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## Virtual Forum Expectations or Norms

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Expectations</th>
<th>Routines</th>
<th>OVERALL Event</th>
<th>CHAT Tab</th>
<th>POLLS Tab (+Q&amp;A)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>BE RESPONSIBLE</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>✦ Use a <em>shared action plan</em> for your team</td>
<td>✦ Post positive <em>on-topic</em> comments</td>
<td>✦ Add questions before and/or during session</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>✦ Complete session evaluations</td>
<td>✦ Questions for the presenters go in the <strong>POLLS</strong> tab</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>BE RESPECTFUL</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>✦ Limit <em>distractions</em></td>
<td>✦ Use <em>inclusive</em> language</td>
<td>✦ Use <em>sincere</em> phrasing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>✦ Follow up on your assigned action items</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>BE SAFE</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>✦ Take <em>movement breaks</em></td>
<td>✦ Engage in <em>productive</em> dialogue</td>
<td>✦ Ask <em>solution-oriented</em> questions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>✦ Be aware of your stress level</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Tips for Participants

Navigating the Session Page

1. **Session Details** (Title, Presenters, Date & Time, Description, Keywords)
2. Join Session
3. Interact through Chat, Polls, & Uploaded Files

[Image of a session page with session details and interactive elements]
Tips for Participants

Chat, Polls, and Q&A

1. Use **Chat** for engaging with other participants around the session topic.

2. Find the **Q&A** under **Polls**. Questions for presenters go there.

Follow overall Forum expectations for *responsible, respectful, and safe* participation.
While participating in a live Session…Be Present!

• If you navigate away from the live Session you will need to press the “Join Meeting” button to get back in.

• What does navigating away look like? Here are some examples:
  1. Clicking on any area of the navigation menu
  2. Clicking on a Person’s name

Tips for Participants

Be careful of accidently navigating away
Tips for Participants

Support is Available

If at any time you need support as a participant, use the Help Desk:
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LEARNING OBJECTIVES

As a result of attending this session, participants will be able to

• Discuss when and why intentional integration of intensive intervention is important

• Describe what is integrated

• Consider how to integrate and intensify based on detailed case study
INTRODUCTION
WHY INTEGRATE?

- Overlapping student SEB and academic needs
- For some students, those needs are directly related (e.g., behaviors are maintained by escape)
- Maximize opportunities for practice throughout the day and enhance outcomes for all

1. Improve efficiencies in implementation
2. Create efficiencies for training, coaching, and support
WHAT DO WE INTEGRATE?
BACKGROUND & RATIONALE
Academic and behavioral problems are related.
Communication skill deficits contribute to severe problem behavior

Typical classroom events evoke severe problem behavior
  • Denials of requests
  • Presentation of academic work

Chow & Hollo, 2018; Chow & Wehby, 2018; Gunter & Coutinho, 1997; Hollo, Wehby, & Oliver, 2014; Sutherland, Lewis-Palmer, Stichter, & Morgan, 2008
• Given the dual deficits in behavior and academics performance that many children show, it is important to provide intensive intervention in both areas.
BARRIERS

Academic and behavior interventions are applied independent of one another, with little communication or shared information.

Lack of preparation for support personnel in both areas.
RESULT = “SILOED” APPROACH

• Academic interventions and behavior are implemented independently.
• A “siloed” approach
  • Can lead to inefficient use of resources
  • May result in one treatment taking precedence over the other
  • Is likely a missed opportunity to support both academic and behavioral interventions across the school day
Provide integrated interventions for students with identified needs in both areas.
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Intensive Intervention Practices

ANTECEDENT STRATEGIES

Ways to **prevent** the occurrence of contextually inappropriate behavior

INSTRUCTIONAL STRATEGIES

Ways to **teach** replacement behavior AND **shape** replacement behavior into desired behavior

CONSEQUENCE STRATEGIES

Ways to (a) **increase** occurrences of replacement and desired behaviors and (b) **decrease** occurrences of contextually inappropriate behaviors
Intensive Intervention Practices

**ANTECEDENT STRATEGIES**
- Redesign the environment to promote reading & behavioral skills (e.g., minimize distractions)
- Increase opportunities for predictability (schedule & routines)
- Increase opportunities for choice
- Adjust instructional materials to prompt/cue desired reading & behavior skills
- Provide prompts for desired reading & behavior skills

**INSTRUCTIONAL STRATEGIES**
- Explicitly teach desired academic skills
- Explicitly teach acceptable alternative behavior skills & practice to fluency (short-term behavior goal)
- Once student meets short-term behavior goal, teach desired behavior skills & practice to fluency

**CONSEQUENCE STRATEGIES**
- Provide specific feedback contingent on student behaviors (>5 positive to 1 corrective ratio)
- Provide function-based reinforcement for acceptable alternatives & desired behaviors
- Prevent reinforcement for behavior/reading challenge (e.g., contextually inappropriate behaviors) & provide brief redirection
- Consider additional strategies (e.g., token economy) to reinforce progress toward desired behavior & reading skills
INTEGRATED INTENSIVE INTERVENTION: A CASE EXAMPLE
CASE EXAMPLE PROCESS

Iteration 1
- Assessment data and plan development
- Implementation
- Check for response

Iteration 2
- Diagnostic assessment
- Plan adjustment
- Check for response

Iteration 3
- Diagnostic assessment
- Plan adjustment
- Check for response
STUDENT CHARACTERISTICS

- Joshua: 3rd grade, 9 years old, male, Black
- Primary label: Emotional Disturbance
- Special day school for students with severe and persistent behavior difficulties
- Referred for deficits in reading (phonics, fluency), intractability of problem behavior during reading instruction
ASSESSMENT OUTCOMES: DISTAL MEASURES

WJ-IV  NWEA MAP
ASSESSMENT OUTCOMES: CURRICULUM-BASED MEASURES

**Strengths**
- Phoneme segmentation fluency
- Letter-sound fluency

**Weaknesses**
- Word identification fluency
- Passage fluency
READING PROGRAM
SELECTION/DESIGN

Horizons Fast Track A-B
Supplementary phonics exercises

1:1 instruction  25 min  3 days/week
FUNCTIONAL BEHAVIOR ASSESSMENT OUTCOMES

Target behaviors: Episode including noncompliance, verbal aggression, property disruption (e.g., knocking over furniture), throwing body on floor, leaving designated area, physical aggression
ANTECEDENTS & CONSEQUENCES

Preferred items and activities restricted

Access to preferred items/activities

Reading/literacy instruction presented

Escape from instruction

Attention diverted or quality reduced

Access to high-quality attention
HYPOTHESIS STATEMENT

- Items restricted
- Reading task presented
- Decrease in attention quality

Episode of escalating behavior

- Items delivered
- Reading task removed
- Increase in attention quality
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PREVENT</th>
<th>TEACH</th>
<th>RESPOND</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Level instruction appropriately</td>
<td>Appropriate request for breaks</td>
<td>Immediate break contingent on request</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Cooperation with tasks</td>
<td>Enriched breaks (i.e., including tangibles, high-quality attention)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>contingent on cooperation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>When problem behavior occurs, briefly prompt to request break or work</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
REQUESTING BREAKS

• Verbal request OR card touch/exchange
• 1 min timed, unenriched break
COOPERATION WITH READING INSTRUCTION

- Points for meeting schoolwide expectations
- Opportunity to earn once every 2 minutes, on average (momentary rule)
- Exchanged points at end of session for play time

1 clock = 1 minute of free choice
INITIAL OUTCOMES
WORD IDENTIFICATION FLUENCY

![Graph showing word identification fluency over weeks. The x-axis represents weeks (1 to 6), and the y-axis represents WCPM (words per minute). The graph shows a decrease from week 1 to week 3, followed by an increase from week 3 to week 4. Weeks 5 and 6 have question marks.]
BEHAVIOR RATING SCALE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rating</th>
<th>Definition</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Completed session with no severe problem behavior</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Completed session with severe problem behavior</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>Did not complete session</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

![Graph showing behavior rating scale with session and behavior rating axes.](image-url)
CASE EXAMPLE PROCESS

Iteration 1
- Assessment data and plan development
- Implementation
- Check for response

Satisfactory response to initial plan?
CASE EXAMPLE PROCESS

**Iteration 1**
- Assessment data and plan development
- Implementation
- Check for response

**Iteration 2**
- Diagnostic assessment
- Plan adjustment
- Check for response
FURTHER DIAGNOSTIC ASSESSMENT

1. What are Joshua's relative preferences among letter-sound identification, decoding, and word reading tasks?

2. Does Joshua prefer playing on the iPad alone or in parallel with an adult?

3. Will Joshua's preference for initially higher preference tasks change if higher quality rewards are contingent on less-preferred tasks?
CHOICE ASSESSMENT

1 clock = 1 minute of free choice

5-minute comparisons

[Browser-Brietweiser et al., 2008; Fienup et al., 2011; Harding et al., 1999; Romani et al., 2017]
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Choice A</th>
<th>Choice B</th>
<th>Interpretation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Reading CVC words</td>
<td>Decoding CVC words</td>
<td>Preferred decoding</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Letter-sound ID</td>
<td>Reading CVC words</td>
<td>Reading words = least preferred</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Decoding CVC words</td>
<td>Letter-sound ID</td>
<td>Decoding = most preferred</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Play alone</td>
<td>Parallel play</td>
<td>Preferred parallel play</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Decoding CVC words + play alone</td>
<td>Reading CVC words + parallel play</td>
<td>Demand preference &gt; play preference; may suggest skill deficit</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Shaded = chosen
PROGRAM REVISION: ANTECEDENT ADJUSTMENTS

Fluency practice with unmastered letter sounds

Scaffolded fluency practice for CVC words

Select word (e.g., mat)

1. Letter sound ID (e.g., a, m, t)
2. Decoding (e.g., “say the sounds in…” [mat])
3. Word reading (e.g., “what word?” [mat])
PROGRAM REVISION: CONSEQUENCE ADJUSTMENTS

Strategically offer parallel play

• When presenting decoding and word reading demands
• When introducing new content
• When cooperation was critical (e.g., CBM probes)

Enrich schedule of reinforcement

• Decrease token-earn intervals from 2 min to 30 s
### OUTCOMES: BEHAVIOR RATINGS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rating</th>
<th>Definition</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Completed session with no severe problem behavior</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Completed session with severe problem behavior</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>Did not complete session</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

![Behavior Rating Graph](https://via.placeholder.com/150)

- X-axis: Session
- Y-axis: Behavior Rating
- Data points indicate variability in behavior ratings across sessions.
NEXT SCHOOL YEAR
CASE EXAMPLE PROCESS

Iteration 1
• Assessment data and plan development
• Implementation
• Check for response

Iteration 2
• Diagnostic assessment
• Plan adjustment
• Check for response

Satisfactory response to adjusted plan?
CASE EXAMPLE PROCESS

Iteration 1
- Assessment data and plan development
- Implementation
- Check for response

Iteration 2
- Diagnostic assessment
- Plan adjustment
- Check for response

Iteration 3
- Diagnostic assessment
- Plan adjustment
- Check for response
EBD: COMMON BEHAVIORAL SKILL DEFICITS

Communication skill deficits contribute to severe problem behavior

Typical classroom events evoke severe problem behavior

- Denials of requests
- Presentation of academic work

[Chow & Hollo, 2018; Chow & Wehby, 2018; Gunter & Coutinho, 1997; Hollo, Wehby, & Oliver, 2014; Sutherland, Lewis-Palmer, Stichter, & Morgan, 2008]
SKILL-BASED TREATMENT
(HANLEY, JIN, VANSELOW, & HANRATTY, 2014)

Practice

[Beaulieu, Nostrand, Williams, & Herscovitch, 2018; Hanley, Jin, Vanselow, & Hanratty, 2014; Herman, Healy, & Lydon, 2018; Jessel, Ingvarsson, Metras, Kirk, & Whipple, 2018; Santiago, Hanley, Moore, & Jin, 2016; Strand & Eldevik, 2017; Taylor, Phillips, & Gertzog, 2018; Rajaraman et al., 2021]
SKILL-BASED TREATMENT  
(HANLEY, JIN, VANSELOW, & HANRATTY, 2014)

1 hr; 3 days/week

Functional Communication Training (FCT)  
Carr & Durand (1985)

Communication skill deficits

Socially-appropriate requests under all circumstances

Tolerance Training

Indicate acceptance of request denial

Cooperation Training

Cooperate with instructions increasing in number and complexity

Practice

PB evoked by denials of requests

PB evoked by presentation of academic work

Communication skill deficits evoked by denials of requests and presentation of academic work.

[Beaulieu, Nostrand, Williams, & Herscovitch, 2018; Hanley, Jin, Vanselow, & Hanratty, 2014; Herman, Healy, & Lydon, 2018; Jessel, Ingvarsson, Metras, Kirk, & Whipple, 2018; Santiago, Hanley, Moore, & Jin, 2016; Strand & Eldevik, 2017; Taylor, Phillips, & Gertzog, 2018]
EXTINCTION FOR PROBLEM BEHAVIOR

Increases efficacy of function-based intervention

Collateral effects pose challenges in school settings
  Response bursts; extinction-induced aggression

Escape extinction requires manual guidance

Manual guidance may be contraindicated for children who have experienced trauma

[Athens & Vollmer, 2010; Fisher et al., 1993; Hagopian et al., 1998; Lerman & Iwata, 1996; McCord, Thompson, & Iwata, 2001; Rajaraman et al., 2021b]
ENHANCED CHOICE MODEL (ECM)

Practice

Highly enriched, contingent break

Hangout

Semi-enriched break, always available

Leave

Regularly programmed activities, always available
COMMUNICATION SKILL
TEACHING

“My way.”

“My way, please.”

“May I have my way, please?”

“Excuse me.” [pause for response] “May I have my way, please?”
SKILL ACQUISITION: COMMUNICATING NEEDS

- Required polite voice, brief eye contact, setting toys aside
- Varied what teacher did and said to confirm that communication would be used under all circumstances
SKILL ACQUISITION: TOLERATING DENIALS

“Excuse me.”
[adult response]

“May I have my way, please?”
[adult denies]

“Okay.”
COOPERATING WITH ACADEMIC INSTRUCTION

Functional communication and denial tolerance training

Cooperation training

Average criterion

Cooperation (%)
ENHANCED CHOICE MODEL (ECM)

98.1% Highly enriched, contingent break
1.5% Semi-enriched break, always available
0.4% Regularly programmed activities, always available
FURTHER ASSESSMENT: BEHAVIORAL SKILL GENERALIZATION

Will Joshua use his skills with a different person?

What if someone doesn’t know what “my way” means?
GENERALIZATION SUMMARY
GENERALIZATION
SUMMARY
## CASE EXAMPLE PROCESS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Iteration</th>
<th>Steps</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Iteration 1</td>
<td>Assessment data and plan development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Implementation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Check for response</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iteration 2</td>
<td>Diagnostic assessment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Plan adjustment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Check for response</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iteration 3</td>
<td>Diagnostic assessment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Plan adjustment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Check for response</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
RECOMMENDATIONS

Deliver diagnostic reading assessment in the context of skill-based treatment and use results to inform instruction.
RECOMMENDATIONS

Continue reminding Joshua of his options prior to and throughout academic intervention sessions

• Polite request
• Accept being told no
• Cooperate
• Walk away (hangout)
RECOMMENDATIONS

Continue intermittently and unpredictably reinforcing each skill

- Polite request
- Accept being told no
- Cooperate
- Walk away (hangout) should always be reinforced, though the substance of hangout may change
RECOMMENDATIONS

Continue increasing the rigor of academic instruction as Joshua is successful.

As a team, monitor progress on specific reading (and other) targets and use data to inform needs for adjustment.

Communication skill deficits contribute to severe problem behavior.

Typical classroom events evoke severe problem behavior:

- Denials of requests
- Presentation of academic work

[Chow & Hollo, 2018; Chow & Wehby, 2018; Gunter & Coutinho, 1997; Hollo, Wehby, & Oliver, 2014; Sutherland, Lewis-Palmer, Stichter, & Morgan, 2008]
WRAP UP
Q&A
Please Complete this Session’s Evaluation
Session #A4 - Intentional Integration of Intensive Intervention

1. In the Event Platform/App:
   • In “Files” tab,
   • In “Evaluations” in the navigation menu
   • In “Chat”

OR

2. QR Code

Evaluations are anonymous! We send reminder emails to all participants.

AFTER YOU SUBMIT EACH SESSION EVALUATION, CLICK THE LINK TO ENTER THE GIFT CARD RAFFLE
THANK YOU!