

DAYC-2 Report Write-Up Cheat Sheet

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

The DAYC-2 (PRO-ED, 2013) is a norm-referenced developmental battery for birth through 5 years 11 months: five IDEA-aligned domains scored (mean 100, SD 15) through observation, caregiver interview, or direct assessment, with the General Development Index available only when all five are given. The write-up's hard parts are sourcing (label each domain's method; interview and direct scores have no equivalence evidence) and eligibility arithmetic (SD cuts and percent delay are different currencies; the state's rule decides).

Identification + rule ages, edition, and the criterion

Do: state chronological and corrected age (formula + authority), the edition, and the named state or program rule being applied.

Pitfall: "corrected for prematurity" with no arithmetic; states differ (half-prematurity vs 24-month stops).

Methods per domain observed, interviewed, or elicited

Do: name each domain's information source; arena and interview administration are permitted, so the label is the evidence.

Pitfall: "the child demonstrated" when the only evidence is a caregiver's report.

Validity conditions bound the interpretation

Do: chart engagement, health, language and interpreter, sensory or motor limits, and representativeness.

Pitfall: "did not demonstrate today" converted into "cannot do."

Domain results + bands no bare numbers at boundaries

Do: report each SS with percentile and confidence band; subdomains only when the rule turns on them.

Pitfall: a bare 79 at a 77.5 threshold; the band is the honest sentence.

Scatter before composite GDI needs all five

Do: lead with the domain pattern; report the GDI (correctly named) only with five domains; say when it dilutes a focal delay.

Pitfall: "GDQ," or a middling composite nullifying a qualifying domain.

Eligibility analysis the rule's own currency

Do: apply the quoted criterion as written: SD rules from standard scores, percent delay from age equivalents per the state formula; then the multisource process.

Pitfall: "1.5 SD = 25% delay": the metrics disagree in thousands of combinations.

Family summary + next steps plain language, required

Do: strengths, needs, what the family reported, whether the criterion was met, team review, IFSP, transition timing.

Pitfall: a report that ends at score classifications.

Before the note is signed

- ☐ Both ages stated, with correction formula and authority
- ☐ Each domain's method labeled; reports never read as observed
- ☐ Every score carries percentile and confidence band
- ☐ GDI named correctly, only with all five domains
- ☐ State rule quoted and applied in its own currency
- ☐ No single procedure asserted as deciding eligibility
- ☐ Family summary in plain language with next steps

Drafting with AI

Give it the facts: ages and correction arithmetic, domains with methods, standard scores with bands, the state rule, observations, family-reported information.

"Draft a DAYC-2 results section: 22 months, term, all five domains, communication SS 70 second percentile by direct assessment and interview, others 92 to 98, rule 1.5 SD in one area, uneven profile, GDI de-emphasized, hearing referral."

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

5 domains, SS 100/15

percentile + band with every score

GDI needs all five

General Development Index, never GDQ

SD and % delay differ

apply the state rule in its currency

Label every source

observed, interviewed, or elicited

DAYC-2 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: _____

Program + eligibility rule applied: _____ Domains administered + methods: _____

Referral and identification

Referral question · evaluation dates · correction formula + authority if applicable · disciplines involved

Behavioral and validity conditions

Engagement · regulation · health · language and interpreter · sensory or motor limits · representativeness

Domain results with uncertainty

Each domain: SS (mean 100, SD 15) · percentile · confidence band · functional line · source method · subdomains only when rule-relevant

Composite and scatter

GDI with interval only if all five domains given · uneven profiles led by domains · what the composite hides

Eligibility analysis

Quoted criterion applied in its own currency · result vs threshold · converging sources · informed clinical opinion · team determination

Family summary

Plain language: strengths · needs · family-reported information · criterion met or not · what happens next

Team determination and next steps

Multidisciplinary review · IFSP development · referrals (hearing for communication delays) · transition planning near age three

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