# Protocol for Evaluating Behavior Progress Monitoring Tools

***National Center on Intensive Intervention***
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The National Center on Intensive Intervention defines progress monitoring as repeated measurement of student performance over the course of intervention to index/quantify responsiveness to intervention and to thus determine, on an ongoing basis, when adjustments to the program are needed to improve responsiveness. When the need for a program adjustment is determined, supplementary data sources (e.g., functional behavior assessments, diagnostic academic assessments, informal observations, work samples) or more fine-grained data available within the repeated measurement samples are used to decide the most productive strategies for altering intervention. The purpose of this progress monitoring is to design an individualized intervention that optimizes student outcomes.

## **Please Read Before You Start**

***Q1. Are there minimum criteria that my tool must meet in order to qualify for review?***

* **Yes**. The TRC will only review submissions that meet the following five criteria:

1. Measure must target social, emotional and/or behavioral functioning.
2. Measure must involve formative assessment (i.e. repeated administration), with the intended purpose of progress monitoring.
3. Measure must include, but is not limited to, monitoring of individual student behavior.
4. Evidence supporting the reliability, validity or feasibility of the measure under consideration must be **direct** evidence; in other words, it is derived from data collected on the tool being submitted for review. Indirect evidence, or data collected on tools similar to the tool being reviewed, will not be accepted.
5. Evidence of reliability and validity must be provided for a grade span/informant combination to be reviewed.

Center staff will review this submission upon receipt, to ensure that these minimum criteria are met. Only submissions that are determined to meet all five criteria will be assigned for review.

***Q2.* *My progress monitoring tool assesses multiple domains of behavioral performance. Do I need a separate protocol for each domain?***

* **Yes**. The Center recognizes that for products designed to measure progress in multiple behavioral domains, some of the information to be submitted in the protocol will be the same. However, the tool for each behavioral domain or subcomponent within a domain will be evaluated and reported separately on the tools chart. Therefore, if your tool assesses more than one domain/subcomponent, you **MUST** submit separateprotocols for **EACH** domain/subcomponent. For example, if your tool measures domains that represent distinct areas of behavior or school performance (e.g., internalizing/externalizing; problem behavior/academic performance), you must submit a separate protocol for each.

***Q3. The protocol requires information that is already included in a technical report or research study. Can I submit this study instead of filling out the protocol?***

**No**. Technical reports and relevant research papers may be submitted as supporting information, but you ***MUST COMPLETE THE FULL PROTOCOL***. Reviewers will use the information in the protocol to make their judgments. They are not expected to search for and find additional information in accompanying materials.

Q4. The protocol requires information that is not currently available. Can I still submit my progress monitoring tool?

* **Yes**. The Protocol for Evaluating Behavioral Monitoring Tools is designed to collect comprehensive and detailed information on the submitted progress-monitoring tools to ensure rigorous evaluation of tools. Therefore, tools that are undergoing improvements or are in an early phase of development may not have all the information requested in the protocol. Please provide as much information available as possible.

If it is found that your submission packet needs substantial amount of supplemental information or is missing critical information, the entire packet will be returned to you. A revised protocol packet with additional information may be re-submitted.

Q7. Can I withdraw my tool from the review process?

* **No.** Results of the review will be posted on the Center’s website, in the Behavioral Progress Monitoring Tools Chart. ***Once the review has begun, withdrawal from the process is not permitted.***

Q8. I am not familiar with some of the terms in the protocol, and thus, I am not sure what information I should provide. What should I do?

* Center staff are available to answer your questions or to assist you in completing the protocol for submission. Please contact the National Center on Intensive Intervention:

**National Center on Intensive Intervention**

American Institutes for Research

1000 Thomas Jefferson Street, NW

Washington, DC 20007

E-mail: [ToolsChartHelp@air.org](mailto:ToolsChartHelp@air.org)

**Marketing Language Agreement**

**In order to be eligible for review, you must read and sign the following marketing language agreement.**

By signing this agreement, I have indicated my understanding of the intent and purpose of the NCII tools charts, 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:

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

If the NCII 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 NCII 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

* 1. **Tool Information**

1. Tool Name:
2. Developer:
3. Publisher:
4. Publication Date:
5. Submission Contacts
   1. Primary Contact:

Title/Organization:

Email address:

Telephone:

* 1. Alternate Contact:

Title/Organization:

Email address:

Telephone:

* 1. **Descriptive Information**

1. Description of tool:

1. What grade(s) does the tool target, if applicable? Check all that apply.

Pre-K

Kindergarten

1st grade

2nd grade

3rd grade

4th grade

5th grade

6th grade

7th grade

8th grade

9th grade

10th grade

11th grade

12th grade +

1. What age(s) does the tool target, if applicable? 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

1. 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

1. Please identify which broad domain/construct that is measured by your tool and define each sub-domain or sub-construct:

* 1. **Acquisition Information**

1. Where can your tool be obtained?

Website:

Address:

Phone number:

Email address:

1. Describe basic pricing plan and/or structure of the tools, including, as applicable: cost per student per year, start-up or other one-time costs, reoccurring costs, training cost, and what is included in each expense.

1. Provide information on what is included in the published tools, including information about special accommodations for students with disabilities.

Section II: Development and Administration

1. **Time, Administration, and Frequency**
2. Who is/are rater(s) or scorer(s)? Check all that apply.

General education teacher  Special education teacher

Parent  Child  External observer

Other school personnel (please specify):

Other (please specify):

1. What is the administration setting? Check all that apply.

General education classroom  Special education classroom

School office  Recess  Lunchroom

Home

Other (please specify):

1. What is the administration context? Check all that apply.

Large group  Small group  Individual

Other (please specify):

1. What is the assessment format? Check all that apply.

Direct observation  Rating scale  Checklist  Performance Measure

Other (please specify):

1. How long does it take to administer and score?

Administration time per student:

Additional scoring time per student:

1. Can students be rated concurrently by one administrator?

Yes; specify how may:

No

1. If relevant, are there alternate form?

Yes; specify how may:

No

1. **Training**
2. How long is tester training?

Less than 1 hour of training

1-4 hours of training

4-8 hours of training

8 or more hours of training

Training not required

Information not available

1. Are there minimum qualification of the examiner?

Yes (please specify): \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

No

1. Are training manuals and materials available?

Yes  No

1. Are training manuals/materials field-tested?

Yes  No

1. Are training manuals/materials included in cost of tools

Yes  No (Please describe training costs):\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

1. Is there ongoing technical support available?

Yes (Please describe):\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

No

1. **Scoring**
2. What types of scores result from the administration of the assessment? Check all that apply.

| **Score** | | **Conversion** | | **Interpretation** | |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Observation | Behavior Rating | Observation | Behavior Rating | Observation | Behavior Rating |
| Frequency  Duration  Interval  Latency | Raw score | Rate  Percent | Standard score  Subscale/ Subtest  Composite  Stanine  Percentile ranks  Normal curve equivalent  IRT based scores | Error analysis  Peer comparison  Rate of change | Dev. benchmarks  Age-Grade equivalent |

1. What is the basis for calculating level or performance?

Age norms  Grade norms  Classwide norms  Schoolwide norms

Stanines  Normal curve equivalent

1. Scoring Structure: Please provide details about the number of items, the scoring format, and number of items per subscale, as well as the method used to compute raw scores.

1. How is scoring conducted? Check all that apply.

Manually  Computer

Other (please specify):

1. Can administrators calculate slope (i.e. amount of improvement per unit in time) using information in the manual or as a function of the scoring software?

Yes  No  N/A

1. What is the basis for calculating slope?

Age norms  Grade norms  Classwide norms  Schoolwide norms

Stanines  Normal curve equivalent

1. **Levels of Performance**
2. Are levels of performance specified in your manual or published materials?

Yes  No

If yes, specify the levels of performance and how they are used for progress monitoring:

1. What is the basis for specifying levels of performance?

Norm-referenced  Criterion-referenced  Other

* 1. If norm-referenced, describe the normative profile.

National representation:

Northeast:  New England  Middle Atlantic

Midwest:  East North Central  West North Central

South:  South Atlantic  East South Central  West South Central

West:  Mountain  Pacific

Local representation (please describe, including number of states):

Date:

Size:

Gender (Percent): Male: \_\_\_\_\_ Female: \_\_\_\_\_ Unknown: \_\_\_\_\_

Eligible for free or reduced-price lunch: \_\_\_\_\_

Other SES Indicators: \_\_\_\_\_

Race/Ethnicity (Percent):

White, Non-Hispanic: \_\_\_\_\_

Black, Non-Hispanic: \_\_\_\_\_

Hispanic: \_\_\_\_\_

American Indian/Alaska Native: \_\_\_\_\_

Asian/Pacific Islander: \_\_\_\_\_

Other: \_\_\_\_\_

Unknown: \_\_\_\_\_

Disability classification (Please describe):

First language (Please describe):

Language proficiency status (Please describe):

* 1. If criterion-referenced, describe procedures for specifying levels of performance (attach documentation).

1. Describe any other procedures for specifying levels of performance.

**E. Usability Study**

1. Has a usability study been conducted on your tool (i.e., a study that examines the extent to which the tool is convenient and practicable for use?)

Yes  No

If yes, please describe, including the results, and attach a copy of the study:

1. Has a social validity study been conducted on your tool (i.e., a study that examines the significance of goals, appropriateness of procedures (e.g., ethics, cost, practicality), and the importance of treatment effects)?

Yes  No

If yes, please describe, including the results, and attach a copy of the study:

Section III: Technical Information

1. **Foundational Psychometric Standards**

**A1. Reliability**

In the section below, describe the reliability analyses conducted and provide results. You may report more than one type of reliability (e.g., model-based, internal consistency, inter-rater reliability); however you must also justify the appropriateness of the method used given the type and purpose of the tool. It is expected that the sample for these analyses represents the general student population (or intended population of the tool if it differs from the general population).

Please ensure that you submit evidence for each informant (e.g., rater/observer) and each individual grade level(s) targeted by the tool.

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

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

1. Describe the analysis procedures for each reported type of reliability:

1. In the charts below, report the reliability data (e.g., model-based, internal consistency, inter-rater reliability) described above, including detail about the type of reliability, statistic generated, and sample size and demographic information. Copy additional forms as necessary to allow for reporting reliability for every possible subscale, form and age range combination.

**Subscale:\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_ Form: \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_ Age Range: \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_**

| **Type of Reliability** | **Coefficient** | **Confidence Interval** | **n (examinees)** | **n**  **(raters)** | **Sample Information / Demographics** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |

Manual cites other published reliability studies:  Yes  No

Provide citations for additional published studies.

1. Do you have reliability data that are disaggregated by gender, race/ethnicity or other subgroups (e.g., English language learners, students with disabilities)? If so, complete below for each subgroup for which you provide disaggregated reliability data.

**Subscale:\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_ Form: \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_ Age Range: \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_**

| **Type of Reliability** | **Subgroup** | **Coefficient** | **Confidence Interval** | **n (examinees)** | **n**  **(raters)** | **Sample Information / Demographics** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

Manual cites other published reliability studies:  Yes  No

Provide citations for additional published studies.

**A2. 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 measures given the theoretical assumptions about the relationship between your tool and other, similar constructs. It is expected that the sample for these analyses represents the general student population (or intended population of the tool if it differs from the general population).

Please ensure that you submit evidence for each informant (e.g., rater/observer) and each individual grade level(s) targeted by the tool.

1. 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 prefers and strongly encourages criterion measures that are ***external to the progress monitoring system***. If internal measures are used, please include a description of what provisions have been taken to address the limitations of this method, such as possible method variance or overlap of item samples.):

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

1. Describe the analysis procedures for each reported type of validity:

1. In the chart 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.

**Subscale:\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_ Form: \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_ Age Range: \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_**

| **Type of Validity** | **Test or Criterion** | **Coefficient** | **n**  **(examinees)** | **n**  **(raters)** | **Sample Information / Demographics** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |

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

Manual cites other published reliability studies:  Yes  No

Provide citations for additional published studies.

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

1. Do you have validity data that are disaggregated by gender, race/ethnicity or other subgroups (e.g., English language learners, students with disabilities)? If so, complete below for each subgroup for which you provide disaggregated validity data.

**Subscale:\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_ Form: \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_ Age Range: \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_**

| **Type of Validity** | **Subgroup** | **Test or Criterion** | **Coefficient** | **N**  **(examinees)** | **n**  **(raters)** | **Sample Information / Demographics** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

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

Manual cites other published reliability studies:  Yes  No

Provide citations for additional published studies.

**A3. Bias Analyses**

1. Have you conducted additional 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,

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

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

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

1. **Progress Monitoring with Intensive Population**

Note: In this section, it is expected that the sample for all analyses represent students in need of intensive intervention. When describing your sample, provide evidence that students demonstrate this need. Convincing evidence that children were in need of intensive intervention may include one or more of the following: students have ED label; students are placed in an alternative school/classroom; students have demonstrated non-response to moderately intensive intervention (e.g., Tier 2); or students have demonstrated severe problem behaviors (e.g., Tier 3), according to an evidence-based tool (e.g., systematic screening tool or direct observation).

**B1. Sensitivity to Behavior Change**

Please ensure that you submit evidence for each informant (e.g., rater/observer) and each individual grade level(s) targeted by the tool. If you fail to submit data for a targeted grade level, that grade will receive a “dash” rating for this standard.

1. Describe evidence that the monitoring system produces data that are sensitive to detect incremental change (e.g., small behavior change in a short period of time such as every 20 days or more frequently depending on the purpose of the construct). Evidence should be drawn from samples targeting the specific population that would benefit from intervention. Include in this example a hypothetical illustration (with narrative and/or graphics) of how these data could be used to monitor student performance frequently enough and with enough sensitivity to accurately assess change:

**B2. Reliability for Students in Need of Intensive Intervention**

In the section below, describe the reliability analyses conducted with a sample that is representative of students potentially in need of intensive intervention1, and provide results. You may report more than one type of reliability (e.g., model-based, internal consistency, inter-rater reliability); however you must also justify the appropriateness of the method used given the type and purpose of the tool.

Please ensure that you submit evidence for each informant (e.g., rater/observer) and each individual grade level(s) targeted by the tool. If you fail to submit data for a targeted grade level, that grade will receive a “dash” rating for this standard.

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

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

1. Describe the analysis procedures for each reported type of reliability:

1. In the charts below, report the reliability data (e.g., model-based, internal consistency, inter-rater reliability) described above, including detail about the type of reliability, statistic generated, and sample size and demographic information. Copy additional forms as necessary to allow for reporting reliability for every possible subscale, form and age range combination.

**Subscale:\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_ Form: \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_ Age Range: \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_**

| **Type of Reliability** | **Coefficient** | **Confidence Interval** | **n (examinees)** | **n**  **(raters)** | **Sample Information / Demographics** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |

Manual cites other published reliability studies:  Yes  No

Provide citations for additional published studies.

1. Do you have reliability data that are disaggregated by gender, race/ethnicity or other subgroups (e.g., English language learners, students with disabilities)? If so, complete below for each subgroup for which you provide disaggregated reliability data.

**Subscale:\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_ Form: \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_ Age Range: \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_**

| **Type of Reliability** | **Subgroup** | **Coefficient** | **Confidence Interval** | **n (examinees)** | **n**  **(raters)** | **Sample Information / Demographics** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

Manual cites other published reliability studies:  Yes  No

Provide citations for additional published studies.

**B3. Validity for Students in Need of Intensive Intervention**

In the section below, describe the validity analyses conducted with a sample that is representative of students potentially in need of intensive intervention, 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 measures given the theoretical assumptions about the relationship between your tool and other, similar constructs.

Please ensure that you submit evidence for each informant (e.g., rater/observer) and each individual grade level(s) targeted by the tool. If you fail to submit data for a targeted grade level, that grade will receive a “dash” rating for this standard.

1. 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 prefers and strongly encourages criterion measures that are ***external to the progress monitoring system***. If internal measures are used, please include a description of what provisions have been taken to address the limitations of this method, such as possible method variance or overlap of item samples.):

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

1. Describe the analysis procedures for each reported type of validity:

1. In the chart 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.

**Subscale:\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_ Form: \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_ Age Range: \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_**

| **Type of Validity** | **Test or Criterion** | **Coefficient** | **n**  **(examinees)** | **n**  **(raters)** | **Sample Information / Demographics** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |

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

Manual cites other published reliability studies:  Yes  No

Provide citations for additional published studies.

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

1. Do you have validity data that are disaggregated by gender, race/ethnicity or other subgroups (e.g., English language learners, students with disabilities)? If so, complete below for each subgroup for which you provide disaggregated validity data.

**Subscale:\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_ Form: \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_ Age Range: \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_**

| **Type of Validity** | **Subgroup** | **Test or Criterion** | **Coefficient** | **N**  **(examinees)** | **n**  **(raters)** | **Sample Information / Demographics** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

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

Manual cites other published reliability studies:  Yes  No

Provide citations for additional published studies.

**B4. Data to Support Intervention Change**

1. Are validated decision rules for when changes to the intervention need to be made specified in your manual or published materials?

Please ensure that you submit evidence for each informant (e.g., rater/observer) and each individual grade level(s) targeted by the tool. If you fail to submit data for a targeted informant and grade level(s), that informant and grade level(s) will receive a “dash” rating for this standard.

Yes  No

If yes, specify the decision rules:

1. What is the evidentiary basis for these decision rules?

NOTE: The TRC expects evidence for this standard to include an empirical study that compares a treatment group to a control and evaluates if student outcomes increase when decision rules are in place.

**B5. Data to Support Intervention Selection**

1. Are validated decision rules for what intervention(s) to select specified in your manual or published materials?

Please ensure that you submit evidence for each informant (e.g., rater/observer) and each individual grade level(s) targeted by the tool. If you fail to submit data for a targeted informant and grade level(s), that informant and grade level(s) will receive a “dash” rating for this standard.

Yes  No

If yes, specify the decision rules:

1. What is the evidentiary basis for these decision rules?

NOTE: The TRC expects evidence for this standard to include an empirical study that compares a treatment group to a control and evaluates if student outcomes increase when decision rules are in place.