

BDI-3 Report Write-Up Cheat Sheet

Reviewed by the BastionGPT Clinical Advisory Board · August 2026 · Reproduces no items, forms, norms, or tables

The BDI-3 (Battelle Developmental Inventory, Third Edition; Riverside Insights, 2020) is a birth-to-7:11 eligibility battery: five IDEA-aligned domains, 13 subdomains, Developmental Quotients (mean 100, SD 15) with confidence intervals, and structured, observed, or interviewed administration. It is unrelated to the Beck BDI-II, its DQ is a standard score (never a ratio to convert to percent delay), the screener is not the battery, and no score decides eligibility alone: the state's quoted rule and the multisource team do.

Identification + disambiguation full name; never bare "BDI"

Do: name the edition, component (Complete / Screening Test / BEAS), platform, ages, examiners, and add the Beck BDI-II disambiguation line.

Pitfall: "BDI score" in a table or EHR field: two unrelated instruments share the acronym.

Edition boundaries Social-Emotional, not Personal-Social

Do: confirm third-edition terminology and norms; treat any BDI-2 baseline as a measurement discontinuity, per the publisher.

Pitfall: Personal-Social wording, BDI-2 crosswalks, or change computed across editions.

Sources per domain structured, observed, or interviewed

Do: label each domain's method, list every examiner and date (the platform records them per subdomain), note age-inapplicable subdomains.

Pitfall: interview credit reading as elicited performance, or three sessions presented as one.

Validity with content earn the conclusion

Do: chart engagement, sensory and motor factors, language, opportunity, informant-observation disagreements; conclude valid / cautious / descriptive.

Pitfall: "results are valid" as boilerplate.

DQs + intervals, scatter first no bare numbers at thresholds

Do: report each DQ with CI and percentile, subdomain scaled scores where they explain scatter, and decline the Total DQ as summary when domains diverge.

Pitfall: a Total DQ doing eligibility work over an uneven profile.

Eligibility, three parts the DQ is not a ratio

Do: normative interpretation (SDs below mean), the quoted state rule in its own currency, then the team's multisource determination.

Pitfall: 100 minus DQ = percent delay, or "eligible because the score was low."

Outcomes + family summary separate jobs, plain language

Do: name the indicator and timepoint, use the crosswalk as a map (never a checklist), document progress with same-edition Change Sensitive Scores, close with a family summary.

Pitfall: outcome data conflated with eligibility, or rising scores read as exit.

Before the note is signed

- ☐ Full name at first mention; Beck disambiguation included
- ☐ Component and edition named; no BDI-2 drift
- ☐ Every domain's source, examiner, and date labeled
- ☐ DQs with intervals and percentiles; scatter before the total
- ☐ Adaptive integrated once, never double-counted
- ☐ Eligibility in three parts, in the state rule's currency
- ☐ Outcomes separated; family summary in plain language

Drafting with AI

Give it the facts: component and edition, ages, domains with sources and examiners, DQs with intervals, subdomain scatter, the state rule, adaptive measures, outcome-reporting role.

"Draft a BDI-3 results section: Developmental Complete, 18 months, two evaluators, communication DQ 68 CI 63-75, social-emotional 76, others 84-94, rule 1.5 SD in two areas, receptive above expressive, family summary."

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

DQ 100/15, with CIs

subdomain scaled scores 10/3

Not the Beck BDI-II

full name first; never bare "BDI"

Screener is not the battery

flagging score, no DQ profile

State rule decides

DQ is a standard score, not a ratio

BDI-3 Results Section Template

Copy or print for your practice · Adapt fields to your organization's, payer's and jurisdiction's documentation requirements. Contains no test content.

Client (initials): _____ Chronological age: _____ Corrected age: _____ Evaluator: _____

Component + platform: _____ Program + eligibility rule applied: _____

Identification and disambiguation

Full name + edition · component · unrelated to the Beck BDI-II · referral question · examiners and disciplines · dates

Administration and sources

Structured / observed / interviewed, by domain · examiner and date per subdomain · accommodations · age-inapplicable subdomains

Validity statement

Engagement · sensory and motor factors · language · opportunity · informant-observation disagreements · conclusion

Domain results with intervals

Each DQ (mean 100, SD 15) with CI and percentile · subdomain scaled scores where scatter matters · Total DQ and whether it summarizes

Adaptive integration and eligibility

One adaptive conclusion (with Vineland-3 / ABAS-3 if given) · normative interpretation · quoted state rule in its currency · team determination

Outcome reporting and progress

Indicator 3 / 7 · entry, interim, exit · crosswalk as map, not checklist · same-edition Change Sensitive Scores for growth

Family summary and next steps

Plain language: strengths · needs · routine examples · IFSP or IEP step · transition timing near age three

Clinician (name and credentials): _____ Signature: _____ Date: _____