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Where are you in the implementation process?

- Exploration & Adoption: We think we know what we need so we are planning to move forward (evidence-based)
- Installation: Let’s make sure we’re ready to implement (capacity infrastructure)
- Initial Implementation: Let’s give it a try & evaluate (demonstration)
- Full Implementation: That worked, let’s do it for real and implement all tiers across all schools (investment)
- Institutionalized Use: Let’s make it our way of doing business & sustain implementation (institutionalized use)

Maximizing Your Session Participation

When Working In Your Team

Consider 4 questions:
- Where are we in our implementation?
- What do I hope to learn?
- What did I learn?
- What will I do with what I learned?

Leadership Team Action Planning Worksheets:

- Self-Assessment: Accomplishments & Priorities
- Session Assignments & Notes: High Priorities
- Action Planning: Enhancements & Improvements

Objectives

- Identify key features of CICO
- Describe how CICO can be adapted to support students with internalizing behaviors at the elementary school level
- Identify best practice implementation of Tier II interventions using a standardized daily progress report (DPR)

Check-In, Check-Out (CICO)

- Tier 2 behavior intervention
- Implemented with students at risk but not currently engaging in severe problem behavior
- KEY TO SUCCESS = SIMILAR IMPLEMENTATION ACROSS STUDENTS!!!
Students with Internalizing Behaviors

- 20% of students in schools experience levels of internalizing behaviors severe enough to impact students’ behavioral, social, or academic functioning (Walker, Nishioka, Zeller, Severson, & Feil, 2000).
- Proactive interventions can reduce symptoms and the likelihood of the behavior problem developing into a chronic disorder (NRC & IOM, 2009).

Statement of the Problem

- Most schools are not equipped with resources necessary to treat mental health disorders (Herman, Merrell, Reinke, & Tucker, 2004; Rones & Hoagwood, 2008).
- Additional research is needed to better understand the current amount of support available for students with internalizing behavior problems in the elementary school setting (McIntosh et al., 2013).

Research Questions

1. What is the effect of CICO-IB on active engagement behaviors of students with internalizing behavior problems in an elementary school setting?
2. What is the effect of CICO-IB on students’ internalizing behavior problems in an elementary school setting?
3. Do teachers, parents, and students consider the CICO-IB intervention acceptable for the treatment of internalizing behaviors?
Methods

Setting

1. Urban public school in the intermountain west of the USA
2. Diverse
   - 53% Caucasian
   - 31% Hispanic
   - 8% Asian or Pacific Islander
   - 5% Native American
   - 3% African American
3. Low-income population (60% Free or reduced lunch)

Participants

Eligibility Criteria
1. Upper elementary – fourth, fifth, or sixth grade
2. Elevated levels of internalizing behaviors in areas of anxiety, depression, and withdrawal
3. Low levels of externalizing behaviors
4. No prior experience of Check-in, Check-Out (CICO)
5. Not currently involved in any other social/emotional behavior interventions

Ethnicity
Grade
SRSS-I5 Score - Shy/Withdrawn
SRSS-I5 Score Anxiety
Warren
Caucasian
6th
3
3
Lily
Caucasian
4th
3
3
Alex
Hispanic
4th
3
3
Jin
Asian
4th
3
3

Measures – Fidelity of Implementation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measure</th>
<th>Purpose</th>
<th>Timeframe</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CICO-I8 Fidelity of Implementation Observation Checklist</td>
<td>Lists steps to be completed by CICO coordinator and teachers during CICO-I8 implementation</td>
<td>Weekly observations conducted by researcher and graduate student</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Measures – Dependent Variables

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measure</th>
<th>Purpose</th>
<th>Timeframe</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SRSS-I5 (Lane et al., 2013)</td>
<td>Screening; identify students at-risk for internalizing behavior problems</td>
<td>Administered prior to CICO-I8 intervention</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SRSS-E7 (Lane et al., 2013)</td>
<td>Screening; identify students at-risk for externalizing behavior problems to disqualify selection for intervention</td>
<td>Administered within 2 weeks after completion of the intervention to participating students or by the end of the school year</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DPR</td>
<td>*Data for research question 1: Measure for assessing participants’ levels of prosocial behaviors</td>
<td>Data will be collected during baseline and throughout treatment phase</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Measures – Social Validity

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measure</th>
<th>Purpose</th>
<th>Timeframe</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>IRP-15 – Teacher Feedback (Witt &amp; Elliot, 1985)</td>
<td>Data for research question 3 – Measure for assessing participant perceptions of the intervention</td>
<td>Participating teachers completed 3 weeks after termination of the intervention</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parent Feedback Form</td>
<td>Measure for assessing parents’ perceptions of the intervention</td>
<td>Parents of students participating in the intervention completed 2 weeks after termination of the intervention</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CIRP – Student Feedback Form (Witt &amp; Elliot, 1985)</td>
<td>Measure for assessing participant perceptions of the intervention</td>
<td>Participating students completed 3 weeks after termination of the intervention</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Design & Procedures

- Single case, multiple-baseline design across participants
- Participant selection (screening, consent, assent, file reviews)
- Baseline
- Intervention
  - Implementation of CICO-IB
  - Student observations in the classroom
- Maintenance/fading (for first participant)
- Treatment Integrity Procedures:
  - Fidelity of implementation of CICO-IB
  - Interrater reliability of student observation
  - Interrater reliability of CICO-IB fidelity of implementation

Direct Observation Codes

- Follow Directions (Ask for Help) – code 1
  - Student raises hand or verbally prompts for assistance from the teacher
  - Student verbally prompts for assistance from a peer
  - Examples: “How do I do____?” “I don’t get it.” “I need help.” “This doesn’t make sense.” “Is this right?”
- Respect Everyone (Active Social Engagement) – code 2
  - Student greets a peer or an adult (e.g., says hello, good morning, waves and smiles)
  - Student initiates a social interaction with adult or peer (e.g., “What are you doing?” “Will you be my partner?” “Can I sit here?”)
  - Student responds to a social interaction initiated by an adult or peer (e.g., verbal response, gesture, facial expression)

On Task (Active Academic Engagement) – code 3

- Student responds to a question orally (e.g., individual response, choral response, partner response, or team response)
- Student uses an action to respond to a question (e.g., hand signals, gestures)
- Student shares a written response to answer a question (e.g., white board, response cards, slate)
- Student uses technology to respond to a question (e.g., classroom response systems)
- Student actively participates during small group/partner work (e.g., shares an answer with the group, answers a peer’s question, passes out group materials, writes an answer on the group paper)

Passively Engaged – code 4

- Student is working on assigned task
- Student is using appropriate materials
- Student follows directions of assigned task
- Student completes assigned task
- Student actively listens to others in small group or partner work (e.g., looking at person while they are talking, not engaging in other distracting behaviors – playing with materials, paper, other objects)
Direct Observation Codes

- Not Engaged – code 0 (required in order to write a code for every interval)
  - Student is not engaged physically/verbally with materials
  - Student is not looking at the board, teacher, seatwork
  - Student is not contributing to or writing/reading assigned task
  - Student is not following along and on the correct page during reading
  - Student is engaged in other distracting behaviors (e.g., inappropriately playing with materials, other objects)

Fidelity Results

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Components</th>
<th>Warren</th>
<th>Lily</th>
<th>Alex</th>
<th>Jin</th>
<th>Overall</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mean Check In Fidelity</td>
<td>94%</td>
<td>98%</td>
<td>98%</td>
<td>98%</td>
<td>97%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Range</td>
<td>80%-100%</td>
<td>80%-100%</td>
<td>75%-100%</td>
<td>83%-100%</td>
<td>80%-100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean Feedback Fidelity</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>98%</td>
<td>98%</td>
<td>98%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Range</td>
<td>87%-100%</td>
<td>75%-100%</td>
<td>75%-100%</td>
<td>86%-100%</td>
<td>80%-100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean Feedback IOA</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>99%</td>
<td>99%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean Check Out Fidelity</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall Implementation Fidelity</td>
<td>94%</td>
<td>91%</td>
<td>91%</td>
<td>91%</td>
<td>97%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Interrater Reliability Results

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Agreement</th>
<th>Warren</th>
<th>Lily</th>
<th>Alex</th>
<th>Jin</th>
<th>Overall</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Avg. Baseline Agreement</td>
<td>95%</td>
<td>93%</td>
<td>97%</td>
<td>84%</td>
<td>92%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Avg. Intervention Agreement</td>
<td>91%</td>
<td>90%</td>
<td>93%</td>
<td>90%</td>
<td>94%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Avg. Fading/Maintenance Observations</td>
<td>2/5 = 40%</td>
<td>91%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Avg. Fading/Maintenance Agreement</td>
<td></td>
<td>91%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Anecdotal Teacher Comments

This intervention made me think about other issues in the classroom, other than the disruptive problem behaviors or students acting out. I noticed that there are other problems students could be having. Because a student is quiet, doesn’t mean that they are OK. I now understand that. I am so consumed with putting out fires and not thinking about other issues students might be having. CICO IB helped make me more aware. CICO IB prompted me to initiate social and academic interactions with my students who are quietier.”
Summary of Results

DPR Data
- All four participants demonstrated immediate increases in active engagement behaviors as measured by daily DPR point percentages
- Immediacy of effects was consistent and significant
- Data demonstrate increasing trends, elevated levels, and stable data patterns as compared to baseline for all four participants

Student Observation – Active Engagement Behaviors
- Increases in level and trend occurred for all four participants between baseline to intervention phase
- All participants demonstrated an immediate decrease in levels of off-task behaviors from baseline to intervention
- Variability of data decreased slightly for all four participants from baseline to intervention

Contribution to Research
- Adds to research on the use of CICO-IB with students with internalizing behaviors in the elementary school setting
- Provides evidence of a functional relation between CICO-IB implementation and increased active academic engagement and a decrease in off-task behaviors for students with internalizing behavior problems
- Adds to the research of using a universal DPR with school-wide behavior expectations
- CICO-IB as a standardized protocol Tier 2 intervention for students with internalizing behavior problems

Limitations
- Conducted with four students at one elementary school. Results cannot be generalized to other contexts.
- Lack of variability in the type of instructional activity
- Frequent fidelity checks were used throughout the study, this may not be a realistic expectation for schools to implement
- Importance of fidelity of implementation for the overall success of the intervention

Resources on How to Implement the CICO

Book/Manual

DVD
RESEARCH TEAM
Barbara Mitchell
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AltheaGriffin@uw.edu
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Lisa Powers
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RESEARCH SITE
Municipalities
St. Louis County, Missouri

RESEARCH SITE
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Campus</th>
<th>Enrollment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Elementary</td>
<td>39, 5,763</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Middle</td>
<td>5, 1.885</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jr. High</td>
<td>0, 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High</td>
<td>5, 923</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>34, 36,204</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

RESEARCH SITE
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Percent of Total Enrollment</th>
<th>Percent of Total Enrollment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Asian</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black</td>
<td>10.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indian</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multi-racial</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pacific Islander</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>35.93</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

RESEARCH SITE
Elementary School

STUDENT IDENTIFICATION
- Student Risk Screening Scale – Internalizing and Externalizing (SRSS-IE)
- Winter screening data – moderate range – internalizing concerns
- Teacher Consent
  - CICO Coordinator reviewed data with individual teachers and prioritize students
- Family Consent
  - Teachers send consent forms to the top 5 priority students in their classrooms

Notes:
- * Indicates the number has been suppressed due to a potential small sample size
- "From VIA/Revised Lunch"
STUDENT IDENTIFICATION

- GICO Tracker Spreadsheet

INTERVENTION GROUP

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Student</th>
<th>Grade</th>
<th>Sex</th>
<th>Winter</th>
<th>Spring</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>I-5</td>
<td>I-9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>I-5</td>
<td>E-3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>I-5</td>
<td>E-4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>I-5</td>
<td>E-3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>E-3</td>
<td>E-3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>I-3</td>
<td>E-3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

DAILY PROGRESS REPORT

- Goal: standard application of GICO for a unique population
- Anchored with school-wide expectations
- Generic across students with ability to tailor
- Designated space for praise
- Points aligned with GICO-SWIS
- Embedded fidelity checks

OUTCOME DATA

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Total DPP</th>
<th>Baseline Mean</th>
<th>Daily Goal Mean</th>
<th>Intervention Mean</th>
<th>Difference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>50.91</td>
<td>69.00</td>
<td>65.22</td>
<td>+5.41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>53.96</td>
<td>77.00</td>
<td>71.35</td>
<td>+4.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>70.46</td>
<td>77.00</td>
<td>68.59</td>
<td>-18.91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>97.22</td>
<td>88.00</td>
<td>95.27</td>
<td>+0.99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td>108.13</td>
<td>96.00</td>
<td>98.45</td>
<td>+2.42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>96.48</td>
<td>98.00</td>
<td>98.75</td>
<td>+0.72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Combined</td>
<td>97.75</td>
<td>90.13</td>
<td>91.49</td>
<td>+1.49</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

IMPLICATIONS FOR PRACTICE

- Teachers were more fluent with feedback on externalizing behaviors than internalizing behaviors.
- Consider revising matrix to include behaviors that address internalizing concerns.
- Teachers reported student skill development and growth throughout the intervention.
- Students and teachers gave high social validity scores.

IMPLICATIONS FOR PRACTICE

- Training/teaching needed on internalizing behaviors and feedback.
- Consider including sample feedback statements in the back of the DPP to provide teacher.
- Revise DPP to provide consistent feedback on a daily basis.
- Consider feedback based on internal behaviors rather than on content areas/activities.
- Motivation of implementation at pilot levels.
Please Complete the Session Evaluation to Tell Us What You Thought of This Session