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**NCII Behavior Screening Definition**

The National Center on Intensive Intervention defines behavior screening as a process using tools with convincing evidence of classification accuracy, reliability, and validity to identify students who may require behavioral intervention efforts to meet their social, emotional, and/or behavioral needs.

Submission Eligibility Criteria

To determine whether your tool qualifies for review, please answer the following questions about the tool you are submitting. Please note that answering "No" to any of the below questions disqualifies your tool from review. If you cannot answer all of our questions in the affirmative, you will not be able to move forward with your submission.

If you indicate that your tool meets these criteria and proceed with the submission, your application will still be subject to vetting by staff from the National Center on Intensive Intervention, who will verify that your tool meets our eligibility criteria.

If you have a strong rationale for why your tool should be exempt from these requirements, please contact us at ToolsChartHelp@air.org.

\* Indicates a required field.

**\*Enter Tool Title or Suite Name:** Click here to enter text.

**\*Enter Tool Area or Subtool Name:** Click here to enter text.

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| 1. Can you provide direct evidence\* on the effects of using your tool?

*\*Direct evidence refers to data from a study that has been conducted based on the tool submitted for evaluation. Studies that use data from the use of another tool, even if it is similar, are considered indirect evidence and will not be considered as adequate evidence for the purposes of this review.*  | [ ]  Yes | [ ]  No |
| 1. Do you have the following classification data?
	* Specificity, sensitivity, positive predictive power, and negative predictive power,

OR* + Area Under the Curve (AUC) derived from a Receiver Operating Characteristic (ROC) curve analysis?
 | [ ]  Yes | [ ]  No |
| 1. Are your classification data analyses conducted using cut points identifying students in need of behavioral intervention? This could be students exhibiting a moderate or high level of risk for behavior of interest.
 | [ ]  Yes | [ ]  No |
| 1. Does your outcome variable focus on a social, emotional, or behavioral need (as opposed to academic performance)?
 | [ ]  Yes | [ ]  No |
| 1. Are there at least three months between the screening and your outcome measure for classification accuracy and predictive validity analysis?
 | [ ]  Yes | [ ]  No |

Review Process and Timeline

NCII uses a standard review process to evaluate the scientific rigor of behavior screening tools that can be used to identify students with disabilities who require behavioral intervention due to persistent social, emotional, and/or behavioral problems.

Reviews are conducted by Behavior Screening (BS) Technical Review Committee (TRC) made up of national content and methodological experts. The TRC, in conjunction with NCII staff and advisors, are responsible for the development of review materials including establishing technical standards and rating rubrics.

Product developers, researchers, or other proprietors of evidence-based behavior screening tools are invited to respond to the call for submissions by completing this document, the Standard Protocol for Evaluation Behavior Screening Tools.

Submissions received by NCII will be screened ensure the provided evidence meets the review eligibility criteria. Vendors are notified of their acceptance into the review cycle or given an opportunity to submit missing evidence to meet the criteria. Submissions that are unable to meet the eligibility criteria are encouraged to gather the necessary data and submit in a subsequent review cycle.

Submissions in compliance with the eligibility criteria are randomly assigned to two anonymous and independent TRC reviewers to review the submission in according to the evidence supporting each standard in the Protocol for Evaluation. The review process has two levels. In the first level of the review, the TRC reviewers will rate the tool based on the evidence provided and comment on each standard as necessary. The NCII will provide vendors with the results of the interim review within a few months of receipt of submission. Vendors will have a chance to respond to these preliminary ratings by providing additional evidence in support of the submission, if appropriate. Submitting additional evidence is not necessary but may help improve the ratings and/or clarify an issue expressed by the reviewers in the summary comments.

During the second level of the review, the TRC reviewers will re-review the tool considering any additional evidence provided. Once the two reviewers have come to a consensus for each standard, the review will be finalized. The NCII will provide vendors with the TRC’s final decisions as to the technical adequacy of submitted tool prior to publishing the results on the Center’s [Behavior Screening Tools Chart](https://charts.intensiveintervention.org/chart/behavior-screening) and disseminating to the Center’s partners including state and local education agencies, institutions of higher education, technical assistance centers and professional development providers, parent centers, and relevant professional organizations.

**Special Note for 2019 Review Cycle**

Typically, once a submission accepted into the review cycle (i.e., it is confirmed to meet the submission eligibility criteria), withdrawal from the process is not permitted. This means all eligible submissions will complete the review process including having results posted on NCII Behavior Screening Tools Chart. There is no minimum rating, or quality of evidence, that a tool must meet to be included on the tools chart beyond the submission eligibility criteria. **However, for the 2019 Behavior Screening review cycle only, vendors may withdraw their tools from the review at any time prior to posting the results on the tools chart.** Vendors may elect to withdraw their submissions after receipt of the interim or final review results. We hope this encourages a broader pool of submissions and look forward to working with all interested vendors of social, emotional, and/or behavioral screening tools.

If you have any questions about the review materials or process, our staff can be reached at:

National Center on Intensive Intervention
American Institutes for Research

E-mail Address: ToolsChartHelp@air.org
Website: [www.intensiveintervention.org](http://www.intensiveintervention.org/)

Marketing Language Agreement

To be eligible for review, you must read and sign this marketing language agreement.

By signing this agreement, I have indicated my understanding of the intent and purpose of the NCII tools chart, and my agreement to use language that is consistent with this purpose in any marketing materials that will be used to publicize my product’s presence and ratings on the chart.

Specifically, I understand the following:

1. The Technical Review Committee (TRC) rated each submitted tool against established criteria but did not compare it to other tools on the chart. The presence of a particular tool on the chart does not constitute endorsement and should not be viewed as a recommendation from either the TRC or the National Center on Intensive Intervention.
2. All tools submitted for review are posted on the chart, regardless of results. The chart represents all tools that were reviewed, not those that were “approved.”

When marketing my product, I will not use any language that is inconsistent with the above. Examples of inappropriate marketing language include, but may not be limited to, the following:

* + Reference to a “top-ranked” product in comparison to other products on the chart
	+ Reference to “approval” or “endorsement” of the product by the NCII

If the Center becomes aware of any marketing material on my product that violates this agreement, I understand that I risk removal of the product from the chart. I also understand that I may draft language and submit to Center staff for review in advance of releasing it, in order to ensure compliance with this agreement.

**I have read and understand the terms and conditions of this Agreement. By signing below, I signify my agreement to comply with all requirements contained herein.**

Signature Date

Print Name

Organization

Section I: Basic Information

A. Tool Information

**Suite Name**: Click here to enter text.

**Area/Subtool:** Click here to enter text.

**Developer and/or Publisher**: Click here to enter text.

**Publication Year**: Click here to enter text.

**Points of Contact**

**Primary Contact Name**: Click here to enter text.

**Primary Contact Phone**: Click here to enter text.

**Primary Contact Email**: Click here to enter text.

**Alternate Contact Name:** Click here to enter text.

**Alternate Contact Phone**: Click here to enter text.

**Alternate Contact Email**: Click here to enter text.

B. Descriptive Information

**Please answer the following questions about the tool you are submitting.** Be advised that your answers will be incorporated in the NCII Tools Chart webpage(s) for your tool. We recommend carefully reviewing all the Descriptive Information fields before submitting, with the understanding that your language may be used verbatim, and that unanswered questions will be reflected as missing data on our tools chart webpage(s).

Please provide a description of your tool:Click here to enter text.

The tool is intended for use with the following grade(s). (Check all that apply.)

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| [ ]  Preschool/Pre-kindergarten | [ ]  Sixth grade |
| [ ]  Kindergarten | [ ]  Seventh grade |
| [ ]  First grade | [ ]  Eighth grade  |
| [ ]  Second grade | [ ]  Ninth grade  |
| [ ]  Third grade | [ ]  Tenth grade |
| [ ]  Fourth grade | [ ]  Eleventh grade  |
| [ ]  Fifth grade | [ ]  Twelfth grade |

The tool is intended for use with the following age(s). (Check all that apply.)

[ ]  0-4 years old [ ]  10 years old [ ]  16 years old

[ ]  5 years old [ ]  11 years old [ ]  17 years old

[ ]  6 years old [ ]  12 years old [ ]  18 years old

[ ]  7 years old [ ]  13 years old

[ ]  8 years old [ ]  14 years old

[ ]  9 years old [ ]  15 years old

If your assessment gathers data from multiple informants such as parents, teachers, or children (via self-report), and distinct forms have been developed for these informants, please select the relevant forms or informants below. If your tool does not offer tailored forms for multiple informants, please select “Not applicable”.

☐ Not applicable

☐ Researcher

☐ Parent

☐ Teacher

☐ Child

☐ Other (please specify): Click here to enter text.

The tool is intended for use with the following student populations. (Check all that apply.)

[ ]  Students in general education

[ ]  Students with disabilities

[ ]  English language learners

Which category of behaviors does your tool target?

[ ]  Internalizing

[ ]  Externalizing

Please identify which broad domain(s)/construct(s) are measured by your tool and define each sub-domain or sub-construct.

Click here to enter text.

C. Acquisition Information

**Where to obtain:**

Email Address: Click here to enter text.

Address: Click here to enter text.

Phone Number: Click here to enter text.

Website: Click here to enter text.

**Initial cost for implementing tool:**

Cost: Click here to enter text.

Unit of cost (e.g., district, school, student): Click here to enter text.

**Replacement cost per unit for subsequent use:**

Cost: Click here to enter text.

Unit of cost (e.g., district, school, student): Click here to enter text.

Duration of license (e.g., year, month, number of forms): Click here to enter text.

**Additional cost information:**

Describe basic pricing plan and structure of the tool. Provide information on what is included in the published tool, as well as what is not included but required for implementation.

Click here to enter text.

Provide information about special accommodations for students with disabilities.

Click here to enter text.

D. Time, Administration, and Frequency

What type of administrator is your tool designed for? (Check all that apply.)

[ ]  General education teacher

[ ]  Special education teacher

[ ]  Parent

[ ]  Child

[ ]  External observer

[ ]  Other (please specify): Click here to enter text.

Can multiple students be rated concurrently by one administrator?

 [ ]  Yes

 [ ]  No

 If "yes", how many students can be rated concurrently? Click here to enter text.

What is the administration format? (Check all that apply.)

[ ]  Direct observation

[ ]  Rating scale

[ ]  Checklist

[ ]  Performance measure

[ ]  Questionnaire

[ ]  Direct: Computerized

[ ]  One-to-one

[ ]  Other (please specify): Click here to enter text.

Does the tool require technology?

[ ]  Yes

[ ]  No

If yes, what technology is required to implement your tool? (Select all that apply)

[ ]  Computer or tablet

 [ ]  Internet connection

 [ ]  Other technology (please specify)

If your tool requires additional technology not listed above, please describe the required technology: Click here to enter text.

What is the administration context? (Check all that apply.)

☐ Individual

☐ Small group; n= Click here to enter text.

☐ Large group; n= Click here to enter text.

☐ Computer-administered

☐ Other (please specify): Click here to enter text.

What is the administration time?

 [time in minutes] per [student/group/other unit]

Additional scoring time:

 [time in minutes] per [student/group/other unit]

Does your tool provide discontinue rules? (Check all that apply.)

☐ Not provided

☐ Basals

☐ Ceilings

☐ Other (please specify): Click here to enter text.

Are norms available?

[ ]  Yes

[ ]  No

Are benchmarks available?

[ ]  Yes

[ ]  No

If "yes", how many benchmarks per year? Click here to enter text.

If "yes", for which months are benchmarks available? Click here to enter text.

E. Training & Scoring

Is training for the administrator required?

[ ]  Yes

[ ]  No

Describe the time required for administrator training, if applicable:

Click here to enter text.

Please describe the minimum qualifications an administrator must possess.

Click here to enter text.

[ ]  No minimum qualifications

Are training manuals and materials available?

[ ]  Yes

[ ]  No

Are training manuals/materials field-tested?

[ ]  Yes

[ ]  No

Are training manuals/materials included in the cost of the tool?

[ ]  Yes

[ ]  No (Please describe training costs): Click here to enter text.

Can users obtain ongoing professional and technical support?

[ ]  Yes

[ ]  No

If yes, please describe how users can obtain support: Click here to enter text.

How are scores calculated? (Check all that apply.)

☐ Manually (by hand)

☐ Automatically (computer-scored)

☐ Other (please specify): Click here to enter text.

Do you provide basis for calculating performance level scores?

[ ]  Yes

[ ]  No

What is the basis for calculating performance level and percentile scores? (Check all that apply.)

[ ]  Age norms

[ ]  Grade norms

[ ]  Classwide norms

[ ]  Schoolwide norms

[ ]  Stanines

[ ]  Normal curve equivalent

What types of performance level scores are available? (Check all that apply.)

[ ]  Raw score

[ ]  Standard score

[ ]  Percentile score

[ ]  Grade equivalents

[ ]  IRT-based score

[ ]  Age equivalents

[ ]  Stanines

[ ]  Normal curve equivalents

[ ]  Developmental benchmarks

[ ]  Developmental cut points

[ ]  Equated

[ ]  Probability

[ ]  Lexile score

[ ]  Error analysis

[ ]  Composite scores

[ ]  Subscale/subtest scores

Other (please specify): Click here to enter text.

Describe the decision rules your tool includes.

Click here to enter text.

Do you provide evidence in support of multiple decision rules?

[ ]  Yes

[ ]  No

Please describe the scoring structure. Provide relevant details such as the scoring format, the number of items overall, the number of items per subscale, what the cluster/composite score comprises, and how raw scores are calculated.

Click here to enter text.

Describe the tool’s approach to screening, behavior samples, test format, and/or scoring practices, including steps taken to ensure that it is appropriate for use with culturally and linguistically diverse populations and students with disabilities.

Click here to enter text.

\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

Section II: Technical Standards

1. Classification Accuracy

Please provide the following classification data for your tool disaggregated by age/grade level/span, time of year, informant (if applicable), and outcome measure.

Please note, we will only rate information on two different criterion measures. If you provide information from more than two criterion measures, we will report but not rate that additional information.

The cut points for this analysis should be aligned with students needing behavioral intervention. If you provide information on cut points not associated with students needing behavioral intervention, we will report but not rate that additional information.

In the tables below, enter the classification accuracy data corresponding to the criterion measure (criterion 1 or 2) used and time of year (fall, winter, or spring) your tool was administered. If you do not have data corresponding with the criterion/time of year, leave that table blank. You must submit classification data for at least one criterion and one time of year for each age/grade level/span that you are submitting for review. The criterion measure may vary by age/grade level/span. Complete a column for each age/grade level/span for which you are submitting data.

To learn more about what is expected for each row in the criterion tables below, please refer to the matrix and formulas presented below. You may also wish to consult the Behavior Screening Frequently Asked Questions guide on our [website](https://intensiveintervention.org/about-charts-review-process). Copy columns and tables as needed to present evidence corresponding to all times of year, informants, and age/grade levels/spans that apply.

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | Students Actually“At-Risk” | Students Actually“Not At-Risk” | Total |
| Students Classified as “At-Risk” | True Positivea | False Positiveb | a + b |
| Students Classified as “Not At-Risk” | False Negativec | True Negatived | c + d |
|  |  |  | N = a+b+c+d |

Filling out the Classification Accuracy section of the screening protocol will require you to use the following formulas:

**False Positive Rate** = b/(b+d)

**False Negative Rate** = c/(a+c)

**Sensitivity** = a/(a+c)

**Specificity** = d/(b+d)

**Positive Predictive Power** = a/(a+b)

**Negative Predictive Power** = d/(c+d)

**Overall Classification Accuracy Rate** = (a+d)/(a+b+c+d)

**Criterion 1 Fall**

Informant: Click here to enter text.

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Age/Grade |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Criterion |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Cut points: Percentile rank on criterion measure |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Cut points: Performance score (numeric) on criterion measure |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Cut points: Corresponding performance score (numeric) on screener measure |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Base rate children requiring behavioral intervention |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| False Positive Rate |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| False Negative Rate |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Sensitivity |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Specificity |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Positive Predictive Power |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Negative Predictive Power |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Overall Classification Rate |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Area Under the Curve (AUC) |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Specificity Value at 90% Sensitivity |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Specificity Value at 80% Sensitivity |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Specificity Value at 70% Sensitivity |  |  |  |  |  |  |

**Criterion 1 Winter**

Informant: Click here to enter text.

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Age/Grade |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Criterion |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Cut points: Percentile rank on criterion measure |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Cut points: Performance score (numeric) on criterion measure |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Cut points: Corresponding performance score (numeric) on screener measure |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Base rate children requiring behavioral intervention |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| False Positive Rate |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| False Negative Rate |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Sensitivity |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Specificity |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Positive Predictive Power |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Negative Predictive Power |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Overall Classification Rate |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Area Under the Curve (AUC) |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Specificity Value at 90% Sensitivity |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Specificity Value at 80% Sensitivity |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Specificity Value at 70% Sensitivity |  |  |  |  |  |  |

**Criterion 1 Spring**

Informant: Click here to enter text.

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Age/Grade |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Criterion |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Cut points: Percentile rank on criterion measure |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Cut points: Performance score (numeric) on criterion measure |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Cut points: Corresponding performance score (numeric) on screener measure |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Base rate children requiring behavioral intervention |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| False Positive Rate |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| False Negative Rate |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Sensitivity |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Specificity |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Positive Predictive Power |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Negative Predictive Power |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Overall Classification Rate |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Area Under the Curve (AUC) |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Specificity Value at 90% Sensitivity |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Specificity Value at 80% Sensitivity |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Specificity Value at 70% Sensitivity |  |  |  |  |  |  |

**Criterion 2 Fall**

Informant: Click here to enter text.

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Age/Grade |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Criterion |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Cut points: Percentile rank on criterion measure |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Cut points: Performance score (numeric) on criterion measure |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Cut points: Corresponding performance score (numeric) on screener measure |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Base rate children requiring behavioral intervention |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| False Positive Rate |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| False Negative Rate |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Sensitivity |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Specificity |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Positive Predictive Power |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Negative Predictive Power |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Overall Classification Rate |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Area Under the Curve (AUC) |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Specificity Value at 90% Sensitivity |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Specificity Value at 80% Sensitivity |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Specificity Value at 70% Sensitivity |  |  |  |  |  |  |

**Criterion 2 Winter**

Informant: Click here to enter text.

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Age/Grade |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Criterion |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Cut points: Percentile rank on criterion measure |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Cut points: Performance score (numeric) on criterion measure |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Cut points: Corresponding performance score (numeric) on screener measure |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Base rate children requiring behavioral intervention |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| False Positive Rate |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| False Negative Rate |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Sensitivity |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Specificity |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Positive Predictive Power |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Negative Predictive Power |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Overall Classification Rate |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Area Under the Curve (AUC) |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Specificity Value at 90% Sensitivity |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Specificity Value at 80% Sensitivity |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Specificity Value at 70% Sensitivity |  |  |  |  |  |  |

**Criterion 2 Spring**

Informant: Click here to enter text.

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Age/Grade |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Criterion |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Cut points: Percentile rank on criterion measure |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Cut points: Performance score (numeric) on criterion measure |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Cut points: Corresponding performance score (numeric) on screener measure |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Base rate children requiring behavioral intervention |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| False Positive Rate |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| False Negative Rate |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Sensitivity |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Specificity |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Positive Predictive Power |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Negative Predictive Power |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Overall Classification Rate |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Area Under the Curve (AUC) |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Specificity Value at 90% Sensitivity |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Specificity Value at 80% Sensitivity |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Specificity Value at 70% Sensitivity |  |  |  |  |  |  |

If you include, in your user’s manual, classification data that are disaggregated by race, ethnicity, or language proficiency, provide these data below. Copy columns and tables as needed.

 Subgroup: Click here to enter text.

 Time of year: Click here to enter text.

Informant: Click here to enter text.

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Age/Grade |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Criterion |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Cut points: Percentile rank on criterion measure |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Cut points: Performance score (numeric) on criterion measure |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Cut points: Corresponding performance score (numeric) on screener measure |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Base rate children requiring behavioral intervention |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| False Positive Rate |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| False Negative Rate |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Sensitivity |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Specificity |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Positive Predictive Power |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Negative Predictive Power |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Overall Classification Rate |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Area Under the Curve (AUC) |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Specificity Value at 90% Sensitivity |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Specificity Value at 80% Sensitivity |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Specificity Value at 70% Sensitivity |  |  |  |  |  |  |

Please provide descriptions for the study samples corresponding to each set of classification data reported above (for each criterion and time of year). Copy columns and tables as needed. Cells should indicate the characteristics of the study sample as described in the left-most column. Where applicable, please provide the percentage of the study sample (e.g., demographic characteristics). Complete a column for each age/grade level/span for which you are submitting data.

**Criterion 1**

Time of year: Click here to enter text.

Informant: Click here to enter text.

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Age/Grade |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Criterion |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| National/Local Representation1 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Date |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Sample Size |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Male |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Female |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Gender Unknown |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Free or Reduced-price Lunch Eligible  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Other SES Indicator |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| White, Non-Hispanic |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Black, Non-Hispanic |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Hispanic |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| American Indian/Alaska Native |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Other |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Race/Ethnicity Unknown |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Disability Classification |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| First Language |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Language Proficiency Status |  |  |  |  |  |  |

1**National/Local Representation** should be used to report what geographic regions and/or states were represented in the study sample. If participants were drawn from multiple states, indicate whether the population represents a Northeastern region (New England or Middle Atlantic), Midwestern Region (East North Central or West North Central), Southern region (South Atlantic, East South Central, or West South Central), or Western region (Mountain or Pacific). Also indicate which states data were gathered from. For guidance on how to present sample representativeness data, see the Behavior Screening Frequently Asked Questions guide on our [website](https://intensiveintervention.org/about-charts-review-process).

**Criterion 2**

Time of year: Click here to enter text.

Informant: Click here to enter text.

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Age/Grade |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Criterion |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| National/Local Representation1 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Date |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Sample Size |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Male |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Female |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Gender Unknown |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Free or Reduced-price Lunch Eligible  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Other SES Indicator |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| White, Non-Hispanic |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Black, Non-Hispanic |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Hispanic |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| American Indian/Alaska Native |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Other |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Race/Ethnicity Unknown |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Disability Classification |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| First Language |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Language Proficiency Status |  |  |  |  |  |  |

1**National/Local Representation** should be used to report what geographic regions and/or states were represented in the study sample. If participants were drawn from multiple states, indicate whether the population represents a Northeastern region (New England or Middle Atlantic), Midwestern Region (East North Central or West North Central), Southern region (South Atlantic, East South Central, or West South Central), or Western region (Mountain or Pacific). Also indicate which states data were gathered from. For guidance on how to present sample representativeness data, see the Behavior Screening Frequently Asked Questions guide on our [website](https://intensiveintervention.org/about-charts-review-process).

Describe the criterion (outcome) measure(s) including the degree to which it/they is/are independent from the screening measure.

Click here to enter text.

Describe how the classification analyses were performed and cut-points determined. Describe how the cut points align with behavioral intervention need. Please indicate which groups were contrasted in your analyses (e.g., low risk students versus high risk students, low risk students versus moderate risk students).

Click here to enter text.

Were the children in the study/studies involved in an intervention in addition to typical classroom instruction between the screening measure and outcome assessment?

[ ]  Yes

[ ]  No

If yes, please describe the intervention, what children received the intervention, and how they were chosen.

Click here to enter text.

2. Reliability

In the section below, describe the reliability analyses conducted, and provide results. You may report more than one type of reliability (e.g., internal consistency, inter-rater reliability); however, you must also justify the appropriateness of the method used given the type and purpose of the tool (e.g., inter-rater reliability is provided for tools that require human judgment).

Please ensure that you submit evidence for each informant and age/grade level/span targeted by the tool. If you fail to submit data for a targeted age/grade level/span, that age/grade will receive a “dash” rating for this standard.

Offer a justification for each type of reliability reported, given the type and purpose of the tool.

Click here to enter text.

Describe the sample(s), including size and characteristics, for each reliability analysis conducted.

Click here to enter text.

Describe the analysis procedures for each reported type of reliability.

Click here to enter text.

In the table below, report the reliability of performance level score (e.g., internal consistency, inter-rater reliability).

| **Type of Reliability** | **Age/Grade** | **Informant** | **n** | **Coefficient** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |

Results for other forms of reliability not conducive to the table format:

Click here to enter text.

If your manual cites other published studies on reliability, provide these citations.

Click here to enter text.

If you include, in your user’s manual, reliability data that are disaggregated by subgroup (e.g., race-ethnicity, ELL students), provide these data below.

| **Type of Reliability** | **Age/Grade**  | **Informant** | **Subgroup** | **n** | **Coefficient** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |

Results for other forms of disaggregated reliability not conducive to the table format:

Click here to enter text.

If your manual cites other published reliability studies, provide these citations.

Click here to enter text.

3. Validity

In the section below, describe the validity analyses conducted, and provide results. You may report more than one type of validity (e.g., concurrent, predictive, evidence based on response processes, evidence based on internal structure, evidence based on relations to other variables, and/or evidence based on consequences of testing), and more than one criterion measure. However, you must justify the choice of analysis and criterion measure(s) given the theoretical assumptions about the relationship between your tool and other, similar constructs.

Please ensure that you submit evidence for each informant and age/grade level/span targeted by the tool. If you fail to submit data for a targeted age/grade level/span, that age/grade will receive a “dash” rating for this standard.

Describe each criterion measure used and explain why each measure is appropriate, given the type and purpose of the tool. (NOTE: To support validity and generalizability, the TRC requires criterion measures that are ***external to the screening system*** *and theoretically linked to the underlying construct measured by the tool*.

Click here to enter text.

Describe the sample(s), including size and characteristics, for each validity analysis conducted.

Click here to enter text.

Describe the analysis procedures for each reported type of validity.

Click here to enter text.

In the table below, report validity information for the performance level score (e.g., concurrent, predictive, evidence based on response processes, evidence based on internal structure, evidence based on relations to other variables, and/or evidence based on consequences of testing), and the criterion measures.

| **Type of Validity** | **Age/Grade** | **Informant** | **Criterion** | **n** | **Coefficient** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |

Results for other forms of validity (e.g., factor analysis) not conducive to the table format:Click here to enter text.

If your manual cites other published validity studies, provide these citations.

Click here to enter text.

Describe the degree to which the provided data support the validity of the tool.

Click here to enter text.

If you include, in your user’s manual, validity data that are disaggregated by diverse populations (e.g., race-ethnicity, ELL students), provide these data below.

| **Type of Validity** | **Age/Grade** | **Informant** | **Subgroup** | **Criterion** | **n** | **Coefficient** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

Results for other forms of disaggregated validity (e.g., factor analysis) not conducive to the table format:Click here to enter text.

If your manual cites other published validity studies, provide these citations.

Click here to enter text.

4. Cross-Validation

Has a cross validation study been conducted? *In a cross-validation study, previously identified classification rules are used to predict risk and non-risk in the new sample.*

[ ]  Yes

[ ]  No

If yes, in the tables below, enter the cross-validation study data corresponding to the criterion measure (criterion 1 or 2) used and time of year (fall, winter, or spring) your tool was administered. Note that the outcome/criterion measure used for the cross-validation study should be one that was used to supply classification accuracy data. That is, the TRC expects the outcome measure reported in this section to match one of the criterion measures named in the classification accuracy section of the protocol.

To learn more about what is expected for each row in the tables below, consult the Behavior Screening Frequently Asked Questions guide on our [website](https://intensiveintervention.org/about-charts-review-process). Copy columns and tables as needed to present evidence corresponding to all times of year, informants, and age/grade levels/spans that apply.

Time of year: Click here to enter text.

Informant: Click here to enter text.

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Age/Grade |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Criterion |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Cut points: Percentile rank on criterion measure |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Cut points: Performance score (numeric) on criterion measure |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Cut points: Corresponding performance score (numeric) on screener measure |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Base rate children requiring behavioral intervention |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| False Positive Rate |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| False Negative Rate |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Sensitivity |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Specificity |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Positive Predictive Power |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Negative Predictive Power |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Overall Classification Rate |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Area Under the Curve (AUC) |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Specificity Value at 90% Sensitivity |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Specificity Value at 80% Sensitivity |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Specificity Value at 70% Sensitivity |  |  |  |  |  |  |

Please provide a description of the cross-validation study sample on which the preceding data are based.

Time of year: Click here to enter text.

Informant: Click here to enter text.

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Age/Grade |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Criterion |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| National/Local Representation1 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Date |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Sample Size |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Male |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Female |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Gender Unknown |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Free or Reduced-price Lunch Eligible  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Other SES Indicator |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| White, Non-Hispanic |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Black, Non-Hispanic |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Hispanic |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| American Indian/Alaska Native |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Other |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Race/Ethnicity Unknown |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Disability Classification |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| First Language |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Language Proficiency Status |  |  |  |  |  |  |

1**National/Local Representation** should be used to report what geographic regions and/or states were represented in the study sample. If participants were drawn from multiple states, indicate whether the population represents a Northeastern region (New England or Middle Atlantic), Midwestern Region (East North Central or West North Central), Southern region (South Atlantic, East South Central, or West South Central), or Western region (Mountain or Pacific). Also indicate which states data were gathered from. For guidance on how to present sample representativeness data, see the Behavior Screening Frequently Asked Questions guide on our [website](https://intensiveintervention.org/about-charts-review-process).

Describe the criterion (outcome) measure(s) including the degree to which it or they are independent from the screening measure.

Click here to enter text.

Describe how the cross-validation analyses were performed and cut-points determined. Describe how the cut points align with behavioral intervention need.

Click here to enter text.

Were the children in the cross-validation study involved in an intervention in addition to typical classroom instruction between the screening measure and outcome assessment?

[ ]  Yes

[ ]  No

If yes, please describe the intervention, what children received the intervention, and how they were chosen.

Click here to enter text.

5. Bias Analysis

Have you conducted analyses related to the extent to which your tool is or is not biased against subgroups (e.g., race/ethnicity, gender, socioeconomic status, students with disabilities, English language learners)? Examples might include Differential Item Functioning (DIF), or invariance testing in multiple-group confirmatory factor models.

[ ]  Yes

[ ]  No

If yes, please provide the following information.

* 1. Describe the method used to determine the presence or absence of bias.

Click here to enter text.

* 1. Describe the subgroups for which bias analyses were conducted.

Click here to enter text.

* 1. Describe the results of the bias analyses conducted, including data and interpretative statements. Include magnitude of effect (if available) if bias is identified.

Click here to enter text.