

Woodcock-Johnson Report Write-Up Cheat Sheet

Reviewed by the BastionGPT Clinical Advisory Board · July 2026

The Woodcock-Johnson (Riverside Insights) is a co-normed battery of cognitive (COG) and achievement (ACH) tests built on CHC theory, in two current editions: WJ IV (2014, paper, ages 2–90+) and WJ V (2025, digital, ages 4–90+, with a Virtual Test Library). Standard scores (mean 100, SD 15) sit over two WJ-specific metrics: the Rasch-based W score and the criterion-referenced RPI, written X/90. Two live norm sets, one recomputed composite: anchor every score set to its edition and norms.

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

Do: name WJ IV or WJ V, the norm set, batteries and clusters given, format and scoring platform.

Pitfall: "the Woodcock-Johnson" alone; same-looking cluster names cover different tests across editions.

2 – Behavioral observations and validity before any score

Do: describe effort, engagement, breaks, departures; state whether results are valid estimates; note the digital format.

Pitfall: boilerplate that contradicts the interpretation the scores then receive.

3 – Score metrics statement one plain sentence per WJ metric

Do: standard scores with percentiles and bands; if RPI appears, translate it: 60/90 means 60% success where peers hit 90%.

Pitfall: RPI columns pasted unexplained; teams read 55/90 as a fraction or a typo.

4 – Cognitive results, composite first GIA or BIA, then broad clusters

Do: lead with the composite, then clusters as functional meaning for this examinee.

Pitfall: the test-by-test dump; narrow clusters over-read against the factor-structure evidence.

5 – Achievement results by domain reading · math · writing · oral language

Do: organize by domain, tie each to the referral; state age or grade norms where both are in play.

Pitfall: grade equivalents promoted to placement decisions; GE 3.2 is not an instructional level.

6 – Variation and comparison procedures name the model, describe the base rates

Do: name the procedure and framework (state SLD method or PSW model); base rates in words.

Pitfall: "significant discrepancy" with no named method, or comparison tables pasted wholesale.

7 – Prior testing and edition note the transition trap

Do: name both editions and norm sets; describe change qualitatively; restart trend lines inside the WJ V.

Pitfall: cross-edition arithmetic; "math fell six points" across WJ IV to WJ V treats two instruments as one ruler.

8 – Interpretive summary and recommendations answer the referral question

Do: state what the data establish and do not; honor the no-single-measure rule; trace each recommendation to a cluster finding.

Pitfall: an eligibility verdict from a score table; teams and agencies own that decision.

Before you sign

- ☐ Edition, norm set, batteries, and format named
- ☐ Prior-edition scores never subtracted
- ☐ RPI translated where it first appears
- ☐ Prose numbers match the table throughout
- ☐ Comparison model named, base rates in words
- ☐ Recommendations trace to cluster findings

Drafting with AI

Paste your cluster summary: standard scores, bands, percentiles, RPIs. Not the items, not the software narrative.

"Draft a Woodcock-Johnson results section from this summary: WJ V COG and ACH, US age norms; GIA 96; Gc 108; Gwm 82; Gs 84; Brief Math 78, RPI 47/90; 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

~5–10 min
per test given

Ages 2–90+
WJ IV · WJ V 4–90+

IEP teams · evaluators
who reads it

Woodcock-Johnson 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 dates: _____

Edition / norm set: _____ Format / platform: _____ Referral question: _____

Measures and administration

Batteries and clusters given; metrics reported (standard score, percentile, RPI) with the one-sentence RPI translation

Behavioral observations and validity

Effort, engagement, breaks, departures from procedure; statement that results are valid estimates

Cognitive results, composite first

GLA or BIA with band and percentile, then broad clusters as functional meaning, not a test-by-test dump

Achievement results by domain

Reading, math, written language, oral language; each tied to the referral concern; age or grade norms stated

Variations and comparisons

Named procedure and framework (state SLD method or PSW model); base rates described in words

Prior testing and edition note

Prior instrument and norms named; change described qualitatively when editions differ

Interpretive summary

Answer the referral question; what the data do NOT establish; no-single-measure limit; measurement error

Recommendations linkage

Each recommendation tied to a specific cluster finding; re-evaluation plan

RPI house rule stated: _____ Next re-evaluation due: _____

Evaluator signature / credentials: _____ Date signed: _____

Supervisor signature, where required: _____ Date: _____