

D-KEFS Report Write-Up Cheat Sheet

Reviewed by the BastionGPT Clinical Advisory Board · July 2026

The D-KEFS (Delis, Kaplan & Kramer; Pearson, 2001) is a battery of nine co-normed stand-alone executive function tests for ages 8 to 89: primary scaled scores (mean 10, SD 3), contrast and error scores, selective administration by design, and no overall composite. Since 2025 an all-digital D-KEFS Advanced coexists with the 2001 battery, so every write-up now names its edition.

1 – Measures and edition statement two products share the name now

Do: name the edition (original 2001 or Advanced 2025), the tests given, the format (paper, Q-interactive, telepractice), the norms year, and why these tests fit the referral.

Pitfall: writing "the D-KEFS" with no edition; the two products differ in tests, format, and norms.

2 – Behavioral observations written to inform interpretation

Do: two or three sentences on engagement, pace, and strategy use; note how switching demands were handled and whether errors were self-corrected.

Pitfall: observations that never connect to a score they should explain.

3 – Results by executive construct inhibition, switching, fluency, planning, concepts

Do: group findings across tests by what they measure, lead with primary scaled scores, and use intact baseline conditions to localize a weakness before calling it executive.

Pitfall: the test-by-test laundry list that buries the profile and over-reads isolated scores.

4 – Process and contrast observations hypothesis level, stated caution

Do: describe the pattern, say what it suggests, and state the reliability caution in the section itself.

Pitfall: a contrast score doing decisional work; published reliabilities for all 51 contrast measures stay below 0.7.

5 – Integration with ratings and history explain divergence, never average it

Do: put performance next to rating scales, records, and history, and explain what each source samples; weak correlation between them is expected.

Pitfall: averaging sources, or declaring whichever one is inconvenient invalid.

6 – Interpretive summary a profile statement, never a summary score

Do: state the construct profile in plain language, tied to the referral question, with limits stated: norms year, selective battery, single session.

Pitfall: inventing a composite by averaging scaled scores; the battery withholds that number on purpose.

7 – Recommendations linked to findings nothing from nowhere

Do: tie each recommendation to a documented strength or weakness, and plan re-evaluation around the battery's limited alternate forms (three tests only).

Pitfall: a boilerplate list that could sit under any profile.

Before you sign

- ☐ Edition, tests, format, and norms year named
- ☐ Organized by construct; primary scaled scores lead
- ☐ Baselines used to localize before executive claims
- ☐ Contrast scores hypothesis-level with caution stated
- ☐ Rating divergence explained, not averaged
- ☐ Recommendations trace to findings; limits stated

Drafting with AI

Paste your score summary: edition, tests, scaled scores, observations. Not the items, not the record form.

"Draft a D-KEFS results section from this summary: Color-Word Inhibition 6, Inhibition/Switching 5, Trail Making Switching 6, baselines 10 to 11, Tower 9; age 15, ADHD referral; ..."

Never paste client-identifying information into consumer AI tools. BastionGPT is HIPAA-compliant with a signed BAA on every plan.

300–700 words
D-KEFS section

~90 minutes
full battery, varies

Ages 8–89
mean 10, SD 3

No composite
by design

D-KEFS Results Section Template

Copy or print for your practice · Adapt fields to your organization's, payer's and jurisdiction's documentation requirements.

Client (initials): _____ Age: _____ Testing dates: _____

Edition and norms year: _____ Format (paper, Q-interactive, telepractice): _____ Referral question: _____

Measures and edition statement

Tests administered and why they fit the referral; edition and norms year stated

Behavioral observations during testing

Engagement, pace, frustration tolerance, strategy use; connected to the scores they explain

Results by executive construct

Inhibition, flexibility and switching, fluency, planning, concept formation; primary scaled scores (mean 10, SD 3), intact baselines localized first

Process and contrast observations

Hypothesis level only; the pattern, what it suggests, and the reliability caution

Integration with ratings, records, and history

Convergence and divergence explained rather than averaged; performance and ratings sample different conditions

Interpretive summary

Construct profile tied to the referral; no composite language; limits stated (norms year, selective battery, single session)

Recommendations linked to findings

Each recommendation tied to a documented finding; re-evaluation accounts for alternate forms on three tests only

Re-evaluation plan (measures, timing): _____ Report due: _____

Evaluator signature / credentials: _____ Date signed: _____

Supervisor signature, where required: _____ Date: _____