Call for Submissions:
Behavior Screening and Progress Monitoring Tools

With funding from the Office of Special Education Programs, the National Center on Intensive Intervention (NCII) aims to build the knowledge and capacity of state and local leaders, faculty and professional development providers, educators, and other stakeholders to support implementation of intensive intervention for students with severe and persistent learning and/or social, emotional, or behavioral needs using data-based individualization (DBI). Rigorous research has shown that educating students with disabilities and other students who require intensive intervention because of persistent learning and/or behavioral problems begins with a validated instructional platform that is "personalized" using DBI. NCII believes that DBI is the engine that powers a dynamic, continuous interplay between assessment and intervention until each student demonstrates a satisfactory response.

The primary goals of this call for submissions are as follows:

- To solicit information about existing behavior screening and progress monitoring tools.

- To evaluate the quality of the evidence that demonstrates efficacy for these tools.

- To provide technical assistance to participating stakeholders for successful implementation of screening and progress monitoring tools.

NCII will share information about evidence-based behavior screening and progress monitoring assessments identified through this call with an array of partners, including state and local education agencies, institutions of higher education, technical assistance centers, professional development providers, parent centers, and relevant professional organizations.

This call for submissions is perpetually open, and vendors may submit at their convenience. There is no submission deadline.

Criteria for Reviewing Behavior Tools

Entities that develop evidence-based behavior screening and progress monitoring tools that match the following definitions and review criteria are invited to respond to this call. For detailed information on the review standards and rating criteria, see the Behavior Screening and Behavior Progress Monitoring Rating Rubrics and FAQs on our website at https://intensiveintervention.org/tools-charts/review-process.

Behavior Screening Tools Criteria

For this call, the NCII defines behavior screening as follows:

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

Submissions of evidence-based behavior screening tools must meet the following criteria:

- Documentation of the tool's effectiveness must be based on direct evidence,[1] not indirect evidence.

- The tool must have the following classification data:

  - specificity, sensitivity, negative predictive power, and positive predictive power or

  - area under the curve derived from a receiver operating characteristic curve analysis

- Evidence of classification accuracy must be available for at least one criterion and time of year for each grade span/informant combination undergoing review.

- Classification data analyses must include cut points that identify students in need of behavioral intervention (e.g., students exhibiting a moderate or high level of risk for the behavior of interest).

- The tool's outcome variable must focus on a social, emotional, or behavioral need.

- The tool must have at least 3 months between the screening and the outcome measure for classification accuracy and predictive analysis.

Behavior Progress Monitoring Tools Criteria

For this call, the NCII defines behavior progress monitoring as follows:

> The National Center on Intensive Intervention defines behavior progress monitoring as repeated measurement of student behavior 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, observations) or more fine-grained data available within the repeated measurement samples are used to decide the most productive

---

[1] Direct evidence refers to data from a study based on the tool submitted for evaluation. Studies that use data from another tool, even if it is similar, represent indirect evidence and will not be considered as adequate evidence for the purposes of this review.

strategies for altering intervention. The purpose of this progress monitoring is to design an individualized intervention that optimizes student outcomes.

Submissions of behavior progress monitoring tools must meet the following criteria:

- The measure must target social, emotional, and/or behavioral functioning.

- The measure must involve formative assessment (i.e., repeated administration), with the intended purpose of progress monitoring.

- The measure must include the monitoring of individual student behavior.

- Evidence supporting the reliability, validity, or feasibility of the measure under consideration must be direct evidence,[t] not indirect evidence.

- Evidence of reliability and validity must be available for each grade span/informant combination undergoing review.

NCII staff will review all submissions to ensure that these minimum criteria are met. Only submissions that meet all criteria will be assigned for review.

Special Note for First-Time Submissions

Typically, once a submission enters the review cycle (i.e., it meets the submission eligibility criteria), withdrawal from the review process is not permitted. This means that all eligible submissions will complete the review process, including having results posted on the NCII Tools Charts. There is no minimum rating, or quality of evidence, that a tool must meet for inclusion on the Tools Charts—beyond the submission eligibility criteria. **However, first-time submissions of behavior tools may withdraw their tools from the review 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.

Online Submission Portal

NCII now has an online submission portal to streamline the submission and review process. This customized platform allows submitters to provide data using a fillable, dynamic form. The online submission portal is at https://trcreview.intensiveintervention.org; submitters must create an account to use the new system. Instructions are embedded throughout the form, but submitters may direct questions about the new portal or the submission form to ToolsChartHelp@air.org.

Review Process

The Technical Review Committee (TRC) review process has four steps. For a detailed explanation, visit our website at https://intensiveintervention.org/tools-charts/review-process.

1. NCII staff will check all submissions for completeness. Required documentation must accompany the protocol before review consideration by the TRC.

2. All complete submissions will undergo a review process by the NCII's TRC of nationally renowned experts on behavior screening or progress monitoring. For further information about the committee members and their roles in the review process, please visit our website.

3. The review process includes two phases. Submitters will receive the initial results and comments after the first phase of review. If presented evidence is insufficient after the first phase, submitters may submit additional evidence or clarification. This additional information will be used to re-review and finalize the results during the second phase of review.

4. Final TRC decisions as to the technical adequacy of submitted tools will be disseminated through NCII to states, districts, schools, and NCII's partners for implementation.