



Number: _____

Date: _____

PROBLEM IDENTIFICATION

Behavioral Definition

<p>5 Definition is (a) <u>objective</u> — refers to observable and measurable characteristics of behavior; (b) <u>clear</u> — so unambiguous that it could be read, repeated, and paraphrased by observers; and (c) <u>complete</u> — delineates both examples and non-examples of the behavior.</p>	<p>4 Definition is objective and clear BUT only partially meets criteria for complete (e.g., examples provided but non-examples are not provided).</p>	<p>3 Definition meets only one of the three criteria (i.e., objective, clear, complete).</p>	<p>2 Problem behavior is stated in general terms (e.g., reading comprehension, aggressive behavior, poor fine motor skills, etc.).</p>	<p>1 Behavioral definition is not written.</p>
---	---	---	---	---

Evidence Supporting Rating:

Baseline Data

<p>5 (a) Prior to implementing the intervention, repeated and direct measures (i.e., at least three data points) of the target behavior have been collected over several sessions, days, or even weeks</p>	<p>4 (a) Prior to implementing the intervention, repeated and direct measures (i.e., at least three data points) of the target behavior have been collected over several sessions, days, or even weeks</p>	<p>3 (a) Prior to implementing the intervention, direct measures of the target behavior have been collected on the behavior; however, only two data points or a median are reported; (b) Appropriate</p>	<p>2 (a) Prior to implementing the intervention, indirect measures of the target behavior have been collected; or information present indicates baseline data were gathered, but data may or</p>	<p>1 (a) Baseline data not gathered prior to implementing the intervention; or baseline data are estimates or general descriptions of the target behavior; (b) Appropriate dimension(s) (FLITAD) not</p>
---	---	---	---	---

until a stable range of behavior has been identified; and (b) The appropriate <u>dimension(s)</u> of the target behavior (FLITAD) has been identified.	until a stable range of behavior has been identified; but (b) The appropriate <u>dimension(s)</u> of the target behavior (FLITAD) has not been identified.	dimension(s) (FLITAD) identified.	may not be present; (b) Appropriate dimension(s) (FLITAD) identified.	identified.
--	--	-----------------------------------	---	-------------

Note: Peer comparison data, local norms, and research-based standards are prioritized over teacher expectations, national norms, and developmental standards, when appropriate.

Evidence Supporting Rating:

Problem Validation

5 (a) An appropriate standard of comparison*, specific to the target behavior, is used in the calculation of the discrepancy between what is expected (i.e., the standard) and the student's current level of functioning (i.e., baseline); AND (b) Discrepancy is quantified numerically (e.g., 2.1 times discrepant, 15 th percentile, 30 rubric points different)	4 (a) A standard of comparison* is used in the calculation of the discrepancy between what is expected (i.e., the standard) and the student's current level of functioning (i.e., baseline) BUT it is <u>not</u> the most appropriate standard to use; and (b) Discrepancy is quantified numerically (e.g., 2.1 times discrepant, 15 th percentile, 30 rubric points different)	3 (a) A standard of comparison* is used in the calculation of the discrepancy between what is expected (i.e., the standard) and the student's current level of functioning (i.e., baseline) BUT it is <u>not</u> the most appropriate standard to use; or (b) Discrepancy is quantified numerically but is calculated inappropriately (e.g., dividing rubrics, subtracting percentile ranks)	2 (a) Discrepancy described using unspecified standards; and (b) discrepancy not quantified	1 Problem is not validated; discrepancy not described or quantified.
---	--	--	---	--

Evidence Supporting Rating:

PROBLEM ANALYSIS

Problem Analysis

<p>5 Examined only relevant and alterable factors from instruction, curriculum, environment, and learner (ICEL) domains using a variety of sources (RIOT: review, interview, observe, test). Used this information to develop a specific intervention to change the behavior.</p>	<p>4 Examined relevant and alterable factors from instruction, curriculum, environment, and learner (ICEL) domains using a variety of sources (RIOT: review, interview, observe, test), BUT also examined some irrelevant and unalterable factors. Used this information to develop a specific intervention to change the behavior.</p>	<p>3 Examined relevant and alterable factors from one, two, or three domains using a variety of sources. Used this information to develop a specific intervention to change the behavior.</p>	<p>2 Examined only irrelevant and unalterable factors from the domains using a variety of sources. However, there is no indication this information was used to develop a specific intervention to change behavior.</p>	<p>1 Problem analysis is not conducted.</p>
--	--	--	--	--

Evidence Supporting Rating:

PLAN IMPLEMENTATION

Goal Setting: Components

<p>5 Goal stated narratively and represented graphically on performance chart, specifying time frame, condition, behavior, and criterion</p>	<p>4 Goal represented graphically on performance chart specifying time frame, behavior, criterion, and condition — not stated narratively.</p>	<p>3 Goal stated narratively specifying time frame, behavior, criterion, and condition — not represented graphically.</p>	<p>2 Goal stated narratively and/or represented graphically on performance chart but does not specify all four components (time frame, condition, behavior, criterion).</p>	<p>1 Goal not set.</p>
---	---	--	--	-----------------------------------

Evidence Supporting Rating:

Goal Setting: Usefulness for Decision Making

<p>5 Goal is (a) measurable (i.e., can be counted), (b) meaningful (based on problem definition), (c) able to be monitored (i.e., behavior can be repeated), and (d) useful for making decisions (based on a criteria for proficiency [e.g., research-based standards, growth standards, benchmark criteria] meant to close the gap).</p>	<p>4 Goal meets three of four criteria</p>	<p>3 Goal meets two of four criteria</p>	<p>2 Goal meets one of four criteria</p>	<p>1 Goal not written or goal meets zero criteria</p>
--	---	---	---	--

Evidence Supporting Rating:

Intervention Plan

<p>5 Plan stated (a) procedures/strategies, (b) materials, (c) when, (d) where, and (e) persons responsible.</p>	<p>4 Plan stated procedures/strategies. But one of the following components is missing: materials, when, where, or persons responsible.</p>	<p>3 Plan stated procedures/strategies. But two of the following components is missing: materials, when, where or persons responsible.</p>	<p>2 Generic description of intervention strategy (e.g., behavior management, decoding) is stated. Materials, when, where, and persons responsible may be present.</p>	<p>1 Intervention plan not written. OR Generic descriptions of intervention (e.g., behavior management, decoding) are stated.</p>
---	--	---	---	--

Evidence Supporting Rating:

Measurement Strategy

<p>5 A measurement strategy is developed that (a) answers the 5 questions: How? What? Where? Who? And when? AND (b) is aligned with the measurement strategy used to collect baseline data.</p>	<p>4 A measurement strategy is developed that (a) answers four of the five questions: How? What? Where? Who? And when? AND (b) is aligned with the measurement strategy used to collect baseline data.</p>	<p>3 A measurement strategy is developed that (a) answers three of the five questions: How? What? Where? Who? And when? AND (b) is aligned with the measurement strategy used to collect baseline data.</p>	<p>2 A measurement strategy is developed that (a) answers two of the five questions: How? What? Where? Who? And when? AND (b) may or may not be aligned with the measurement strategy used to collect baseline data.</p>	<p>1 Measurement strategy is not developed. OR The measurement strategy only answers one of the five questions: How? What? Where? Who? And when? OR The measurement strategy does not align with the measurement strategy used to collect baseline data.</p>
--	---	--	---	---

Evidence Supporting Rating:

Integrity Monitoring Plan

<p>5 A plan for monitoring treatment integrity is developed that answers Who? What method? How often? How well?</p>	<p>4 A plan for monitoring treatment integrity is developed but only answers three of four questions: Who? What method? How often? How well?</p>	<p>3 A plan for monitoring treatment integrity is developed but only answers two of four questions: Who? What method? How often? How well?</p>	<p>2 A plan for monitoring treatment integrity is developed but only answers one of four questions: Who? What method? How often? How well?</p>	<p>1 Integrity monitoring plan is not developed.</p>
--	---	---	---	---

Evidence Supporting Rating:

Decision-Making Plan

<p>5 The decision-making plan indicates (a) how frequently data will be collected, (b) the strategies to be used to summarize the data for evaluation, (c) how many data points or how much time will occur before the data will be analyzed, and (d) what actions will be taken based on the intervention data.</p>	<p>4 The decision-making plan indicates three of the four components.</p>	<p>3 The decision-making plan indicates two of the four components.</p>	<p>2 The decision-making plan indicates only one of the four components.</p>	<p>1 Decision-making plan is not documented.</p>
---	--	--	---	---

Evidence Supporting Rating:

PLAN EVALUATION

Progress Monitoring

<p>5 Progress is monitored and graphed at least once or twice/month for students receiving core + supplemental, and once/week for students receiving core + intensive. Appropriate graphing/charting conventions were used (i.e., goal line, student name, meaningful X and Y axis labels, appropriate scale units, intervention phases labeled).</p>	<p>4 Progress is monitored and graphed at least once or twice/month for students receiving core + supplemental, and once/week for students receiving core + intensive. AND one or more graphing/charting labels are unclear or missing (i.e., student name, X and Y axis labels, appropriate scale units, phase labels).</p>	<p>3 Data are collected and charted/graphed irregularly and infrequently (less than once a week, but more than pre and post). Appropriate graphing/charting conventions may or may not be used.</p>	<p>2 Data are collected but not charted or graphed. OR Only pre and post information was collected and/or charted/graphed.</p>	<p>1 Progress monitoring data not collected.</p>
--	---	--	---	---

Evidence Supporting Rating:

Formative Evaluation

5	4	3	2	1
There is evidence the decision rule was followed and visual analysis was conducted (e.g., trendline drawn). This data was used to modify or change the intervention as necessary (i.e., phase line drawn and changes identified).	There is evidence the decision rule was followed and visual analysis was conducted, but the data were not used to modify or change the intervention as necessary.	Modifications or changes were made to the intervention based on subjective data.	Modifications or changes were made to the intervention but no indication as to what data were used to make these changes.	No formative evaluation was conducted.

Evidence Supporting Rating:

Treatment Integrity

5	4	3	2	1
Integrity data were collected (a) more than once during intervention implementation (b) using methods matched to the degree of decision, AND (c) integrity data were used in combination with student progress monitoring data to make changes/modifications to the intervention as necessary.	Integrity data were collected (a) more than once during intervention implementation (b) using methods matched to the degree of decision, BUT (c) integrity data were <u>not</u> used in conjunction with student progress monitoring data to make changes/modifications to the intervention as necessary.	Integrity data were collected more than once during intervention implementation BUT methods were <u>not</u> matched to the degree of decision, and (c) integrity data were not used in conjunction with student progress monitoring data to make changes/modifications to the intervention as necessary.	Integrity data were collected once during intervention implementation, but intervention was not implemented as planned.	Treatment integrity not considered.

Evidence Supporting Rating:

Summative Evaluation

<p>5 Outcome decisions are based on the progress monitoring data.</p>	<p>4 Outcome decisions are based on minimal data.</p>	<p>3 Outcome decisions are based on subjective data or pre/post data.</p>	<p>2 Outcome decision stated but no indication of what data were used to make the conclusion.</p>	<p>1 No summative evaluation took place, when it should have.</p>
--	--	--	--	--

Evidence Supporting Rating:

EDUCATIONAL EVALUATION REPORT

Progress: Intervention Summary

<p>5 For each area of concern within a service (e.g., instruction, speech language pathology, OT, PT), results of the intervention/instruction are summarized and include the beginning and ending level of performance as well as the expected performance (for behavior, include a description of the frequency, intensity, and duration of the behavior across time).</p>	<p>4 For each area of concern within a service (e.g., instruction, speech language pathology, OT, PT), results of the intervention/instruction are summarized and include the beginning and ending level of performance but the expected performance is not identified.</p>	<p>3 For each area of concern within a service (e.g., instruction, speech language pathology, OT, PT), results of the intervention/instruction are summarized in global terms and do not include the beginning and ending level of performance or the expected performance.</p>	<p>2 If multiple services are considered, intervention/instruction summaries that include the beginning and ending level of performance as well as the expected performance are included for only one area of service.</p>	<p>1 No intervention summaries include the beginning and ending level of performance or the expected performance.</p>
---	--	--	---	--

Evidence Supporting Rating:

Progress: Treatment Integrity

<p>5 For each area of concern within a service (e.g., instruction, speech language pathology, OT, PT), methods used to monitor treatment integrity are included (who was responsible, how it was monitored, and how often).</p>	<p>4 For each area of concern within a service (e.g., instruction, speech language pathology, OT, PT), methods used to monitor treatment integrity only included two of three components.</p>	<p>3 For each area of concern within a service (e.g., instruction, speech language pathology, OT, PT), methods used to monitor treatment integrity only included one of three components.</p>	<p>2 If multiple services are considered, methods used to monitor treatment integrity are included for only one area of service.</p>	<p>1 Treatment integrity is not mentioned.</p>
--	--	--	---	---

Evidence Supporting Rating:

Discrepancy

<p>5 At least two assessment sources indicating converging information are identified for each area of concern, including (a) date it was administered, (b) quantifiable measurement of student performance and expected performance, and (c) standard used.</p>	<p>4 At least two assessment sources indicating converging information are identified for each area of concern but at least one assessment source is missing one of the three components.</p>	<p>3 At least two assessment sources indicating converging information are identified for each area of concern but at least one assessment source is missing two of the three components.</p>	<p>2 At least two assessment sources indicating converging information are identified for each area of concern but both assessment sources are missing one or two of the three components.</p>	<p>1 There are not two assessment sources identified for each area of concern or discrepancies are not quantifiable (only explained in global terms).</p>
---	--	--	---	--

Evidence Supporting Rating:

Instructional Needs

5	4	3	2	1
<p>INSTRUCTION: Student instructional needs are summarized with specific recommendations for how instruction is to be delivered (e.g., amount of time needed, instructional practices, specialized materials, those practices that enhance learning)</p> <p>CURRICULUM: What the student needs to learn is identified for each area of concern to a level of specificity that would enable the service provider to know which skills need to be taught</p> <p>ENVIRONMENT: Adaptations to procedures, schedules, routines, behavioral expectations, room, seating arrangements and materials needed are described or it is indicated that none are needed.</p> <p>LEARNING SUPPORTS: Learning supports and accommodations and modifications are described in observable, specific terms or it is indicated that none are required.</p>	<p>Instructional needs are missing in one of the four domains</p>	<p>Instructional needs are missing in two of the four domains.</p>	<p>Instructional needs are missing in three of the four domains or are stated in global terms.</p>	<p>Instructional needs are not identified.</p>

Evidence Supporting Rating: