FORM 3.1

Sample Universal Screening Assessment Inventory to Be Completed for Each Content Area Screened

Content or Skill Area	Assessment Name	Cost of Measure	Time Required to Administer	Frequency of Administration	What Decision Is Made? (circle one)	Adequacy/Accuracy of Measure?
					• Initial or continued risk/screening • Instruction or intervention development or modification/formative • Intervention effects/progress monitoring • Program evaluation	
					• Initial or continued risk/screening • Instruction or intervention development or modification/formative • Intervention effects/progress monitoring • Program evaluation	
					• Initial or continued risk/screening • Instruction or intervention development or modification/formative • Intervention effects/progress monitoring • Program evaluation	

FORM 3.2

Checklist for Screening Data Interpretation

Check if true:	Screening Data May Be Used for Decision Making If the Following Conditions Are Met:
	Measure content is aligned with state standards and reflects a skill that students have been taught and must know how to do to benefit from upcoming instruction.
	Scores on measure are predictive of future performance.
	Measure yields reliable scores.
	Measure is brief and efficiently administered.
	Measure yields scores that are sensitive to changes in learning over time.
	Assessment inventory was completed to prevent overassessment.
	Procedures were used to ensure that data collection occurred accurately.
	Graphs were generated for classroom teachers showing each child's performance relative to other children in the same class and a risk benchmark criterion.
	All students participated in screening.
	Schoolwide, gradewide, and classwide patterns of performance were evaluated to identify whether schoolwide, gradewide, or classwide problems were present.

FORM 7.1

Intervention Troubleshooting Checklist

LEVEL 1: Troubleshoot Problem Definition and Data System	**Yes**	**No**
Were all students in the class screened using the same measure?		
Are data of sufficient quality to make decisions (i.e., sensitive to change, reliable, reflect the outcome desired)?		
Was the screening task aligned with instructional expectations according to the state standards?		
Are data available to verify that the screening was correctly conducted?		
Is the screening criterion efficient, accurate, and has it been correctly applied?		
Did teachers receive graphs of student performance by class and by grade?		
Does screening occur three times per year for all classes?		
Summary *If yes is marked in all rows, then the screening data may be used for decision making. Proceed to Level 2.*		
LEVEL 2: Troubleshoot Data Interpretation	**Yes**	**No**
Are at least 50% of students performing at or above the screening benchmark (i.e., is the class median score greater than the benchmark)? If not, there is a classwide learning problem.		
Do at least 50% of classes in each grade have class median scores that exceed the screening criterion? If not, there is a gradewide learning problem.		
Do at least 50% of grades in the school have classes with median scores that exceed the screening criterion? If not, there is a schoolwide learning problem.		
Have screening data been organized by poverty status, ethnicity, language status, and gender to verify proportionate numbers of students at risk and growth over time that closes any identified performance gaps?		
Summary *If yes is marked in all rows, then the data have been examined adequately to plan corrective actions at Tiers 1 and 2. Proceed to Level 3.*		

(continued)

Adapted from Witt, VanDerHeyden, and Gilbertson (2004) and VanDerHeyden and Burns (2010).

LEVEL 3: Troubleshoot Core and Supplemental Instruction	**Yes**	**No**
Does the teacher utilize lesson plans that provide for clear directions, guided practice, frequent opportunities to respond, and feedback?		
Are high-quality research-based curricular materials available to guide instruction?		
Do teachers follow an instructional calendar that specifies a timeline for mastering essential skills at each grade level?		
Are student data collected to verify mastery of essential skills?		
Is Tier 2 intervention sufficient to meet the needs of students who are not mastering essential skills?		
Does Tier 2 intervention involve more explicit instruction (modeling, frequent opportunities to respond, immediate corrective feedback, repetition loops, structured materials that are matched to student instructional level and gradually increased in difficulty as learning progresses)?		
Are student progress data collected weekly with criteria applied for exiting students from Tier 2 and adding new students who are struggling?		
Are fewer than 20% of screened students at risk on subsequent screenings?		
Summary *If yes is marked in all rows, then data are adequate to plan individual interventions at Tier 3. Proceed to Level 4.*		
LEVEL 4: Troubleshoot Intervention Integrity	**Yes**	**No**
• Intervention was developed based on student assessment.		
Was a functional academic assessment conducted to establish intervention targets and baseline level of performance?		
Was the intervention tested to verify that it produces improved learning when it is correctly used prior to installing it in the classroom?		
• Interventionist support and training was provided.		
Was the intervention developed to ensure that it required minimal classroom time and resources and fit within daily classroom routines?		
Has the teacher accepted and committed to conduct the intervention?		
Are materials (e.g., rewards, worksheets) readily available to the teacher?		
Was a step-by-step coach-card describing how to implement the intervention provided?		
Was the teacher shown how to implement the intervention by a “coach”?		
Did the coach observe implementation of the intervention to ensure that the teacher could use the intervention correctly and had all needed materials?		
Was weekly follow-up support provided to the teacher after initial training?		

(continued)

LEVEL 4: Troubleshoot Intervention Integrity *(continued)*	**Yes**	**No**
• Integrity of the intervention is monitored.		
Is integrity monitored via permanent products?		
Do permanent products accurately indicate intervention use?		
Are permanent products reviewed with the teacher?		
• Performance management is occurring.		
Are integrity data graphed?		
Are performance data graphed (replacement and problem behavior)?		
Has performance feedback been used?		
Is an administrator involved?		
• Is the intervention occurring daily as planned?		
Summary *If yes is marked in all rows, then the teacher has been adequately trained to use an intervention and intervention integrity is accurately assessed. If the intervention did not change the problem behavior, then proceed to Level 5.*		
LEVEL 5: Troubleshoot Intervention Design	**Yes**	**No**
Is the student making errors during the intervention? If so, has task difficulty been reduced?		
Have incentives been added and adjusted to support improved performance?		
Does the student need acquisition-type learning supports (e.g., more extensive demonstrations of correct and incorrect responding, guided practice with more elaborate feedback)?		
Does the student need fluency-building learning supports (e.g., more opportunities to respond, goal setting, incentives for more fluent performance each day)?		