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SECTION I. (TO BE COMPLETED BY BOARD)

Decision on Case Study:

__ Approved - Effective
__ Not Approved - Needs Development

SECTION II. (TO BE COMPLETED BY REVIEWER)

Summary of Strengths (Based on the rubric):

Summary of Areas for Improvement (Based on the rubric):
The determination of an effective/needs development case study is guided by whether it is both data driven and makes logical sense, rather than how many isolated elements are found to be effective.

**Section 1: Elements of an Effective Case Study**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Effective</th>
<th>Needs Development</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>Demographics of the case are adequately described (e.g., age, type of class/school, grade, SES, disability, etc.).</td>
<td>Demographic information does not include sufficient information.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>Assessment, intervention, and/or consultation practices consider unique individual characteristics.</td>
<td>Assessment, intervention, and/or consultation practices do not consider unique individual characteristics.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>Collaboration with relevant stakeholders (e.g., parents, teachers, and other professionals) is evident throughout the process.</td>
<td>Decisions regarding problem identification and intervention are made without consultation with relevant stakeholders.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>Steps of the problem-solving process are implemented coherently (i.e., sequential, goal directed, and flow logically based on evidence).</td>
<td>The steps of the problem-solving process are not followed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>Professional practices of writing style, formatting, and graphing are present in the case study (i.e., clear succinct and well written text with clearly labeled graphs).</td>
<td>Errors in writing convention, style, and graphing interfere with readability and interpretation of data.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>Personal identifying information of the case study subject is redacted from the report.</td>
<td>Personal identifying information is not redacted from the report.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**RATING**

- **EFFECTIVE**
- **NEEDS DEVELOPMENT**

**Comments:**
## Section 2: Problem Identification

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Effective</th>
<th>Needs Development</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>2.1</strong></td>
<td>□ Information is gathered from multiple sources (e.g., Record review, Interview, Observation, and Testing [RIOT]).</td>
<td>□ Data are not gathered from multiple sources.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>2.2</strong></td>
<td>□ The problem is operationally defined in observable, measurable terms (i.e., the referral concern is restated as an observable, measurable dependent variable).</td>
<td>□ The problem is not operationally defined. (e.g., it is reported as a categorical/descriptive cause such as Autism, Depression, ADHD; or terms such as aggression, anxiety or hyperactivity).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>2.3</strong></td>
<td>□ Expectations for the identified behavior are stated based upon an appropriate source for comparison (e.g., grade level standards, peer performance, normative data, etc.).</td>
<td>□ Expected performance is not based on an appropriate source for comparison or is not included OR □ The difference between actual and expected levels of performance is not explicitly stated.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>2.4</strong></td>
<td>□ Adequate baseline data are graphed to depict the discrepancy between the case's performance relative to an appropriate comparison.</td>
<td>□ Baseline data are not graphed OR □ Baseline data include fewer than three data points OR □ Expected level of performance is not included in the graph (i.e., aimline or goal line).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**RATING**

- □ EFFECTIVE
- □ NEEDS DEVELOPMENT

**Comments:**
### Section 3: Problem Analysis

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Effective</th>
<th>Needs Development</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 3.1 | - The problem behavior is hypothesized as a skill or performance deficit  
      AND  
      - Data are used to test the hypothesis. | - There is no hypothesis regarding skill or performance deficit.  
      OR  
      - Data are not used to test the hypothesis |
| 3.2 | - Additional hypotheses are formulated to address the problem across one or more of the following areas: curriculum, instruction, and environment. | - Multiple hypotheses are not developed  
      OR  
      - Hypotheses are untestable. |
| 3.3 | - Each hypothesis is stated in observable/measureable terms. | - Hypotheses are not stated in observable/measurable terms. |
| 3.4 | - Proposed hypotheses are empirically tested and/or other sources of data are used to confirm or reject each hypothesis. | - Hypotheses are not tested or appropriate sources of data are not used to confirm or reject each hypothesis. |
| 3.5 | - A conclusive statement following hypothesis testing and/or data collection is provided that formally describes the cause of the problem and informs intervention(s). | - A conclusive statement formally describing the cause of the problem is not included  
      OR  
      - Does not lead to a logical intervention. |

**RATING**

- EFFECTIVE
- NEEDS DEVELOPMENT

**Comments:**
### Section 4: Intervention

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Effective</th>
<th>Needs Development</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>4.1</strong></td>
<td>A single evidence-based intervention is implemented and linked to preceding sections.</td>
<td>Intervention is not evidence-based. OR Is not linked to preceding sections OR Multiple interventions are implemented simultaneously.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>4.2</strong></td>
<td>Acceptability of the intervention by relevant stakeholders (e.g., caregivers, teachers, etc.) is verified.</td>
<td>Acceptability of the intervention by one or more stakeholders is not verified.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| **4.3** | The intervention is replicable:  
- Intervention components are clearly described (i.e., independent variable)  
- Logistics are reported (e.g., who will implement, setting, duration and frequency of sessions, etc.) | The intervention is not replicable:  
- Intervention components are not described (i.e., independent variable)  
- Logistics are missing (e.g., who will implement, setting, duration and frequency of sessions, etc.) |
| **4.4** | Skill or performance goals are:  
- Described using the same metric as the dependent variables  
- Achievable based on research or other data. | Skill or performance goals are:  
- Described using a different metric as the dependent variables  
- Not achievable or not linked to research or other data. |
### Section 4: Intervention (Continued)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Effective</th>
<th>Needs Development</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>□ Progress is monitored and graphed for data based decision making (formative evaluation).</td>
<td>□ Progress is not monitored. OR □ Progress data are not graphed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.6</td>
<td>Treatment integrity/fidelity data are:</td>
<td>Treatment integrity/fidelity data are not:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>□ Collected and reported AND</td>
<td>□ Collected or reported OR □ Used to describe intervention efficacy.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>□ Used in the interpretation of intervention efficacy.</td>
<td>□ Used to describe intervention efficacy.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**RATING**

| □ EFFECTIVE | □ NEEDS DEVELOPMENT |

**Comments:**
## Section 5: Evaluation (Summative)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Effective</th>
<th>Needs Development</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 5.1 | A single graph is depicted for the target behavior and includes the following elements:  
- Baseline data  
AND  
- Goal/Target indicator or aim line  
AND  
- Treatment/progress monitoring data with a trend line. | A single target behavior is presented on multiple graphs, or relevant graphs are not included.  
The following components are not included in the graph:  
- Baseline data  
OR  
- Goal/Target indicator or aim line  
OR  
- Treatment/progress monitoring data with a trend line. |
| 5.2 | Adequate intervention data (i.e., typically 7 data points) are collected to demonstrate level and/or trend under intervention conditions. | Insufficient data are collected to meaningfully interpret the results of the intervention. |
| 5.3 | Visual analysis of the level, trend and variability and/or statistical analyses (e.g., effect size) demonstrate that the intervention was effective. | Visual or statistical analyses were not used  
OR  
The Intervention was ineffective. |
| 5.4 | Strategies for generalizing outcomes to other settings are described. | Strategies for generalizing outcomes to other settings are not described. |
| 5.5 | Strategies for follow-up are developed. | Strategies for follow-up are not developed. |

**RATING**

- **EFFECTIVE**
- **NEEDS DEVELOPMENT**

Comments:
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