

The Taxonomy of Intervention Intensity: A Case Example of Building Intervention Intensity in Behavior

Transcript

[Slide 2 – The Taxonomy of Intervention Intensity: A Case Example of Building

Intervention Intensity in Behavior]: Tessie Rose Bailey: Good afternoon everyone and welcome to our webinar. The Taxonomy of Intervention Intensity, A Case Example for Building Intervention Intensity in Behavior. Thank you so much for joining us today. My name is Doctor Tessie Rose Bailey and I'm a Principal Technical Assistance Consultant at the American Institutes for Research. And I support the National Center on Intensive Interventions. Today, I will be serving as the Moderator.

[Slide 3 – Webinar Format & Questions]: Before we begin, I wanted to orient you to a few logistical details about this webinar. On this webinar you will see a box where you can submit questions or comments at any time. For technical issues and questions, a webinar team member will try to assist you as soon as possible. For content question, please feel free to submit your questions at any time. I or other presenters will either respond to the questions in the chat box individually or as a group or, I'll share them during the Q and A opportunities throughout the presentation. At the end of today's webinar, I will be sharing some resources from NCII related to the content discussed by today's presenters.

[Slide 4 – Today's Webinar]: Today's webinar is the third and final webinar in a three-part series on the Taxonomy of Intervention Intensity. The first webinar focused on the use of DBI to intensify Math interventions. And the second demonstrated how DBI to intensify a reading comprehension intervention. A recording of these webinars can be found on NCII's website. Today's webinar will focus on using the taxonomy to select and intensify behavior interventions.

Like the other webinars, a recording will be posted soon after the completion of the webinar. Our presenters will begin with a brief overview of data-based individualization often referred to as DBI. And it's linked to the seven dimensions within the taxonomy of intervention intensity. A significant portion of the webinar will include a behavior case study that illustrates how to implement DBI and the taxonomy.

[Slide 5 – Webinar Materials for Download]: There are two downloadable resources that are available to you during the presentation. The first is a rating form that the presenters will use to model how to rate and intensify an intervention using the taxonomy. The second is a one-page summary of the taxonomy of intervention intensity dimensions that will be discussed at the beginning of the presentation. Links to these materials can be found in the chat box or you can find them under handouts section along the righthand side.

[Slide 6 – Presenters]: I am honored to present our two expert presenters. Doctor Joe Wehby is the Chair of the Special Education Department at Vanderbilt University. He has worked as a Special Education teacher for students with emotional disturbance and is currently a Senior Advisor for NCII. His research focuses on the development of classroom-based interventions for students with ADD with a particular interest in adapting Tier One and Tier Two interventions to better serve this population.

Doctor Joey Staubitz is the Clinical Director of the Applied Behavior Analysis program in the Department of Special Education at Vanderbilt University. She has worked in public schools as a teacher and consultant to support students with emotional and behavioral disorders. Her role at Vanderbilt; in her role at Vanderbilt, she trains pre-service behavior analysts and Special Education teachers to develop and implement intensive interventions for students with severe and persistent behavior difficulties. Please welcome me in joining Doctor Wehby and Doctor Staubitz.

Joe Wehby: Thank you and again as Tessie said, I am Doctor Wehby and I'll be going over the overview of the intensification taxonomy; Intensive Intervention Taxonomy.

[Slide 7 – What's the Taxonomy of Intensive Intervention?]: And discuss some of the dimensions that Doctor Staubitz will then apply to a case study related to behavior intervention.

[Slide 8 – The Taxonomy of Intensive Intervention]: So, the taxonomy is mentioned as an approach for thinking about ways that you can actually intensify what I would call a standard protocol intervention in order to better serve children who might be non-responsive to sort of the standard Tier Two programs. The taxonomy allows you to do two things. It allows you to first identify the best match of a platform. A standard Tier Two protocol where you can actually start and that's called the set-up phase. And that's a place where you can look at a particular issue or a concern that you have for a student who is showing behavioral challenges and identify the best place to start in terms of an intervention.

But, the primary purpose of the taxonomy is to then start looking at ways that you can look at the dimensions of that intervention to make adjustments. Initial adjustments and then ongoing adjustments based on a student's response to this. It is a very formal way of identifying what dimensions of an intervention; and we've identified seven. And then where along each of those dimensions intensification might take place. Next slide please.

[Slide 9 – The Taxonomy of Intensive Intervention]: So, this intensive intervention for those of you who may have attended the prior webinars on intensification. It's based upon an article written by Fuchs, Fuchs and Malone that identify this taxonomy process. So, there are seven dimensions in which the intensity can vary. Again, the intensity can be adjusted based on; depending on student responsiveness. So, again it identifies a way to actually help you identify set-up but also make adjustments to boost student's progress depending on their responsiveness to a particular set of adjustments. Next slide please.

[Slide 10 – Taxonomy Dimensions]: So, the seven dimensions are strength, dosage, alignment, attention to transfer, comprehensiveness, academic supports and individualization. Now these seven dimensions are consistent with what was presented in the original article and with what

was provided in the Reading and the Math webinars. But, as you know, behavioral interventions are a little bit different. In some ways and the behavioral community actually refers to a couple of these things in different ways. And I'm going to highlight those differences or kind of a comparison to the prior article and the previous webinars to what we are doing here today.

So, the first one that I want to talk about is strength. And strength is identified in the set-up phase in terms of identifying the best matched; finding the best matched intervention for a particular student. In the academic webinar, that strength is represented by an effect size. And that is basically an approach that tells you what you might expect on average for a child to respond to in terms of movement based on that standard protocol.

In the literature for behavior, effect sizes are for reasons that I'm not going to go into today aren't as prominent. Because, a number of Tier Two type interventions really are really researched using single case design. So, our recommendation for strength and identifying that best matched intervention is to use the resources at the National Center on Intensive Intervention's website, the Tools Charts. I think Tessie will talk about those in a little bit at the end of this. It's where you can look at reviewed interventions and the strength of those interventions will be provided. And it may allow you; along with the descriptions they may allow you to sort of identify the best match.

The second is dosage. And in academics, dosage really refers to the amount of time that an intervention might be delivered, increasing the time. It might look at what we call opportunities to respond. How often you get children actively engaged in an academic task. For behavior it's somewhat similar.

We think about dosage in a couple of different ways. We think about OTRs or opportunities to respond as a way to give children opportunities to practice specific social, behavioral skills that we want them to be performing in classroom-based settings. But, dosage also might refer to opportunities for a teacher or an Interventionist to provide positive feedback. It might refer to the frequency in which a child may exchange tokens or points for backup reinforcers. And it also refers to the frequency in which corrective feedback is provided to that child to encourage them or to redirect them to engage in more positive behavior.

The third dimension is alignment. And in the academic world, we often talk about alignment as how well does a particular intervention match what a curriculum might look like? So, you think about an entire Math curriculum in the second grade. Are there some pieces of that curriculum that the child is strong in? You are intensifying where the child might be weak in.

There's not a standard set of behavioral norms that we look at. There's not; while there are some assumed behaviors you want children to engage in classrooms, there's not like a curriculum. So, we've identified alignment along these sorts of factors. How well and intervention addresses schoolwide expectations along with kind of tiered positive behavior support intervention. But also, how well it addresses the expectations that a teacher might have in their classroom.

Alignment also refers to how well an intervention platform matches a child's skill deficits. You know, are they working on really what that child might need? We look at alignment as how well the rewards or reinforcements that we provide for student behavior actually match that student's

preferences in terms of what they would like to earn and in terms of engaging in problem behavior; engaging in appropriate behavior. But also, we think about alignment as how well the intervention matches the perceived or identified function of that child's behavior while they're actually engaging in problem behavior.

And we also look at platforms that recognize that for example, compliance can look different depending upon the activity or the task or the expectations in the classroom. So, we're also looking for platforms that have some flexibility. And we're looking at various types and forms of behavior as well.

The fourth dimension is attention to transfer. And attention to transfer is really how well a child learn to apply new skills or reinforce skills to different context. And for attention to transfer, we're looking at where an intervention platform might actually provide opportunities for a child to practice new skills in a different setting. So, if an intensive intervention is focused on a child's behavior in Reading. Do those new skills; those new appropriate skills transfer to Math, lunch, PE and other such academic activities as well too?

The fifth dimension is comprehensiveness. And the comprehensiveness really talks about sort of the you know, how well does an intervention platform include those basic principles that we know are important to successful implementation and delivery by a teacher of an Interventionist? But it also looks at ways that it can identify supports for that child executing the sorts of behaviors that we are expecting to see. So, in this taxonomy for the behavior case study we think about comprehensiveness as how well an individual intervention platform has a specific plan for teaching appropriate behaviors; not just punishing behaviors. But for teaching appropriate behaviors and providing frequent academic opportunities to respond or opportunities to respond.

The platform looks at actual ways that you can adjust the antecedent or the sort of context; contextual variables that might impact behavior. Whether it's classroom organization, whether it might be establishment of a good Tier Two model of support as well too. Comprehensiveness in an intervention platform for behavior will include clear plans for reinforcing appropriate behavior and providing minimal reinforcement or attention to problem behavior. A strong intervention platform in this dimension would also include procedures for correct inappropriate behaviors. So, those behaviors that we know will occur not matter how much support we have; is there a systematic plan for identifying those sorts of supports?

An intervention platform that includes strong comprehensiveness would have a plan for fading support once a child starts achieving appropriate levels of desired behavior. It includes a plan for monitoring the fidelity to which an intervention is applied to make sure that the Interventionist is adhering to those steps; of those adjustment that we've made to the standard protocol too. We also look for interventions that are easily integrated into other services. So, for children who have severe problems with behavior it includes not only those children behavior disorders but also may include children who need emotional support from a mental health counselor. So, we look for interventions that actually might integrate across those two disciplines as well too. And finally, an intervention platform that actually provides some component that provides the opportunity to communicate with parents or family members as well.

The sixth dimension which is kind of opposite for behaviors. But, we're also looking for the behavior; academic intensification process. It's that we want to make sure that the behavior interventions are in some ways addressing the academic supports that these children often need. And so, we're looking for intervention platforms that are easily integrated within the context of academic instruction. And the desire is to identify interventions that compliment whether it's a planned academic instruction.

And one thing that we often hear from teachers is that it's hard to do both at the same time and so, we're looking for platforms that can actually be integrated within the context of academics too. And also, we are looking for intervention platforms that target behaviors that are consistent and appropriate for academic instruction. And finally, for individualization we're talking about sort of identifying interventions that provide opportunities for diagnostic information to be included to make adjustments based on the function or the motivation for that child's problem behavior. Next slide please.

[Slide 11 – When is the Taxonomy of Intervention Intensity Used in the DBI Process?]: So, as I talked about, the taxonomy is; sort of has two phases. The first is setting up an intensive intervention process. So, actually you are selecting an intervention that sort of matches that need that you have for a particular child or group of children who might need some level of support. The taxonomy also allows you to look at that initial adjustment and Joey will go over that in her presentation of the case study. To make sure that you can; you might make some initial adjustments based on what you know about that child.

Maybe you know something about the function of that behavior from maybe a diagnostic test or some sort of teacher interview. Maybe you know something about that classroom or the schedule of reinforcers that that child has previously gotten. This taxonomy allows for you to make those adjustments on the front end. So, you're kind of going in with a tailored, adjusted intervention that hopefully heightens the likelihood that that child is going to be successful as well too.

The third step of that process is to think about a progress monitoring system. In academics, that might be a curriculum-based measure. For behavior, it might be a daily report card that monitors that child's progress around certain expected behavior dimensions as well too. And then the next step, step four is to begin implementing the individualized intervention platform for that particular child or group of children as well too. The next phase; the next slide, sorry.

[Slide 12 – When is the Taxonomy of Intervention Intensity Used in the DBI Process?]: So, the second aspect of the taxonomy is to think about ways to individualize the intervention. So, once you're started, you're going to take your progress monitoring data to determine whether or not that child needs some adjustments across those seven dimensions. It may be one dimension, or it may be all seven that you're looking at to make sure that you're going through the process, accessing that child's progress.

If the child is not progressing to some type of standard that's appropriate for that particular setting or those expectations. You go through this process again. Repeat the diagnostic data process. You look at your progress monitoring data, you look at other features and make

additional adjustments to the intervention. And you adapt it to a more intense level than you actually might need for that particular child.

[Slide 13 - Questions]: So, that was sort of; probably the too long but, short overview that particular process. So, are there questions so far?

Tessie Rose Bailey: I do have a couple of questions. And feel free to type in any additional questions in the question box. And then we'll share them along the way. The first one is: are there some dimensions that appear to be more important for behavior interventions than say academic interventions?

Joe Wehby: That's a great question and it's kind of a hard question. Because, it probably depends on what you're targeting to do. My impression would be; my experience would suggest that the first three dimensions; the strength of the initial platform. What evidence do we have that's it's likely to work for kids who have intensive needs?

Those that are actually very malleable in terms of the amount of dosage that can be provided. Whether it's you know time or opportunities to respond or that reinforcers can be delivered at a different schedule. And then where I see probably the most important piece of this might be initially would be how well does it align with the expectations of the setting?

Most schools operate on sort of a standard approach for setting a set of schoolwide expectations. Those kind of get watered down often times when they move to the classroom or they are less defined. So, we want to make sure that an intervention allows a teacher; that's the Interventionist in this case. To adjust the intervention so that they can actually meet and teach and reinforce those behaviors that are important to that child's success in that classroom.

Tessie Rose Bailey: Okay, and then.

Joe Wehby: That doesn't downplay the other dimensions.

Tessie Rose Bailey: Yeah, so that may lead sort of to the next question or sort of address it. Is it okay or what if we have an intervention that doesn't rate high initially on all of those dimensions? Should they just scrap it or?

Joe Wehby: I think initially.

Tessie Rose Bailey: What should they do?

Joe Wehby: The initial approach is that you want to look at an intervention that "A" matches what you think that child's needs is; are in a particular context. I would probably throw in there that it's probably not written anywhere but that it also makes your approach for teaching or your style of teaching or working with students or whatever your role might be. So, you want to try and find the best intervention that's the strongest and it fits those dimensions as well too.

But the beauty of the taxonomy is that it allows you to take interventions that might not as strong as you would like them to be. But, to take systematic efforts to actually strengthen that first pass before you even get started. So, yes, start with the strongest that you can find. But, if it's

adjustable then you may actually be able to increase or strengthen that intervention by using the taxonomy.

Tessie Rose Bailey: Excellent, well thank you Doctor Wehby. So, I'd like to pass this over to Doctor Staubitz who is going to give a case study.

[Slide 14 – Carlos]: That sort of shows you how you can apply the taxonomy within DBI.

Joey Staubitz: Alright and hello everyone. And I believe I'm going to; oh, there it is. So, let's show my screen. Just bear with me while I get this up. Here we go. Can everybody see Carlos here? I'll take that as a yes. Perfect, alright. So, I am going to share with you all a case study application of the taxonomy of intervention intensity that Joe just described. And just something to keep in mind, as I present this case study. While we're looking at what Ms. Harper, Carlos' Interventionist did to support his needs.

The purpose is really to show you the taxonomy and the application process. And so, it's kind of a simplistic example of behavior interventions. And so, you're going to see places where you're going have; need a different adjustment than Ms. Harper did. But, just keep in mind that we're looking at the application of the taxonomy here to intensify an intervention rather than the components of the behavioral intervention itself. With that said, I'll try to be as specific as possible about those components to help us understand the application.

[Slide 15 – Student Profile: Carlos, 3rd Grade]: Okay, without further ado, we're looking at Carlos here. He is a third-grade student and has experienced persistent behavioral difficulties throughout his school career up until the third grade. He is disruptive during independent work periods. And often engages in some inappropriate commenting to teachers as well as to peers. He does have a diagnosis of ADHD but has not yet been determined as eligible for Special Education.

He participated in a Tier Two social skills program throughout the previous year. And he was successful in that program in many ways. He was really able to display social skills during those group session meetings as well as non-academic periods of the school day such as lunch and recess. But, he tended to continue to engage in problem behaviors during academic times of the day.

[Slide 16 – Student Profile: Carlos, 3rd Grade]: Specifically, Carlos engaged in a lot of non-compliance. So, it could be verbally non-compliant, could be refusing to do work and saying no as well as more passively failing to follow directions. He may be putting his head down or just not doing the work. Sometimes, Carlos will wander the classroom. He will touch other people's stuff and also make inappropriate comments towards his teacher or towards his peers. This is stupid, I'm not doing this work and that kind of thing. You can probably picture that.

[Slide 17 – Student Profile: Carlos, 3rd Grade]: However, despite those behavioral difficulties, Carlos really enjoys one on one interaction with adults. Which is important when we start talking about selecting an intervention platform for Carlos. And he is also cooperative during non-academic periods. He's able to apply what he learned in social skills training outside of work time.

He does have some mild academic concerns. Often times, those come along with problem behavior. Specifically, Carlos has deficits in reading comprehension. He is; he has a tough time using text to answer questions or he has a tough time recalling information that he reads. And he also has limited vocabulary and content knowledge.

[Slide 18 – Set-Up Phase]: So, now we're going to focus on the set-up phase that Joe described. Where his interventionist; Carlos' interventionist selects an intensive intervention platform. What Joe kind of referred to as standard protocol intervention.

[Slide 19 – Set-Up Phase, Step 1 and Rate an Intensive Intervention Platform]: So, looking at that taxonomy rating form that you have a copy of. Ms. Harper looks at the NCII Tools Chart to look for or to identify a Tier Two intensive intervention platform. She selects Externalizing Behavior and Elementary Age filters in her search because those match Carlos' characteristics. And she sees that there are a few studies on the behavior education program or Check-In Check-Out which is what I will refer to this intervention as for the rest of this presentation, Check-In Check-Out.

And so, several studies have been reviewed. And their outcomes were rated as convincing and partially convincing. So, this is promising standard protocol or intervention for children with behavioral difficulties. She decides to rate this platform using the taxonomy. So quickly before we go forward and look at the ratings.

[Slide 20 – Set-Up Phase, Step 1: Select and Rate an IIP (Check In/Check Out): I'm going to share with you some of the critical features of the Check-In Check-Out program that Ms. Harper has in mind. So, Check-In Check-Out involves monitoring a student's adherence to school-wide expectations during each subject throughout the school day. So, teachers rate each student who is participating in the intervention after each subject using a three-point scale. Zero corresponds to not meeting an expectation and two indicates that the student met the expectations.

At arrival at school, the student checks in with the designated coach and receives a daily progress report. It's like a point card that they'll carry with them throughout the day that teachers use to deliver the ratings that I just described. In the morning at Check-In, they review their daily point goal with the coach or set a daily point goal. Often times, this might look like eighty or eighty-five percent to begin with. And that's out of possible points.

Then at the end of the school day as they've received ratings from teachers after each subject. The student checks out with the coach. Together they calculate the percentage of possible points that the student earned throughout the day. And the student receives a reward if they met that goal. Then, the student takes that daily progress report or DPR home for parent signature.

And they are supposed to bring it back the next day and share it at Check-In. It's a mechanism here for keeping parents in the loop. So, that's Check-In Check-Out.

[Slide 21 – Set-Up Phase, Step 1: Rating the Intensive Intervention Platform]: Ms. Harper is going to go forward and rate Check-In Check-Out using the taxonomy rating form that you have in front of you. So, for each standard within a dimension she's going to rate zero if the intensive intervention platform Check-In Check-Out fails to address the standard. One if it

addresses it minimally, two if it addresses the standard moderately and three if it addresses the standard well. Now, with that said no two people; these standards aren't defined so precisely that two people would rate them the same thing. But what we're looking for here is a rating that indicates whether there is room for intensification.

So, we wouldn't want someone to take the same standard protocol intervention and one person rates a standard zero and the other person a three. Then we might need to define the intervention a little bit better. But, if we're within a point of each other then we're probably doing okay.

[Slide 22 – Set-Up Phase, Step 1: Rating the Intensive Intervention Platform]: Okay so, the first dimension is strength. And here Joe mentioned that on this particular one the way that this works for the Academic taxonomy of intervention intensity is a little bit different than the way it works for the Behavior taxonomy of intervention intensity. So, we're just looking for an intervention that has research support according to a reliable source. And in this case of course, Ms. Harper pulled this intervention from information in the NCII Tools Chart.

So, she gives it a yes. We're good to proceed further. If Ms. Harper had rated a no, for promise of effectiveness then she would have needed to go back and find a different standard protocol. It wouldn't be worth continuing to rate if there was not research support for the intervention.

[Slide 23 – Set-Up Phase, Step 1: Rating the Intensive Intervention Platform]: Next she looks at the dosage dimension. She's thinking about the number of opportunities to respond. Opportunities for feedback and reinforcement that are imbedded in a standard protocol version of Check-In Check-Out. So, for number of opportunities to respond she think okay, there's a morning check in which students can practice skills and also, they are expected to demonstrate the skills throughout the school day in each subject. So, she rates that a two. It may be something that could be intensified further but there are some pretty good built in opportunities for them to practice skills in the Check-In Check-Out program.

Regarding the number of opportunities for positive feedback, Ms. Harper thinks hmm, teachers are rating this child. In this case for Carlos, his classroom teacher. One teacher is rating his performance; rating the extent to which he met schoolwide expectations after each subject of the school day. That's a fair amount of opportunities for feedback. I'm going to rate that at a two as well. We could also go with a schedule that goes with multiple ratings in an academic period but, this is a really good start.

She thinks about the number of opportunities that Carlos has to exchange for backup reinforcers and that's once per day at the end of the day. Has Carlos met his daily point goal? This is also a two because, we may be able to make that a denser schedule. But for a third-grade student, daily rewards that's a relatively high rate. It seems acceptable.

Finally, she thinks about the number of opportunities for corrective feedback. And in the case of Check-In Check-Out, these opportunities really align with the opportunities for positive feedback. So, she's going to give that the same rating. A teacher can give both positive and corrective feedback according to what; according to the student's performance when they give a rating at the end of an academic subject or at the end of another time during the school day like at lunch or PE.

So, how would you rate the dosage intensity? Well, we would just average across the standards within the dosage dimension. This is pretty easy Math here. There all twos so the overall rating is two.

[Slide 24 – Set-Up Phase, Step 1: Rating the Intensive Intervention Platform]: Alright, let's look at alignment. So, there are several standards that Ms. Harper has to consider here. One is the extent to which the platform addresses schoolwide expectations well. Especially; in any building, the Check-In Check-Out program by definition provides an opportunity for teachers and coaches to rate students based on their adherence to schoolwide rules and expectations. And so, that should be; that rates a three. That's built in and it's perfectly aligned.

Regarding classroom and teacher expectations though. Beyond the extent to which those already align with schoolwide expectations, Check-In Check-Out doesn't have a provision for taking specific classroom expectations into account. So, Ms. Harper rates that a two. Check-In Check-Out addresses target student's; Carlos' skill deficits in some ways in that his skill deficits are likely related to the failure to follow schoolwide expectations. He may not know how to follow all of them but, isn't necessarily more specific than that.

She hasn't done any; or Check-In Check-Out doesn't require any type of diagnostic assessment to identify what skills are targeted. So, Ms. Harper rates this element of the alignment dimension a little lower because, there's more room for aligning the intervention with the student's specific needs. Next, she thinks about whether rewards are matched to Carlos' preferences or his functions of problem behavior. Why is he engaging in the problem behavior?

Well, the school offers a menu of rewards for students needing point scale goals and Check-In Check-Out. So, to that extent his preference comes into play. But again, she hasn't done any diagnostic assessment to determine the functions of his behavior. So, she rates this as a two because there is some room for improvement.

She knows that attention is valuable to Carlos because she knows that he does well in situations with one on one attention from adults. But, she needs some diagnostic assessment to further inform that standard. Next, she thinks about whether; if she had conducted some diagnostic assessment then she could easily adapt the Check-In Check-Out intervention platform to address various functions.

And Ms. Harper says yeah, I certainly could. I could plug in a break card if it turned out that escape from work was really important to Carlos. I could dial up the amount or the quality of teacher attention if necessary. So, it would be easy for her to adjust this intervention with more information about function.

Regarding whether Check-In Check-Out addresses extraneous skills for Carlos. That's another thing that she's not sure about without more assessments. But, it's possible that some extra stuff is in there. Maybe he already knows how to be safe if that's one of the schoolwide expectations; be respectful, be responsible and be safe. And that's; he's earning points for that but that isn't something that he really needs to develop further. So, that may be another area where she can intensify.

So, how would you rate the alignment of the platform overall? Well, we'd average across these six standards and that gives us a two point three. I'm trying to move the box over so that I can see if I'm saying the right numbers.

[Slide 25 – Set-Up Phase, Step 1: Rating the Intensive Intervention Platform]: Alright, so now let's look at attention to transfer, our next dimension. So, Ms. Harper here is thinking about whether Check-In Check-Out emphasis how the student uses skills across their situations or when they should do that. Including opportunities practice skills across context and situations. Well, Check-In Check-Out programs for feedback and opportunities for practice across every part of the school day and in Carlos's case about every hour. Because, that's about how long the academic subjects last. So, Ms. Harper rates this standard as a three or the degree to which Check-In Check-Out meets the standard is a three.

They're a good program for generalization here. Also, reinforcement for the use of those skills as programmed across context and situations. That's what those points are all about and they are partly to give students feedback about the degree to which they met expectations. But, also because the help a student to track their progress toward meeting an end of day goal and accessing a reward.

So, how would we rate attention to transfer? This is another one with easy Math. That's a three there. So, food programing for generalization; the program Check-In Check-Out. According to Ms. Harper.

[Slide 26 – Set-Up Phase, Step 1: Rating the Intensive Intervention Platform]: Now, here is the biggie. Comprehensiveness is a big part of the meat of any behavior intervention. And so, Ms. Harper is going to spend some time thinking through the degree to which the platform meets these standards. So first, she's looking at a plan for teaching appropriate behaviors and adequate opportunities for practice. That is imbedded in Check-In Check-Out as part of its standard form.

While there are opportunities for practice throughout the day and specifically during morning check in and afternoon check out. So, that's great. However, she's not really sure without more assessment what the appropriate behaviors are that she needs to teach. So, she rates this a two. A little more diagnostic assessment and the data from those results may be helpful for informing this element of comprehensiveness a little further.

Next, she thinks about whether Check-In Check-Out includes a plan for adjusting antecedent conditions to prevent the need for problem behavior. And that's really not present in Check-In Check-Out. Aside from the fact that teacher attention is available on a pretty dense schedule. And non-contention attention can reduce problem behavior reinforced by attention. So, you know this standard isn't totally ignored but, there's room for more antecedent adjustments here to prevent problem behavior.

Next, she a plan for reinforcing appropriate behavior. Well, that's built in. It may be that she needs to think about alignment in terms of what those appropriate behaviors are. But, there is a plan for delivering points contingent on following expectations throughout many parts of the school day.

Next, she thinks about whether Check-In Check-Out involves any kind of protocol minimizing reinforcement for problem behavior. Well, Check-In Check-Out doesn't specify how teachers should respond to problem behavior. So, Ms. Harper rates this standard or this as a zero for meeting the standard. Check-In Check-Out does not involve that at this point. She may need to do again some diagnostic assessments to figure out how to advise a teacher to minimize reinforcement for Carlos' problem behavior.

Next, the comprehensiveness dimension includes a plan for punishing problem behavior. If positive reinforcements-based supports are determined insufficient. Well, Check-In Check-Out definitely doesn't involve a plan for that. And this is something that Ms. Harper would reserve for further down the road anyway. So, she rates that as a zero and she may revisit that process if needed.

Regarding a plan for fading supports or the ease to which; for which supports can be faded. Ms. Harper rates Check-In Check-Out a three because, there are many ways that she can fade supports once Check-In Check-Out is in place and successful for supporting Carlos. For example, she could have daily check ins every couple of days instead of each day. She could ask teachers to maybe provide ratings maybe half way through the day instead of after every subject. She could fade the schedule of reinforcement or when Carlos exchanges his meeting his point goal for rewards. Maybe he could work towards doing that weekly instead of daily. There are lots of different ways to attach that.

Regarding fidelity of implementation and the kind of feasibility of checking and monitoring that. Ms. Harper also rates that; rates Check-In Check-Out pretty highly here. Because, Check-In Check-Out yields a permanent product. There is a point sheet that a Coach could look at and see whether teachers providing ratings at different points throughout the day. And so, it would be pretty easy if a child isn't responding to rule out fidelity of implementation as the explanation for that.

She also thinks about whether Check-In Check-Out works in conjunction with related services. For example; Joe mentioned earlier the degree to which mental health supports could be integrated within Check-In Check-Out for example. Or the extent to which the intervention could be carried over into settings where students are receiving; if Carlos is receiving some kind of therapy or that kind of thing and Ms. Harper rates this highly. One great thing about Check-In Check-Out is that the point sheets and the progress report can be placed on a clipboard and passed around to different service providers throughout the school day.

Finally, she rates a three for the degree to which Check-In Check-Out accounts for communication with parents. That daily progress report goes home every day and the following day, the coach checks for the signature. So, how would you rate the comprehensiveness dimension? Alright, so we would add up the scores on these standards and average across them and that gives us a two. So, there's room for intensification on this dimension as well.

[Slide 27 – Set-Up Phase, Step 1: Rating the Intensive Intervention Platform]: Finally, we'll look at academic support. And this means that Ms. Harper needs to think about the ease with which Check-In Check-Out can be integrated within the context of academic instruction. And

she rates this as a three because again, that point sheet is present. The teachers going to provide ratings on the students meeting of expectations throughout each subject of the school day.

She also rates Check-In Check-Out as a three for complimenting rather than supplanting an academic focus for the same reason. If a student is encouraged by this program to follow or to meet schoolwide expectations. That should be in line with engaging with academic instruction.

Finally, she thinks about procedures for reinforcing responses related to academic achievement. And although the platform is very well aligned with schoolwide expectations she thinks that you know, behavior is really specific to academic engagement could be specified further and points tied to those things. So, she rates that a two. It's definitely there but it could be improved upon.

Alright, so how would you rate academic supports as a dimension? Well, if we add up three, three and two and divide by three we get a two point seven. So, that's looking pretty good as well.

[Slide 28 – Set-Up Phase, Step 1: Rating the Intensive Intervention Platform]: Alright, so now Ms. Harper is looking at her ratings overall. So, strength is a yes but the rest of these are quantitative ratings. And so, she adds them up and divides by five. And that gives her a rating of two point four. So overall, Check-In Check-Out is scoring between addresses standards moderately well and addresses standards well.

And that's a good place to start. Note that she doesn't rate the individualization dimension during set-up. As we move further into the DBI process in this case study you'll see where the individualization standards come into play and when Ms. Harper starts to use those. Alright, so she does notice although she's comfortable with this average and things are looking pretty good. There are some areas where the scores are closer to two and she's going to think about those to try and anticipate some of the issues that Carlos might have or some of the things that might impeded his response to intervention once it's in place.

[Slide 29 – Set-Up Phase, Step 2: Make Initial Adjustments to the IIP]: So, specifically she's looking at dosage, alignment and comprehensiveness.

[Slide 30 – Set-Up Phase, Step 2: Make Initial Adjustments to the IIP]: Regarding dosage, she notes some shortcomings. First, Check-In Check-Out involves those morning and afternoon check ins with the coach and the hourly or so opportunities for the teacher feedback in between. Ms. Harper thinks that Carlos may need teacher feedback more often and to earn points for shorter periods of time. Just to help him make the connection between his behavior and what he's earning.

Second, she thinks that calculating the percentage of points that he earned at the end of the day check out may also need to be removed. Maybe forwards or delayed, they are going to have less of an effect on behavior in the future than rewards that are more immediate. So, she's not sure if the density of the schedule of reinforcement or the dosage here is going to be a good fit for Carlos. But, she may start out with it; with the way it's programmed and then see what happens before making it harder work on the teacher.

[Slide 31 – Set-Up Phase, Step 2: Make Initial Adjustments to the IIP]: Regarding alignment, there are a couple of shortcomings as well. Check-In Check-Out isn't directly aligned with the current classroom teacher's expectations. Remember, Ms. Harper rated that; rated that element of alignment a little lower. So, Carlos may continue to engage in behaviors that his teacher doesn't find acceptable even if he's earning points on schoolwide expectations. There may be some things in there that are a little bit more specific to what the teacher is looking for.

Also, although there's built in time during morning check in and end of the day check out for teaching and practicing skills relating to meeting classroom expectations or schoolwide expectations. Check-In Check-Out doesn't specify a procedure for identifying what skills really need to be taught to replace problem behavior. Given that, Ms. Harper anticipates that if Carlos does not respond to Check-In Check-Out as a standard protocol. She may need to do a little diagnostic assessment to identify what replacement behaviors to teach and that Carlos should be practicing. In addition, she'd have information about the functions of potential function or functions of Carlos' problem behavior that can further improve alignment.

[Slide 32 – Set-Up Phase, Step 2: Make Initial Adjustments to the IIP]: Finally, she thinks about the comprehensiveness dimension because there were several elements here where she rated lower than a two or rated a two. So, she notes that she gave low ratings to Check-In Check-Out for plan for teaching appropriate behaviors for the same reason related to alignment. It's not really clear which behaviors we focus on. The schoolwide expectations are so broad. And also, there was a low rating for antecedent adjustments and minimizing reinforcement for problem behavior.

So, to really intensify based on any of those elements of the comprehensiveness dimension Ms. Harper is going to need results of a diagnostic assessment or a functional behavioral assessment to inform changes. And she will probably do that if Carlos fails to make progress after initial adjustments. So, just a note that with this behavior; the taxonomy of intervention intensity for Behavior, the diagnostic assessment is particularly relevant to intensifications related to alignment and comprehensiveness. That's just a note going forward.

[Slide 33 – Set-Up Phase, Step 2: Make Initial Adjustments to the IIP]: We'll come back to that. So, at this point Ms. Harper avoids major substantive changes until she can gauge Carlos' response to Check-In Check-Out using progress monitoring data. So, she's going to give it a shot first and before she makes anything more effortful for school staff to implement. Because, she wants to find what works with the least effort required.

[Slide 34 – Set-Up Phase, Step 3: Select a Progress-Monitoring System]: So, in the set-up phase the next step is to look at progress monitoring because that's how she's going to make decisions about what changes to make. Fortunately, Check-In Check-Out has a built-in progress monitoring system. And that is, I mentioned that Check-In Check-Out yields a permanent product. So, the points earned on the daily progress report can serve as a measure for Carlos' performance throughout the day.

Here is an example of the daily progress report that Ms. Harper is going to use for Carlos. And you can see that there are points that can be earned for each schoolwide expectation; be respectful, be responsible, be safe. And those are across different areas of the school day. Ms.

Harper is going to monitor his points earned; percentage of points earned out of the total possible each day. And she's going to make intervention decisions weekly.

This is an area where the behavior taxonomy or the taxonomy for Intervention Intensity for Behavior or however you want to order those words. It is a little bit different that the taxonomy for Academic Intervention. Academic behavior change takes a while and you might need several weeks to change in progress monitoring data. But with behavior intervention, we'd expect behavior to conform to the new contingencies that we've put in place relatively quickly.

So, weekly is a good place to start. She may need to give it more time. And then in some cases, it may take less time to see that something needs to change.

[Slide 35 – Set-Up Phase, Step 3: Select a Progress-Monitoring System]: Alright so, before Ms. Harper begins to implement the intervention, she needs some baseline data. So, she asks Carlos' classroom teacher to assign points according to the daily progress report without Carlos' knowledge for one week. It's important that Carlos doesn't know that this is happening. If he does, it may act as an intervention and he might not get good baseline data or know where he is before they change anything.

So, here's an example. Actually, here are Carlos' progress monitoring data during the baseline phase. You can see that he earned between forty-five and seventy-five percent of possible points across five days. And there's a little bit of a bounce in this data. So, they definitely have room to improve.

[Slide 36 – Set-Up Phase, Step 4: Begin Implementing Intervention and Collecting Progress-Monitoring Data]: So, Ms. Harper begins implementing the intervention after this point. She's got her baseline data and she graphs the percentage of points that Carlos earns daily each day at the end of the day. And this is what it looks like after the first two days. So, he's met his point goal twice in a row. That's really great and it looks really different from his performance baseline.

Can Ms. Harper judge the effectiveness of the Check-In Check-Out platform at this point? Yes or no? So, I'll let you think about it for a second. You know it looks good, but she really needs more information. We will recall that Ms. Harper decided on the front end that she was going to make decision weekly. So, she needs to give this a week before she declares this as a victory.

[Slide 37 – Implementation Phase]: And now because she's continuing and we're transitioning into implementation phase of this taxonomy process.

[Slide 38 – Implementation Phase, Steps 5 – 9: Use the Taxonomy to Make Adjustments to the Intervention During Implementation]: So, she's going to start using data-based individualization to inform her next steps. So, she's collecting progress monitoring daily and applying decisions rules weekly to determine whether the intervention is producing a desirable pattern in responding for Carlos. So, higher scores in baseline ideally, meeting his point goals of eighty percent or exceeding it each day. Whenever the data indicates that Carlos is not on track, that's when Ms. Harper is going to adjust the program to better fit Carlos' needs and potentially do some diagnostic assessments to help her do that.

[Slide 39 – Implementation Phase, Steps 5 – 9: Use the Taxonomy to Make Adjustments to the Intervention During Implementation] Alright so, just to help you follow along with the rest of this case study application. You'll see slides with grey titles and they indicate a slide in which Ms. Harper is evaluating Carlos' data and making decisions about whether the intervention requires adjusting. And you'll see slides with green titles that focus on Ms. Harper's application of the taxonomy itself to design adjustments of the intervention platform.

[Slide 40 – Determine When to Make an Adjustment to Intervention]: Okay, so here is Carlos' progress monitoring data. After the first week of treatment, Ms. Harper notices in addition to the fact that his performance dropped off after those first two days and they are on a decreasing trend. Which is alarming. She looks a little more closely at his point sheets and she saw ooh, he's earning high scores for meeting expectations during the first couple of subjects during the day. But, his performance is dropping off as the day goes on.

He's doing okay after morning check in but sort of falls off the wagon at some point for the remainder of the school day. In addition, during morning check in he had trouble identifying examples of what it looked like to follow schoolwide expectations in his classroom. He also received an ODR for putting his head down and refusing to work during Language Arts.

[Slide 41 – Determine When to Make an Adjustment to Intervention]: So, should Ms. Harper intensify or individualize the intervention platform? Yes or no? If yes, start thinking about what dimensions. I think it's pretty obvious yes. At this point, the pattern is not desirable.

[Slide 42 – Formulate an Adjustment to the IIP When the Rate of Progress is Inadequate]: And I'm going to speed up a little bit because I just saw what time it is. So, of course Ms. Harper should intensify Carlos's program. And she decides to begin by focusing on elements of the taxonomy's dosage and alignment dimensions that don't yet require diagnostic assessment. She can make the easy fixes first.

[Slide 43 – Formulate an Adjustment to the IIP When the Rate of Progress is Inadequate]: Specifically related to dosage, she's thinking about the opportunities for feedback both positive and corrective. And then number of opportunities to exchange for backup reinforcers. She's going to increase those by adding a mid-day goal and check in with Carlos. So, at that point they will calculate his points earned and deliver a reinforcer if he met the goal. She's also going to look at the number of opportunities that he has to practice and demonstrate the skill. By adding a mid-day check in, she has another opportunity to work on that with him during coaching time.

[Slide 44 – Formulate and Adjustment to the IIP When the Rate of Progress is Inadequate]: Regarding alignment, she's first going to take a look at the degree to which Check-In Check-Out is incorporating the classroom or the teacher's expectations. So, she works with the teacher to identify some areas where Carlos is struggling. And she and Carlos discuss and practice those procedures. Specifically practices for beginning independent work. That's what the teacher identified.

So, for each subject area, students need to follow specific procedures to get started. Get a textbook, retrieve their journal, have a pencil sharpened and ready and do all of that within one minute. So, they practiced this during check ins. And there is a contingency here, it's not just

that he practices it and hope it happens. But, Carlos can earn a two for the be responsible expectation only when he's follow that procedure as well as the other relevant expectations.

[Slide 45 – Implement Adjustment 1 and Progress Monitor to Determine When to Make Next Adjustment to Intervention]: She's making changes to address the short comings in the dosage and alignment dimensions. She implements them and observes Carlos' data. You can see that it's hanging around a lot closer to that eighty percent point goal at this point. He earned it only twice but, he's much closer across days. However, Carlos' teacher noted that he refused to complete independent work in Language Arts multiple times and she's very concerned. Also, he received another office discipline referral for inappropriate commenting and verbal aggression when he refused to complete work.

[Slide 46 – Implement Adjustment 1 and Progress Monitor to Determine When to Make Next Adjust to Intervention]: Should Ms. Harper intensify the platform at this point? Yes or no? If yes, in what dimension? I think we'd say yes. Eighty percent, that were kind of hovering and I think we want to get that point percentage up.

[Slide 47 – Formulate an Adjustment to the IIP When the Rate of Progress is Inadequate]: At this point, Ms. Harper is going to look at the individualization dimension to inform changes to address the comprehensiveness dimension. So, this is about functional and behavioral assessment. That's our diagnostic assessment for behavior problems. So, now according to the rating form, Ms. Harper needs to consider whether the progress monitoring tool is aligned with the student's needs.

Well, progress monitoring is great for evaluating his response to Check-In Check-Out. But, the problem behaviors that the teacher is reporting is not really flagging on the Check-In Check-Out data. We need something better aligned.

[Slide 48 – Formulate an Adjustment to the IIP When the Rate of Progress is Inadequate]: So, his inappropriate commenting and other disruptive behaviors aren't really influencing his DPR data to the extent that it's going to be a sensitive measure. So, Ms. Harper and the teacher work together to define the target behavior and the teacher is going to record direct behavior ratings at the end of Language Arts each day. These ratings reflect the estimated percentage of time in which Carlos engaged in disruptive behavior during Language Arts class specifically. Ms. Harper also proceeds to conduct a basic FBA. She does interviews, collects ABC data as a record review.

[Slide 49 – Formulate an Adjustment to the IIP When the Rate of Progress is Inadequate]: This takes about two weeks. And during that period, she graphs the classroom teacher's DBR data. You can see here on this graph that the DBR data indicates that he was engaging in disruptive behavior for an average of about twenty-five percent of Language Arts class. That is a chunk, that is a problem. They also noted; Ms. Harper and the teacher noted that it's typically during independent work time and all of independent work time.

[Slide 50 – Formulate an Adjustment to the IIP When the Rate of Progress is Inadequate]: So, the outcomes of Ms. Harper's FBA included some ABC data indicating that Carlos often escaped work when he engaged in disruptive behavior and also received help from the teacher in

getting started on an assignment. Once he did, he was typically okay. Ms. Harper also learned from interviewing Carlos that he felt the work was overwhelming, the assignments were long, and he doesn't always know where to begin. And he often missed the teacher's explanation of what to do and didn't understand the instructions. In addition, she found that he just really wanted to listen to his music during breaks from hard work. That's helpful information for aligning the reward to his preferences and potentially function.

[Slide 51 – Formulate an Adjustment to the IIP When the Rate of Progress is Inadequate]:
So, the outcomes of the FBA also included the outcomes of a record review which just reminded Ms. Harper and the classroom teacher that his ADHD diagnosis and deficits in reading comprehension may have something to do with his difficulty working independently during Language Arts.

[Slide 52 – Formulate an Adjustment to the IIP When the Rate of Progress is Inadequate]:
So, the hypothesis statement that Ms. Harper comes to is that the outcome of the FBA is that when presented with independent work in Language Arts Carlos refuses to complete work, comments inappropriately to the teacher. To one, escape demands and two, to access help from the teacher.

[Slide 53 – Formulate an Adjustment to the IIP When the Rate of Progress is Inadequate]:
Now, Ms. Harper has the information that she needs to individualize Check-In Check-Out based on comprehensiveness and alignment dimensions.

[Slide 54 – Formulate an Adjustment to the IIP When the Rate of Progress is Inadequate]:
So, first she revisits the comprehensiveness dimension and thinks about a plan for teaching and practicing appropriate behaviors, adjusting antecedent conditions and minimizing reinforcement for problem behavior. She's not going to worry about punishment at this point. She needs to try some other things first.

[Slide 55 – Formulate an Adjustment to the IIP When the Rate of Progress is Inadequate]:
So, while Check-In Check-Out includes the morning check in and now the mid-day as times for facilitating practice. She knows more about what skill deficits need to be addressed and also, what rewards Carlos may need at the end of day check out.

[Slide 56 – Formulate and Adjustment to the IIP when the Rate of Progress is Inadequate]:
So, with the classroom teacher, Ms. Harper develops a procedure that the teacher will use to check Carlos' understanding before they begin a Language Arts assignment. That's an antecedent adjustment that's going to make sure that he knows how to get started. They're also going to help; Ms. Harper in particular is going to help Carlos practice asking for help by role playing during check ins. And that addresses a plan for teaching alignment with a student's skill deficit.

[Slide 57 – Formulate and Adjustment to the IIP When the Rate of Progress is Inadequate]:
She also decides to align rewards with his; the function of his problem behavior. Escape from work in particular and his preferences. By offering a five-minute music pass contingent on earning point goals. Of course, that can't just be all that they do. They have some stipulations on when he can use it. He has to finish his work in a subject before he may turn it in.

That's also going to help with work completion. Then to minimize reinforcement for problem behavior the teacher is going to provide a brief gestural prompt when she sees disruptive behavior. But otherwise, withhold her help until Carlos asks appropriately. Remember, this skill is also being taught by Ms. Harper.

[Slide 58 – Implement Adjustment 2 and Progress Monitor to Determine When to Make Next Adjustment to Intervention]: Alright so, during the next couple of weeks of implementation, Ms. Harper notices that his point data are looking really good. Should she intensify at this point? Yes or no? Well, it's kind of a trick question. Remember, that she has another measure for progress monitoring at this point and that one is more aligned. So, we need to take into account the daily point data and DBR data.

[Slide 59 – Implement Adjustment 2 and Progress Monitor to Determine When to Make Next Adjustment to Intervention]: So, here is Carlos' DBR data and you can see that disruptive behavior has really decreased across the couple of weeks that the intervention has been in place. That's good news. So, she and the classroom teacher are going to continue to collect DBR data and graph it and see what happens from here.

[Slide 60 – Implement Adjustment 2 and Progress Monitor to Determine When to Make Next Adjustment to Intervention]: But, at this point, what do you think? Should they intensify the platform? Yes or no? Well, looking at the disruption; the decrease in disruptive behavior and the increase in the point data no. They don't need to at this point.

[Slide 61 – Implement Adjustment 2 and Progress Monitor to Determine When to Make Next Adjustment to Intervention]: Carlos is doing really well. He hasn't received an ODR in a while. He's meeting his daily point goal. Disruptive behavior is minimal. He's requesting help appropriately but frequently and so that might me a new target for an Interventionist. Getting that to appropriate rates.

He's doing all of his work and Ms. Harper plans to continue to work with the teacher in the extent that they have been regarding addressing his reading comprehension skill deficit. But, they're going to go ahead and start fading support. So, start by raising the daily point goal maybe to about eighty-five percent. And then maybe up to ninety later. And they are going to continue to monitor progress and fade supports further as he is successful

[Slide 62 – Questions]: Okay, I apologize. That took me a little longer than projected. But, I'm happy to answer any questions.

Tessie Rose Bailey: No, that was great.

Joey Staubitz: Yeah

Tessie Rose Bailey: I do have just two questions. The first one is that you mentioned a lot of changes. How many changes should be considered at each time?

Joey Staubitz: That is such a good question and I think it depends on several factors. One and I think maybe the first is how obvious is it that one element of the intervention needs to change? So, on one hand we want to change as few things as possible to determine you know what are;

what's the most efficient version of the intervention. But, on the other hand if it's clear that the dosage is too low and also the rewards aren't aligned appropriately with the student's preferences then we want to hit those things at once. Because, we have; if we have a good feeling that the intervention is not going to work if we leave out one of those things. We can change more than one thing at one point.

Yeah and so also in the same vein, if you have diagnostic assessment data that indicate the need for multiple changes. I think multiple changes are justified.

Tessie Rose Bailey: Okay

Joey Staubitz: I hope that answers the question.

Tessie Rose Bailey: Where would you recommend that folks document the changes that were outlined?

Joey Staubitz: Oh, super question. So, in the rating form that you all have access to for this webinar. There are boxes to the right of each dimension. And that is where; and I believe we have a copy of the ratings form where those boxes are completed. And I am happy to share those with you Tessie for you to share those with everybody else.

Tessie Rose Bailey: Okay

Joey Staubitz: There is a space for intensification A and intensification B. And so, I would keep track of what changes I made in the box aligned with that dimension in the appropriate column. Did I do that in my first pass at intensification or my second pass?

Tessie Rose Bailey: Excellent and then just one last question. This has to do more with the logistical piece. So, at the beginning you demonstrated how you would rate a particular intervention. When do you recommend that teams or teachers do that? Is this something that they might do over the summer to have on hand when they go to match an intervention with a student? Or, should they do this just before they match with a student?

Joey Staubitz: That's such a cool idea. So, in this case study the Interventionist did it just when she was starting to think about supports for a student. But, I think that a school could potentially rate multiple intervention platforms in advance. And then, when someone is looking for it with a particular student they could look at different intervention's ratings forms. I think that's a good idea.

Tessie Rose Bailey: Great okay, so I'm going to ask that you keep control of the slides and if you'll move them, that would be great.

Joey Staubitz: That works.

Tessie Rose Bailey: So, I wanted to thank both you Doctor Staubitz and Wehby for such an informative presentation. I know that there has been a lot of buzz around the taxonomy and how to imbed it within DBI. And I think you guys did a great job of sort of demonstrating how you would intensify that for behavior interventions.

I do want to let folks know that after the webinar series, we will be posting a Q and A resource that includes a lot of the questions that you heard today as well as those collected over the other webinars as a part of this three-part series. So, if we weren't able to get to the question today, we will include it in that resource. And as with most of our webinars, you probably have more questions and you'll go back and you'll have questions that keep coming. I do want to let you know that there were several resources that were shared with you today that can support your learning. The first is the ratings scale; the rating form that Doctor Staubitz talked about and then you also had a handout in the handouts section that really defines the dimensions in a little bit more clarity.

So, if you have more questions about that, we also have on the NCII website just a short overview of the intervention; the dimensions within the taxonomy of intervention intensity. The full webinar from today will also be posted on the website and we've shared the link in the chat box. And I'll share it again.

[Slide 63 – Taxonomy and NCII Resources]: On the next slide there are a demonstrated number of other resources that we have available around the taxonomy. As I mentioned, we do webinars. We've had the Math and the Reading which are posted. But, we also have training series that are available that get into some considerations around both academics and behavior. And then specifically, a training module around designing intensive interventions with student with severe and persistent academic needs. And then as Doctor Wehby talked about in the beginning and was referred to during the case study on the next slide.

[Slide 64 – The NCII Tools Charts]: You'll see that we have a number of tools charts. But, here's an example of our intervention tools chart for behavior. We also have one for academics. And the academic one covers Reading, Math as well as Writing. And these charts provide reviews of the technical adequacy of the variety of the interventions that can help you in the ratings as you're looking at the strength of the intervention as well as some of the other dimensions.

I want to thank you for joining us today to learn more about applying the DBI process and including the taxonomy of intervention intensity. On the next slide.

[Slide 65 – National Center on Intensive Intervention]: If you'd like to stay connected with us, please check out the NCII website. You can also follow us on Twitter or You Tube. And I want to thank you all and have a great day.

Joe Wehby: Thank you

Joey Staubitz: Thank you

[End of Transcript]