



# Children's Depression Inventory 2nd Edition: Teacher

Maria Kovacs, Ph.D.

## Progress Report

**Child's Name/ID:** Trisha Lang

Sex: Female

Birth Date: April 10, 2002

Normative Option: Sex-specific norms

	Administration 1	Administration 2	Administration 3
Child's Name/ID:	Trisha Lang	Trisha Lang	Trisha Lang
Administration Date:	Apr 20, 2010	May 07, 2010	Jun 21, 2010
Age:	8 years	8 years	8 years
Grade:	3	3	3
Teacher's Name/ID:	Ms. C	Ms. C	Ms. C
Assessor's Name:	Dr. K	Dr. K	Dr. K
Data Entered By:	ML	ML	ML

This Progress Report is intended for use by qualified assessors only, and is not to be shown or presented to the respondent or any other unqualified individuals.



Copyright © 2011 Maria Kovacs, Ph.D. and Multi-Health Systems Inc. All rights reserved.  
P.O. Box 950, North Tonawanda, NY 14120-0950  
3770 Victoria Park Ave., Toronto, ON M2H 3M6

ver. 1.0

## Introduction

The Children’s Depression Inventory 2nd Edition™: Teacher (CDI 2:T) assesses the presence and severity of depressive symptoms in children aged 7–17 years as observed by teachers. When used in combination with other information, results from the CDI 2:T can help to better understand a child and guide intervention decisions. This report combines the results of up to four CDI 2:T administrations to help the user interpret changes in reported depressive symptoms that have occurred over time. Please note that this Progress Report is intended to provide an overview of how scores have changed over time. For detailed information about any given administration, please refer to the CDI 2:T Assessment Reports. Please see the *CDI 2 Technical Manual* (published by MHS) for additional interpretive information.


This report is an interpretive aid and should not be provided to parents, teachers, or children or used as the sole basis for clinical diagnosis or intervention. Administrators are cautioned against drawing unsupported interpretations. To obtain a comprehensive view of the child, information from this report should be combined with information gathered from other psychometric tests, interviews, observations, and available records. This report is based on an algorithm that produces the most common interpretations of the scores that have been obtained. Administrators should review the teacher’s responses to specific items to ensure that these interpretations apply.

## T-score Classifications




The classifications in the following table apply to all T-scores presented in this report.

T-score	Classification
70+	Very Elevated Score (Many more concerns than are typically reported)
65-69	Elevated Score (More concerns than are typically reported)
60-64	High Average Score (Somewhat more concerns than are typically reported)
40-59	Average Score (Typical levels of concern)
<40	Low Score (Fewer concerns than are typically reported)

## Graphical Display of T-scores Across Administrations



## Graphical Display of T-scores by Scale Across Administrations



## Comprehensive Table of Scores: Comparison Across Administrations

The following table displays the CDI 2:T scores for each scale as well as any reliable changes in T-scores. Differences are defined as “reliable” if they meet statistical criteria for reliable change (see the *CDI 2 Technical Manual* for more information). An “Increase” in a score indicates that the symptoms have become notably more pronounced (i.e., the child’s problems have become more of a concern) across administrations. A “Decrease” in a score indicates that the symptoms have become notably less pronounced (i.e., the child’s problems have improved) across administrations. A designation of “No Change” indicates that the amount of change across administrations did not meet statistical criteria for reliable change.

Scale		Admin 1	Admin 2	Admin 3	Reliable Changes in T-scores		
					Admin 1 to Admin 3	Admin 1 to Admin 2	Admin 2 to Admin 3
Total Score	T-score	88	66	51	Decrease	Decrease	Decrease
	90% CI	81-95	59-73	44-58			
	Percentile	98	91	60			
	Raw Score	23	13	6			
Emotional Problems	T-score	90	73	55	Decrease	Decrease	Decrease
	90% CI	81-99	64-82	46-64			
	Percentile	99	94	68			
	Raw Score	13	7	3			
Functional Problems	T-score	70	58	49	Decrease	Decrease	No Change
	90% CI	62-78	50-66	41-57			
	Percentile	95	81	51			
	Raw Score	10	6	3			

**Note(s):**

CI = Confidence Interval.

T-scores of 90 are displayed for all raw scores that are four or more standard deviations above the mean.

### Text Summary of Scores for Trisha Lang

The following section summarizes in a textual format the CDI 2:T scores as well as reliable changes in scores across pairs of administrations. An increase in scores indicates that problems have become notably more pronounced (i.e., there are more reported concerns) across administrations. A decrease in scores indicates that problems have become notably less pronounced (i.e., there are reported improvements) across administrations.

**Note:** Elevated score = T-score ≥ 65; Low/Average score = T-score < 65; T = T-score, CI = Confidence Interval.

The **Total Score** reflects the number and overall severity of depressive symptoms. Elevated scores were obtained for Admin 1 (T = 88; 90% CI = 81-95) and Admin 2 (T = 66; 90% CI = 59-73). Low/average scores were obtained for Admin 3 (T = 51; 90% CI = 44-58). Scores on this scale demonstrated a statistically reliable decrease across: Admin 1 to Admin 3, Admin 1 to Admin 2, Admin 2 to Admin 3.

The **Emotional Problems** scale score reflects the teacher’s assessment of the child’s sadness, irritability, fatigue, or loneliness. Elevated scores were obtained for Admin 1 (T = 90; 90% CI = 81-99) and Admin 2 (T = 73; 90% CI = 64-82). Low/average scores were obtained for Admin 3 (T = 55; 90% CI = 46-64). Scores on this scale demonstrated a statistically reliable decrease across: Admin 1 to Admin 3, Admin 1 to Admin 2, Admin 2 to Admin 3.

The **Functional Problems** scale score reflects the teacher’s assessment of the child’s functioning, including worsening school performance, difficulty interacting with peers, and an impaired capacity to be cooperative and to enjoy school activities. Elevated scores were obtained for Admin 1 (T = 70; 90% CI = 62-78). Low/average scores were obtained for Admin 2 (T = 58; 90% CI = 50-66) and Admin 3 (T = 49; 90% CI = 41-57). Scores on this scale demonstrated a statistically reliable decrease across: Admin 1 to Admin 3, Admin 1 to Admin 2.

## Item Responses

The Teacher provided the following ratings for items on the CDI 2:T.

Item	Teacher's Rating		
	Admin 1	Admin 2	Admin 3
1.	3	1	1
2.	3	2	1
3.	3	2	1
4.	2	3	3
5.	2	0	1
6.	2	2	0
7.	2	0	0
8.	3	2	2
9.	1	3	3
10.	3	3	0
11.	2	1	2
12.	1	0	0

**Response Key:**

- 0 = Not at all
- 1 = Some of the time
- 2 = Often
- 3 = Much or most of the time
- ? = Omitted item

Date printed: January 20, 2011

**End of Report**

SAMPLE