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• FDLRS Multi-Disciplinary Centers (MDCs)
• Purpose of clinics is to function under an interdisciplinary framework to provide:
  – evaluations, consultations, and interventions for children and youth with the most complex behavioral, developmental, or learning problems
  – Parent support and education services to enhance child’s academic success
  – Consultation and TA to school/district personnel
  – Training/presentations for educators, community, and university students
First.....

• Five MDCs currently funded and housed in major universities
  – FSU—Louise R. Goldhagen MDC Evaluation & Consulting Center
    • http://mdc.fsu.edu/
  – UF—Multidisciplinary Diagnostic & Training Program
    • http://www.peds.ufl.edu/mdtp/
  – UF-Jacksonville—FDLRS-UF/JAX
    • http://www.hscj.ufl.edu/pediatrics/diagnostic-and-learning-resources/
  – UM—FDLRS-UM
    • http://www.fdlrs-um.miami.edu/
  – USF—Interdisciplinary Center for Evaluation and Intervention (ICEI)
    • http://icei.fmhi.usf.edu/
• For further information, contact clinic directors (flyers)
Objectives

• Participants will:
  – Describe the purpose of the Technical Adequacy evaluation tool
  – Apply a scoring rubric to case examples
  – Discuss further use of the evaluation in their settings
What do you picture when you think of the FBAs and BIPs in your district/school/setting?
Or.........
Context for FBAs/BIPs

• FBA/BIP—substantial evidence base
• Behavior ‘gold’ standard for nearly 20 years
• Systemic and skill issues impeding implementation
• Wealth of literature providing evidence-basis
  – BUT, does not address the contextual fit of FBA in school culture (Scott & Kamps, 2007)
    • Educators’ willingness and ability to engage in process
    • Level and intensity of FBA necessary to result in improvements
• Conceptually, FBA seen as tool for use in multi-tiered system of supports rather than separate process
  – If part of process, may change traditional definition of what and who is involved in FBA
Current Status of FBA/BIP Implementation in Schools (Scott & Kamps, 2007)

• Although FBA in special education law since 1997, no systematic policies adopted at federal level
• No guidance on key components (who should do FBAs, what features must be included, etc.)
• Three primary flaws in school-setting use (Scott, Liaupsin, Nelson, & McIntyre, 2005).
  – Often used as reactive process
    • Loses power of prevention in developing interventions addressing minor behaviors before they get serious
  – “Expert” model overlooks valuable input gained from persons with whom student consistently interacts
  – Rigid, rigorous procedures not feasible in public school settings
• In response, schools have “implemented a variety of inexact practices and procedures that have been loosely labeled as FBA, the majority of which are not tied to any solid evidence base. (Scott, Anderson, & Spaulding, 2008)
The Top Ten List of Things Needed at Tier 3/Individualized Behavior Supports (Iovannone & Kincaid, in review)

1. Multiple levels of Tier 3
2. Consistent, fluent process with problem solving-process framework
3. Collaborative teaming
4. Problem identification
5. Data collection, simplified
6. Linking hypothesis to the FBA and behavior interventions to hypothesis
The Top Ten List of Things Needed at Tier 3/Individualized Behavior Supports (Iovannone & Kincaid, in review)

7. Multi-component task-analyzed strategies behavior intervention plan matched to classroom context

8. Teacher and classroom coaching/support

9. Array of outcome measures (child-specific, teacher fidelity, social validity, alliance, fidelity of process, technical adequacy of products)

10. Maintenance (beyond “warranty”)
TECHNICAL ADEQUACY TOOL FOR EVALUATION (TATE)
Technical Adequacy Research

• Recent studies conducted exploring technical adequacy of FBAs
    • Evaluated FBAs/BIPs of 43 students in self-contained classrooms for EBD (K-12) in one school district in western US
    • Reviewed FBAs/BIPs for inclusion of essential components (listed in article)
    • Interviewed 6 EBD teachers about use of FBA/BIPs in planning and developing programs (e.g., “what is included on the plan?”, “How is plan implemented?” “How do you show progress?”
    • 71 completed FBA/BIPs submitted for review from school districts across midwest state
    • Rating scale developed for analysis (see article for scale)
Some Results of Technical Adequacy Research

• Teaming issues:
  – Teacher and other input not included

• Identifying behaviors
  – Target behaviors were missing or inadequately defined

• Match of FBA to Hypothesis
  – Attempt to assign one function/hypothesis to group of target behaviors (e.g., treated all behaviors as one behavior—collected data and developed interventions)
  – Hypothesis statements missing or inadequate

• Behavior intervention plan development
  – Behavior strategies not linked with hypothesis statement(s)
  – Predominant type of BIP “hierarchical stock list of possible positive and negative consequences” that follow any problem behavior.
  – Replacement behaviors not included
  – Van Acker—46% FBA/BIPs reviewed only included aversive strategies
Some Results of Technical Adequacy Research

• Follow-up
  – Lack of follow-up support for monitoring and evaluating plan including fidelity
  – No follow-through on next steps (promote and check maintenance and generalization of behavior change)

• Blood interviews with teachers
  – None was able to identify behavior goals nor describe behavior intervention
  – Did not use FBA/BIPs in development of behavior interventions
Purpose of Our Tool

• Determine the technical adequacy of FBA/BIPs and establish baseline and data for improvement
  – District
  – Campus/School
  – Individual

• Second step in requesting Tier 3 technical assistance from Florida PBS/RTI:B Project (Interview of Tier 3 process first step)

• Report generated to guide action planning
Other Uses

• Evaluating FBA/BIPs from students in districts having high reporting of restraint/seclusion incidents
• Provides data for DOE report to district
• Allows DOE and district to identify areas of improvement (if necessary)
Development of Tool

• Review of literature to identify essential components for adequate FBA/BIPs
• Original measure included 24 items (FBA/BIP)
• Edited to 20 items
• Sent out to three national experts (Terry Scott, Cindy Anderson, Glen Dunlap) to review
  – Is the item essential?
  – Is the item worded clearly?
• Final tool contains 18 items (9 FBA/9 BIP)
• Rubric provides scoring guidelines
• Scores range from 0-2 for each item.
Preliminary Psychometrics

• How reliable is the TATE?
  – Inter-rater reliability
    • FBA—82 percent agreement; Kappa coefficient = .81
    • BIP—87 percent agreement; Kappa coefficient = .89
  – Internal consistency (Pearson Product Moment Correlations)
    • FBA = .86*
    • BIP = .91*
    • Total = .88*

*p = 0.01
Outcomes (Preliminary)

• Pattern of performance similar to previous research
• FBA Items
  – Strengths (highest mean scores)
    • More than one source used for FBA
    • Identifying functions that are observable (e.g., escape/avoid; get/obtain)
  – Challenges (lowest mean scores)
    • Considering and identifying setting events
    • Identifying contexts in which problem behavior is absent
    • Identifying responses (consequences) that immediately follow problem behavior
Outcomes (Preliminary)

• BIP Items
  – Strengths
    • BIP completed in timely fashion after FBA
    • Hypothesis included or referenced on BIP
    • Crisis plan consideration (lack of detail)
  – Challenges
    • Interventions not linked to hypothesis
    • Interventions described in stock lists of strategies
    • Interventions to change responses to problem behaviors missing or not linked to function
    • Plans for evaluating fidelity of implementation missing
SAMPLE GRAPHS/TABLES GENERATED BY TOOL
Sample Graphs—Baseline/post FBA

FBA Subscale-Baseline

Post Training Year 1 FBA Percentages by School Psychologist
Sample Graphs BIP Baseline/Post

**BIP Subscale-Baseline**

**Post-training Year 1 BIP Percentage by School Psychologist**
Sample Graph: Total FBA/BIP Baseline/Post
### Table 1. Overall Mean Scores FBA/BIP Baseline Evaluation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Mean Raw Score (max = 2.0)</th>
<th>Standard Deviation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>FBA (N = 14)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 1-Sources of FBA</td>
<td>.93</td>
<td>.48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 2-Operational Definition</td>
<td>.93</td>
<td>.92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 3-Baseline Data</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>.39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 4-Setting Events</td>
<td>.43</td>
<td>.51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 5-Antecedents/problem behavior</td>
<td>1.43</td>
<td>.51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 6-Antecedents/appropriate behavior</td>
<td>1.21</td>
<td>.43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 7-Consequences</td>
<td>1.50</td>
<td>.52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 8-Hypothesis components</td>
<td>1.07</td>
<td>.73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 9-Function research identified</td>
<td>1.30</td>
<td>.73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BIP (N = 13)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 1-Timeline between FBA/BIP</td>
<td>1.54</td>
<td>.78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 2-FBA hypothesis referenced</td>
<td>.38</td>
<td>.77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 3-Prevention strategy/link</td>
<td>.77</td>
<td>.44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 4-Replacement behavior strategy/link</td>
<td>.54</td>
<td>.52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 5-Reinforce new behavior strategy/link</td>
<td>.23</td>
<td>.44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 6-Discontinue reinforing problem behavior</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 7-Crisis plan need considered</td>
<td>.23</td>
<td>.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 8-Monitoring/evaluating data plan</td>
<td>.23</td>
<td>.44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 9-Fidelity/support plan</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>.28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Scales</strong></td>
<td><strong>Mean Percentage</strong></td>
<td><strong>Standard Deviation</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FBA subscale</td>
<td>.55</td>
<td>.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BIP subscale</td>
<td>.22</td>
<td>.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Score</td>
<td>.38</td>
<td>.11</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Table 1. Overall Mean Scores FBA/BIP Post-Training Evaluation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Mean Raw Score (max = 2.0)</th>
<th>Standard Deviation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>FBA (N = 7)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 1-Sources of FBA</td>
<td>1.57</td>
<td>.79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 2-Operational Definition</td>
<td>1.71</td>
<td>.76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 3-Baseline Data</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 4-Setting Events</td>
<td>.43</td>
<td>.79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 5-Antecedents/problem behavior</td>
<td>1.57</td>
<td>.79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 6-Antecedents/appropriate behavior</td>
<td>1.57</td>
<td>.79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 7-Consequences</td>
<td>1.43</td>
<td>.98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 8-Hypothesis components</td>
<td>1.71</td>
<td>.49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 9-Function research identified</td>
<td>1.86</td>
<td>.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BIP (N = 7)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 1-Timeline between FBA/BIP</td>
<td>1.43</td>
<td>.98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 2-FBA hypothesis referenced</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 3-Prevention strategy/link</td>
<td>1.43</td>
<td>.79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 4-Replacement behavior strategy/link</td>
<td>1.43</td>
<td>.79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 5-Reinforce new behavior strategy/link</td>
<td>1.14</td>
<td>.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 6-Discontinue reinforing problem behavior</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 7-Crisis plan need considered</td>
<td>.29</td>
<td>.76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 8-Monitoring/evaluating data plan</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 9-Fidelity/support plan</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Scales</strong></td>
<td><strong>Mean Percentage</strong></td>
<td><strong>Standard Deviation</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FBA subscale</td>
<td>77%</td>
<td>.22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BIP subscale</td>
<td>48%</td>
<td>.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Score</td>
<td>62%</td>
<td>.20</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Sample Tables: Baseline/Post comparison

Table 2. Change in Mean Scores from Baseline to Post-training

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Mean Score Pre/Post</th>
<th>Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>FBA (N = 14/7)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 1-Sources of FBA</td>
<td>.93/1.57</td>
<td>+.54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 2-Operational Definition</td>
<td>.93/1.71</td>
<td>+.78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 3-Baseline Data</td>
<td>1.00/2.00</td>
<td>+1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 4-Setting Events</td>
<td>.43/.43</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 5-Antecedents/problem behavior</td>
<td>1.43/1.57</td>
<td>+.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 6-Antecedents/appropriate behavior</td>
<td>1.21/1.57</td>
<td>+.36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 7-Consequences</td>
<td>1.50/1.43</td>
<td>-.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 8-Hypothesis components</td>
<td>1.07/1.71</td>
<td>+.64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 9-Function research identified</td>
<td>1.30/1.86</td>
<td>+.56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BIP (N = 13/7)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 1-Timeline between FBA/BIP</td>
<td>1.54/1.43</td>
<td>-.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 2-FBA hypothesis referenced</td>
<td>.38/1.00</td>
<td>+.62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 3-Prevention strategy/link</td>
<td>.77/1.43</td>
<td>+.66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 4-Replacement behavior strategy/link</td>
<td>.54/1.43</td>
<td>+.89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 5-Reinforce new behavior strategy/link</td>
<td>.23/1.14</td>
<td>+.91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 6-Discontinue reinforcing problem behavior</td>
<td>.00/1.00</td>
<td>+1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 7-Crisis plan need considered</td>
<td>.23/.29</td>
<td>+.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 8-Monitoring/evaluating data plan</td>
<td>.23/1.00</td>
<td>+.77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 9-Fidelity/support plan</td>
<td>.08/.00</td>
<td>-.08</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TOTAL SCALES</th>
<th>Mean Percentage</th>
<th>Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>FBA subscale</td>
<td>55%/77%</td>
<td>+22%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BIP subscale</td>
<td>22%/48%</td>
<td>+26%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Score</td>
<td>38%/62%</td>
<td>+34%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Sample Report

• Report to Department of Education
PRACTICE TIME
Before practicing....

- Review of tool items
  - Evaluation
  - Scoring guide
Scoring Tips

• Use rubric examples to guide your scoring
  – Match your item with the closest example given on rubric

• If uncertain of score, decide on one of two strategies:
  – Always give credit for the higher score OR
  – Alternate scoring-first time, give credit for higher score, second time-give credit for lower score
Practice Time

• Team up with others
• Try scoring the sample completed FBA/BIP given to you with the evaluation tool
• Come to consensus on the scores
• Debrief
  – What did you like?
  – What did you dislike?
  – What was easy?
  – What was difficult?
  – What questions do you still have?
PTR and PTR Related Publications

• PTR Manual

• Journal Articles
Questions?
Unattended Children Will Be Given Espresso And A Puppy

and

A DRUM

And taught to SWEAR