

## **2018 Call for Submissions of Academic Screening Tools & Behavior Screening Tools**

The **National Center on Intensive Intervention** (NCII) is funded by the Office of Special Education Programs (OSEP) to build capacity of state and local education agencies, universities, practitioners, and other stakeholders to support implementation of intensive intervention in reading, mathematics, and behavior for students with severe and persistent learning and/or behavioral needs.

Rigorous research has shown that educating students with disabilities who require intensive intervention due to persistent learning and/or behavioral problems, whom teachers find among the hardest to teach, begins with a validated instruction platform that is “personalized” using data-based individualization (DBI). NCII believes that DBI is the engine that powers a dynamic, continuous interplay between assessment and intervention until the student demonstrates a satisfactory response.

Recent research has shown that universal screening can be used to identify which children will need the most intensive intervention. Children with the weakest initial skills who can be identified through fast-track screening methods can bypass Tier 2 instruction and move directly into intensive intervention. There is growing evidence that this early identification and provision of intensive intervention results in significantly stronger academic performance for those who move linearly through the tiers (Al Otaiba et al., 2014; Fuchs, Fuchs, & Compton, 2012). Therefore, information on valid and reliable screening instruments is essential for educators who are implementing intensive intervention. In addition, educators are increasingly looking for comprehensive assessment systems—inclusive of screening and progress monitoring tools—to use in their multi-tiered systems of support.

The primary goals of this call are:

- to solicit information about existing academic and behavior screening tools;
- to evaluate the quality of the evidence that demonstrates efficacy for these screening tools; and subsequently,
- to provide technical assistance to participating stakeholders for successful implementation of them.

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

The submission deadline for academic and behavior screening tools is **September 25, 2018**.

## Criteria for Review of Screening Tools

For the purposes of this call, the NCII defines screening as follows.

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

Evidence-based screening tools in accordance with this definition and meeting the specifications for academic screening tools and behavior screening tools that follow, are invited to respond to this call.

For detailed information on the review standards and rating criteria see the Academic Screening Rating Rubric or the Behavior Screening Rating Rubric on our website here: <http://www.intensiveintervention.org/tools-chart-review-process>.

### Academic Screening Tools Criteria

Submissions of evidence-based academic screening tools must meet the following criteria.

- Documentation of the tool's effectiveness must be based on direct evidence<sup>1</sup> rather than indirect evidence.
- The tool must have the following classification data: Specificity, sensitivity, positive predictive power, negative predictive power, and Area Under the Curve (AUC) derived from a Receiver Operating Characteristic (ROC) curve analysis.
- Classification data analyses must be conducted using cut points identifying students in need of intensive intervention (e.g., below 20th percentile on local or national norm).
- The tool's outcome variable must be a reading (for reading screeners) or math (for math screeners) measure.
- The tool must have at least three months between the screening and the outcome measure for classification accuracy and predictive analysis.

### Behavior Screening Tools Criteria

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

- Documentation of the tool's effectiveness must be based on direct evidence<sup>2</sup> rather than indirect evidence.
- The tool must have the following classification data:
  - Specificity, sensitivity, negative predictive power, positive predictive power, or

---

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

<sup>2</sup> Direct evidence refers to data from a study based on the tool submitted for evaluation. Studies that use data from the use of another tool, even if it is similar, are considered indirect evidence and will not be considered as adequate evidence for the purposes of this review.

- Area Under the Curve (AUC) derived from a Receiver Operating Characteristic (ROC) curve analysis.
- Classification data analyses must be conducted using cut points identifying students in need of intensive intervention (e.g., low risk contrasted with the highest level of risk on the measure).
- The tool's outcome variable must focus on a social, emotional, or behavioral need.
- The tool must have at least three months between the screening and the outcome measure for classification accuracy and predictive analysis.

## Directions for Submissions

1. Obtain a copy of the Standard Protocol for Evaluating Academic and Behavior Screening Tools form through the NCII website (<http://www.intensiveintervention.org/tools-chart-review-process>) or contact the NCII. Complete one protocol for each tool submission.

NCII staff will be available to assist as you prepare your submission packet and to answer any questions you may have ([ToolsChartHelp@air.org](mailto:ToolsChartHelp@air.org)).

2. The completed submission protocol must be submitted electronically as a Microsoft Word document. The remainder of the submission packet, which may include required documentation and any supplemental materials, can be submitted to the NCII by attaching to an email or providing on a USB flash drive or CD.

**File Formats:** The submission protocol must be submitted electronically as a Word document. Acceptable file formats for all other materials include Word, PDF, HTML, and text.

3. Submit application packet or make further inquiries to:

**Julia Casasanto-Ferro**

NCII Tools Chart Task Lead

American Institutes for Research

Phone: (781) 373-7002

Email: [JCasasanto-Ferro@air.org](mailto:JCasasanto-Ferro@air.org)

Alternate email: [ToolsChartHelp@air.org](mailto:ToolsChartHelp@air.org)

## Review Process

The TRC review process consists of the four steps below. For a detailed explanation, visit our website: <http://www.intensiveintervention.org/tools-chart-review-process>

1. All submissions will be checked for completeness by NCII staff. Required documentation must accompany the protocol in order to be reviewed by the TRC.
2. All complete submissions will undergo a review process by the Center's Technical Review Committee of nationally renowned experts on academic or behavior screening. For further information about the committee members and their roles in the review process, please visit our website.

3. The review process will be conducted in two phases. Submitters will be notified of initial results and comments after the first phase of review. If presented evidence is found to be insufficient after the first phase, submitters may submit additional evidence or clarification. This additional information will be used to re-review and finalize results during the second phase of review. **Once the review has begun, withdrawal will not be permitted.**
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.

## References

- Al Otaiba, S., Wagner, R. K., & Miller, B. (2014). “Waiting to fail” redux: Understanding inadequate response to intervention. *Learning Disability Quarterly*, 37(3) 129–133.
- Fuchs, D., Fuchs, L., & Compton, D. (2012). Smart RTI: A next-generation approach to multi-level prevention. *Exceptional Children*, 78(3), 263–279.