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**NCII Behavior Progress Monitoring Definition**

NCII 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 or informal observations) 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.

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. **Does your measure target social, emotional, or behavioral functioning?**
 | [ ]  **Yes** [ ]  **No** |
| 1. **Does your measure involve formative assessment (i.e., repeated administration) with the intended purpose of progress monitoring?**
 | [ ]  **Yes** [ ]  **No** |
| 1. **Does your tool monitor individual student behavior?**
 | [ ]  **Yes** [ ]  **No** |
| 1. **Does your evidence constitute *direct★* evidence?**

★*Direct evidence is derived from data collected on the tool being submitted. Indirect evidence, or data collected on similar tools, will not be accepted.* | [ ]  **Yes** [ ]  **No** |
| 1. **Do you provide evidence of reliability and validity for each age-span/informant combination being submitted for review?★**

★*Note that data combining multiple age-spans is not accepted.* | [ ]  **Yes** [ ]  **No** |

Review Process and Timeline

NCII uses a standard review process to evaluate the scientific rigor of behavior progress monitoring tools that can be used as part of a data-based individualization intervention for students with disabilities who require behavioral intervention due to persistent social, emotional, and/or behavioral problems.

Reviews are conducted by Behavior Progress Monitoring (BPM) 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 progress monitoring tools are invited to respond to the call for submissions by completing this document, the Standard Protocol for Evaluation Behavior Progress Monitoring 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 Progress Monitoring Tools Chart](https://charts.intensiveintervention.org/chart/behavioral-progress-monitoring-tools) 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 BPM 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 BPM 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 progress monitoring 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. Tools that meet the submission eligibility criteria are reviewed and their results 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, 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

**Tool/Suite**: 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

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

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

 [ ]  General education classroom

 [ ]  Special education classroom

 [ ]  School office

 [ ]  Recess

 [ ]  Lunchroom

 [ ]  Home

 [ ]  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]

How many alternate forms are available, if applicable?

[number] alternate forms per [unit, e.g., grade, level]

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.

What types of scores does the assessment provide? (Check all that apply.)

| **Score** | **Conversion** | **Interpretation** |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Observation | Rating | Observation | Rating | Observation | 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 |

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.

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.

Do you provide basis for calculating slope (e.g., amount of improvement per unit in time)?

[ ]  Yes

[ ]  No

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

[ ]  Age norms

[ ]  Grade norms

[ ]  Classwide norms

[ ]  Schoolwide norms

[ ]  Stanines

[ ]  Normal curve equivalent

Describe the tool’s approach to progress monitoring, 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.

F. Levels of Performance and Usability

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.

Click here to enter text.

What is the basis for specifying levels of performance?

[ ]  Norm-referenced

[ ]  Criterion-referenced

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

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

National representation (check all that apply):

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):

If **criterion-referenced**, describe procedures for specifying levels of performance (please enclose any relevant documentation with your submission).

Click here to enter text.

Describe any other procedures for specifying levels of performance.

Click here to enter text.

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 enclose any relevant documentation with your submission.

Click here to enter text.

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 enclose any relevant documentation with your submission.

Click here to enter text.

Section II. Performance Level Standards

1. Reliability

\* Indicates a required field.

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(s) used given the type and purpose of the tool. It is expected that the sample for these analyses represents the general student population.

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

\*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(s) below, report the results of the reliability analyses described above (e.g., internal consistency or inter-rater reliability coefficients). Include detail about the type of reliability data, statistic generated, and sample size and demographic information.

| **Type of Reliability** | **Age / Grade** | **Informant** | **n****(sample / examinees)** | **n****(raters, if applicable)** | **Coefficient** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |

Manual cites other published reliability studies: [ ]  Yes [ ]  No

Provide citations for additional published studies.

Click here to enter text.

Do you have reliability data that are disaggregated by gender, race/ethnicity, or other subgroups (e.g., English language learners, students with disabilities)?

[ ]  Yes

[ ]  No

If yes, fill in data for each subgroup with disaggregated reliability data.

| **Type of Reliability** | **Subgroup** | **Age / Grade** | **Informant** | **n****(sample / examinees)** | **n****(raters, if applicable)** | **Coefficient** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

Manual cites other published reliability studies: [ ]  Yes [ ]  No

Provide citations for additional published studies.

Click here to enter text.

2. 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. It is expected that the sample for these analyses represents the general student population.

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

\*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 progress monitoring 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 the results of the validity analyses described above (e.g., concurrent or predictive validity, 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** | **Test or Criterion** | **n****(sample / examinees)** | **n****(raters, if applicable)** | **Coefficient** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

Manual cites other published reliability studies: [ ]  Yes [ ]  No

Provide citations for additional published studies.

Click here to enter text.

Results from other forms of validity analysis not compatible with above table format.

Click here to enter text.

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

Click here to enter text.

Do you have validity data that are disaggregated by gender, race/ethnicity, or other subgroups (e.g., English language learners, students with disabilities)?

[ ]  Yes

[ ]  No

If yes, fill in data for each subgroup with disaggregated validity data.

| **Type of Validity** | **Age / Grade** | **Informant** | **Subgroup** | **Test or Criterion** | **n****(sample / examinees)** | **n****(raters, if applicable)** | **Coefficient** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

Results from other forms of validity analysis not compatible with above table format:

Manual cites other published reliability studies: [ ]  Yes [ ]  No

Provide citations for additional published studies.

Click here to enter text.

3. 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,

* 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 has been identified.

Click here to enter text.

Section III. Growth Standards

*NOTE:* *For all growth standards, it is expected that the sample for analyses represent students in need of behavioral intervention. When describing your sample, provide evidence that students demonstrate this need. Convincing evidence that children were in need of behavioral 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).*

Please ensure that you submit evidence for each **informant** (e.g., rater/observer) and each individual **grade/age level** or range targeted by the tool. Failing to submit data for a targeted grade/age level or range will result in a “dash” rating for that standard.

4. Sensitivity to Behavior Change

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).

Click here to enter text.

5. Reliability and Validity: Intensive Population

5a. Reliability for Students in Need of Behavioral Intervention

In the fields below, describe the reliability analyses conducted with a sample that is representative of students in need of behavioral intervention, 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(s) used given the type and purpose of the tool.

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(s) below, report the results of the reliability analyses described above (e.g., internal consistency or inter-rater reliability coefficients). Report results by age range or grade level (if relevant) and include detail about the type of reliability data, statistic generated, and sample size and demographic information.

| **Type of Reliability** | **Age / Grade** | **Informant**  | **n****(sample / examinees)** | **n****(raters, if applicable)** | **Coefficient** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |

Manual cites other published reliability studies: [ ]  Yes [ ]  No

Provide citations for additional published studies.

Click here to enter text.

Do you have reliability data that are disaggregated by gender, race/ethnicity, or other subgroups (e.g., English language learners, students with disabilities)?

[ ]  Yes

[ ]  No

If yes, fill in data for each subgroup with disaggregated reliability data.

| **Type of Reliability** | **Age / Grade** | **Informant** | **Subgroup** | **n****(sample / examinees)** | **n****(raters, if applicable)** | **Coefficient** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

Manual cites other published reliability studies: [ ]  Yes [ ]  No

Provide citations for additional published studies.

Click here to enter text.

5b. Validity for Students in Need of Behavioral Intervention

In the fields below, describe the validity analyses conducted with a sample that is representative of students potentially in need of behavioral 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 measure(s) given the theoretical assumptions about the relationship between your tool and other, similar constructs.

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 progress monitoring 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(s) below, report the results of the validity analyses described above (e.g., concurrent or predictive validity, 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**  | **Test or Criterion** | **n****(sample / examinees)** | **n****(raters, if applicable)** | **Coefficient** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

Results from other forms of validity analysis not compatible with above table format.

Click here to enter text.

Manual cites other published reliability studies: [ ]  Yes [ ]  No

Provide citations for additional published studies.

Click here to enter text.

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

Click here to enter text.

Do you have validity data that are disaggregated by gender, race/ethnicity, or other subgroups (e.g., English language learners, students with disabilities)?

[ ]  Yes

[ ]  No

If yes, fill in data for each subgroup with disaggregated validity data.

| **Type of Validity** | **Age / Grade** | **Informant** | **Subgroup** | **Test or Criterion** | **n****(sample / examinees)** | **n****(raters, if applicable)** | **Coefficient** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

Results from other forms of validity analysis not compatible with above table format:

Click here to enter text.

Manual cites other published reliability studies: [ ]  Yes [ ]  No

Provide citations for additional published studies.

Click here to enter text.

6. Decision Rules: Changing Intervention

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

[ ]  Yes

[ ]  No

If yes, specify the decision rules: Click here to enter text.

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 whether student outcomes increase when decision rules are in place*.

Click here to enter text.

7. Decision Rules: Choosing Intervention

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

[ ]  Yes

[ ]  No

If yes, specify the decision rules: Click here to enter text.

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 whether student outcomes increase when decision rules are in place*.

Click here to enter text.