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Agenda

• Screening and intervening within tiered prevention models: An Overview of comprehensive, integrated three-tiered (Ci3T) models of prevention

Screening
• Behavior screening tools
• Behavior screening procedures
• Behavior screening data

Intervening
• Implications for Tier 1
• Implications for teachers
• Organizing Tier 2 intervention Grids
• Illustrations for using screening data to inform Tier 2

Comprehensive, Integrated, Three-Tiered Model of Prevention

Tier 3
Tertiary Prevention (>99%)
Goal: Reduce Harm
Specialized Individual systems for students with high risk

Tier 2
Secondary Prevention (<15%)
Goal: Prevent Harm
School/classroom-wide systems for all students, staff, and settings

Tier 1
Primary Prevention (<4%)
Goal: Prevent Harm
System-wide (universal) systems for all students, staff, and settings

Academic ◇ Behavioral ◇ Social

(Lane, Kalberg, & Menzies, 2009)
Academic Component

- Coordinated instruction within and across grade levels
- Instruction linked to College and Career-Ready Standards, early learning standards, state, or district standards
- Benchmarking student progress to inform instruction
- Progress monitoring for students identified for secondary (Tier 2) and tertiary (Tier 3) supports

Social Component: Validated Curriculum

- Violence Prevention
- Second Step Violence Prevention (www.cfchildren.org)
- Character Education
- Caring School Community (www.characterplus.org)
- Positive Action (www.positiveaction.net)
- Social Skills
- Connect with Kids (connectwithkids.com)
- Social Skills Improvement System: Classwide Intervention Program (Elliott & Gresham, 2007)
- BASC™-2 Intervention Guide and Materials (Vannest, Reynolds, & Kamphaus, 2008)

Behavioral Component:
Positive Behavioral Interventions and Supports (PBIS)

A Framework, Not a Curriculum

- Establish, clarify, and define expectations
- Teach expectations
- Give opportunities to practice
- Reinforce students meeting expectations
- Plan for physical layout, procedures, and transition
- Monitor implementation using school-wide data
- Monitor student progress and need for tiered supports


Importance of Unified Systems of Measurement

- Accurate measurement of key variables to enable appropriate decision making
- The ability to analyze academic and behavioral data in tandem
- Information sharing regarding schoolwide goals and student achievement


Essential Components of Primary Prevention Efforts

- Social Validity
- Treatment Integrity
- Systematic Screening
  - Academic
  - Behavior
Systematic Screening for Behavior - Tools

Systematic Screener for Behavior Disorders

Available from Pacific Northwest Publishing

(SSBD 2nd ed., Walker, Severson, & Feil, 2014)

SSBD Results – Winter 2007 through Winter 2009

Risk Status of Nominated Students

Source: Lane, Menard, Voter, & Eichling, 2012. Figure 2.2 Systematic Screening for Behavior Disorders (SSBD; Walker & Severson, 1992) results comparing the percentage of students nominated and exceeding normative criteria for both internalizing and externalizing behavior disorders over a three-year period.
Note. The numbers represent totals for the students for whom the SSBD was completed.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of students</th>
<th>47</th>
<th>13</th>
<th>63</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>57</th>
<th>9</th>
<th>66</th>
<th>11</th>
<th>78</th>
<th>14</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Sample Data – SSBD
2007-2011 Risk Status for Nominated Students

Externalizing

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Grade Level</th>
<th>Total Number of Students Screened</th>
<th>Students Nominated</th>
<th>Students w/ Critical Need</th>
<th>Critical Internalizing</th>
<th>Critical Externalizing</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>K</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>4 (5.56%)</td>
<td>1 (1.39%)</td>
<td>3 (4.17%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1st</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>1 (1.54%)</td>
<td>0 (0.00%)</td>
<td>1 (1.54%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>1 (5.00%)</td>
<td>2 (3.33%)</td>
<td>1 (1.67%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Students missing
Student Risk Screening Scale

The SRSS is a 7-item mass screener used to identify students who are at risk for antisocial behavior.

Uses 4-point Likert-type scale:
- never = 0, occasionally = 1, sometimes = 2, frequently = 3

Teachers evaluate each student on the following items:
- Steal
- Lie, Cheat, Sneak
- Behavior Problems
- Aggressive Behavior
- Peer Rejection
- Low Academic Achievement
- Negative Attitude

Student Risk is divided into 3 categories:
- Low: 0 – 3
- Moderate: 4 – 8
- High: 9 – 21


Figure 4. Middle school behavior screening data over time at the fall time point. Adapted from Figure 4.6 p. 127 Lane, K. L., Menzies, H. M, Oakes, W. P., & Kalberg, J. R. (2012). Systematic screenings of behavior to support instruction: From preschool to high school. New York, NY: Guilford Press.
SAMPLE DATA: SRSS
Middle School Study 1: Behavioral & Academic Characteristics of SRSS Risk Groups

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Low (n = 422) M (SD)</th>
<th>Moderate (n = 51) M (SD)</th>
<th>High (n = 12) M (SD)</th>
<th>Significance Testing</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ODR</td>
<td>1.50 (2.85)</td>
<td>5.02 (5.32)</td>
<td>8.42 (7.01)</td>
<td>L=M-H</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In-School Suspensions</td>
<td>0.08 (0.38)</td>
<td>3.15 (1.04)</td>
<td>1.71 (2.26)</td>
<td>L=M-H</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GPA</td>
<td>3.35 (0.52)</td>
<td>2.63 (0.65)</td>
<td>2.32 (0.59)</td>
<td>L=H, M=H</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Course Failures</td>
<td>0.68 (1.50)</td>
<td>2.47 (1.46)</td>
<td>4.17 (3.49)</td>
<td>L=H, M=H</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Lane, Parks, Kalberg, & Carter, 2007)

STUDENT RISK SCREENING SCALE
High School: Behavioral & Academic Characteristics of SRSS Risk Groups
Non-Instructional Raters

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Low (n = 328) M (SD)</th>
<th>Moderate (n = 52) M (SD)</th>
<th>High (n = 35) M (SD)</th>
<th>Significance Testing</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ODR</td>
<td>3.53 (5.53)</td>
<td>8.27 (7.72)</td>
<td>8.97 (9.39)</td>
<td>L &lt; M, H, M = H</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GPA</td>
<td>3.10 (0.82)</td>
<td>2.45 (0.84)</td>
<td>2.38 (0.88)</td>
<td>L &gt; M, H, M = H</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Lane, Kalberg, Parks, & Carter, 2008)

Student Risk Screening Scale for Internalizing and Externalizing

Available from ci3t.org
(SRSS-II; Drummond, 1994 and Lane & Menzies, 2009)
STUDENT RISK SCREENING SCALE-IE

12 items scale for use at the elementary, middle, and high schools
Subscale scores used for interpretation.
No total scale score.

SRSS-IE Middle and High School Scoring

Elementary Winter
SRSS-E7 Results – All Students
Strengths and Difficulties Questionnaire

Available from sdqinfo.org

(SDQ; Goodman, 1997)

SDQ: Screening Results by Domain
Elementary School Winter 2009

### SDQ Results: 2nd Grade Students

* = number of students not rated (or missing items)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Domain</th>
<th>Total Difficulties</th>
<th>Emotional Symptoms</th>
<th>Conduct Problems</th>
<th>Hyperactivity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N=77</td>
<td>n=37</td>
<td>n=12</td>
<td>n=25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>64</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(51.95%)</td>
<td>(47.44%)</td>
<td>(15.58%)</td>
<td>(32.47%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Domain</th>
<th>Emotional Symptoms</th>
<th>Conduct Problems</th>
<th>Hyperactivity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N=78</td>
<td>n=57</td>
<td>n=11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>64</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(82.05%)</td>
<td>(74.36%)</td>
<td>(14.10%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Domain</th>
<th>Emotional Symptoms</th>
<th>Conduct Problems</th>
<th>Hyperactivity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N=78</td>
<td>n=57</td>
<td>n=11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>64</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(82.05%)</td>
<td>(74.36%)</td>
<td>(14.10%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*SDQ Results: 2nd Grade Students

BASC3 Behavioral and Emotional Screening Scale©

Available from Pearson Education, PsychCorp®

(BASC3 BESS; Kamphaus & Reynolds, 2015)
Social Skills Improvement System – Performance Screening Guide

Available from Pearson Education, PsychCorp™

(SSIS-PSG; Elliott & Gresham, 2007)

Social Skills Improvement System – Performance Screening Guide

Spring 2012 – Total School

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subscales</th>
<th>Adequate progress</th>
<th>Moderate Difficulties</th>
<th>Significant Difficulties</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Reading Skills</td>
<td>42.35</td>
<td>47.60</td>
<td>6.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Math Skills</td>
<td>47.60</td>
<td>47.50</td>
<td>6.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prosocial Behavior</td>
<td>56.12</td>
<td>36.73</td>
<td>8.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Motivation to learn</td>
<td>55.42</td>
<td>38.24</td>
<td>6.34</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

N = 489

Social, Academic, and Emotional Behavior Screener

Available from Fastbridge Learning

(SAEIRS; Kilgo, Chafoules, & Riley-Tillman, 2013)
Note - we present the percentage of students by risk category on the total scale and each subscale, as we find the two-step approach to subscale interpretation to be the most defensible.

SOURCE: Kilgus, Kilpatrick, Taylor, Eklund, & von der Embse, 2016 (in prep)

SAMPLE DATA: SAEBS
Large Urban Elementary - Fall Screening Data
Fall 2015 Scores Schoolwide

SAEBRS SCALE
Not Identified as At‐Risk  Identified as At‐Risk

PERCENT
10% 20% 30% 40% 50% 60% 70% 80% 90% 100%

SAMPLE DATA: SAEBS
Large Urban Elementary - Fall Screening Data

% of Students by Risk Category
Total Scale by Grade Level

PERCENT
10% 20% 30% 40% 50% 60% 70% 80% 90% 100%

SOURCE: Kilgus, Kilpatrick, Taylor, Eklund, & von der Embse, 2016 (in prep)

Review and Discuss the SSIS PSG/ BESS/ SAEBS
Ci3T.org/screening

Select a screening tool that you want to know more about!

SSBD  BESS  SRSS-IE  SSIS-PSG  SDQ

Systematic Screening for Behavior - Procedures
Preparing

- District support
- Examine and select tool(s)
- Professional development
- Share information with parents

---

Screening

- Gather teachers together
- Review procedures
- Conduct screening

---

Interpreting

- School level
- Grade level
- Student level

---
After Screening

Responding

• ... implications for primary prevention efforts
• ... implications for teachers
• ... implications for student-based interventions

Social Skills Improvement System – Performance Screening Guide
Spring 2012 – Total School

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subscales</th>
<th>Adequate progress</th>
<th>Moderate Difficulties</th>
<th>Significant Difficulties</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Reading Skills</td>
<td>43.15</td>
<td>43.95</td>
<td>56.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mark Skills</td>
<td>45.50</td>
<td>56.80</td>
<td>56.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prosocial Behavior</td>
<td>40.30</td>
<td>40.30</td>
<td>40.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Motivation to Learn</td>
<td>39.10</td>
<td>39.10</td>
<td>39.10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

N = 54
N = 223
N = 212
n = 489
n = 490
n = 490
n = 489
N = 22
N = 233
N = 235
N = 35
N = 180
N = 275
N = 31
N = 187
N = 271
Student Risk Screening Scale
Middle School Fall 2004 - Fall 2011

Percentage of Students

Essential Components of Primary Prevention Efforts

Social Validity

Treatment Integrity

Systematic Screening

Academic Behavior

Social Validity: Primary Intervention Rating Scale (PIRS)
Treatment Integrity

PBIS Component: School-wide Evaluation Tool (SET; Sugai et al., 2001)

www.pbisapp.org

Building capacity through professional learning

- Self-monitoring
- Behavior Contracts
- Check in/Check Out
- Low intensity strategies
- Instructional Strategies
After Screening

Responding

• ... implications for primary prevention efforts
• ... implications for teachers
• ... implications for student-based interventions

Consider this class....

Low Intensity Strategies

Opportunities to Respond
Behavior Specific Praise
Active Supervision
Instructional Feedback
High I Requests
Precorrection
Incorporating Choice

After Screening

Responding

• ... implications for primary prevention efforts
• ... implications for teachers
• ... implications for student-based interventions
Tiered Intervention Grids: A Step-By-Step Process

1. Step 1: Construct your assessment schedule
2. Step 2: Identify your secondary (Tier 2) supports
3. Step 3: Determine entry criteria
4. Step 4: Identify outcome measures
5. Step 5: Identify exit criteria
6. Step 6: Consider additional needs
Step 1: Construct your assessment schedule

Examining Academic and Behavioral Data:

Elementary Level

Middle and High School Levels
Step 2: Identify your secondary (Tier 2) supports

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Support</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>School-wide Data: Entry Criteria</th>
<th>Data to Monitor Progress</th>
<th>Exit Criteria</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Self-monitoring</td>
<td>Students meet with faculty member to create a checklist for target expectations in the setting of interest. Goal setting and graphing daily points earned. BRAVE Bucks when goal is met.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Lane, Kalberg, & Mancini (2009). pp. 131 - 137, Boxes 6.1 - 6.4

Step 3: Determine entry criteria

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Support</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>School-wide Data: Entry Criteria</th>
<th>Data to Monitor Progress</th>
<th>Exit Criteria</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Self-monitoring</td>
<td>Students meet with faculty member to create a checklist for target expectations in the setting of interest. Goal setting and graphing daily points earned. BRAVE Bucks when goal is met.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Screening/Assessment tool: SRSS
Decision rule or cut points: Moderate risk and ODRs 3+ (moderate risk)

Step 4: Identify outcome measures

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Support</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>School-wide Data: Entry Criteria</th>
<th>Data to Monitor Progress</th>
<th>Exit Criteria</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Self-monitoring</td>
<td>Students meet with faculty member to create a checklist for target expectations in the setting of interest. Goal setting and graphing daily points earned. BRAVE Bucks when goal is met.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Daily points earned on SM checklist
Treatment integrity monitoring
Social validity
Step 5: Identify exit criteria

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Support Description</th>
<th>School-wide Entry Criteria</th>
<th>Data to Monitor Progress</th>
<th>Exit Criteria</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Self-monitoring</td>
<td>Students meet with faculty member to create a checklist for setting of target expectations</td>
<td>Daily points earned on SM</td>
<td>SRSS Low Risk, ODRs &gt;3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Goal setting and graphing daily points earned. Student earns BRAVE Bucks when goal is met.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Step 6: Consider additional needs

Lane, Menzies, Bruhn, & Crnobori (2011).

Instructional choice, Behavior Contracts, Mindfulness strategies, Increased opportunities to respond.

Lane, Menzies, Ennis, & Oakes (2015)
Secondary (Tier 2) Intervention Grids

Comprehensive, Integrated, Three-Tiered Model of Prevention
(Lane, Kalberg, & Menzies, 2009)

www.ci3t.org

Ci3T: Tertiary Prevention
Ci3T: Secondary Prevention
Ci3T: Primary Prevention

Overview of Ci3T
Prevention Models
Setting a Purpose
Establish team meetings and roles
Mission and Purpose
Establish Roles and Responsibilities
Procedures for Teaching
Procedures for Monitoring
Revise Primary Plan using Stakeholder feedback

Teacher Driven Supports: Instructional Techniques to Improve Students’ Motivation; General Classroom Management Practices; Low Intensity Behavior Supports

Functional Assessment-based Interventions
Reading, Math, Writing
Benchmarking and Progress Monitoring Tools

Student Driven Interventions, Strategies, & Practices
Check In - Check Out

Additional Tier 3 Supports

Additional Professional Development on Specific Topics

Secondary Intervention Grids

Tertiary Prevention (~5%)
Secondary Prevention (~15%)
Primary Prevention (~80%)

Academic
Behavioral
Social
Thinking about Screening & Intervening ...
Temperature Check!

Watching from afar
Want to learn more
Ready to dip a toe in
Ready to dive in!

Illustrations for using screening data to inform Tier 2

Instructional Choice: Lane, Royer, Messenger, Common, Ennis, & Swogger (2015)
Opportunities to Respond: Messenger, Lane, Common, Oakes, Menzies, Cantwell, & Ennis (in preparation).
**Illustration 1: Setting**

- Midwestern United States
- Large suburban public elementary school
- 604 students, grades K-5
- 1st grade general education class with full inclusion of students with special needs
- 25 students (14 girls, 11 boys)
- Intervention took place during Writing Workshop time
- Intervention implemented by general education and special education co-teachers

---

**Identify Concern**

**Writing Workshop**
- Limited work completion
- Low levels of independent work
- Behavioral concerns

---

**Consult you Intervention Grids for selecting an option – Instructional Choice**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Support</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>School-wide Data</th>
<th>Date to Monitor Progress</th>
<th>Exit Criteria</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Instructional Choice</td>
<td>Within and across task choices offered during reading instruction. During independent language arts assignments, choices offered by teacher in general education classroom.</td>
<td>Academic engaged time % work completed Treatment integrity component checklist</td>
<td>Social Validity (student &amp; teacher completed)</td>
<td>consecutive weeks of daily academic engagement 80% and work completion 90%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

Lane, Royer, Messenger, Common, Ennis, & Swogger (2015)
Examine screening and other schoolwide data for decision making.

Teacher:
Ms. Merriweather
Fall 2014

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Student</th>
<th>SRSS</th>
<th>Work Completed</th>
<th>Report Card</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Crumpet, Tabitha</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Achieving</td>
<td>Progressing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hugo, Nathan</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Achieving</td>
<td>Achieving</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hugo, Vinnie</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Progressing</td>
<td>Achieving</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kane, Scarlett</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Achieving</td>
<td>Achieving</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kase, Hall</td>
<td>Moderate</td>
<td>Progressing</td>
<td>Achieving</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kane, Teddy</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Progressing</td>
<td>Limited Progress</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lane, Tony</td>
<td>Moderate</td>
<td>Progressing</td>
<td>Achieving</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lane, Randolf</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Achieving</td>
<td>Achieving</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vasquez, Shelby</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Achieving</td>
<td>Achieving</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- Examine screening and other schoolwide data for decision making.
- Instructional Choice
- Examine screening and other schoolwide data for decision making.

Training for Teachers

- Instructional Choice
- Examine screening and other schoolwide data for decision making.

Examining Progress and Outcomes

- Treatment Integrity: Is the intervention in place as designed?
- Social Validity: What are stakeholders perceptions of the goals, procedures, and outcomes?
- Student Outcomes: What does the student outcome data tell us about progress?
Treatment Integrity Checklist

Social Validity

Three Teachers
- Intervention Rating Profile (IRP-15; Witt & Elliott, 1985)
  - Pre- and post-intervention versions
  - Measured teacher opinions of the intervention

Two Students
- Children’s Intervention Rating Profile (CIRP; Witt & Elliott, 1985)
  - Pre- and post-intervention versions
  - Measured student opinions of the intervention

Outcome Measures

Measurement
- 2 min momentary time sampling
  - Motiv-Aider®
  - Marked at each interval if academically engaged or engaged in disruptive behavior
    - 0 = not observed
    - 1 = observed
- Percentage of AET and DB
  - Total ÷ by total possible × 100
  - IOA calculated for at least 25% of sessions
Illustration 2: Setting

- Midwestern United States
- Large suburban public elementary school
- 578 students, grades K-5
- 4th grade general education class
  - 21 students (10 girls, 11 boys)
  - Intervention took place following a Math Workshop model: opening, introduction, mini-lesson, explore/work time, and reflection sharing/time
  - Classroom rules: respect yourself, respect others, and respect the school

Identify Concern

- **Math Instruction**
  - Expected math achievement
  - Limited responding in class
  - Low accuracy

Consult your Intervention Grids for selecting an option – Increased Opportunities to Respond (OTR)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>OTR</th>
<th>Support</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>School-wide Data</th>
<th>Data to Monitor</th>
<th>Exit Criteria</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>OTR</td>
<td>Teacher provides increased OTR during math review and practice. Choral responding and mixed (“For one student” (30%)/ “One for the class” (70%)). Known material, visual and verbally presented, fast pace.</td>
<td>% Active student responding</td>
<td>% Accuracy</td>
<td>% consecutive weeks of work completed at 100% in math</td>
<td>Social Validity (Student &amp; teacher completed)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Menzinger, Lane, Conner, Oakes, Menzies, Cantwell, & Ennis (in preparation)
Examining Progress and Outcomes

- Treatment Integrity
  - Is the intervention in place as designed?

- Social Validity
  - What are stakeholders' perceptions of the goals, procedures, and outcomes?

- Student Outcomes
  - What does the student outcome data tell us about progress?
Treatment Integrity Checklist

Social Validity
Three Educators
• Intervention Rating Profile (IRP-15; Witt & Elliott, 1985)
  • Pre- and post-intervention versions
  • Measured teacher opinions of the intervention

Two Students
• Children’s Intervention Rating Profile (CIRP; Witt & Elliott, 1985)
  • Pre- and post-intervention versions
  • Measured student opinions of the intervention

Outcome Measures
• Percent Accuracy
  • Total ÷ by total possible × 100
  • IOA calculated for at least 25% of sessions

• Percentage of Active Responding
  • Total ÷ by total possible × 100
  • IOA calculated for at least 25% of sessions