized administration procedures. For additional experience with test formats, students will be paired with a partner who will analyze their protocols for errors after completion. The second party will sign and submit all checked protocols directly to the instructor (not back to first student). Both students will be evaluated for their procedural skills in administration and scoring (4 points) and attention to details when checking (3 points).

Assessment interpretation and write-up (15 points)

This exercise will give students the opportunity to develop assessment skills in a logical sequence. Students will incorporate data from any one of the previous five assessment sessions (and any relevant observations). This data will be organized into a summary report. Reports will be graded based on the following:

- A) Standard format of score reporting and conveyed degree of certainty.
- B) Relevance and organization of language.
- C) Appropriateness of inferences, interpretations, generalizations, and recognition of potential bias.

Mid-term and Final Exam (20 points each./40 total)

There will be two non-cumulative essay, short answer, and/or multiple choice exams given following presentation of the designated portion of the class content. The

exams are designed to ensure your familiarity and working knowledge of a best-practice approach to assessment. The dates for these exams are tentatively listed on the schedule. Please meet with me if you need extra help or wish to arrange a study group.

All exams will begin promptly at the beginning of the scheduled time. Late arrivals will be permitted to take the exam insofar as the first person has not completed the exam. Late arrivals will not be permitted extra time in which to complete the exam. Please arrange your schedule so as to not miss any exams. Makeup exams are given only by the discretion of the instructor. Anyone requiring a make-up exam will automatically lose 2 points (10%) from the exam. Exams, grades, and outside assignments will be returned as quickly as possible.

Grades: Your grade will be calculated as a percentage of the accumulation of the highest grades achieved on each assignment. This will protect students from a test, which was too challenging for the class etc.

<u>Test or Assignment</u>	<u>Highest Score</u>	<u>Your Score</u>
Test 1	80 (Joe)	70
Test 2	85 (Sally)	80
Paper 1	100 (Joe)	90
Paper 2	100 (Sam)	90
Paper 3	90 (Pat)	80
Total	455	410

Your Total Score divided by the “Highest Score Total” = Your Grade

$$410/455 = 90\% \text{ or } A-$$

*On each exam and on the assessment write-up, 2 to 5 bonus points may be given to students showing exemplary work.

Attendance Policy: Attendance in this course is required in order to receive a favorable grade. As expected with graduate level work, you will be in control of your attendance and your educational experience. This means you are responsible for motivating yourself to fulfill all of the requirements for successfully completing this class. I expect both myself and the students to be ready to begin at the designated time. It is distracting to me and to the students when someone enters the room after the lecture has begun. Again, you are responsible for determining the weather conditions and planning appropriately to arrive on time.

Time Extensions: In order to promote optimal learning and reduce stress, each student will be allotted a **total of ten days**, non-penalized, time extension for the aggregate of all class assignments. Assignments outstanding after the exhaustion of the allotted ten

days will be penalized at a rate of 10% per day. If you choose to use a time extension, it is your responsibility to notify me via e-mail when your assignment has been submitted **and** the cumulative number of days you have expended. Failure to do so may result in forfeiting time extension privileges. Scheduled in-class presentations are not eligible for time extensions. Allowances for the assignment of an “incomplete” course grade will be made in accordance with university policy.

Academic Integrity: Since your performance will be compared to the performance of your fellow students, I commit myself to do everything in my power to provide a fair learning environment. You, however, must be equally committed to this goal by resisting the temptation to use the work of others and by informing me of any compromise to fairness in the environment. Cheating is considered to be a serious offence. If prevention attempts fail and cheating occurs, formal action may be taken, which may include dismissal from the class or the program.

Disability and Counseling Services: Any student eligible for and needing academic adjustments or accommodations because of a disability is requested to speak with the professor no later than the first two weeks of class. Students should also notify the Coordinator of Specialized Services located in Seton Hall of their particular situation and special needs. The university will make reasonable accommodations for persons with documented disabilities.

H. Bibliography:

- Andrews, J.J.W.; Saklofske, D.H.; & Janzen, H.L. (2001). (Eds.) *Handbook of psychoeducational assessment: Ability, achievement and behavior in children*. San Diego: Academic Press.
- Axelrod, B.N. & Woodard, J.L. (2000). Parsimonious prediction of Wechsler Memory Scale – III Memory Indices. *Psychological Assessment, 12*, 431-435.
- Axelrod, B.N., Ryan, J.J. & Ward, L.C. (2001). Evaluation of a seven-subtest short forms of the Wechsler Adult Intelligence – III in a referred sample. *Archives of Clinical Neuropsychology 16*,1-8.
- Bracken, B.A. (Ed.) (2000). *The psychoeducational assessment of preschool children (3rd Ed.)*. Needham Heights, MA: Allyn & Bacon.
- Dorfman, W.I. & Hersen M. (Eds.) (2001). *Understanding psychological assessment: Perspectives on individual differences*. New York: Plenum.
- Dumont, R., Willis, J.O., Farr, L.P. McCarthy, T. & Price, L. (2000). The relationship between the Differential Ability Scales (DAS) and the Woodcock-Johnson Tests of Cognitive Ability – Revised (WJ-R COG) for students referred for special education evaluations. *Journal of Psychoeducational Assessment, 18*, 27-38.

- Goldstein, S. & Reynolds, C.R. (1999). *The handbook of neurodevelopmental and genetic disorders in children*. New York: Guildford Press.
- Hale, J.B., Fiorello, C.A., Kavanagh, J.A., Hoeppner, A.B. & Gaither, R.A. (2001). WISC-III predictors of academic achievement for children with learning disabilities: Are global and factor scores comparable? *School Psychology Quarterly*, *16*, 31-55.
- Heaton, R.K., Temkin, N. Dikmen, S. Avitable, N., Taylor, M.J., Marcotte, T.D. & Grant, I. (2001). Detecting change: A comparison of three neuropsychological methods using normal and clinical samples. *Archives of Clinical Neuropsychology* *16*, 75-91.
- Iverson, G.L. (2001). Interpreting change on the WAIS-III/WMS-III in clinical samples. *Archives of Clinical Neuropsychology*. *16*, 183-191.
- Keith, T.Z., Kranzler, J.H., & Flanagan, D.P. (2001). What does the cognitive Assessment System (CAS) measure? Joint confirmatory factor analysis of the CAS and the Woodcock-Johnson Test of Cognitive Ability (3rd edition). *School Psychology Review*, *30*, 89-119.
- Keith, T.Z. Quirk, K.J. Schartz, C. & Elliott, C.D. (1999). Construct bias in the Differential Ability Scales? Confirmatory and hierarchical fact structure across three ethnic groups. *Journal of Psychoeducational Assessment*, *17*, 249-268.
- Liss, M., Fein, D., Allen, D., Dunn, M., Feinstein, C., Morris, R., Waterhouse, L. & Rapin, I. (2001). Executive functioning in high-functioning children with autism. *Journal of Child Psychology & Psychiatry & Allied Disciplines*, *42*, 261-270.
- McIntosh, D.E., Gibney, L., Quinn, K. & Kundert, D. (2000). Concurrent validity of the Early Screening Profiles and the Differential Ability Scales with an at-risk preschool sample. *Psychology in the Schools*, *37*, 201-207.
- National Association of School Psychologists. (1997). *Professional conduct manual (3rd Ed.)*. Bethesda, MD: Author.
- Naglieri, J.A. (2000). Can profile analysis of ability test scores work? An illustration using the PASS theory and CAS with an unselected cohort. *School Psychology Quarterly*, *15*, 419-433.
- Naglieri, J.A. (2000). Intelligence testing in the 21st century: A look at the past and suggestion for the future. *Educational & Child Psychology* *17*, 6-18.
- Naglieri, J.A. & Rojahn, J. (2001). Gender differences in planning, attention,

- simultaneous, and successive (PASS) cognitive processes and achievement. *Journal of Educational Psychology*, 93 , 430-437.
- Ryan, J.J.& Paolo, A.M. (2001). Exploratory factor analysis of the WAIS-III in a mixed patient sample. *Archives of Clinical Neuropsychology*. 16 , 151-156.
- Sattler, J.M. (2001). *Assessment of children: Cognitive applications (4th Ed.)*. LaMesa, CA: Author.
- Sattler, J.M. (2001). *Assessment of children: Behavioral and clinical applications (4th Ed.)*. LaMesa, CA: Author.
- Siegel, D.J. (1999). *The developing mind: Toward a neurobiology of interpersonal experience*. New York: Guilford Press.
- Snow, J.B. & Sapp, G.L. (2000). WISC-III subtest patterns of ADHD and normal samples. *Psychological Reports* 87, 759-765.
- Sternberg, R.J. (2001). What is the common thread of creativity? : Its dialectical relation to Intelligence and Wisdom. *American Psychologist*, 56, 360-362.
- Sternberg, R.J. & Grigorenko, E.L. (1999). *Our labeled children*. Reading, MS: Perseus Books.
- Teeter, P.A. & Semund-Clikeman, M. (1997). *Child neuropsychology: Assessment and interventions for neurodevelopmental disorders*. Needham Heights, MA: Allyn & Bacon.
- Thomas A. & Grimes J. (Eds.), (1995). *Best practices in school psychology: III*. Washington DC: National Association of School Psychologists.
- Watkins, M.W. & Glutting, J. J. (2000). Incremental validity of the WISC-III profile elevation, scatter, and shape information for predicting reading and math achievement. *Psychological Assessment*, 12, 402-408.