

WIAT-4 Report Write-Up Cheat Sheet

Reviewed by the BastionGPT Clinical Advisory Board · July 2026

The WIAT-4 (Wechsler Individual Achievement Test, Fourth Edition, 2020) is the academic achievement battery for ages 4:0–50:11: reading, mathematics, written expression, and oral language across 20 subtests and 32 scores. Subtests and composites are both mean 100, SD 15 (not the mean-10 Wechsler subtest metric). No WIAT-5 has been announced: name the edition, norm set, and age-or-grade basis behind every score.

1 – Measures, edition, norms, format which norms produced these scores?

Do: name the edition, norm set (US or Canadian), age or grade basis with season, subtests given, format, platform.

Pitfall: no stated age-versus-grade basis; ability-achievement comparisons need one shared frame.

2 – Observations and validity before any score is reported

Do: describe effort, attention, breaks, departures from procedure; state whether results are valid estimates.

Pitfall: observations that contradict the interpretation, like fatigue noted and timed scores read at face value.

3 – Composite summary the score triplet, every time

Do: report standard score, CI, and percentile for every composite; state the metric once (mean 100, SD 15).

Pitfall: bare scores; eligibility and accommodations are threshold decisions where error bands matter.

4 – Domain results + error analysis reading · math · writing · oral language

Do: write functional meaning per domain, then how the student erred: decoding attempts, self-corrections, strategies.

Pitfall: the score dump that buries the error patterns teachers actually use.

5 – Composite integrity interpret at the level the data support

Do: surface within-composite splits; keep ipsative and score-difference arithmetic labeled supplementary.

Pitfall: one Reading number hiding a twenty-point word-reading vs comprehension split.

6 – Ability-achievement integration name the model

Do: name the state SLD framework, the cognitive estimate anchoring comparisons, and the shared norm frame.

Pitfall: "a severe discrepancy is required"; federal law says states must not require one (34 CFR 300.307).

7 – Dyslexia Index boundaries screening, not diagnosis

Do: report score, CI, percentile; frame as risk screening inside the comprehensive evaluation.

Pitfall: the index written as a diagnosis; its subtest mix also changes at grade 4.

8 – Summary + recommendations close the loop

Do: answer the referral question, state single-measure limits, tie each recommendation to a finding.

Pitfall: "reads at a 3rd-grade level" as a placement; grade equivalents cannot carry instructional decisions.

Before you sign

- ☐ Edition, norm set and basis, subtests, format named
- ☐ Table and prose numbers agree
- ☐ CI and percentile beside every score
- ☐ Within-composite splits surfaced
- ☐ State model and cognitive anchor named
- ☐ Dyslexia Index as screening; no grade-equivalent placements

Drafting with AI

Paste your composite summary: scores, CIs, percentiles. Not the items, not the record form, not software narrative.

"Draft a WIAT-4 results section from this summary: Oral Language 104, Mathematics 101, Written Expression 88, Reading 82, Decoding 76, Dyslexia Index 80; US age norms; referral question: ..."

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

500–900 words
results section

Time varies
by grade + subtests

Ages 4–50
20 subtests

IEP teams · parents
who reads it

WIAT-4 Results Section Template

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

Student (initials): _____ Age / grade: _____ Testing date(s): _____

Edition / norms (age or grade): _____ Format / scoring: _____ Referral question: _____

Measures and administration

Subtests given; format; scoring platform; norm-choice rationale

Behavioral observations and validity

Effort, attention, breaks, departures from procedure; validity statement

Composite summary

Each composite with standard score, CI, percentile; metric stated (mean 100, SD 15)

Domain-by-domain results and error analysis

Reading, mathematics, written expression, oral language; splits named; error patterns

Ability-achievement integration

State SLD model; cognitive anchor; shared norm frame

Dyslexia Index (if given)

Score, CI, percentile; risk screening within the comprehensive evaluation

Interpretive summary

Answer the referral question; single-measure limits; measurement error

Recommendations linkage

Each recommendation tied to a finding; no grade-equivalent placements

GSV baseline recorded: _____ Re-evaluation due: _____

Evaluator signature / credentials: _____ Date signed: _____

Supervisor signature, where required: _____ Date: _____