**Intervention Essential Features Rubric**

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Feature | Proficient (2 points) | Developing (1 point) | Not in Place/ No Evidence (0 point) | Score |
| 1. Description of major components of intervention, including function addressed. | Description of major components of intervention is clear and concise and includes the specific function of behavior that is addressed by the intervention.  ☐ Obtain  ☐ Escape | Description of major components of intervention is unclear or insufficient, but does include the specific function of behavior that is addressed by the intervention.  ☐ Obtain  ☐ Escape | Description of major components of intervention is unclear and does not address function. | 2  1  0 |
| 2. Intervention coordinator and/or facilitator(s) identified. | There is an assigned Intervention Coordinator and/ or assigned facilitator(s) who are able to coordinate and deliver the intervention with fidelity. | There is an assigned Intervention Coordinator and/ or assigned facilitator(s) who are able to coordinate and deliver the intervention with fidelity. | There is an assigned Intervention Coordinator and/ or assigned facilitator(s) who are able to coordinate and deliver the intervention with fidelity. | 2  1  0 |
| 3. List at least two sources of data used to identify students for intervention, with criteria for entry to intervention clearly described. | Two or more of the following sources were used to identify students who would participate in this intervention and the criteria for entry is described (i.e. Student Identification Plan):  ☐ *Existing School Data*  ☐ *Staff or parent nomination*  ☐ *Universal Screening process* | Only one of the following sources was used to identify students who would participate in this intervention:  ☐ *Existing School Data*  ☐ *Staff or parent nomination*  ☐ *Universal Screening process* | There is not a standard method to identify which students will participate in this intervention that includes school data, nomination, or universal screening. | 2  1  0 |

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Feature | Proficient (2 points) | Developing (1 point) | Not in Place/ No Evidence (0 point) | Score |
| 4. Description of system to determine function of student behavior that includes both record review and context analysis. | Team collects information to determine possible function of student behavior (i.e. Tier 2 Adapted FACTS part A) which includes:  ☐ records review  ☐ context analysis | Team collects information using one but not both of the following methods:  ☐ records review  ☐ context analysis | Team does not collect information that includes records review and context analysis to determine the function of behavior. | 2  1  0 |
| 5. Description of documented procedures for introducing/orienting new participants to intervention for students, teachers and families. | Documented procedures for introducing/orienting new participants to the intervention that include sufficient detail for implementation are in place for:  ☐ Students  ☐ Teachers  ☐ Families | Procedures for introducing/ orienting new participants to the intervention are unclear or undocumented or are in place for only two of the three listed below:  ☐ Students  ☐ Teachers  ☐ Families | There are no formal, documented procedures in place for introducing/orienting new students, teachers and families to the intervention. | 2  1  0 |
| 6. Description of data-based system for monitoring student progress in intervention (daily/weekly progress report ratings and monitoring) with data decisions applied at least monthly. | A data-based system is in place to graph daily/weekly behavior ratings; weekly monitoring of student progress in the intervention takes place with data decisions applied at least monthly. | A data-based system is in place but is monitored less than weekly and/or decisions based on data from student progress in the intervention do not take place at least monthly. | There is no data-based system in place for monitoring student progress. | 2  1  0 |
| 7. Documented fading process that includes decision rules, description of process and graduation from intervention. | There are documented decision rules in place to determine when a student is ready | There are decision rules as to when a student begins the fading process from this intervention and completes the fading process, but they are not documented or used consistently. | There are no documented decision rules in place about fading and graduating from the intervention. | 2  1  0 |

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Feature | Proficient (2 points) | Developing (1 point) | Not in Place/ No Evidence (0 point) | Score |
| 8. Description of documented strategies for generalization and maintenance of skills across settings and over time that are linked to Schoolwide Expectations. | to begin the fading process from this intervention. Documentation also exists that systematically describes the fading process and graduation from the intervention. | There are decision rules as to when a student begins the fading process from this intervention and completes the fading process, but they are not documented or used consistently. | There are no strategies in place for follow-up from this intervention that are linked to building’s Schoolwide Expectations Matrix that will promote generalization over time and across settings. | 2  1  0 |
| 9. Description of documented strategies for weekly family communication / feedback regarding intervention. | There are strategies in place to communicate with families of students participating in the intervention that include all of the following:  ☐ Clearly documented  ☐ Contains Feedback Process  ☐ Occurs at least weekly | There are strategies in place to communicate with families regarding the intervention, but one or more of the following are not present:  ☐ Clearly documented  ☐ Contains Feedback Process  ☐ Occurs at least weekly | There are no documented strategies in place to communicate with and receive feedback from families regarding the intervention. | 2  1  0 |
| 10. Description of documented strategies for weekly communication and feedback with participating classroom teachers. | There are strategies in place to communicate with participating classroom teachers regarding their students in this intervention that include all of the following:  ☐ Clearly documented  ☐ Contains Feedback Process  ☐ Occurs at least weekly | There are strategies in place to communicate with teachers regarding their students in this intervention, but one or more of the following are not present:  ☐ Clearly documented  ☐ Contains Feedback Process  ☐ Occurs at least weekly | There are no documented strategies in place to communicate with and receive feedback from participating classroom teachers regarding their students in this intervention. | 2  1  0 |
| 11. Description of documented strategies for regular (at least quarterly) updates to full staff regarding intervention or students involved in intervention. | There are documented strategies in place to provide updates to full staff regarding the intervention or students involved in the intervention at least quarterly. | Updates regarding the intervention are provided to some staff, are not documented, or do not take place at least quarterly. | There are no strategies in place to provide updates regarding the intervention to full staff. | 2  1  0 |

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Feature | Proficient (2 points) | Developing (1 point) | Not in Place/ No Evidence (0 point) | Score |
| 12. Description of documented system for monitoring fidelity of implementation of intervention process. | There is a clear, documented system in place for the Tier 2 Team to monitor and review the fidelity of implementation of the intervention process that includes at least one of the following:  ☐ Permanent Product Review (i.e. DPR/WPR, Lesson Plans)  ☐ Direct Observation  ☐ Self-Assessment | The Tier 2 Team monitors and reviews the fidelity of implementation of the intervention process but it is unclear, not documented, or does not include at least one of the following:  ☐ Permanent Product Review (i.e. DPR/WPR, Lesson Plans)  ☐ Direct Observation  ☐ Self-Assessment | If student data indicates a questionable or poor response to the intervention, the fidelity of implementation of the intervention process is not monitored, reviewed, updated or modified. | 2  1  0 |
| 13. Description of documented system for regularly assessing social validity of intervention. | There is a documented system in place to assess the social validity of the intervention at least twice during the intervention and modify intervention as needed. | Social validity of the intervention is assessed, but the system is not documented, or it does not take place at least twice during the intervention. | There is no system in place to assess the social validity of the intervention. | 2  1  0 |
| 14. Description of documented system for annually evaluating intervention outcomes that includes:  ☐ # Students Participating  ☐ # Students Graduating  ☐ # Students Needing  More Intensive Support | There is a documented system in place to evaluate intervention outcomes that is completed at least annually (i.e. MO SW-PBS Outcomes Evaluation Tool) and includes the following:  ☐ # Students Participating  ☐ # Students Graduating  ☐ # Students Needing More Intensive Support | There is a system in place to evaluate intervention outcomes but is not documented or is not completed annually or includes some but not all of the following:  ☐ # Students Participating  ☐ # Students Graduating  ☐ # Students Needing More Intensive Support | There is no system in place for evaluating intervention outcomes. | 2  1  0 |