

WISC-V Report Write-Up Cheat Sheet

Reviewed by the BastionGPT Clinical Advisory Board · July 2026

The WISC-V (Wechsler Intelligence Scale for Children, Fifth Edition, 2014) is the child intelligence battery for ages 6:0–16:11: ten primary subtests, five index scores (VCI, VSI, FRI, WMI, PSI), FSIQ from seven of them. Composites: mean 100, SD 15; scores 90–109 are typically described as Average. A WISC-6 is in standardization with no announced release date: always name the edition and norms behind your scores.

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

Do: name the edition, the norm set (US, Canadian, A&NZ), subtests given, format (paper or digital), scoring platform.

Pitfall: "the WISC" with nothing else; a WISC-6 is in the field, and undated reports age badly.

2 – Observations and validity before any score is reported

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

Pitfall: boilerplate observations that contradict the interpretation you make later.

3 – Composite summary the score triplet, every time

Do: report standard score, 95% CI, percentile rank, and descriptor for every composite, from one labeled system.

Pitfall: bare standard scores presented as exact points; agency readers expect the interval and percentile.

4 – Index-by-index results VCI · VSI · FRI · WMI · PSI

Do: write what each result means functionally for this child, not a re-read of the table.

Pitfall: the score dump: a paragraph per subtest, in administration order, with no pattern.

5 – FSIQ, GAI, and the decision the contested move, made in the open

Do: report the FSIQ; if indexes diverge, state which estimate anchors comparisons and the rationale (often GAI over CPI).

Pitfall: silent substitution; a GAI without a stated reason reads as score-shopping.

6 – Subtest commentary, bounded qualitative only

Do: keep any subtest remarks descriptive and tied to collateral data; composites carry the interpretive weight.

Pitfall: diagnosis from scatter; ipsative profile analysis has failed validation for thirty years.

7 – Interpretive summary answer the referral question

Do: state what the data establish and what they do not; no single measure decides eligibility; note measurement error.

Pitfall: an eligibility verdict from an IQ score; teams and agencies decide, the report informs.

8 – Recommendations linkage close the loop

Do: tie every recommendation to a finding; say which results drove the supports you propose.

Pitfall: recommendations that could follow any profile.

Before you sign

- ☐ Edition, norms, and format named
- ☐ Table and prose numbers agree
- ☐ CI and percentile beside every score
- ☐ One descriptor system throughout
- ☐ FSIQ-GAI choice stated with reason
- ☐ Each recommendation traces to a finding

Drafting with AI

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

"Draft a WISC-V results section from this summary: VCI 110 High Average, VSI 102, FRI 105, WMI 82 Low Average, PSI 80 Low Average, FSIQ 96, GAI 106; 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

~60 minutes
administration

Ages 6–16
10 primary subtests

IEP teams · SSA · parents
who reads it

WISC-V 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: _____ Format / scoring: _____ Referral question: _____

Measures and administration

Subtests given; administration format; scoring platform

Behavioral observations and validity

Effort, engagement, language, departures from procedure; validity statement

Composite summary

Each composite with standard score, 95% CI, percentile, descriptor; one system

Index-by-index results

Functional meaning per index for this child, not a re-read of the table

FSIQ / GAI decision

Report both; state which estimate anchors comparisons and the rationale

Interpretive summary

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

Recommendations linkage

Each recommendation tied to a finding; re-evaluation plan

Subtest commentary noted: _____ Re-evaluation due: _____

Evaluator signature / credentials: _____ Date signed: _____

Supervisor signature, where required: _____ Date: _____