

## Functional Behavior Assessment/Behavior Intervention Plan Technical Adequacy Evaluation Tool-(TATE) Scoring Guide

Component	0 – Not Addressed	1 – Partially Addressed	2- Completely Addressed
<b>Part 1: Functional Behavior Assessment (Data Gathering and Hypothesis Development)</b>			
<p>1. Input is collected from multiple people/sources to complete the functional behavior assessment.</p> <p><b>*Note: If the FBA/BIP indicates that a brief process was used in alignment with a problem-solving meeting (e.g., PTR-Brief, ERASE) and at least two people were participants in the meeting, score this item as a 2.</b></p>	<p>Unable to determine if input was collected from multiple people/sources OR FBA indicates that input was only gathered from one source.</p>	<p>Vague indication that input was collected from more than one person/source; details missing</p> <p><b>Example:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Checklist or list of names of people who participated in the FBA but no explanation of how they participated.</li> </ul>	<p>Clear documentation that input was collected from more than one source with supporting details or the FBA/BIP used a brief process aligned with a problem-solving format (e.g., PTR-Brief, ERASE) and indicated that at least 2 people participated in the meeting.</p> <p><b>Examples:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Direct observation AND teacher/parent rating scales indicated or checked.</li> <li>Statements such as, "The teacher(s) and the parent(s) were interviewed."</li> </ul>
<p>2. Problem behavior(s) are identified and operationally defined (easily observable and measurable). If more than one behavior is identified, it is clear which behavior(s) are/will be the focus of the FBA.</p> <p><b>*Note: There needs to be a link between the behavior identified as the problem, the definition, and the behavior listed in the hypothesis to get full credit for this item.</b></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No problem behavior(s) are identified OR</li> <li>Problem behaviors are identified and may be defined, but none of the behaviors identified is the focus of the FBA.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Behaviors are <b>identified</b> but definitions are ambiguous or subjective and do not provide enough information so that a person who is unfamiliar with the student would agree, upon observation, that the behavior identified has started and stopped. OR</li> <li>Behavior definitions are identified and defined in "dead man" terminology (i.e., a dead person could perform the behaviors).OR</li> <li>Problem behavior(s) are checked from a stock or dropdown list with no further definitions. OR</li> <li>Definition of target behavior includes a list of multiple problem behavior names or multiple unique behaviors</li> </ul> <p><b>Examples:</b></p> <p>Ambiguous/subjective examples</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Talks to peers</li> </ul> <p>Problem behaviors selected from list:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Expressing anger</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>ALL identified problem behaviors are operationally defined (observable and measurable; can be seen, heard, counted), AND</li> <li>If more than one behavior is identified, it is clear which behavior(s) are the focus of the assessment</li> </ul> <p><b>*Note: If the FBA only identifies one problem behavior the problem behavior is clearly defined and is the focus of the FBA, score '2'.</b></p> <p><b>*Note: There may not be a clear statement that indicates the behaviors that will be the focus of the FBA. If the antecedents, functions, and hypothesis in questions 4 through 8 clearly identify the behavior(s) of concern, the criterion has been met.</b></p> <p><b>*Note: Behaviors do not need to be broken down into discrete units (e.g., pushes until other person is moved 1.5 meters/inches), but behaviors are defined so that anyone can</b></p>

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Hostility</li> <li>• Off-task</li> <li>• Defiant</li> <li>• Non-compliant</li> </ul> <p>“Dead-man” description</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Not starting work</li> <li>• Sits and does not work</li> </ul> <p>List of multiple problem behaviors or grouping of unique behaviors under one category/class or vague overall title or one function</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Inappropriate behaviors including pouting, crying, cursing, throwing objects at peers and staff; hitting, kicking pushing, leaving assigned area, &amp; verbally threatening staff with bodily harm and property destruction</li> </ul>	<p>determine when the behavior starts and stops.</p> <p><b>Examples</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Talks to peers without permission during independent work assignments</li> <li>• Disruption is defined as “hitting, kicking, and punching”</li> <li>• Inappropriate behavior definition: Student shouts negative comments to adults and peers which can escalate to (a) cussing at peers/adults, (b) throwing objects toward peers/adults; (c) getting up from assigned area and leaving the room while shouting out verbal threats.</li> <li>• Shouts out curse words at the teacher</li> <li>• Off task is defined as “playing with pencil, looking around the room, etc.”</li> <li>• Not starting work is defined as “looks around the room at peers, talks to peers sitting close to student about topics unrelated to task, or turns head toward window and remains in position for several minutes.”</li> </ul>
<p>3. Baseline data on the problem behaviors are collected and detailed or summarized. The data are in addition to office discipline referrals (ODRs), in-school suspension (ISS), and/or out of school suspension (OSS) data.</p> <p><i>*note—the analysis does not need to be at a level a board certified behavior analysis would provide. It should include a summary of all the data that allows a team to determine how behavior occurred over the time period data were collected (e.g., statements such as 4 times a day on average, 10 times a week)</i></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Unable to determine from FBA information if baseline data were collected in addition to school-wide sources (i.e. ODR, ISS, OSS), OR</li> <li>• Baseline data were collected on a behavior other than the one that is the focus of the FBA. OR</li> <li>• Data presented on targets that are not specific behaviors</li> </ul> <p><b>Example:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Data presented are on number of time-outs, restraints, or duration of time-outs rather than data on the occurrence of targeted problem behavior.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Baseline data collected on a target behavior but omits at least one of the 4 essential details (e.g., method/format, time period data collected, specific target behavior on which data were collected, analysis of data). OR</li> <li>• Baseline data include all of the essential components but the time period of data collection ended more than 30 days prior to FBA date.</li> </ul> <p><b>Examples:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Daily; Weekly; Monthly boxes checked from a list of options for data collection, etc. but no indication of the format data were collected, time period, or analysis.</li> <li>• Baseline data summary is provided for target behavior January – April 2014 but</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Baseline data collected on the specific behavior and description addresses the 4 essential details: (a) target behavior on which data were collected; (b) method/format (e.g., frequency, rating scale/DBR, ABC, duration, etc.), (c) the time period of the data collection (e.g., dates, statement such as “data collected over last 2 weeks), and (d) analysis of outcomes (e.g., average of 4 times a week). Data collected should be within 30 days of the FBA. Data may be provided in graphic, check box, or narrative format.</li> </ul> <p><b>Example:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Frequency data box checked, dates-9/01/10-9/05/10, hitting averages</li> </ul>

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Baseline data outcomes reported on “hitting” but target behavior for FBA is “cursing”.</li> </ul>	the current FBA date is October 3, 2014.	<p>3 times a week, and hitting was the problem behavior targeted.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>“Data collected over the last 3 weeks show that Jack curses 3-5 times a day.” (‘times’ indicates frequency format).</li> </ul>
<p>4. Setting events (i.e., slow triggers; antecedent events that provide the context or “set the stage” for a higher likelihood of problem behavior) are considered, identified (if present) and the contingency to the problem behavior is described.  <i>*Note: If the FBA identifies setting events, the hypothesis (item 8) should include the identified setting event(s).</i></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Unable to determine based on available FBA information. No indication setting events were considered in relation to the problem behavior, OR</li> <li>Events listed are not setting events (e.g., immediate triggers or antecedents, physical locations)</li> <li>Events listed are permanent facts or situations (e.g., has ADHD, takes medication)</li> </ul> <p><b>Example:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Immediate antecedents such as “teacher gives a non-preferred task”</li> <li>“Classroom” listed as the antecedent</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>At least one potential setting event is identified, but fails to provide information on how the setting event predicts occurrence of the problem behavior OR</li> <li>A setting event is identified and relation between the event and behavior are described but the hypothesis (item 8) does not include the setting event.</li> </ul> <p><b>Example:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>‘flickering lights’ is listed as a setting event but no further explanation is given.</li> <li>States “missing medication” as a setting event with no further details on the pattern of missing medication impact on problem behavior performance.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>At least one setting event is identified, the relation or pattern to problem behavior occurrence is described</li> <li>Data clearly indicate no setting events exist.</li> <li>Note: It is not necessary for the setting event to be included in the hypothesis or to have an intervention developed to address it. Given that we are unable to determine, through a review of a product, the discussion the team had on the strength of the setting event to the problem behavior occurrence, the team may decide to concentrate on the immediate antecedent instead.</li> </ul> <p><b>Example:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Sleep deprivation is checked with further details providing confirmation of a <b>pattern</b>—“When Jordan doesn’t get enough sleep and he is asked to do non-preferred tasks, the problem behavior happens more frequently.”</li> </ul>
<p>5. Antecedent events (immediate trigger) that precede and predict the occurrence of problem behavior are identified and specified.  <i>*Note: A 0 on this item will prevent giving a score of 2 on item 8.</i></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No antecedent event most likely to trigger or predict the occurrence of problem behavior is identified, OR</li> <li>Antecedent events listed would not be considered antecedents or are written in a way that is non-observable.</li> </ul> <p><b>Examples:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>“Student gets upset.”</li> <li>“Joe slowly rocks in his seat and taps his head”.</li> <li>“There is no clear trigger.”</li> <li>“Behavior happens throughout the day”</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>At least one antecedent event most likely to trigger or predict problem behavior is identified (written or through a checklist/drop-down menu), but lacks the detail to generate an intervention, OR</li> <li>Multiple behaviors are identified in Item 2 but no clear indication of which specific antecedent events predict specific behavior(s).</li> </ul> <p><b>Examples:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>‘Transition’ is checked from a drop-down list, but no further detail</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>One or more antecedent events most likely to trigger or predict problem behavior are identified and includes enough detail or description to generate an intervention, AND</li> <li>If more than one target behavior is listed, includes a clear description of which antecedent events predict each target behavior.</li> </ul> <p><b>Examples:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>“Teacher demand to complete <b>written</b> assignments”</li> <li>Antecedent events for behavior 1 (fighting)—‘peers make teasing</li> </ul>

		<p>given on the type of transitions that trigger behaviors.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• “Teacher demands” or “non-preferred activities” listed, but is lacking details such as the type of teacher demands or the tasks involved in the demands or the specific activities that are non-preferred, etc.</li> <li>• Three behaviors were targeted for the FBA—“yelling out”, “incompletion of tasks, teasing peers” and antecedents identified—difficult tasks, chaotic environments, new tasks, transitions from preferred to non-preferred, but no indication of which antecedents trigger which behaviors.</li> </ul>	<p>comments during independent work time’ Antecedents for behavior 2 (cussing)—‘teacher presents demand to do a <b>non-preferred</b> task such as academic related work’</p>
<p>6. Antecedent events in which problem behavior is least likely to occur (or appropriate behavior is more likely to occur) are identified and specified. <i>*Note: This item is determining whether the FBA identified the context in which there is an ABSENCE of the problem behavior.</i></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• No antecedent events most likely to trigger or predict the occurrence of appropriate behavior or absence of problem behavior are identified OR</li> <li>• Antecedent events listed would not be considered antecedents or are not written in a way that would be observable</li> </ul> <p><b>Examples:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• When student is not frustrated</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• At least one antecedent event in which problem behavior is least likely to occur or appropriate behavior is more likely to occur is identified but lacks detail.</li> </ul> <p><b>Examples:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• “Specials” is written or checked but no further detail is provided.</li> <li>• “Engaged in preferred activities (but no further description of preferred activities).</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• One or more antecedent events in which problem behavior is least likely to occur or appropriate or pro-social behavior is most likely to occur identified, and includes some detail or descriptor.</li> </ul> <p><b>Examples:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• When given hands-on activities to complete like Art</li> <li>• When allowed to work with a partner to complete a written assignment;</li> <li>• When doing preferred activities such as recess outside.</li> </ul>
<p>7. Consequences (i.e., how others respond immediately after problem behavior occurs) are identified. <i>*Note: A 0 on this item will prevent giving a score of 2 on items 8 and 9. The hypothesized function cannot be linked back to the FBA data due to not knowing the responses following problem behavior.</i></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• No events or consequences identified that occur immediately after problem behavior, OR</li> <li>• The events listed are not <b>immediate</b> consequences, OR</li> <li>• Consequences listed are long-term or are inferential emotional states of target student OR</li> <li>• The consequences indicated are functions of behavior (e.g., <i>escapes</i>, <i>attention</i>) with no listing of actual responses following</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• At least one consequence identified that occurs immediately after problem behavior, but lacks details OR</li> <li>• Multiple target behaviors identified but no clear indication of which consequences follow specific target behaviors.</li> </ul> <p><b>Example:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• ‘Proximity’ is identified as a consequence but no further descriptive detail</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• One or more consequences identified that occur immediately after problem behavior and includes some detail or descriptor, AND</li> <li>• If more than one target behavior is listed, clear description of the consequences that follow each target behavior is provided.</li> </ul> <p><b>Example:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Teacher moves next to the student (decreases proximal distance)</li> </ul>

	<p>problem behavior that could confirm the function</p> <p><b>Examples:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Token economy (not a consequence)</li> <li>• “Student loses self-worth and sense of accomplishment.”</li> <li>• Failing grades</li> <li>• “Increased stress and feeling overwhelmed”</li> <li>• “teacher attention” but does not describe the nature of the attention (e.g., redirects, reprimands, calming/soothing)</li> <li>• “Escapes non-preferred activity” but does not describe the nature of the escape (e.g., task is removed, student is sent to time out or the office)</li> <li>• Automatic access/escape (no further details explaining how the student gets automatic access or automatic escape.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• “Removed”-(lacks details)</li> <li>• Two target behaviors were identified-Hitting and Off-Task. Consequences were identified as “verbal redirect”, “sent to time-out”, “takes points away” “peers make comments” with no indication which responses followed which of the two target behaviors.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• sent to the Guidance Counselor</li> <li>• verbal reprimand</li> <li>• redirects the student,</li> <li>• peers laugh</li> <li>• peers make comments to the student,</li> <li>• PB1: Hitting-takes points away, sends to office; PB2 Off Task: verbally redirects, peers make comments</li> </ul>
<p>8. An identifiable hypothesis or summary statement is present and includes three essential components (i.e., antecedent events, behavior, function that are linked to the antecedent events and consequences listed gathered in the FBA.</p> <p><i>*Note: Score of 0 on this question results in a score of 0 on item 9.</i></p> <p><i>*Note: Score of 0 on this question results in a score of 0 on Items 12, 13, 14 and 15.</i></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• No identifiable hypothesis statement is included on the FBA, OR</li> <li>• A hypothesis statement is written but only has <u>one</u> component linked to the FBA data</li> <li>• A hypothesis statement is written but none of the 3 components is linked to the FBA data.</li> <li>• <u>A hypothesis statement is written with all 3 components, the antecedent and the consequences are linked to the FBA, but the behavior in the hypothesis is not the behavior that was the focus of the FBA for which data were gathered and <u>no explanation of why the target behavior changed is provided.</u></u></li> </ul> <p><i>*Note: Some school districts use the term “theory of behavior” rather than “hypothesis”. If the Theory is found in one complete statement, score this as the hypothesis.</i></p> <p><b>Example:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Hypothesis reads: “When Joe is presented with a teacher demand to do an</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Hypothesis written in an easily identifiable statement within the FBA but only has TWO of the three components linked to the FBA data.</li> </ul> <p><b>Example:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• When student is frustrated, he displays aggressive behavior to avoid doing work.(2 components present—behavior and function and are linked to FBA data; antecedent is not an antecedent)</li> <li>• When student is presented with a demand to do non-preferred tasks, he displays aggressive behavior because he is frustrated. (2 components present and linked-antecedent and behavior; function is not valid or linked).</li> <li>• When student is presented with a demand to do non-preferred tasks, he displays aggressive behavior to avoid doing work. (FBA data did not indicate demands as an antecedent).</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Easily identifiable hypothesis written in one complete statement in the FBA, contains all three of the essential components, the behavior listed in the hypothesis is the same one identified as the focus of the FBA and all three components are linked to the FBA data.</li> </ul> <p><b>Examples of a Complete Hypothesis:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• When the student is given lengthy (one page or more) writing assignment (antecedent), s/he will rip the assignment into pieces and throw it on the floor (description of problem behavior that is the same one identified as the focus of the FBA). As a result, the student is able to avoid completing the task. (function of behavior).</li> <li>• The student shows aggressive behavior when he is given a non-preferred task (e.g., academic tasks that are perceived difficult) which gets him an escape from the task.</li> </ul>

	<p>independent math task that involves a worksheet, he will engage in a tantrum. As a result, he delays/avoids doing the task". The behavior identified and defined as the focus of the FBA was "Off-task: looks around the room, plays with materials on his desk, talks out to peers nearby, puts head down on desk."</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Hypothesis reads: "When Susan has difficulty staying in her area, she will leave the area to talk with another student to avoid the non-preferred activity." <i>(The antecedent is not an actual antecedent and the FBA provided "teacher demand" as an antecedent. The function is escape but the FBA did not provide any data on the responses others make following student problem behavior that would provide support for an 'escape' function. The only component that is included is the behavior</i></li> <li>• The theory of behavior is primarily to get adult attention. <i>(the attention function is linked to the FBA data, but is missing the antecedent and behavior components).</i></li> </ul>		
<p>9. Function of behavior is one identified in research literature, provides specificity, and is linked to the FBA data (i.e., items 5-8).</p> <p><i>*Note: Valid functions are positive reinforcement (access/obtain) or negative reinforcement (escape/avoid) and are observable</i></p> <p><i>*Note: Score of 0 on this question results in a score of 0 on Items 13, 14, and 15.</i></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• No function identified, OR</li> <li>• No identifiable hypothesis, OR</li> <li>• The function is not identified in research literature</li> </ul> <p><b>Examples</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Function is listed as revenge, vengeance, control, power, status, frustration, autism, etc.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Function is present, and is identified in research literature but is not linked to FBA data</li> </ul> <p><b>Example:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Function is 'attention from peer' but no FBA data indicate that problem behavior consequences result in peer attention.</li> <li>• Function is "escape from task" but FBA consequence data indicate that peers laugh and teacher provides verbal support.</li> </ul>	<p>Function is present, is identified in research literature, and is linked to FBA data.</p> <p><i>*Note: If the hypothesis lists multiple functions, <b>at least one of the functions</b> is valid and linked to FBA data.</i></p> <p><b>Example:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Function is 'attention from peers' and FBA data indicate that problem behavior consequences result in peer laughter, comments.</li> </ul>

Part II: Behavior Intervention Plan			
<p>10. Behavior plan is developed in a timely manner (e.g., within 30 days) upon completion of the FBA.</p> <p><i>*Note: If the BIP being reviewed is an update to a previous FBA/BIP, to score a 2 the team must describe how they determined that the FBA information collected at a much earlier date is still accurate or provide a description of the FBA data they updated to confirm that the original hypothesis is still valid.</i></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No dates included on FBA and BIP to determine time span between development, OR</li> <li>BIP developed <math>\geq 60</math> days after FBA was completed, OR</li> <li>BIP date occurs prior to the FBA date OR</li> <li>BIP is an update to an earlier FBA/BIP and no description on how the original or preceding FBA hypothesis was confirmed for the updated BIP.</li> </ul>	<p>BIP developed <math>&gt;30</math> days but less than 60 days after FBA was completed based on dates provided on documents.</p>	<p>BIP developed <math>\leq 30</math> days after FBA was completed based on dates provided on documents.</p> <p><b>Examples:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Dates clearly visible on both the FBA and BIP; OR</li> <li>There is only one date on the document and it is clear that the FBA and BIP were developed at the same time (i.e. FBA/BIP occurred during one team meeting or report is a seamless narrative summary).</li> </ul>
<p>11. Hypothesis developed from the FBA is included or referenced on the behavior plan.</p> <p><i>*Note: Score of 0 on 8 results in a score of 0 on this item.</i></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No hypothesis is included or referenced on behavior intervention plan, OR</li> <li>A hypothesis is included but is substantially different from the one included on the FBA (in all 3 components).with no explanation about the change. OR</li> <li>The form is a continuous document; however, the BIP targets a different problem behavior than the one included in the FBA hypothesis (item 8).</li> </ul> <p><b>Example:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The behaviors identified in the FBA hypothesis, item 8, were “cursing, disrespect, and arguing”. The behavior identified as the target problem behavior on the BIP was “physical aggression”.</li> </ul>	<p>Hypothesis is included or referenced on the behavior intervention plan and is similar to the one on the FBA (one or two components match), but not identical.</p> <p><b>Example:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The hypothesis on the FBA was “when presented with a demand to do non-preferred difficult writing tasks, the student engages in cursing to avoid doing the demand.” The hypothesis on the BIP was “when presented with academic demands, the student engages in cursing to escape.”</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Hypothesis is included on the behavior intervention plan and is identical in all 3 components to the one on the FBA, OR</li> <li>The BIP references the FBA hypothesis, OR</li> <li>The BIP and FBA appear to be part of the same document (e.g., stapled together, page numbers are continuous; form numbers are sequential)</li> </ul> <p><b>Example:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The form is called FBA/BIP, the numbers are sequential, and there was no observable change in any of the hypothesis components throughout the document.</li> </ul>
<p>12. A minimum of one strategy that directly addresses and modifies antecedent events listed in the “when” component of the FBA hypothesis (item 8) is identified and described in enough detail for implementation.</p> <p><i>*Note: Score of 0 on Item 8 results in a score of 0 on this item.</i></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No antecedent identified in the hypothesis, OR</li> <li>No direct link exists between antecedent strategies identified and hypothesis, OR</li> <li>Strategies would not be considered antecedent strategies (e.g., teaching or consequential strategies rather than modifying antecedent events)</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>At least one antecedent strategy is identified and directly linked to the antecedent component of the hypothesis, but does not include enough detail about the intervention procedures that would allow another person to do the intervention correctly and completely</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>At least one antecedent strategy is identified, is clearly and directly linked to FBA hypothesis, both to the antecedent and the function, and includes enough detail describing the intervention so that it can be implemented (e.g., who is doing the intervention, when, related to the antecedent, the strategy is implemented</li> </ul>

<p><i>*Note: If the hypothesis (item 8) did not include the antecedents, but the BIP lists antecedent/prevention strategies that address the events listed in Items 4 or 5, score this item.</i></p>	<p><i>*Note: If the hypothesis (item 8) did not include the antecedents, but the BIP lists antecedent/prevention strategies that address the events listed in Items 4 or 5, score this item</i></p> <p><b>Examples:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• “transition supports” identified as antecedent strategy but FBA hypothesis does not identify transitions as an antecedent.</li> <li>• “Provide choice of reinforcement to be earned” is identified as an antecedent strategy but as described, does not directly modify the antecedent or event that triggers the problem behavior. Instead, it provides a description of how to select a reinforcement nor does it provide enough detail about reinforcement choices to determine if any provide the function that the problem behavior gets for the student.</li> </ul>	<p><b>Examples:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Boxes with names of antecedent strategies checked but no additional details are offered.</li> <li>• Antecedent strategy identified and some details are provided, but essential details are missing for implementation (e.g., when to do the intervention, how to present it to the student, etc.)</li> <li>• Teach Joe to complete work first and then get reinforcement by saying “First do social studies, then get free time”. (the “when part” is vague—the description does not specify when the intervention is to be implemented in relation to the antecedent event listed on the hypothesis.</li> </ul>	<p>and how-including verbal and motor behaviors of <b>the adult</b>). The description is detailed enough that a stranger would be able implement the strategy with the student and/or multiple people would implement the strategy in the same way. The description should clearly describe the strategy as preventative; that is, the intervention is implemented <b>prior</b> to student performance of problem behavior.</p> <p><b>Example:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Immediately prior to presenting a demand to do a non-preferred task (<i>antecedent listed on hypothesis</i>), the teacher will verbally present two choices to Jack. The choices will be which tool to use for writing (e.g., pen or pencil, red pen or blue pen) and/or where to do the task (e.g., desk or round table; in classroom or with Ms. Cool—co-teacher)</li> </ul>
<p>13. A minimum of one socially valid replacement behavior that will be taught to the student is identified, linked to the FBA hypothesis (item 8), and described in enough detail for implementation.</p> <p><i>*Note: <sup>a</sup>Score of 0 on item 8 and 9 results in a score of 0 on this item.</i></p> <p><i>*Note: <sup>b</sup>Score of 0 on this item results in a score of 0 on Item 14.</i></p> <p><i>*Note: The replacement behavior can be one that is a functional equivalent (i.e., a behavior that directly asks for the function) or an alternate skill (e.g., pro-social/academically desirable) behavior</i></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• No replacement behavior is identified OR</li> <li>• Replacement behavior identified but does not serve the same function as the problem behavior or does not provide the same outcome (reinforcement) after student engages in replacement behavior or is an alternate/desired behavior that is not incompatible with the problem behavior, OR</li> <li>• The identified function is not one identified in the research literature (i.e. control, revenge, status, power, etc.), OR</li> <li>• No function identified in hypothesis</li> <li>• FBA did not provide the responses of others following the problem behavior and the function in hypothesis is unable to be linked to FBA information</li> </ul> <p><b>Examples:</b></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• At least one replacement behavior is identified and serves the same function as does the problem behavior or is incompatible with the problem behavior (e.g., alternate skill or desired behavior) but an intervention is not described with enough detail to be implemented.</li> </ul> <p><i>Note: If the function listed in the hypothesis was unable to be confirmed by the consequence information (item 7), and the intervention described links to the function and is described in sufficient detail, the item can receive a score of “1”.</i></p> <p><b>Examples:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Replacement behavior is to “raise hand for attention”, it matches the attention function but no clear description of how</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• At least one replacement behavior is identified, serves the same function as the problem behavior or is incompatible with the problem behavior, and an intervention is described with enough detail to be implemented (i.e., a stranger would be able to implement the strategy). The detail should include the exact skill that will be taught, who will teach the skill, at what point related to the antecedent will the skill be prompted or practiced, and how the skill will be taught (instructional plan). The description is detailed enough that a stranger would be able implement the strategy with the student and/or multiple people would implement the strategy in the same way. The plan describes the</li> </ul>



	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Replacement behavior identified is to “raise hand for attention”, but problem behavior (calling out) occurs to escape tasks</li> <li>The identified replacement behavior is for the student to “raise hand” in order to “gain control”, not a research literature identified function.</li> </ul>	<p>to implement the intervention is included, OR</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Replacement behavior is “remain on task” (incompatible to problem behavior), but no clear description of how to implement the intervention is provided.</li> <li>Teach Tracy to complete work by using a First/Then format by saying, “First finish your assignment than get free time.”</li> </ul>	<p>behaviors the <b>adult</b> will do to implement the strategy.</p> <p><b>Example:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Fred will be taught to “raise his hand” to get teacher/adult attention. Prior to class discussions, an adult will review when and how Fred will raise his hand to get attention. A pre-arranged signal (picture of raised hand) will be used for the times Fred forgets to raise his hand.”</li> </ul>
<p>14. A minimum of one strategy that will reinforce the replacement behavior and provide the same outcome/function as did the problem behavior is identified and described in enough detail to implement</p> <p><i>*Note: <sup>a</sup>Score of 0 on Item 13 results in a score of 0 on this item.</i></p> <p><i>*Note: <sup>b</sup>Score of 0 on item 8 and/or 9 results in a score of 0 on this item.</i></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No strategy identified on BIP, OR</li> <li>Reinforcement inventory/items checked off from a list with no additional detail OR</li> <li>The strategy listed is not a reinforcement strategy, OR,</li> <li>The reinforcement strategy is not linked to the function of the problem behavior, OR</li> <li>No replacement behavior was identified in Item 13, OR</li> <li>The only “reinforcement strategy” listed is an aversive consequence, OR</li> <li>No function identified in hypothesis</li> <li>FBA did not provide the responses of others following the problem behavior and the function in hypothesis is unable to be linked to FBA information</li> </ul> <p><b>Examples:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Reinforcement strategy identified is for student to receive a sticker each time he/she raises hand, but problem behavior (calling out) occurs to escape tasks.</li> <li>If Shawn continues to engage in disruptive behavior rather than ask for a break, use a “first-then” statement</li> </ul>	<p>At least one strategy is identified to reinforce use of replacement behavior and results in the same outcome/function as did the problem behavior, but does not include a task analysis or clear description of procedures for implementing the strategy.</p> <p><b>Example:</b></p> <p>Reinforcement strategy identified is for student to receive teacher attention and a sticker each time he/she raises hand for attention, and student’s problem behavior (calling out) occurs to obtain teacher attention, but no detailed description of procedures is provided.</p>	<p>At least one strategy is identified on BIP to reinforce use of replacement behavior, results in the same outcome/function as the problem behavior and is described in enough detail so that a stranger would be able to implement the intervention with the student and/or multiple people would implement the strategy in the same way. The detail should include, at a minimum when the intervention is delivered and how the intervention is delivered. The plan describes the behaviors the <b>adult</b> will do to implement the strategy.</p> <p><b>Example:</b></p> <p>“Each time Fred raises his hand, the teacher will provide prompt attention from the teacher by using a gesture (“thumbs up”) and deliver a sticker with positive praise (“way to go”). At the end of the day, the teacher will review the number of stickers Fred earned and provide him a choice of reinforcers in exchange for the stickers from the following: (a) being the teacher’s helper, (b) going to the office to talk with the principal, or (c) playing a game for 10 minutes with a peer of his choice.”</p>
<p>15. A minimum of one strategy that eliminates the maintaining consequences (i.e., function) identified in the hypothesis and is described with sufficient detail to</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No strategies identified on BIP to minimize reinforcement of problem behavior, OR</li> <li>Strategies are identified but continue to provide same outcome (function).</li> </ul>	<p>At least one strategy is identified on the BIP to minimize reinforcement of the problem behavior and is linked to the function, but is not described with enough detail to implement.</p>	<p>At least one strategy is identified on the BIP to minimize reinforcement of the problem behavior, is linked to the function and is described with enough detail to implement. The description is detailed enough that a</p>

<p>implement (i.e., changes the way others respond to problem behavior).</p> <p><i>*Note: Score of 0 on Item 8 and 9 results in a score of 0 on this item.</i></p>	<p><b>Example:</b> The strategy is 'If the student yells at the teacher, the teacher will remove the student to time-out' and the function was identified as escape.</p>	<p><b>Examples:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• A box is checked from a list of possible strategies.</li> <li>• Planned ignoring is listed for a student whose behavior resulted in attention, but no detail on how the strategy will be implemented is given.</li> </ul>	<p>stranger would be able implement the strategy with the student and/or multiple people would implement the strategy in the same way.</p> <p><b>Example:</b> When the student calls out, the teacher will not respond (neutral facial expression, no verbal comments). If the student continues to call-out, the teacher will use a flat affect (monotone, minimal eye contact) to verbally redirect the student to use his replacement skill.</p>
<p>16. A need for a safety plan is considered, justified and described with sufficient detail if a need is indicated.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• No safety plan developed although product indicated a need for a plan, OR</li> <li>• No evidence or documentation provided that showed team considered the need for safety plan.</li> <li>• A safety plan is provided, but it is a program-wide plan that is done with any student (i.e., no individualization or customization made to safety plan. FBA not necessary for development of the safety plan)</li> </ul>	<p>Need for safety plan is indicated, but procedures are not described with sufficient detail.</p> <p><b>Examples:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Plan does not specify who, what, when and how things will be done during a safety situation.</li> <li>• Plan states "office will be called to escort student out of room" but does not provide additional details.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Need for safety plan is indicated and procedures are described with sufficient detail OR</li> <li>• There is documentation that the team agreed that no safety plan is needed.</li> <li>• The description is detailed enough that a stranger would be able implement the strategy with the student and/or multiple people would implement the strategy in the same way.</li> <li>• The plan describes the behaviors the <b>adult</b> will do to implement the strategy.</li> </ul> <p><b>Examples:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• BIP indicates safety plan is needed and specifically outlines who, what, when and how things will be done during a safety situation.</li> <li>• BIP indicates that no safety plan is necessary (e.g., checks a box, or provides a statement).</li> </ul>
<p>17. A specific plan for collecting monitoring data on both the problem and replacement behaviors following implementation of the behavior plan is included.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• No plan for collecting data on either problem or replacement behavior is included in the plan OR</li> <li>• Unable to determine if there is a plan</li> </ul>	<p>A partial plan is described for either the targeted problem behavior or the replacement behavior but only includes 1, 2, or 3 relevant details (e.g., who, how often, format/type, review date)</p> <p><b>Example:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Teacher will monitor (who)</li> </ul>	<p>A detailed and specific plan describing who, how often, the format, and the review date for collecting outcome data on both the problem and replacement behavior following implementation of the BIP is included and is linked to the target problem behavior on the intervention plan.</p>

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Frequency box is checked (how)</li> <li>• Teacher will collect frequency data daily.(who, how, when)</li> <li>• Plan is included, but the data are collected on a behavior that was not the focus of the FBA/BIP.</li> <li>• Graphs will be charted (no indication of who, how often, when it will be reviewed)</li> <li>• Plan states that teacher (who) will use point cards (format) but no further information provided.</li> <li>• Boxes checked from a possible list of evaluation options, without providing any specific details.</li> <li>• Plan describes data collection procedures for throwing pencils but the behavior addressed on the FBA/BIP was hitting peers.</li> </ul>	<p><b>Example:</b>  Who: All teachers working with the student  When: Every day at the end of each class (math, art, etc.)  Format: Rating each occurrence of the behavior  Review Date: Within two weeks.</p>
18. A specific plan for collecting fidelity data on BIP implementation is included.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• No plan included on BIP describing specific procedures for collecting fidelity of implementation data, OR</li> <li>• Follow-up fidelity mentioned but lacks details (who, data method, schedule of measurement, review), making plan difficult to replicate.</li> <li>• Statement or description provided, but does not address a way of <b>measuring</b> fidelity; rather provides vague descriptions of follow-up activities</li> </ul> <p><b>Example:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Statement suggesting fidelity, but lacking specific details, e.g., Fidelity will be collected</li> <li>• Vague statement such as: Weekly communication between team members</li> </ul>	<p>Plan included on BIP describing procedures for collecting data on fidelity of implementation, but is missing two or more details (who, data method, schedule of measurement, review)</p> <p><b>Example:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Boxes checked from drop down lists indicating who, method, schedule, and/or review dates</li> <li>• Statement suggesting fidelity will be evaluated but methods are lacking two or more details, e.g., "Fidelity will be evaluated once a week".</li> </ul>	<p>Detailed and specific plan included on BIP describing procedures for collecting fidelity of implementation data (e.g., who, when, how, review).</p> <p><b>Examples:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The guidance counselor will observe the plan being implemented once a week for 2 weeks and data will be reviewed in 3 weeks.</li> <li>• The teacher will complete a weekly self-assessment that will rate the degree of the plan's implementation. Data will be reviewed within 3 weeks.</li> </ul>