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Abstract

A multi-tiered system of supports offers a comprehensive model for the prevention of academic and behavior problems in schools. To date, research has emphasized the impact of universal and intensive interventions. However, the need for research on secondary or targeted group interventions (Tier 2) for those students who do not respond to the universal level of support is growing. This study evaluated CICO, a Tier 2 intervention, in improving student behavior when it is used with three elementary students from a high-need population and in conjunction with student accountability tracking, designed to promote parental involvement. Functional assessments indicated that all three students had attention-maintained problem behavior during instruction sessions. The study employed a concurrent multiple baseline design across students to assess the effects of CICO and CICO with accountability tracking on academic engagement and problem behavior. Results indicated that the team members were able to implement CICO with fidelity and their implementation of the intervention was effective in increasing academic engagement and reducing problem behavior. The CICO with accountability tracking implementation with one student contributed to further improvement of his target behaviors. These effects were shown to be maintained moderately well for two students who underwent fading. Results are discussed in terms of the study limitations and implications for practice and future research.
Introduction

School discipline is a concern here in the U.S. A report on youth violence released by the Office of the Surgeon General (2001) suggests that the number of students displaying problem behaviors in schools is rising. This report also discussed the correlation of poor academic performance and problem behavior and their potential to be at risk for violent behaviors later in life. In response to similar concerns, schools are implementing a multi-tiered system of supports. School-Wide Positive Behavior Support (SWPBS) is designed to incorporate the use of individualized behavior support interventions, but more importantly, the primary goal is the implementation of prevention practices that work to support the entire school population (Luiselli, Putnam, Handler, & Feinberg, 2005). As of June 2012, over 16,000 schools nationwide were implementing some portion of the SWPBS (Sugai & Simenson, 2012).

SWPBS utilizes three levels of prevention. The primary level (Tier 1), also referred to as universal supports, focuses on the prevention of problem behaviors through the development of school-wide expectations that encourage appropriate behavior. Out of the student population, typically 80% are likely to respond to Tier 1. The secondary level (Tier 2) includes targeted interventions for students (approximately 10% to 15% of students) for whom the first tier of intervention is ineffective on its own. The remaining ~5% of students require support at the tertiary level (Tier 3) which consists of individualized interventions for their severe problem behaviors (Crone, Hawken, &
SWPBS has been shown to have a great impact at the universal level as well as at the intensive individual tertiary level (Horner, Sugai, Todd, & Lewis-Palmer, 2005; Walker et al. 1996). However, before a child develops the need for a Tier 3 individualized intensive intervention, support should be provided at the Tier 2 level to address behavioral concerns. Targeted interventions that fall under the Tier 2 level include programs such as social skills training, peer mentors, and a very popular choice which will be explored further: Check-In/Check-Out. According to Horner et al. (2005), there are three elements that have been identified as being crucial to the effectiveness of Tier 2 interventions: team-based system of planning, intervention practices that are available and known by the staff, and use of data to make program decisions.

An effective and frequently used Tier 2 intervention is Check-In/Check-Out (CICO) also referred to as the Behavior Education Program (BEP). Benefits of this approach include: (1) increasing antecedent prompts for appropriate (goal) behavior, (2) increasing the daily and weekly amount of adult feedback, (3) providing a more structured daily schedule for students, and (4) improving the school feedback to families with respect to the students behavior goals (Filter et al., 2007). The CICO intervention has the following main components: (a) students “check-in” with an adult (the CICO coordinator) in the morning, receive their daily report card (DRC; also referred to as a daily point card), and reviews the day’s expectations; (b) students receive ongoing feedback from teachers/staff throughout the day; (c) students “check-out” in the afternoon and review their DRC with the CICO coordinator, discussing the level of success; and (d) a summary of the DRC, or the DRC itself, is sent home for parents to sign and return the following day. When the student checks-out and discusses their
overall behavior performance, the CICO coordinator assesses the student’s progress by quantifying the child’s daily report card scores. A pre-established goal is put in place by the CICO team in advanced (for instance 80% of total points possible) in order to determine if the day was a success overall (Crone et al., 2010).

Many CICO programs use the office discipline referrals (ODRs) as a means of program qualification, but these data are often used to assess success of the program as well. ODRs have been shown to serve as reliable cut points in determining the level of support needed by a student: zero to one ODR being adequately supported by Tier 1 support; two to five ODRs indicating need for Tier 2 support; and six or more indicating need for Tier 3 support (McIntosh, Campbell, Carter, & Zumbo, 2009). Some studies rely on the use of ODR data as the primary means of quantifying the CICO program (Filter et al., 2007; Hawken, 2006; Hawken, MacLeod, & Rawlings, 2007; Hawken, O’Neill, & MacLeod, 2011). While ODRs are commonly used in the public school system to assess interventions, ODRs are liable to miss individual behaviors that can still have a significant impact on the classroom environment. However, few studies included direct observation of target behaviors in addition to ODR data (Simonsen, Myers, & Briere, 2011; Todd, Campbell, Meyer, & Horner, 2008) while others use direct observations as their primary form of reported data (Campbell & Anderson, 2008; Campbell & Anderson, 2011; Hawken & Horner, 2003). McCurdy, Kunsch, and Reibstein (2007) reported the percentage of DRC points earned per day as their primary data source.

Many of the studies on CICO included checks for social validity and showed that, overall, the CICO program was well received by teachers and parents (Campbell &
Anderson, 2011; Filter et al., 2007; Hawken & Horner, 2003; Hawken et al., 2007; Hawken et al., 2011; Simonsen et al., 2011; Todd et al., 2008). In order to assess the extent to which the program procedures are consistent with skills, resources, and administrative supports available to team members, the *Self-Assessment of Contextual Fit in Schools* can be used (Hawken et al., 2011; Todd et al. 2008).

Of the current literature on CICO, the fidelity checks reported are often very limited and do not delve into the quality of implementation, but instead focus only on the overall implementation (Filter et al., 2007; Hawken, 2006; Hawken & Horner, 2003; Hawken et al., 2007; Hawken, et al., 2011). The components most frequently assessed for accurate implementation are: (1) student checks-in at start of the day; (2) DRC is marked by the teacher; (3) student checks-out at the end of day; (4) parent’s initialed DRC; (5) data is assessed by implementation team. While these are key components, research has not been done to assess whether the teacher is attending to all of his/her components (i.e., marks DRC at the designated intervals throughout the day, gives student verbal feedback, etc.), nor has the assigned adult at check-in/out been assessed (i.e., checks to see if student has materials, goes over expectations for the day with student, uses positive statements, provides reinforcers for points at check-out). These are all essential components of the CICO intervention as described by Crone et al. (2010) and should likewise be assessed for accurate implementation.

One of the biggest points of concerns in regards to fidelity of CICO is that while teacher feedback, check-in/check-out attendance, and data collection fidelity were consistent, studies show a lack of family review and feedback (Filter et al., 2007; Hawken et al., 2007). In some cases parents did not initial the DRC that was sent home,
nor did they complete and return the social validity questionnaire. In the study conducted by Filter et al. (2007) on 19 students from 3 elementary schools, only seven out of the 17 individuals who completed the fidelity questionnaire reported that a family member reliably initialed the DRCs. Additionally, only 41% of respondents, consisting of teachers, administrators, and staff, said that the family feedback component was even utilized. Hawken et al., (2007) reported that family review and feedback only occurred 36% of the time. In a study conducted by Gutman and McLoyd (2000) it was found that of families living in poverty, parents of high achieving students were more involved in their child’s academic activities and had a greater amount of school-home collaboration than parents of low achieving students.

Considering that the schools operating with a high degree of home-school collaboration and those that utilized the DRC more often throughout the day, showed stronger effects than those that did not, as shown in a meta-analysis of 17 DRC studies (Vannest, Davis, Davis, Mason & Burke, 2010), procedures for increasing the parent use of the DRC should be sought out in order to increase the effectiveness of the CICO intervention for students who are not showing adequate, desired behavior change if the parent portion is not consistently being utilized.

The use of a daily behavior report card for school-home communication is not a novel idea. Chafouleas, Riley-Tillman, and McDougal (2002) looked at the use of DRCs as a monitoring and intervention technique. However, the use of the DRC with CICO serves as a visual prompt for the student throughout the day, and increases family participation in the students’ academic and behavioral progress. Based on the student’s success throughout the day, parents can choose to carry the day’s behavior consequences
to the home environment. Long and Edwards (1994) stressed that like other behavioral interventions, the effectiveness of using a DRC depends on the extent of correct and the consistent implementation.

Another issue to note in the CICO intervention is the lack of research regarding fading of the intervention. Crone et al. (2010) recommends that once the students are ready to be removed from the CICO program, they should be gradually eased off the intervention. This is also supported by research conducted by Campbell & Anderson (2011). In their component analysis of CICO with four elementary students, after maintaining a high percentage of possible DRC points, the students were weaned off the adult attention by decreasing the intervals at which they received teacher feedback throughout the day (two, one, zero). One student made it to the zero level where only the check-in and check-out components of the intervention were in place. Three out of four students continued to maintain low levels of in-classroom problem behaviors, but still required a return to an increased level of teacher feedback. All students showed an increase in academic engagement.

While the authors speculate that the most powerful components of CICO might be the morning check-in and afternoon check-out, fading of these components should also be assessed. Reducing the coordinator’s role in CICO and transitioning to a classroom managed behavior intervention might be appropriate. Once the DRC has been reduced to fewer instances of daily feedback, while still shown to be effective for participating students, the teacher could incorporate the intervention into his/her classroom management techniques already in place.
Therefore, the purpose of the present study was to evaluate the effectiveness of the standard CICO intervention in a high-need public elementary school (K-5th grade) and the additional component of student accountability-tracking for those who required additional support. It was hypothesized that the standard CICO would be effective in decreasing problem behaviors and increasing academic engagement for at-risk students from a high-need area. For students who require additional support, it was hypothesized that increasing the parental involvement by increasing the accountability for students to obtain the signed DRC with marked checklist items, there would be further improvements in student behavior. This study extends the literature by: a) assessing CICO in a high-need population; b) promoting family involvement through student accountability tracking; and c) examining all aspects of the CICO implementation fidelity. This study addressed the following questions:

1. To what extent was the CICO intervention implemented with fidelity by team members (i.e., teachers, coordinator, and parents)?

2. To what extent were students from high-need backgrounds successful on the standard version of CICO?

3. To what degree did the CICO intervention with additional student accountability tracking further improve student problem behavior and academic engagement?

4. Were students capable of being systematically faded off of the CICO intervention and still maintain positive outcomes?
Method

Setting

This study took place at a high-need local public elementary school (K– 5th grade) located in a low-income residential area. The school’s population was approximately 420 students and was listed as a Title 1 school, where at least 75% are eligible for free or reduced price meals. Of the student population, approximately 66% were African-American, 24% were Hispanic, and 9% were Caucasian. The school consisted of three to five classes in each grade level with an average of 17 children per class. Additionally, the school had 17 students that attend one of three Emotional and Behavior Disorder (EBD) classes on a full-time basis. The school’s average daily attendance for the previous academic year was reported at 95%.

The school was assessed using the Benchmarks of Quality – Revised (Kincaid, Childs, & George, 2010) and received a 95 out of 107 points signifying that Tier 1 SWPBS was being implemented with fidelity. Some of these critical elements from the Benchmarks of Quality – Revised Survey included: (a) visibly posted expectations (Respectful, Eager to learn, Active Learners, Directions-we follow them promptly, and Yes to safe and responsible choices) that have been defined and taught to all students, (b) a school-wide token economy system in place with a focus on rewarding appropriate behavior as defined by the school-wide expectations, and (c) a series of consequences are in place in the event of rule violation (e.g., major office discipline referrals, minor office
discipline referrals). Even though the school had been implementing Tier 1 with fidelity for more than three years, they still had many behavioral concerns. In the previous academic year, before the study began, it was reported that the school had a total of 93 major office discipline referrals (ODRs). This was the school’s first academic year of CICO implementation.

**Participants**

The primary participants in this study consisted of three first grade boys, and their two classroom teachers. The secondary participants are their three parents and the school CICO coordinator (guidance counselor). All child participants were from African-American families with incomes below the poverty line and were receiving free lunch at the school. They were all from single-parent families. Through implementation of SWPBS, the school’s behavior support team identified the participating students who were not adequately progressing while receiving Tier 1 supports, having moderate problem behavior. Selection criteria for students included: (a) having received a major ODR or two to five minor ODRs in the current academic school year; (b) exhibiting problem behaviors that occurred throughout the day; and (c) the maintaining factor for problem behavior was hypothesized to be attention. Exclusion from the study included: (a) students whose problem behaviors were dangerous to themselves or others; (b) students whose problem behaviors did not occur in multiple locations or time periods; and (c) students who found adult attention aversive. Teachers were eligible for participation if they had at least one, but no more than two students in the CICO program. This was to ensure that teachers had adequate time to review the students’ behavior throughout the day using the DRC. Once students were deemed eligible, a meeting was
held in order to explain the study and attain written parental and teacher consent and student assent. Neither monetary compensation nor extra credit was provided for participation in the study. Students were evaluated using a Functional Assessment Checklist for Teachers and Staff (FACTS - A & B; March et al., 2000; see appendix A), a brief (20-30 min.) functional assessment teacher interview tool, in order to ascertain if problem behaviors were in fact in line with the selection criteria. The results of FACTS were corroborated with results of observations conducted during the academic time period when problem behaviors occurred most often, as suggested by the FACTS.

**Students.** Evan was 7 years old, and did not have any known developmental or medical diagnoses. On the statewide reading assessment, he was performing in the 75th percentile in relation to his peers. He was referred to the CICO program for problem behavior in the classroom. It was reported that Evan engaged in frequent out-of-seat behavior, verbal classroom disruption (i.e. crying, whining, grunting), and nonverbal classroom disruption (i.e. throwing items, kicking or hitting furniture or objects) often requiring the school’s Behavior Specialist to assist the teacher with problem behaviors about three to four times a week. While these behaviors occurred throughout the day, the teacher had indicated in the FACTS that they most frequently occurred in the morning during writing. This was corroborated by direct observations by the researcher. At this time, it was also observed that problem behaviors occurred at higher rates when the teacher did not provide attention immediately following Evan’s request or hand raise. Peer attention was also observed to be reinforcing. During situations in which Evan was given the opportunity to be in front of the class for a special task, garnering attention, his
problem behaviors occurred less often and he did not engage in the problem behaviors throughout the duration of following instructions.

Jeremy was 6 years old, and did not have any known developmental or medical diagnoses. On the statewide reading assessment, he was performing in the 10th percentile in relation to his peers. The school’s behavior support team referred him for problem behavior that occurred throughout the day. Jeremy was frequently observed engaging in off-task behavior, not attending to the teacher or materials, as well as engaging in inappropriate sitting (i.e. lying across the chair, sitting/laying on the floor, rocking the chair) and physical classroom disruption in the form of hitting and throwing items, sweeping items off the desk, and removing items from his desk cubby or backpack onto the floor. The teacher often required the Behavior Specialist’s support in the classroom to address Jeremy’s problem behaviors on a weekly basis. Teacher and adult attention were reported and observed to be a high reinforcer for Jeremy’s behavior. Based on the FACTS and direct observations by the researcher, it was determined that Jeremy’s problem behavior was most likely to occur during class instruction/activities that took place in the morning till lunch, with reading being most problematic.

James was a typically developing 7-year-old from the same class as Evan. He also did not have any known developmental or medical diagnoses. On the statewide reading assessment, James was performing in the 10th percentile in comparison with his peers. James was referred for problem behavior that was observed to be in the form of physical classroom disruption (i.e. hitting, kicking, throwing items, knocking over furniture), frequent out-of-seat behavior, lying on the floor, and was often off-task, not attending to the materials or the teacher during times of instruction. The Behavior
Specialist was being utilized to address James’ problem behaviors on a weekly basis. Information obtained through the FACTS and observations by the researcher indicated that unstructured activities were especially problematic for James. During center activities in which students were permitted to work with peers in designated locations around the room (science station, buddy read, etc.), James was most frequently observed engaging in problem behaviors. During this time, the teacher’s attention was often directed at a couple of students in a teacher-directed activity center. James was observed engaging in problem behaviors, receiving both peer attention (giggles, complaints, conversational interaction) and teacher attention (reprimands, verbal or physical redirection).

**Teachers.** Two first grade teachers participated in the study. One student (Jeremy) was from Teacher 1’s first grade class consisting of 18 students (72% African-American, 17% Hispanic, and 11% Caucasian). Teacher 1 was a fairly new teacher with three years of teaching experience. This was her second year teaching at a school implementing SWPBS. Her classroom management strategies included: having the SWPBS rules and expectations posted, teaching and referring to them throughout the year; assigned seating that was easy to maneuver while not providing excess opportunities for elopement; using a classroom level system in which students’ name cards are moved up a level at the end of the day for good behavior, working towards a classroom party/activity once the whole class reached a set goal; and using a token economy which was integrated into the overall schoolwide Tier 1 token system.

Two students (Evan and James) were from Teacher 2’s first grade class consisting of 17 students (82% African-American, 12% Hispanic, and 6% Middle Eastern). Teacher
2 was also a fairly new teacher with two years of experience. Her classroom management strategies included: having the SWPBS rules and expectations posted, teaching and referring to them throughout the year; having a posted daily schedule that is discussed with the students at the start of each day; using a five-level color system in which students’ clips were moved up and down throughout the day in response to their behavior with students receiving tokens at the end of the day for finishing on the third level or hire; and using a token economy that was integrated into the schoolwide Tier 1 token system. Teacher 2 was also observed giving frequent praise for desired behaviors and even utilized pivot praise. During these times she would turn to a student who was engaging in the desired behavior and publicly acknowledge/praise them while paying little to no attention to students engaging in undesired behaviors, quickly turning back to provide them praise once they began to engage in the desired behavior.

**Parents and CICO Coordinator.** The participating students’ parents and the school CICO coordinator participated as secondary participants to provide data on treatment fidelity. Evan’s mother was a single parent in her mid thirties. Teacher 2 reported that communications were difficult and that papers and materials sent home requiring parent attention or signature were often not looked at nor returned unless a phone call home was made. This was often made more difficult because the home phone number was sometimes disconnected. Teacher 2 indicated that the instances she was successful in reaching Evan’s mother, follow through with requests was often seen. Jeremy’s mother was a single parent in her late twenties. Teacher 1 reported that communication with home were successful approximately half of the time. James’ mother was a single parent in her mid forties. Teacher 2 reported that James’ mother was
often disinterested in collaborating with the school on addressing James’ problem behaviors, frequently declining to meet with faculty and administrators on campus. Communications home, through notes in the student’s planner and school flyers, were successful about half of the time in receiving a response. The school guidance counselor was a female in her early forties. She had been working at the school for three years and had been serving on the school’s PBS team for the current school year.

Measurements

Direct Observation of Problem Behavior and Academic Engagement. Both student problem behavior and behaviors linked to academic engagement were identified and operationally defined, based on the results obtained through the FACTS questionnaire and two 30-min direct observation sessions conducted covertly by the researcher prior to baseline data collection. All target behaviors were recorded during 30-minute sessions using a 15-second partial interval recording procedure (see appendix B for interval recording data sheet). The percentages of intervals for academic engagement and problem behavior were measured. For all participants, one academic target behavior for increase and two problem behaviors for reduction were chosen (see Table 1 for complete list and operational definitions of behaviors). For Evan, academic engagement was chosen to be sitting appropriately, and problem behaviors were verbal classroom disruption and nonverbal classroom disruption. For both Jeremy and James, academic engagement was chosen to be attending and problem behaviors were inappropriate sitting and classroom disruption.

Direct observations occurred three to five days per week for each student and took place during the academic time period when problem behaviors occurred most often, as
suggested by the FACTS. Observations were conducted using an iPhone/Android application called Interval Timer to signal the intervals within 30-minute sessions. Intervals were set to occur every 15 seconds throughout the 30-minute observation sessions at which time the timer would lightly buzz or make a quiet tick sound. If the observer was unable to easily hear the signal sound, earphones were permitted so that increasing the volume would not disturb the classroom being observed.

**Treatment Fidelity.** In order to assess correct implementation of CICO procedures, three areas of treatment fidelity were assessed: teacher implementation, CICO coordinator implementation, and parent use of DRC. (See appendix D for fidelity checklists). A trained research assistant covertly conducted the fidelity checks using a yes/no format checklist for 24% of intervention sessions. Teacher fidelity assessments occurred in the classroom and included six items: (1) marking the card after each assigned class segment; (2) treating each class segment independently; (3) providing verbal feedback; (4) going over what was inappropriate and how to do better if a score of “0” is received; (5) giving the student praise and going over how to do better next time if the score of “1” is received; and (6) giving the student praise if a score of “2” is received. Two teachers were assessed during the standard CICO phase. In addition, while the researcher acted as the primary CICO coordinator, the school’s guidance counselor served as an additional trained CICO support coordinator on the days the primary CICO coordinator was unavailable. This coordinator was assessed for treatment fidelity on 11 items: (1) asking the student to show their materials at check-in or prompting the student for their DRC; (2) checking for parent signature and checklist; (3) providing praise for turning in a signed card or reminding the student for the next day; (4) asking the student
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Academic Engagement</th>
<th>Problem Behavior</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Evan</strong></td>
<td><strong>Sitting Appropriately</strong> - Sitting on bottom in assigned desk chair or sitting on bottom or knees in assigned spot on floor for longer than 8 sec.; kneeling in chair does not qualify as in-seat behavior unless the child is seated such that there is contact between their bottom legs.</td>
<td>• <strong>Verbal Classroom Disruption</strong> - Any verbal echoing of teacher’s dialogue without explicit instruction from the teacher to do so; crying, loud exhalation audible from 3ft away, grunting, or any vocalization above the classroom’s volume or attempting to engage peers in conversation when the teacher is giving instruction or when expectation is to work independently.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• <strong>Nonverbal Classroom Disruption</strong> – Any attempt to throw items at others, desk, or floor; throwing items, hitting one item with hand or item, kicking or knocking over items or furniture, removing items from desk by engaging in a sweeping motion with arms; removing of items from the desk cubby or backpack onto the floor or desktop.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Jeremy</strong></td>
<td><strong>Attending</strong> – Eyes are directed toward the teacher or instructional materials presented by the teacher for longer than 8 sec. during instruction; touching, manipulating, or interacting with assigned task materials, working on assignments or completing independent work for longer than 8 sec. during in seat work or group work.</td>
<td>• <strong>In appropriate Sitting</strong> - One or more feet on the desktop, chair, or counter such that the student’s weight is supported by the foot/feet; kneeling in seat; rocking or leaning the chair so that two or more chair legs are off the ground; laying across the chair or desk on back or belly; lying on the floor on back or belly; failure to remain in assigned seat, being out of assigned area.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• <strong>Classroom Disruption</strong> - Any attempt to throw items at others, desk, or floor; throwing items, hitting one item with hand or item, kicking or knocking over items or furniture, removing items from desk by engaging in a sweeping motion with arms; removing of items from the desk cubby or backpack onto the floor or desktop.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>James</strong></td>
<td><strong>Attending</strong> – Eyes are directed toward the teacher or instructional materials presented by the teacher for longer than 8 sec. during instruction; touching, manipulating, or interacting with assigned task materials, working on assignments or completing independent work for longer than 8 sec. during in seat work or group work.</td>
<td>• <strong>In appropriate Sitting</strong> - Failure to remain in assigned seat, being out of assigned area.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• <strong>Classroom Disruption</strong> - Any attempt to throw items at others, desk, or floor; throwing items, hitting one item with hand or item, kicking or knocking over items or furniture.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
to identify the expectations; (5) reviewing the students point goal for the day; (6) collecting the DRC from the student at afternoon check-out; (7) reviewing the days progress; (8) tallying DRC points; (9) asking the student to identify the expectations again; (10) reminding the student to have parents sign the card; and (11) concluding the session with a positive statement.

Further treatment fidelity was assessed by measuring the parent use of DRC for 100% of intervention and fading sessions. The assessment of parent use of the DRC was focused on whether the parent reviewed the DRC with the child and provided feedback to the coordinator. The assessment was done during each session when students arrived at check-in, by recording whether or not the student returned the previous day’s DRC with a parent signature. The percentage of steps (items) implemented by the teachers or coordinator and the frequency of parents provided signed DRC were measured to assess the treatment fidelity.

Social Validity

At the conclusion of the study, participating students, parents, and teachers were given the student, teacher, and parent versions of the Behavior Education Program Acceptability Questionnaire (Crone et al., 2010; see appendix E) in order to ascertain their opinions on the intervention. These questionnaires assessed social validity using a Likert-type scale (1-6) with higher scores indicating higher acceptability. For students, eight items were assessed including if they felt it helped change their behavior, if they would want to participate again, and if they were likely to recommend the intervention to other students. For parents, seven items were assessed including whether they felt the intervention helped keep them informed of their child’s behavior, if they felt the
intervention was successful in increasing academic performance, and if they felt their child’s behavior had improved. For teachers, seven items were assessed with an additional option to write in comments at the end. Questions addressed whether the CICO was worth the time and effort, whether they felt there was a significant change in behavior, the ease of implementation, and if they would recommend the program to others teachers.

**Interobserver Agreement**

In order to assess interobserver agreement (IOA), two observers independently and simultaneously recorded data for approximately 30% of all direct observation sessions across participants, behaviors, and experimental conditions. Six research assistants filling the role of observers consisted of psychology undergraduate students and graduate students in an Applied Behavior Analysis Master’s Program, who had been trained on data collection for classroom observations of target behaviors. Observers were trained in data collection methods using (a) verbal instruction, (b) modeling, and (c) an instructional training video created by the researcher, which included a practice observation test. Additionally, observers were given a list of behaviors for each child to have on-hand at all times during observations. Observers practiced data collection procedures with the researcher until 85% reliability was achieved during a 10-min observation test period. Most observers’ scores were above 90%. Percentage of agreements was calculated using a point-by-point method (Kazdin, 1982) by dividing the number of agreements by the number of agreements plus disagreements, multiplied by 100. Mean IOAs for baseline and interventions across student participants were 97.40%
and 96.55%, respectively. Table 2 displays details on IOAs across participants and behaviors in each experimental phase.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Phases</th>
<th>Evan AE</th>
<th>Evan PB</th>
<th>Jeremy AE</th>
<th>Jeremy PB</th>
<th>James AE</th>
<th>James PB</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Baseline</td>
<td>97.92%</td>
<td>96.67%</td>
<td>96.67%</td>
<td>97.92%</td>
<td>96.94%</td>
<td>98.33%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Standard CICO</td>
<td>97.92%</td>
<td>98.34%</td>
<td>95.83%</td>
<td>96.46%</td>
<td>93.84%</td>
<td>95.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accountability CICO</td>
<td>96.39%</td>
<td>98.88%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fading</td>
<td>95.83%</td>
<td>97.67%</td>
<td></td>
<td>95.21%</td>
<td>96.67%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>97.02%</td>
<td>97.89%</td>
<td>96.25%</td>
<td>97.17%</td>
<td>95.33%</td>
<td>96.83%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note. AE: Academic Engagement; PB: Problem Behavior*

**Experimental Design and Procedures**

The outcome of the CICO intervention was tested using a concurrent multiple baseline design across participants, with five phases: baseline, standard CICO, standard CICO plus student accountability tracking, systematic fading, and follow-up.

Additionally, a preference assessment was conducted using a 42-item student survey with a 0-2 rating scale (see appendix F) to ensure that the items available for purchase with their CICO points were desired and likely to act as reinforcers. The DRC was developed by the researcher in collaboration with both teachers. The DRC’s format consisted of a grid in which each teacher’s class schedule was broken down into six main subjects and
listed in a row along the top. The school’s five READY expectations (Respectful, Eager to learn, Active learner, Directions I follow them, and Yes to safe choices) were listed in a column along the left side. Next to each expectation an example was written on what to do. The researcher worked with the teachers to come up with these examples so that they correlated with the language being used in the classroom (nice hands and feet, walking feet, etc.) and met the teachers’ classroom needs.

**Staff Training.** School faculty and staff attended a 20-minute information session on the basics of CICO program and the referral process. This session was conducted by the researcher and consisted of a PowerPoint presentation and elements from the DVD, *The Behavior Education Program: A Check-In/Check-Out Intervention for Students at Risk* (Hawken, Pettersson, Mootz, & Anderson, 2006). The focus of this session was on school-wide support for the CICO program. Once students had been selected for participation, their teachers were given additional one-on-one training (approximately 20-30 minute session) with the researcher prior to baseline data collection, reviewing the CICO program, their role in the process, and how to use the DRC point card.

**Baseline.** After obtaining signed consent and assent and conducting the appropriate assessments for eligibility, initial observations were conducted across target activities to determine current levels of academic engagement and problem behavior.

During baseline, all participants continued to participate in the school’s universal supports as part of SWPBS. All students were instructed on the school’s expectations in the classroom, and these lessons were carried out school-wide. Additionally, the school utilized a school-wide token economy in which the students could earn paper tokens
(cougar coins) throughout the day for engaging in appropriate behaviors. All faculty and staff participated in administering the tokens to students throughout the day and each class had tangible reinforcers for which students could purchase with their tokens on designated days. Students also had the option of participating in the school store or buying special treats (i.e., ice pops, popcorn, sweets) on a monthly basis. Students continued to contact these universal supports and discipline measures throughout the study. Baseline data was collected 3-5 times per week for a period of approximately 2 weeks during the most problematic activity period of the school day. At the conclusion of baseline data collection, the researcher met with each teacher to review briefly the CICO process and their role. Both teachers easily recalled their responsibilities and did not express any additional concerns.

**Standard CICO.** During this phase, CICO consisted of morning and afternoon meetings with the coordinator and regular feedback from teachers using a DRC at designated intervals throughout the day. The point goal, determined during baseline, was used to assess the students’ progress each day. At morning check-in, students arrived at the designated CICO meeting room and met with the CICO coordinator. At this time the students returned the previous days’ DRC, with parent signature, to the coordinator. The coordinator then checked to see if the students had his/her materials (pencil, paper, planner). The student(s) at this time, was verbally reinforced for remembering to come to check-in, bringing the signed DRC, and having their materials. If the DRC was not returned signed, the coordinator talked to the student about remembering for the next day. The coordinator and student then reviewed the school’s expectations and discussed the day’s point goal. The student was given a DRC with the correlating information. Once
morning check-in was completed, the coordinator sent the student off to class. Teachers scored the students after each designated class segment using a 0-2 scale for each behavioral goal on the DRC point card. At the end of the day, students returned to the CICO location and checked-out with the coordinator. At this time the student provided the coordinator with their completed DRC for review. The coordinator and student discussed the day’s accomplishments and areas requiring additional efforts. The coordinator tallied the student’s DRC points and rewarded the student with the correlating incentive for the attained score. Data were collected on the percentage of intervals with both problem behavior and academic engagement. While data on the parent use of the DRC were collected, no additional efforts were made to increase its use. The CICO coordinator simply reminded the student to have a parent sign the card and provided verbal praise if this is achieved.

Prior to starting the intervention, each student attended one brief 20-min training session conducted by the researcher. The sessions consisted of: (a) instruction regarding what to do with the card at school; (b) modeling of the routine by the researcher; (c) a chance for students to rehearse the skills; and (d) feedback from the researcher.

**CICO with Student Accountability Tracking.** Out of the three students chosen to participate in the standard CICO program, one student, Evan, was shown to be unsuccessful with the standard CICO and was transferred to the CICO with accountability tracking intervention phase. Evan was selected based on the following inclusion criteria: (a) continued to maintain low levels of academic engagement and high levels of problem behavior throughout the day; (b) failed to turn in the previous days
DRC or show a lack of parental use of the DRC; and (c) failed to bring materials to school (i.e. backpack, planner).

CICO with student accountability tracking followed the daily schedule of the standard CICO. However, the student was assessed using a five-item accountability-tracking sheet (see appendix G) during the morning check-in routine. These items include: (1) bringing card to morning check-in; (2) having the card signed; (3) the parents have marked that the student showed them the card without a reminder; (4) the student brought their school items with them (e.g., pencil, paper, planner); and (5) the student consistently brought a signed DRC throughout the week. The DRC also included an additional place for parent response and a place for parental signature (see appendix C). In order to ensure that Evan understood what was expected, an additional 20-min session was conducted prior to the implementation of the accountability tracking. This session consisted of: (a) instruction regarding what to do with the new DRC and accountability sheet at school and at home (e.g., being responsible for giving card to mom and dad and having them sign); (b) modeling of the routine by the researcher; (c) a chance for students to rehearse the skills; and (d) feedback from the researcher. At this time, Evan was introduced to the new accountability-tracking component. The researcher reviewed with him the checklist items on the accountability-tracking sheet and explained his responsibilities for having his parent review and sign the DRC. As with the standard CICO, Evan was rewarded for meeting set point percentage goals. The accountability tracking included an additional chance to come into direct contact with those reinforcers at the start of the day. At the beginning of the morning check-in routine, the researcher went through the accountability-tracking sheet with him. During the student
accountability-tracking phase, Evan had the opportunity to earn additional points that were exchanged for additional incentives. These items correlated with the preference assessment conducted during the baseline phase and were available for purchase with their additional incentive points at the morning check-in. During the afternoon check-out, Evan was given a copy of the accountability-tracking sheet to take home in order to provide a visual reminder of his responsibilities.

**Fading.** Students who met their set point goals for at least 5 consecutive days began fading off the CICO program. Through their consistent patterns of target behaviors, these students had demonstrated that they might be capable of engaging in the desired academic behaviors independently. The fading and maintenance process was done gradually by systematically decreasing the number of times teachers utilize the DRC in the classroom. For example, if the teacher originally scored the student at five different time periods throughout the day, they would then move down to four feedback periods, then three. The final step in the fading procedure involved removing the CICO coordinator from the daily routine so that the teacher can continue using the feedback period and parent-home note as necessary. In the event that a student showed an undesired behavior change during the fading procedure, the student was returned to the last successful fading step for additional time until the student had consistently returned to a desired level of academic engagement and problem behavior.
Results

Treatment Fidelity

Scores on the teacher fidelity checklist indicated that all items (6 out of 6) were in place suggesting that the teachers were implementing the standard intervention with high fidelity across sessions. Scores indicated that all items were also in place and that implementation fidelity was carried throughout in both standard CICO and CICO with accountability tracking phases.

Additionally, the school’s guidance counselor served as an additional trained CICO support coordinator on the days the primary CICO coordinator was unavailable. This coordinator was assessed for treatment fidelity on 11 items. During the fidelity assessment, the additional support coordinator showed that all components were properly in place (11 out of 11) suggesting high coordinator treatment fidelity.

Figure 1 shows the percentage of sessions in which Evan returned the previous day’s DRC with a parent signature. During the standard CICO phase, Evan’s parent signed DRCs for approximately 13% of sessions. Once CICO with accountability tracking began, his parents signed DRCs for approximately 83% of the sessions. During fading phases percentage of sessions with parent signatures continued to increase to 92% of sessions.

Figure 2 also shows the percentage of sessions in which Jeremy and James returned the previous day’s DRC with a parent signature. During the standard CICO
phase, both Jeremy and James were returning the DRC with signature for approximately 82% and 75% of sessions respectfully. James’ percentage of sessions with signed DRC continued to increase throughout the fading phase to 83% of sessions.

**Student Behavior During Standard CICO**

Figure 3 displays data on the use of CICO across three participants regarding their percentage of intervals with academic engagement or problem behavior. During baseline, two participants displayed lower levels of academic engagement and higher levels of problem behavior compared to the intervention phase. Implementation of the standard CICO resulted in an immediate increase of academic engagement and immediate reduction of problem behavior across students.

For Evan, while baseline started out with relatively high academic engagement (68% of intervals for the first four sessions) and low problem behavior (10% of intervals for the first four sessions), by the fifth day of observations both target behaviors returned to the level reported by the teacher during the FACTS interview, averaging 20% (range = 13%-29%) of intervals with academic engagement and 39% (range = 33%-53%) of intervals with problem behavior for the last three sessions of baseline. Data showed an increasing trend for academic engagement and an increasing trend for problem behavior. Overall averages for baseline were 47% (range = 13%-87%) of intervals for academic engagement and 23% (range = 4%-53%) of intervals for problem behavior. It is likely that the higher levels of academic engagement and lower level of problem behavior during the initial phase of baseline than those reported by the teacher were the result of reactivity to the presence of the observers. Implementing the standard CICO, resulted in an immediate increase in academic engagement with an average of 62% (range= 37%-
Figure 1. Percentage of sessions in which Evan returned the DRC signed by a parent.

Figure 2. Percentage of sessions in which James and Jeremy returned the DRC signed by a parent.
87%). Problem behavior also decreased immediately following the implementation of CICO; however, it continued to occur during an average of 22% (range = 6%-47%) of intervals and had a great amount of variability. During this CICO phase, Evan was not returning signed cards the following school day, was not remembering to bring school items daily, and thus qualified to be moved to the accountability CICO phase.

Jeremy likewise started out with moderate levels of appropriate academic engagement and problem behavior in baseline. Although data were relatively variable, there was an observable decreasing trend for academic engagement and increasing trend for problem behavior. Academic engagement occurred an average of 48% (range = 26%-71%) of intervals during baseline and problem behavior occurred an average of 33% (range = 5%-63%). Once Jeremy was started on the Standard CICO phase, a high degree of level change was seen in both academic engagement at an average of 62% (range = 44%-84%) of intervals and problem behavior at an average of 19% (range = 1%-42%). By the fourteenth session, we see that Jeremy’s behaviors began to level out, close to the initial data seen during baseline, however, there was very little variability seen.

Unfortunately, after the twenty-first session, Jeremy was removed from the study due to moving to a new school.

James continued to operate at a relatively moderate level for both academic engagement (an average of 54%; range = 42%-65%) and problem behavior (an average of 27%; range = 14%-42%) during baseline. James displayed a significant level change immediately after he began participating in the standard CICO; behaviors were shown to be consistent with an average of 74% (range = 43%-97%) of intervals with academic engagement and an average of 17% (range = 3%-35%) of intervals with problem
behavior. There was an additional drop in academic engagement and an increase in problem behavior, which occurred during Session 18. A new CICO was conducting the morning and afternoon checks with the students during Sessions 18 through 21. The initial drop was most likely due to the change in staff, but effects were not long lasting as behavior returned to previous levels shortly after Session 18.

**Student Behavior During CICO with Accountability Tracking**

The CICO with accountability tracking was tested with only one student, Evan. Once Evan received additional supports through the accountability CICO, there was a consistent level change with academic engagement averaging 73% (range = 67%-96%), and problem behavior continued to drop to an average of 10% (range = 3%-36%). Changes in variability of both behaviors were also observed. Upon implementation of CICO with accountability tracking, Evan displayed a reduction in variability of both academic engagement and problem behavior.

**Student Behavior During the Fading Phase**

The number designation listed in the fading phase indicates the number of times the teacher provided feedback using the DRC throughout the day. The last fading phase is the time in which the coordinator was removed from the intervention and the student received only three instances of teacher feedback (morning, lunch, and prior to dismissal).

When the fading was introduced, Evan’s academic engagement and problem behavior remained stable with an average of 68% (range= 63%-72%) and 21% (range= 16%-24%) respectively. Academic engagement and problem behavior remained stable upon the second fading phase, with an average of 77% (range = 68%-84%) for academic
engagement and 18% (range = 9%-27%) for problem behavior. Upon the third fading, academic engagement further increased to 100% while problem behavior decreased to 0% in Session 33. Although both behaviors did not remain at those levels during the next session, academic engagement remained at a higher level while problem behavior remained at a lower level during the following two sessions than those observed in the prior fading phase.

Undesired behavioral changes were seen while attempting to move James onto the fading procedure phase 4 in which the teacher was assessing the student at only four segments throughout the day. Behavior returned to appropriate levels after returning to the previous fading phase in which five segments were used. Overall, Jeremy maintained an average of 66% (range = 19%-92%) of intervals with academic engagement and 14% (range = 0%-36%) with problem behavior during the fading phases.

Social Validity

At the conclusion of the study, participating students, faculty, and parents were given the student, teacher, and parent versions of the Behavior Education Program Acceptability Questionnaire (Crone et al., 2010; see appendix E) in order to ascertain their opinions on the intervention. Satisfaction with the intervention was rated high, with a mean of 5.59 (scores ranging from 4 to 6). Tables 3 through 5 show the results of the acceptability questionnaires across participants. Overall scores show high satisfaction amongst all participants, teachers, and parents including the likelihood of recommending the intervention to others. Only Evan’s parent returned the social validity survey. Attempts were made to contact Jeremy’s parent in order to follow up with social validity but were unsuccessful.
Figure 3. Percentage of intervals with academic engagement and problem behavior across experimental conditions for each student.
### Table 3. *BEP Acceptability Questionnaire Results for Teachers*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th><strong>Teacher 1</strong></th>
<th><strong>Teacher 2</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a)</td>
<td>Problem behaviors have decreased since enrollment in the modified CICO program</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b)</td>
<td>Appropriate classroom behaviors have increased since enrollment in the modified CICO program</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c)</td>
<td>It was relatively easy (e.g. amount of time/effort) to implement the modified CICO program</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d)</td>
<td>How effective was the modified CICO program in decreasing students' number of absences and tardies?</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e)</td>
<td>The modified CICO process for this student was worth the time and effort</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f)</td>
<td>I would recommend that other schools (or classrooms) use the modified CICO program with similar students</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Mean</strong></td>
<td>5.6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Table 4. *BEP Acceptability Questionnaire Results for Students*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th><strong>Evan</strong></th>
<th><strong>James</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a)</td>
<td>CICO helps me improve my behavior at school.</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b)</td>
<td>CICO helps increase my homework completion and classroom assignments completion.</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c)</td>
<td>CICO helps me decrease the number of days I am tardy.</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d)</td>
<td>CICO helps decrease the number of days I am absent</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e)</td>
<td>It is easy to be on CICO (carry the card around, get parents to sign, check-in/out daily)</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f)</td>
<td>CICO is worth the time and effort. Overall, it really helps me.</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>g)</td>
<td>If I had a choice, I would participate in CICO again.</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>h)</td>
<td>I think CICO would be good for other kids who may be struggling in school.</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Mean</strong></td>
<td>5.7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 5. *BEP Acceptability Questionnaire Results for Parents*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Parent (Evan)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a)</td>
<td>How effective was CICO in improving your child's behavior at school?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b)</td>
<td>How effective was CICO in increasing your child's academic performance (e.g. improving grades)?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c)</td>
<td>How effective was CICO in decreasing your child's number of absences and tardies?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d)</td>
<td>How easy was it to participate in CICO (e.g. review and sign the card, communicating with the school)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e)</td>
<td>Having my child on CICO was worth my time and effort.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f)</td>
<td>CICO really helps me know how well my child is doing in school on a daily basis.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>g)</td>
<td>I would recommend CICO to other parents and students.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Mean</strong></td>
<td><strong>5.9</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Discussion**

This study evaluated the impact of the secondary tier intervention, Check-in/Check-out (CICO), on academic engagement and problem behavior for three elementary students from a high-need population. In addition to the standard CICO, CICO with student accountability tracking was implemented with a student to examine whether the enhanced CICO would further improve the student’s target behaviors. The study measured treatment fidelity across teachers, coordinator, and parents to examine whether the team members were able to implement the intervention procedures with fidelity. The results indicated that the team members implemented the CICO with fidelity, with the exception of the standard CICO phase for Evan, and their implementation of intervention was effective in increasing the participating students’ academic engagement and reducing problem behavior. The CICO with accountability tracking implemented with one student contributed to further improvement of his target behaviors. These effects were shown to be maintained moderately well for two students who underwent fading. The CICO interventions examined in this study also demonstrated strong social validity. The students, teachers, and parents all expressed satisfaction with the outcomes of the intervention procedures.

The findings were consistent with previous research in that staff can implement the CICO components with fidelity (Campbell & Anderson, 2011; Filter et al., 2007; Hawken et al., 2011; Simonsen et al., 2011; Todd et al., 2008). The implementation
fidelity scores showed that all elements were fully in place by staff. During implementation of the CICO intervention, teachers anecdotally reported finding that the DRC served as a visual reminder for them to provide ongoing feedback to their students on their behavior progress throughout the day.

This study also supports previous findings that CICO is effective in increasing academic engagement and reducing problem behavior of students in general education settings (Campbell & Anderson, 2011; Filter et al., 2007; Hawken et al., 2007; Hawken et al., 2011; McIntosh et al., 2009; Simenson et al., 2011). The data also extends the current literature on CICO/BEP conducted with urban elementary school students in high low-income settings (McCurdy et al., 2007), as well as the overall CICO body of literature by including additional research on CICO with elementary students from high-need minority families.

The present data support the contention of previous researchers in that for students who have not responded to an evidence-based intervention, such as the standard CICO, more intensive interventions or additional supports are needed to maximize treatment gains (Campbell & Anderson, 2008; Hawken, 2006; Hawken et al., 2007; McIntosh et al., 2009). It was apparent that Evan’s academic engagement increased and problem behavior decreased with the standard CICO, but not to the full extent possible. The use of student accountability tracking accounted for a greater improvement in his target behaviors. Compared to Jeremy and James, Evan had lower levels of academic engagement and higher levels of problem behaviors that were present along with a low rate of parent-teacher communication. By supplementing the standard CICO intervention
with accountability tracking it was possible to promote behavior change without requiring Tier 3 intervention supports.

The present data suggest that the use of school-home collaboration has a significant impact on the support of at-risk students in general education settings. Home-school collaboration enables parents to be part of intervention and foster greater school success as demonstrated in this study and in the literature (Chafouleas et al., 2002; Long & Edwards, 1994; Vannest et al., 2010). The accountability tracking method used in this study contributed to increased parent involvement, which may have led to increased outcome for one student.

One important aspect of the present study is its maintenance. The fading data indicated that removing the children from the DRC by systematically reducing the instances of feedback throughout the day and removing the coordinator was successful for one student. However, one student did need to be returned to a previous fading phase which could indicate that fading phases might need to be extended as changing levels of support could cause an adverse effect on target behaviors as corroborated in a component analysis study conducted by Campbell and Anderson (2011). Schools looking to implement CICO should consider that some students might require being on CICO for an extended period of time. However, options to reduce the staff resources (teacher time, use of daily reinforcers, etc.) for these at-risk students should be explored in order to sustain the intervention without risking staff burnout (Pas, Bradshaw, Herschfeldt, & Leaf, 2010).

While the standard CICO intervention was successful for all participating students involved, the results are limited in that only three students participated in the study.
Additionally, only one student was found eligible for the CICO with accountability tracking phase. For Evan, the additional modifications to the standard CICO intervention were successful in bringing about further increases in academic engagement and decreases in problem behavior; however, it is unknown if these changes would be seen in other participants. Future research should attempt to replicate the study with a larger number of participants.

Due to time restraints, the intervention could only be faded to three feedback sessions (without the coordinator) for one student, Evan. Jeremy was also unable to continue onto fading as his family moved to a new area, thus changing schools. It is unknown if results would be maintained throughout a full removal of the intervention and at an additional follow-up time. Future research should look at systematically fading off the entirety of the intervention. For one student, the intervention was only capable of being faded successfully to five feedback sessions.

Additionally, it should be noted that some difficulties were seen in the use of the DRC during the fading of the CICO with accountability tracking. Evan reported to the researcher that punishment was being used at home for higher point goals that did not correlate with those being used at the school by an extended family member whom he had begun spending the afternoons with. The family member was requiring that Evan meet a higher percentage goal on the DRC than what was set by the team members. In the event that Evan made less than the family expected goal, regardless of whether he made the goal set by the team members, punishments were delivered by the extended family member in the form of verbal reprimands, loss of privileges, and even corporal punishments. Attempts to work with the family to address these concerns were
unsuccessful in maintaining progress confidentiality with only the mother, so it was the
decision of the school and the researcher to discontinue sending the DRC home for the
final two fading phases. Instead, the researcher would call home and discuss Evan’s
progress with his mother at the end of the day. Evan reported that this was successful in
alleviating the issue. Additional positive outcomes were seen for the students involved in
the study. Throughout the intervention, students were observed encouraging one another
to meet their point goals and at times were even effective in deescalating one another’s
problem behaviors.

Despite its limitations, this study offers a significant contribution to the body of
research on CICO. This study is one of the few that evaluated CICO for improving
academic engagement and problem behavior of students from high-need minority
backgrounds. This study is also the first study that demonstrates the enhanced CICO, which uses the student accountability tracking procedure. Although CICO is an effective
Tier 2 intervention that is applicable with students from high-need backgrounds,
supplementing the intervention with additional strategies similar to the accountability
tracking used in this study could be a promising option for the Tier 2 intervention.

This study is also one of the few studies that looked to increase the parent use of
the DRC to improve the effects of CICO for an unsuccessful student. To date, while
social validity and fidelity of CICO have been high, studies show a lack of parent review
and feedback (Filter et al., 2007; Hawken et al., 2007). While some students may have
been successful without the parent use of the card being utilized (Campbell & Anderson,
2011), increasing the parent use of the DRC may be successful in promoting behavior
change for some students who are not responding to the standard CICO.
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Appendix A

Functional Assessment Checklist for Teachers and Staff (FACTS-Part A)

Step 1
Student/ Grade: ____________________________ Date: ____________________________
Interviewer: ____________________________ Respondent(s): ____________________________

Step 2
Student Profile: Please identify at least three strengths or contributions the student brings to school.

Step 3
Problem Behavior(s): Identify problem behaviors

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tardy</th>
<th>Fight/physical Aggression</th>
<th>Disruptive</th>
<th>Theft</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Unresponsive</td>
<td>Inappropriate Language</td>
<td>Insubordination</td>
<td>Vandalism</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Withdrawn</td>
<td>Verbal Harassment</td>
<td>Work not done</td>
<td>Other</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Verbally Inappropriate</td>
<td>Self-injury</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Describe problem behavior: __________________________________________________________

Step 4
Identifying Routines: Where, When and With Whom Problem Behaviors are Most Likely.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Schedule (Times)</th>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Likelihood of Problem Behavior</th>
<th>Specific Problem Behavior</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Before School</td>
<td>Low 2 3 4 5 6</td>
<td>High</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Math</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transition</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Language Arts</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recess</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reading</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lunch</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Science</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transition</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Block Studies</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Art</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Select 1-3 Routines for further assessment: Select routines based on (a) similarity of activities (conditions) with ratings of 4, 5 or 6 and (b) similarity of problem behavior(s). Complete the FACTS-Part B for each routine identified.
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**Functional Assessment Checklist for Teachers & Staff (FACTS-Part B)**

**Step 1**
- Student/ Grade: __________________________ Date: __________________________
- Interviewer: __________________________ Respondent(s): __________________________

**Step 2**
- **Routine/Activities/Context:** Which routine (only one) from the FACTS-Part A is assessed?
  - Routine/Activities/Context | Problem Behavior(s)
  - __________________________ | __________________________

**Step 3**
- **Provide more detail about the problem behavior(s):**
  - What does the problem behavior(s) look like?
  - How often does the problem behavior(s) occur?
  - How long does the problem behavior(s) last when it does occur?
  - What is the intensity/level of danger of the problem behavior(s)?

**Step 4**
- **What are the events that predict when the problem behavior(s) will occur?** *(Predictors)*
  - Related Issues (setting events) | Environmental Features
  - illness | Other: | reprimand/correction | structured activity
  - drug use | | physical demands | unstructured time
  - negative social | | socially isolated | tasks too boring
  - conflict at home | | with peers | activity too long
  - academic failure | | Other | tasks too difficult

**Step 5**
- **What consequences appear most likely to maintain the problem behavior(s)?**
  - Things that are Obtained | Things Avoided or Escaped From
  - adult attention | Other: | hard tasks | Other: | ___________
  - peer attention | | reprimands | | ___________
  - preferred activity | | peer negatives | | ___________
  - money/things | | physical effort | | ___________
  - | | adult attention | | ___________

**Step 6**
- **SUMMARY OF BEHAVIOR**
  - Identify the summary that will be used to build a plan of behavior support.
  - Setting Events & Predictors | Problem Behavior(s) | Maintaining Consequence(s)
  - __________________________ | __________________________ | __________________________

**Step 7**
- **How confident are you that the Summary of Behavior is accurate?**
  - Not very confident | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | Very Confident

**Step 8**
- **What current efforts have been used to control the problem behavior?**
  - Strategies for preventing problem behavior | Strategies for responding to problem behavior
  - schedule change | Other: | reprimand | Other: | ___________
  - seating change | | office referral | | ___________
  - curriculum change | | detention | | ___________

---
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Interval Recording

Data Sheet

Observer: __________________ Date: ____________

[S] = Sitting Appropriately  [V] = Verbal Disruption  [C] = Classroom Disruption

**Non-occurrences leave blank

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Start Time:</th>
<th>1 S V C</th>
<th>2 S V C</th>
<th>3 S V C</th>
<th>4 S V C</th>
<th>1 min</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5 S V C</td>
<td>6 S V C</td>
<td>7 S V C</td>
<td>8 S V C</td>
<td>2 min</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9 S V C</td>
<td>10 S V C</td>
<td>11 S V C</td>
<td>12 S V C</td>
<td>3 min</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13 S V C</td>
<td>14 S V C</td>
<td>15 S V C</td>
<td>16 S V C</td>
<td>4 min</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17 S V C</td>
<td>18 S V C</td>
<td>19 S V C</td>
<td>20 S V C</td>
<td>5 min</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21 S V C</td>
<td>22 S V C</td>
<td>23 S V C</td>
<td>24 S V C</td>
<td>6 min</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25 S V C</td>
<td>26 S V C</td>
<td>27 S V C</td>
<td>28 S V C</td>
<td>7 min</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29 S V C</td>
<td>30 S V C</td>
<td>31 S V C</td>
<td>32 S V C</td>
<td>8 min</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33 S V C</td>
<td>34 S V C</td>
<td>35 S V C</td>
<td>36 S V C</td>
<td>9 min</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37 S V C</td>
<td>38 S V C</td>
<td>39 S V C</td>
<td>40 S V C</td>
<td>10 min</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41 S V C</td>
<td>42 S V C</td>
<td>43 S V C</td>
<td>44 S V C</td>
<td>11 min</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45 S V C</td>
<td>46 S V C</td>
<td>47 S V C</td>
<td>48 S V C</td>
<td>12 min</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49 S V C</td>
<td>50 S V C</td>
<td>51 S V C</td>
<td>52 S V C</td>
<td>13 min</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>53 S V C</td>
<td>54 S V C</td>
<td>55 S V C</td>
<td>56 S V C</td>
<td>14 min</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>57 S V C</td>
<td>58 S V C</td>
<td>59 S V C</td>
<td>60 S V C</td>
<td>15 min</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>61 S V C</td>
<td>62 S V C</td>
<td>63 S V C</td>
<td>64 S V C</td>
<td>16 min</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65 S V C</td>
<td>66 S V C</td>
<td>67 S V C</td>
<td>68 S V C</td>
<td>17 min</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>69 S V C</td>
<td>70 S V C</td>
<td>71 S V C</td>
<td>72 S V C</td>
<td>18 min</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>73 S V C</td>
<td>74 S V C</td>
<td>75 S V C</td>
<td>76 S V C</td>
<td>19 min</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>77 S V C</td>
<td>78 S V C</td>
<td>79 S V C</td>
<td>80 S V C</td>
<td>20 min</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>81 S V C</td>
<td>82 S V C</td>
<td>83 S V C</td>
<td>84 S V C</td>
<td>21 min</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>85 S V C</td>
<td>86 S V C</td>
<td>87 S V C</td>
<td>88 S V C</td>
<td>22 min</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>89 S V C</td>
<td>90 S V C</td>
<td>91 S V C</td>
<td>92 S V C</td>
<td>23 min</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>93 S V C</td>
<td>94 S V C</td>
<td>95 S V C</td>
<td>96 S V C</td>
<td>24 min</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>97 S V C</td>
<td>98 S V C</td>
<td>99 S V C</td>
<td>100 S V C</td>
<td>25 min</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>101 S V C</td>
<td>102 S V C</td>
<td>103 S V C</td>
<td>104 S V C</td>
<td>26 min</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>105 S V C</td>
<td>106 S V C</td>
<td>107 S V C</td>
<td>108 S V C</td>
<td>27 min</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>109 S V C</td>
<td>110 S V C</td>
<td>111 S V C</td>
<td>112 S V C</td>
<td>28 min</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>113 S V C</td>
<td>114 S V C</td>
<td>115 S V C</td>
<td>116 S V C</td>
<td>29 min</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>117 S V C</td>
<td>118 S V C</td>
<td>119 S V C</td>
<td>120 S V C</td>
<td>30 min</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total # S=______________  Total # V=______________  Total # C=______________
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DRC Front

DRC Back
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Teacher Fidelity</th>
<th>Yes/No/NA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Class Routine</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Marked card after each assigned class segment</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Each class segment was treated independently (i.e., morning problem behaviors were not being brought up again in afternoon segments)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Provided verbal feedback to student</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. If student received a “0” teacher went over what was inappropriate and how he/she can do better next time</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. If student received a “1” teacher praised efforts and went over how he/she can do better next time</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. If student received a “2” teacher praised efforts</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Coordinator</th>
<th>Yes/No/NA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Morning Check-In</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Asked student to show materials (paper, pencil, planner), prompting if necessary or prompting for the DRC</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Checked for parent signature</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Praised if signed, if not reminded for next day</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Ask student to identify the expectations</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Reviewed students point goal for the day</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Afternoon Check-Out</th>
<th>Yes/No/NA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>6. Collected DRC from student</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Reviewed the days progress</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Tallied points</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Asked the student to identify the expectations</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Reminded student to have parent sign the card</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Concluded day with a positive statement</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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BEP Acceptability Questionnaire—Student Version

For each statement, circle one number that best describes how you feel about the BEP.

1. The BEP helps improve my behavior at school.
   
   Strongly disagree 2 3 4 5 6 Strongly agree
   
   1 2 3 4 5 6

2. The BEP helps increase my homework completion and classroom assignments completion.
   
   Strongly disagree 2 3 4 5 6 Strongly agree
   
   1 2 3 4 5 6

3. The BEP helps decrease the number of days I am tardy.
   (This question does not apply to me. I am rarely tardy. Check here ______.)
   
   Strongly disagree 2 3 4 5 6 Strongly agree
   
   1 2 3 4 5 6

4. The BEP helps decrease the number of days I am absent.
   (This question does not apply to me. I am rarely absent. Check here ______.)
   
   Strongly disagree 2 3 4 5 6 Strongly agree
   
   1 2 3 4 5 6

5. It is easy to be on the BEP (carry the DPR around, get DPR signed by parent[s], check in and check out daily, etc.).
   
   Strongly disagree 2 3 4 5 6 Strongly agree
   
   1 2 3 4 5 6

6. The BEP is worth the time and effort. Overall, it really helps me.
   
   Strongly disagree 2 3 4 5 6 Strongly agree
   
   1 2 3 4 5 6

7. If I had a choice, I would participate in the BEP again.
   
   Strongly disagree 2 3 4 5 6 Strongly agree
   
   1 2 3 4 5 6

8. I think the BEP would be good for other kids who may be struggling in school.
   
   Strongly disagree 2 3 4 5 6 Strongly agree
   
   1 2 3 4 5 6
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---

BEP Acceptability Questionnaire—Parent Version

For each question or statement, circle one number that best indicates how you feel about the BEP.

1. How effective was the BEP in improving your child's behavior at school?

   Not effective                     Very effective
   1      2      3      4      5      6

2. How effective was the BEP in increasing your child's academic performance (e.g., improving his or her grades)?

   Not effective                     Very effective
   1      2      3      4      5      6

3. How effective was the BEP in decreasing your child's number of absences and tardies?
   (This question does not apply. My child is rarely tardy or absent. Check here ________.)

   Not effective                     Very effective
   1      2      3      4      5      6

4. How easy is it to participate in the BEP (e.g., review and sign DPR, attend meetings)?

   Very difficult                     Very easy
   1      2      3      4      5      6

5. Having my child on the BEP is worth my time and effort.

   Strongly disagree                   Strongly agree
   1      2      3      4      5      6

6. The BEP really helps me know how well my child is doing in school on a daily basis.

   Strongly disagree                   Strongly agree
   1      2      3      4      5      6

7. I would recommend the BEP to other parents and students.

   Strongly disagree                   Strongly agree
   1      2      3      4      5      6
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BEP Acceptability Questionnaire – Teacher Version

For each statement, circle one number that best describes how you feel about the BEP/CICO.

1. Problem behaviors have decreased since enrollment in the modified CICO program.

   Strongly disagree 1 2 3 4 5 6
   Strongly agree

2. Appropriate classroom behaviors have increased since enrollment in the modified CICO program.

   Strongly disagree 1 2 3 4 5 6
   Strongly agree

3. It was relatively easy (e.g., amount of time/effort) to implement the modified CICO program.

   Strongly disagree 1 2 3 4 5 6
   Strongly agree

4. How effective was the modified CICO program in decreasing this student’s number of absences and tardies?
   (This question does not apply. This student is rarely tardy or absent. Check here ___.)

   Strongly disagree 1 2 3 4 5 6
   Strongly agree

5. The modified CICO process for this student was worth the time and effort.

   Strongly disagree 1 2 3 4 5 6
   Strongly agree

6. I would recommend that other schools (or classrooms) use the modified CICO program with similar students.

   Strongly disagree 1 2 3 4 5 6
   Strongly agree

7. Please list any other comments or concerns.

   __________________________________________________________
   __________________________________________________________
   __________________________________________________________
Appendix F

REINFORCER PREFERENCE SURVEY

PROMPT: “Boys and girls like to get good things. I am going to name things that kids sometimes get in school. I want to know how much you like each of these things. After I name each thing, you tell me if you like it “not at all”, “a little”, or “a lot.” For example, if I say “Going to the supermarket” you might say you like it “not at all”, but if I say “Going to a movie”, you might say you like it “a lot.”

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Not at All</th>
<th>Just a little</th>
<th>A lot</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Gum</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Help</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Art Projects</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Certificates, awards</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Teacher says, “Good job, I like that”</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Work pass for an assignment</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Nuts (Ex. Peanuts, granola bar, etc.)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Spend time with a friend at school</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Help the teacher</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Stickers, stars</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Teacher says, “You’re really paying attention”</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Put your feet up and relax</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Not at All</th>
<th>Just a little</th>
<th>A lot</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>13. Juice, drinks</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. Friend says, &quot;Good job, I like that&quot;</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. Read a book</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. Pencils or pens</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17. Teacher says, &quot;That's right, that's correct&quot;</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18. Leave the classroom for alternative activity</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19. Pretzels, chips</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20. Friend pats you on the back/hugs you</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21. Run/Jump/Dance</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22. Pennies</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23. Teacher says, &quot;I’m going to let your parents know you’re doing a great job&quot;</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24. Skip 20 minutes of reading time</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25. Cookies</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26. Play a game with a friend</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27. Play a computer game</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28. Getting crayons or markers to keep</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29. Teacher pats you on the back/hugs you</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30. Getting to sit in another place in the class</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Not at All</th>
<th>Just a little</th>
<th>A lot</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>31. Popcorn</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32. Talk with a friend at school</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33. Free time in library</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34. Getting a file folder/pocket folder to keep</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35. Time with favorite teacher at school</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36. Skip art, music, or P.E.  {Note which one(s)}</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37. Candy (M &amp; M’s, Snickers)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38. Friend says, ”You’re really doing a good job”</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39. Play with toys (legos/dinosaurs/games/centers)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40. Getting erasers to keep</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41. Teacher gives you extra help with your work</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42.Skipping a school activity {Which one?}</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Of everything we talked about, which is your favorite?________________________

How much do you like that?______________________________________________

Is there anything else you would like?____________________________________
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Accountability Tracking Checklist

I will remember to...

☐ Show mom/dad my card and get a check

☐ Have mom/dad sign my card

☐ Bring my card to morning check-in

☐ Bring my school supplies

Total: ____________________

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>I brought my card...</th>
<th>Monday</th>
<th>Tuesday</th>
<th>Wednesday</th>
<th>Thursday</th>
<th>&amp; Friday</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Last Day Total: ____________________