

Sensory Profile 2 Report Write-Up Cheat Sheet

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

The Sensory Profile 2 (Pearson, 2014) is a family of five caregiver and teacher questionnaires for birth through 14:11, scoring Dunn's four quadrants (Seeking, Avoiding, Sensitivity, Registration) plus sensory-system and behavioral sections as frequency bands against age norms. The write-up's hard parts are identification (five forms with different items, respondents, and norms: name the form and respondent), honest language (frequency, not severity, and never a diagnosis), and cross-rater discordance (context, never error).

Identification: form + respondent which of the five forms, who answered, age band

Do: name the form, the respondent by role and relationship, the child's age against the form's band, platform and language.

Pitfall: "SP2 completed": five forms, different items and norms; unnamed = uninterpretable.

Referral question + battery why sensory assessment, what it feeds

Do: state the referral concern and what the SP2 sits alongside (observation, history, diagnostic instruments).

Pitfall: a questionnaire with no stated purpose; the reader guesses what it was for.

Model before numbers one sentence, then results

Do: explain threshold crossed with self-regulation strategy -> the four patterns; bands = frequency vs peers.

Pitfall: bare quadrant labels read as verdicts instead of frequency patterns.

Quadrants in band language frequency, tied to function

Do: report each relevant quadrant's band in Dunn's language with a daily-life illustration; keep values in the record.

Pitfall: "severe sensory issues" from a frequency band, or proprietary cut values reproduced.

Sections tied to participation only referral-relevant ones

Do: connect sensory-system and behavioral sections to feeding, dressing, attention, play; use School Companion school factors.

Pitfall: a bare list of section bands that says nothing about the child's day.

Cross-rater comparison context, never error

Do: name both respondents, compare setting to setting, interpret the gap by structure and demands.

Pitfall: averaging the forms, or "mother over-reported."

Boundaries + recommendations patterns, not a diagnosis

Do: state: not diagnostic, SPD not in DSM-5-TR, B.4 supported not established; match modifications to the pattern.

Pitfall: "results confirm SPD," or sensory-diet outcome promises.

Before the note is signed

- ☐ Form named (of the five) with respondent and age-band check
- ☐ Referral question stated; battery context given
- ☐ Quadrant model explained in a sentence before results
- ☐ Bands in frequency language tied to function; no cut values
- ☐ Discordance interpreted by setting, never averaged
- ☐ Not-a-diagnosis statement present; B.4 supported, not established
- ☐ Recommendations matched to pattern; no outcome promises

Drafting with AI

Give it the facts: which form and respondent, ages and dates, quadrant and section bands, functional observations, referral question, the rest of the battery.

"Draft a Sensory Profile 2 results section: Child form by mother, School Companion by teacher, age 7, Avoiding and Sensitivity elevated at home, near-typical at school with Seeking at recess, autism evaluation, criterion B.4 support, no cut values."

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

5 forms, name yours

different items, respondents,
norms

Frequency, not severity

"more than others" = reported
more often

Patterns, not a diagnosis

SPD is not in DSM-5-TR

Discordance = context

compare settings, never average

Sensory Profile 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): _____ Age: _____ Form: _____ Respondent: _____

Referral question + battery context: _____ Administration (platform, language): _____

Identification and age-band check

Form (of the five) · respondent role + relationship + time known · child's age vs the form's band · dates

Model statement

1-2 sentences: threshold crossed with self-regulation strategy -> Seeking / Avoiding / Sensitivity / Registration · bands = frequency vs same-age peers

Quadrant results

Each relevant quadrant: classification band in Dunn's language -> functional illustration (mealtime, dressing, classroom, play) · no cut values

Section scores tied to participation

Sensory systems (auditory, visual, touch, movement, body position, oral) + behavioral sections · referral-relevant only · participation impact

Cross-rater comparison

Both respondents named · setting vs setting · discordance as context, never averaged, no rater blamed

Interpretation boundaries

Patterns, not a diagnosis · SPD not in DSM-5-TR · supports (not establishes) DSM-5 criterion B.4 · integration with observation and history

Recommendations and next steps

Environmental + routine modifications matched to the pattern · no outcome promises · progress monitored through function · referrals

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