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School Wide Positive Behavior Supports includes three tiers of support for students. Some students continue to struggle with following school expectations with only tier one supports in place and thus need additional supports. Because of this, tier two interventions have been created to help support these students. Self-monitoring and Check-In/Check-Out (CICO) are both tier two interventions and have been used independently to decrease problem behavior. This study combined these two interventions to teach students to monitor their own behavior and in addition get feedback from their teacher which is already a component of the CICO intervention. A multiple baseline across participants design was used to evaluate the effects of CICO with self-monitoring. Results indicated that CICO with self-monitoring was effective in reducing off-task behavior for one participant while two other participants required the addition of more immediate reinforcement to decrease off-task behavior.
CHAPTER ONE:
INTRODUCTION

School Wide Positive Behavioral Interventions and Supports (SWPBIS) is a three-tier prevention system that helps decrease challenging behaviors with positive behavioral interventions and increase socially significant behaviors (Sailor, Dunlap, Sugai, & Horner, 2009; Sugai et al., 2000). It has been shown that when schools implement SWPBIS, the number of suspensions and referrals decrease, while academic success increases (Luiselli, Putnam, Handler, & Feinberg, 2005). Within this system, there are three tiers that schools follow in order to achieve their behavior goals. Horner and Sugai (2015) explain each of the tiers. Within a SWPBIS system, all students will receive tier one supports with a goal of preventing problem behavior by clearly identifying, describing and teaching students behavior expectations in each setting (e.g., classroom, cafeteria, playground). Tier two is for the estimated 15% of children that still need extra support for behavior after the tier one intervention has been implemented and found to be unsuccessful in reducing a group of students’ challenging behaviors. Tier three is for the 5% of students that may need additional intervention with an individualized assessment or behavior plan. The focus of this study is tier two supports

Tier two interventions include both behavioral and academic supports. Tier two includes a team of people that know the student to implement evidence-based practices. In tier two, a group of students that are showing similar issues receive the same interventions to decrease problem behavior and increase appropriate behavior. Implementing a tier two intervention may take additional time and effort from the teacher and the student; however, these interventions are individualized to support each student’s weakness. Tier two supports can also help increase
communication between the teacher, students, and parents to acquire better results. There are many tier two interventions that can be utilized for students that need more support. These interventions include First Step to Success, Check and Connect, and Self-management techniques.

First step to success has been found to be a propitious intervention for students (Golly, Stiller, & Walker, 1998; Walker et al., 1998). First step to success is an intervention that initially screens children at risk for antisocial behavior and includes a school intervention and a parent-training component (Walker, 1998). Intervention components have included daily task lists, praise, points, and other procedures to reinforce positive behaviors such as following directions, asking appropriately for assistance, and cooperating with others. Walker (1998) explained the professional will also do a parent training and follow-up with the intervention to make sure that there is progress being made. This is just one intervention that can be used with students who receive additional tier two supports. While this intervention has been shown to help students at-risk for antisocial behavior, this intervention is geared towards a school psychologist implementing it rather than a teacher. Therefore, it may be harder to implement in the classroom due to a lack of resources and time.

Check and connect focuses on helping students become more engaged in school including building relationships, participating in class, and attending school in general (Anderson, Christenson, Sinclair, & Lehr, 2004). This intervention relies on staff members that work at the school (i.e., monitors) to build relationships with students to help monitor and problem solve with the child (Christenson et al., 1997). In the first stage, Christenson et al. explains that there are five essential elements that help build these relationships: trust, time, acceptance, advocacy, and referrals. In the next stage, the monitoring stage, monitors will check attendance and engagement to see that students are on track. Then, monitors will model and
show students how to problem solve and give them steps to follow in this process. Monitors will then help the student create a sense of belonging in the community or school. This intervention involves mainly antecedent strategies with little to no feedback provided to the student. Adding a feedback component might be helpful in increasing student appropriate behavior.

Self-management is another intervention that teachers and schools use at the tier two level (Cavalier, Ferretti, & Hodges, 1997; DuPaul & Hoff, 1998; Gureasko-Moore, DuPaul, & White, 2006). Farley, Torres, Wailehua, and Cook (2012) described the steps that are involved in self-management techniques. These steps are typically self-monitoring, self-evaluation, self-instruction, goal setting, and self-reinforcement. Self-monitoring is when students observe their own behavior and has been used to decrease challenging behavior and increase academic and social behaviors in the classroom and other settings (Briere & Simonsen, 2011; Hager, 2012; Holifield, Goodman, Hazelkorn, & Heflin, 2010; Menzies, Lane, & Lee, 2009; Shimabukuro, Prater, Jenkins, & Edelen-Smith, 1999). Self-evaluation is when students reflect upon their behavior and how well they completed tasks. Self-instruction allows the student to guide his or her own behavior. Goal setting permits the student to choose a behavior to focus on and improve. Self-reinforcement includes the student deciding which behaviors will result in rewarding themselves based on completion. The procedures used in self-management have showed positive results with students of varying ages and abilities (Hughes et al., 2002; Dalton, Martella, & Marchand-Martella, 1999). One of the benefits of self-management is the feasibility of using this intervention in the classroom setting as it involves minimal teacher time and effort. However, limited interactions with the teacher could result in less teacher involvement and decreases in positive reinforcement opportunities which could limit the long-term success of the intervention.
One of the most commonly implemented tier two interventions is Check-In/Check-Out (CICO), also referred to as the Behavior Education Program (Crone, Horner, & Hawken, 2004). With CICO, students who are struggling following the expectations of a tier 1 intervention are assigned a mentor with whom they have an important relationship (Swoszowski, 2013). The relationship is key to helping the students maintain good behavior and increase motivation to get higher scores every day. At the beginning of the day, the student meets with their mentor and discusses his/her point goal for the day. Throughout the day, students earn points and feedback from their teacher for following the school wide expectations. At the end of the day, students complete a “check-out” with their mentor to go over whether or not they reached their goal for the day. If they reached the goal for the day, they earn a reward. If students do not meet goals for the day, the mentor discusses what happened and ways to reach their goals for the next day.

There have been many studies with CICO that show its effectiveness (Campbell & Anderson, 2011; Miller, Dufrene, Sterling, Olmi, & Bachmayer, 2014; Todd, Campbell, Meyer, Horner, 2008; Melius, Swozowski, & Siders, 2015; Sanchez, Miltenberger, Kincaid, & Blair, 2015; Smith, Evans-McCleon, Urbanski, & Justice, 2015). Todd et al. (2008) implemented CICO with four students that were engaging in disruptive classroom behavior and were frequently visiting the office due to problem behaviors. A Functional Behavior Assessment (FBA) was completed for each of the students and found that adult attention was the function of the problem behavior. The authors note that the FBA was critical to the success of the intervention for decreasing problem behavior because the check-ins throughout the day resulted in increased amounts of teacher attention. The check-ins happened three times a day: before morning recess, before lunch, and before afternoon recess with the teacher. The check-out meeting was at the very end of the day. At each meeting, the teacher provided feedback about how the student was doing so far and the student earned points during this time. CICO resulted in a 17.5% decrease in
mean rates of problem behavior. Miller et al. (2014) used an ABAB reversal design for three students in different grades and found similar results as Todd et al. using CICO. All three students were struggling with only tier one supports in place. Results indicated that appropriate classroom behavior increased, and problem behavior decreased with CICO.

While CICO has been shown to effectively decrease problem behavior and increase appropriate classroom behavior, it can be time consuming for teachers to implement due to the number of check-ins. Ways to decrease teacher time might involve fading out the number of check-ins and/or adding a self-monitoring component. Miller, Dufrene, Olmi, Tingstrom, and Filce (2015) used self-monitoring as a way to fade the CICO intervention once it was shown successful in reducing challenging behavior. In the self-monitoring phase, students were taught to fill out the same daily report card as the teachers filled out to award points. Initially, student and teacher ratings on the daily report card were compared until students reached a high accuracy of recording. Results indicated that students earned similar points and maintained low rates of problem behavior as they did in the teacher implemented CICO phase. Using the CICO and self-monitoring interventions together as a package might help students become more independent because they are gauging their own behaviors. This combined intervention will likely reduce teacher time and result in higher levels of positive reinforcement from teachers during the check-in and -out meetings. No known studies have used the combination of CICO and self-monitoring as a package from the beginning of the intervention to help facilitate fading out. For this reason, the purpose of this study was to evaluate the effectiveness of CICO plus self-monitoring on decreasing off-task behavior in the classroom.
CHAPTER TWO:

METHOD

Participants and Setting

Three students were recruited from a public elementary school in the Pasco County school system. These students were chosen due to off-task behaviors in the classroom as identified by the teachers. They were in general education classrooms but due to the amount of off-task behavior they were engaging in, they were receiving tier 2 supports. The 5th grade classroom had 23 students and the 2nd grade classroom had 21 students. CICO meetings for the students in this study took place at the student’s desk or at the teacher’s desk in the classroom. Students that engaged in severe aggression or high rates of problem behavior toward peers or teachers were not included in this study. The names for the following students have been changed for purposes of this project to make sure there are no identifiers to the students.

Andy was an 11-year-old, male in 5th grade. His teacher and principal referred him to this study due to behaviors such as playing with items at his desk, staring out the window, and talking with peers, which made it difficult for him to complete tasks during the school day. Andy had no current Functional Behavior Assessment (FBA), Individual Education Plan (IEP), or diagnoses that would contribute to these off-task behaviors. When Andy was in 3rd grade, he participated in CICO at the same school. It was reported to be beneficial for him and problem behavior decreased during that year. Upon obtaining assent from Andy, he stated that he remembered doing CICO and was very willing to participate in it again.

Leslie was a 7-year-old, female in 2nd grade. The teacher referred her to this study for excessive amounts of talking during lessons and playing with toys, instead of completing work
during the school day. At the beginning of this study, Leslie had no FBA, IEP, or diagnoses that might explain these off-task behaviors, however, it was noted that during the study, she came up on a list of students that may qualify for gifted services. She was not identified as gifted during this study but was continuing to undergo testing.

Ben was an 8-year-old, male in 2nd grade. He was in the same class as Leslie. The teacher and principal referred him to this study due to off-task behaviors that included staring out the window, talking to peers, playing with his pencil, and not completing academic tasks during the school day. Ben had no current FBA, IEP, or diagnoses that would explain off-task behaviors in the classroom. It was reported during the study that the teacher was meeting with his parents to start the IEP process due to results of this study and the lack of work he was completing.

The school district PBIS leader helped in identifying PBIS schools within the school district. Then, the principals were contacted through email with a letter explaining the study. The principals sent out flyers to their teachers or staff. The school in which this study took place was awarded a gold status for PBIS in 2017-2018 which means that this school has a comprehensive tier 1 intervention, implement tier 2 and tier 3 interventions with the highest fidelity, using the SWPBIS Tiered Fidelity Inventory. The school was utilizing CICO as a tier 2 intervention and the students chosen for this study were just about to begin the process of CICO. Because this is a tier two intervention, it took place in two general education classrooms that had tier one strategies already in place.

The tier one strategies that were in place included three school expectations that each student was required to follow. Each of these expectations was posted in the hallways, cafeteria, and different parts of the school to remind students of these expectations, along with rules for each expectation in different areas of the school. Then, the students were placed in a level system starting at level 0. There were 10 levels in the school and students earned points for following
expectations to move up levels. Students could earn up to 10 points each day from their teachers for following these expectations throughout the day. If students were following expectations in each of the seven subjects in a day, they could earn 1 point, then if students were going above and beyond the usual expectations, they could earn up to 3 more points. The students were in charge of writing down their points for the day and adding them up for each week. When the students received 40 points, they could then move up a level. Once the students moved up a level, they could pick a reward from a menu of items for that specific level. Each grade level had a different menu to pick from. After this, the points they earned turned into “Mall Money” that could be used to purchase items at a school store. However, the two students in 2nd grade had been struggling to keep up with this system and the student in 5th grade had reported he did not care to buy anything from this store. Therefore, these students were not responding to tier 1 interventions that were in place and thus referred for tier 2 support.

Assessment

After teachers identified students for intervention, both an indirect assessment and direct assessment were completed. The primary researcher conducted an interview with each of the teachers about the student behaviors they were observing in their classroom. This interview used the Functional Assessment Checklist for Teachers and Staff (FACTS; Crone et al., 2004), which included questions about times of the day off-task behavior was more likely to occur, what the off-task behavior looked like, and what happened after the behaviors occurred. This gave the teacher and researcher an idea of the function of the behavior and what time of day the researcher would come in to observe. After this, the primary researcher directly observed the student. During this observation, ABC data was collected to create an operational definition, not to find a function of behavior. From this, the researcher created an operational definition for the
behavior for each student. Together the teacher and researcher decided which school expectation the students were having the most difficulty with, based on their off-task behaviors.

The school in which the study took place was already using CICO as one of their tier 2 interventions. The school did not give out individual rewards to students, but the students could earn tickets for each time they earned their goal to then earn a reward for the whole class. The students were given choices such as extra recess time for the whole class, class dance party, class snack, and class treasure box. This was used to help motivate the students to stay on-task during the day.

**Data Collection**

During the day, the teacher used a Daily Progress Report (DPR; Crone et al., 2004) to rate students on their behavior for the day. At the same time, students used the same DPR to rate themselves, as well. At the beginning of the day, during the check-in meeting, the teacher went over the students’ goal and gave them a reminder about the expectations they needed to follow in order to meet the goal. The students were scored after each subject area during the day for each school expectations. The expectations at this school were “Be Safe,” “Be Responsible.” and “Be Respectful.” After interviewing the teachers about the student’s behavior and looking at how the students were scored, it was clear that the “Be Responsible” expectation was the one with the biggest deficit of points and math tended to be the most difficult class period of the day therefore data were collected during that subject time. Even though each student’s off-task behavior fell under “Be Responsible”, it was important to note that they were all slightly different in the behaviors that they were engaging in.

For Leslie her off-task behavior included staring at peers that were not on task (i.e., not answering a question the teacher asked or not engaging in the math lesson), talking to peers when inappropriate (when the teacher had not asked the students to be talking), turning away
from the front board while instruction was occurring, calling out when the teacher asked a question, playing with items (pencil, bracelet, backpack, etc.) and/or not following directions within 15 s of being asked by the teacher.

For Ben his off-task behavior included any time he looked out of the window or at peers that were not on task (i.e., not answering a question the teacher asked or not engaging in the math lesson) and/or leaning over in his desk to a 45-90 degree angle, talking to peers or calling out without raising his hand or when not appropriate and/or playing with his hand/pencil (not including counting on his fingers for math).

For Andy his off-task behavior included any time he looked at the clock, window, observer, or peers that were not on task and/or talked without raising his hand or being told to do so to peers or teachers and/or playing with items (i.e. pencil, shoes, etc.).

The rating scale used on the DPR was from 0 to 2. If the teacher deemed that the student needed to “Try harder tomorrow”, meaning the student did not follow the expectations and engaged in off-task behavior during the certain subject area, the student received a rating of 0. If the student gave “Some Effort” when trying to follow the expectations, but still needed to work on an aspect of those expectations, the student received a rating of a 1 during the subject area. When the student met all or exceeded expectations, he or she received a rating of 2 for that subject area. These data were used at the check-out meetings at the end of the day with the student and the teacher to determine if the student met their goal for the day for both the DPR and self-monitoring. First, the teacher and the student reviewed their scores together. They checked off the intervals on which they had scored the same rating on. If the student had matched 80% or 22 out of 27 of the intervals, the student earned 3 extra bonus points on his or her score. Then, the teacher added up the points on the DPR that the teacher filled out. These points determined if the student met their goal for the day.
During both baseline and intervention phases the primary researcher and research assistant took direct observation data during the subject area that the students were having the most off-task behavior (math for all three students). Each observation lasted for 20 min and. off-task behavior data were collected using 10 s partial interval recording system. The observations were conducted three to five times per week.

Interobserver Agreement

Both the primary researcher and a research assistant observed and collected data on student behavior. Interobserver Agreement (IOA) data were calculated for 29% of the observations across participants in baseline, 36% across participants in CICO with Self-monitoring, and 45% across participants in the reinforcement condition. An agreement on the occurrence of off-task behavior was defined as both observers recording that the behavior did (+) or did not occur (-) during part of the interval. IOA for the off-task was calculated by dividing the number of agreements by the number of agreements plus disagreements and multiplying by 100 for a percentage. The average IOA calculation for Andy was 81% in baseline and 97% in intervention. The average for Leslie was 78% in baseline, 83% in intervention, and 91% in the reinforcement phase. Ben’s average in baseline was 83%, 93% in intervention, and 92% in the reinforcement phase.

Design

A nonconcurrent multiple baseline across participants design (Kazdin, 2011) was utilized during this study. Experimental control was demonstrated when the level of off-task behavior decreased from baseline to intervention for students only after the intervention was implemented.
Procedures

Teacher Training

The teacher in the classroom used the DPR to rate each student’s behavior throughout the day. The teachers were trained on the DPR and how to fill it out in the morning before school started for the day. The primary researcher trained the teacher on the DPR using behavioral skills training (BST; Miltenberger, 2016, p. 223). In the first step, the primary researcher explained to the teacher how to fill out the DPR. Then, using a video of a child engaging in off-task behavior, the researcher modeled how to fill out the DPR. Next, a different video was played of a child engaging in off-task behavior and the teacher filled out the DPR, then the researcher gave feedback on it. The mastery criterion for the teacher was 100% on all steps of the CICO process as observed during the role-play.

BST was used to train teachers on how to implement the CICO meetings with the students. The researcher explained each step of the meeting and gave the teachers a cheat sheet for each step. Then, the researcher modeled how to do a meeting with the teacher acting as the student. After the model, the teacher role-played, and the researcher acted as the student. During this, the teacher was given feedback on how to improve and what she did well.

Baseline

During baseline, teachers completed a Daily Progress Report (DPR) for the students throughout the entire day. The students did not receive any feedback during the day with the daily reports, nor did they fill out a DPR themselves. The teachers implemented their day as usual with no added interventions. The researcher observed and collected data during the class period in which the teacher had reported that the most off-task behavior occurs (math).
**Student Training**

The students used the same DPR sheet that the teachers did throughout the day to self-monitor their own behavior. The students were taught to complete the DPR the same way the teachers were taught, but with cartoon videos of students in a classroom to learn the rating system.

**CICO with self-monitoring**

At the beginning of the day, the teacher and the student met for the check-in meeting. At the check-in meeting, the teacher reviewed the point goal for the day, made sure that the goal was written on the DPR, along with the name of the student and the date, and reviewed the expectations on how to earn their goal. The students could earn a total of 54 points a day and needed 44 points to earn an 80%. The school was already utilizing a DPR that included all of this information, so this was the DPR that was used for this study to maintain consistency for the teachers. Because we were specifically targeting the expectation of “Be Responsible”, the teacher went over what it meant to be responsible and reminded them how to score a 2 in that section. After this, the teacher handed the students their DPR and send them back to their desks to start the day.

After each subject area, the teacher went by the student’s desk and prompted them to score themselves. After the student did this, the teacher would let the student know what they scored them and gave a reminder on how to improve or gave specific praise for being responsible. Praise included behavior specific praise, as well as connecting that to being responsible. The teacher could say something such as, “Great job finishing your work! That was very responsible!” At the end of the day, the student and teacher met for a check-out meeting. During this meeting, the teacher took the student’s DPR and compared it to her own DPR
ratings. She checked off the intervals or times of the day they had matched their ratings. The teacher already knew the number of intervals the student needed to match to earn the extra bonus points from the cheat sheet that was given to her. This was so the teacher did not have to take time at the end of the day or the check-out meeting to do the math which made it more feasible for the teacher to complete. If the student’s score matched at least 80%, then the student received three extra bonus points added to their total for the day. The teacher then added up the points on the DPR she filled out to see if the student reached the goal for the day, including the bonus points if earned. The teacher circled whether or not the goal was met and then gave specific praise or feedback to the student about his or her day. If the goal was met, the students received the appropriate number of tickets for earning their goal and meeting the self-monitoring goal. For this specific school, tickets could be earned for meeting the 80% point goal for the day (2 tickets), if the students received a perfect score which would be scoring a 2 in each section of the DPR (1 ticket), if the student completed his or her homework (1 ticket), and if the student returned the DPR from the previous day with a parent signature (1 ticket). Even though this study only focused on scoring 80% of the points and self-monitoring, the students were still able to earn those other tickets. They would then look at the ticket menu (Appendix A) to see how many more tickets the student needed to buy an activity for the class.

**CICO with self-monitoring + reinforcement**

If students did not show substantial decreases in off-task behavior in the CICO with self-monitoring condition additional reinforcement was added. After the 20 min direct observation session during math class, the teacher decided if the student scored a 2 in the “Be Responsible” section of the DPR. If the student scored a 2 in that section, the student received a break with a preferred item or activity, such as iPad, drawing time, or toy time for 5 min. If the student did not earn a 2 in the “Be Responsible”, they received feedback on why they did not earn the reinforcer
and what they could do in the next 20 min to improve their score. The student could earn a break with a preferred item two times during math.

**Treatment Fidelity**

To ensure the treatment was implemented with fidelity, the teacher and students were observed for 40% of all check-in meetings, 28% of all check-out meetings in the CICO with self-monitoring phase. During the reinforcement condition, they were observed for 33% of reinforcement, 44% of check-in meetings, and 33% of check-out meetings. Appendix B has a checklist of all of the steps the teacher implemented in both the check-in meeting and the check-out meetings. Each time the teacher was observed, she received feedback including praise and corrective feedback. The teachers averaged a score of 99% correct performance in the check-in meetings for the CICO with Self-monitoring phase and 100% for all other meetings and reinforcement sessions.

**Social Validity**

After the intervention was completed, the teachers and the students completed a social validity questionnaire. The teacher’s questionnaire included eight questions and a 5-point likert type scale, ranging from 1 (strongly disagree) to 5 (strongly agree). The student questionnaire included eight to 10 questions depending on whether or not the student engaged in the reinforcement condition. It also included a 4-point Likert type scale using numbers and smiley faces to help students answer and understanding the questions ranging from 1 (strongly disagree) to 4 (strongly agree).
CHAPTER THREE: RESULTS

Figure 1 shows the percent of intervals with off-task behavior for each participant in the 10 min observations. In baseline, Andy was off-task an average of 58% of intervals. When CICO with self-monitoring was implemented he was off-task an average of 14%. For Leslie, she was off-task an average of 43% during baseline and 31% during CICO with self-monitoring. During the reinforcement condition, Leslie was off-task an average of 13%. In baseline, Ben was off-task 58% and when CICO with self-monitoring was implemented, his off-task behavior decreased to 54%. When the reinforcement phase was implemented, Ben’s off-task behavior decreased to 20%.

Figure 2 shows the percentage of points the student earned during the entire day on the Daily Progress Report. For Andy, the average percentage during both baseline and intervention was 76%, with a score of 80% on the follow-up. Leslie had an average of 76% in baseline, 86% in intervention, and 92% in CICO with self-monitoring and reinforcement. Leslie’s follow-up DPR score was a 100% Ben had an average of 78% in baseline, 77% in intervention, and 75% in CICO with self-monitoring and reinforcement. His follow-up score was an 81%.

Figure 3 shows the total number of points students earned on the DPR during math class. Andy earned an average of 4 points during both baseline and intervention, and 5 during the follow-up. For Leslie, she earned an average of 4 points during both baseline and intervention, and 6 points during the CICO with Self-Monitoring and Reinforcement. For Ben, he earned an average of 4 points during baseline, 4 points during intervention, and an average of 6 points during CICO with self-monitoring and reinforcement.
Responses on the 5th grade teacher (Andy’s teacher) social validity included mostly 4 and 5’s on all questions. She reported that during this intervention, she liked that the student was able to rate himself, however, she did not feel that he would be honest if she was not also rating the student. She also reported that after the follow-up data, she did not implement CICO with self-monitoring for one day, regretted it due to an escalation in off-task behavior, and claimed she would be continuing to implement the intervention for the rest of the school year. Andy reported mostly 4’s, except for the question about being singled out, which he answered a 1 for this. The 2nd grade teacher reported two different scores for the students she was implementing CICO with in her classroom. For Ben, she rated answers lower than for Leslie. For questions about decreasing problem behavior and increasing appropriate behavior, she scored these as a 1, which does align with the results of the study. She also did not feel as though it was worth the time for Ben, as she reported many times that he struggled to rate himself during the day. However, for Leslie, she rated 4’s and 5’s for most questions, except for the question about this being easy to implement, which she rated a 3. She reported that this is not an intervention that she will continue with Ben, but she would continue to implement it for Leslie. The student’s reported 3’s and 4’s for questions about liking the CICO process, that it helped them stay focused on work and stay motivated during the day. They also reported 4’s on questions about earning activities after being responsible for 20 min. Ben differed from Leslie on the questions about finding it helpful to rate himself and that he knew how to do it. He rated a 1 and 2 in this section, whereas Leslie reported 4’s on this section. This aligns with what the teacher indicated regarding him struggling with the self-monitoring piece. Neither student reported he or she felt singled out or reported any negative feelings about CICO with self-monitoring.
Figure 1. Percent of intervals off-task during math class. CICO + SM represents Check-in/Check-out with Self-Monitoring phase. CICO + SM + SR represents Check-in/Check-out with Self-Monitoring and reinforcement after 20 min observation.
Figure 2. Percent of daily points earned on the Daily Progress Report for the entire day.
Figure 3. Number of points earned on DPR during math class only.
CHAPTER FOUR:

DISCUSSION

Check-in/Check-out can be time consuming with meetings in the morning, afternoon, and feedback throughout the day. The purpose of this study was to evaluate the effectiveness of CICO with self-monitoring for decreasing off-task behavior in the classroom. The results show that for Andy the CICO with self-monitoring helped with decreasing off-task behavior. Both Leslie and Ben required the addition of more immediate reinforcement to help decrease their off-task behavior.

While many CICO studies (Campbell & Anderson, 2011; Hunter, Chenier, & Gresham, 2014; Todd, Campbell, Meyer, Horner, 2008) employ extra resource staff to conduct the meetings at the beginning and end of the day, this study utilized the teacher to complete the intervention. Anecdotally, watching the check-in and check-out meetings, it appeared that the teacher and student were clear on the expectations for the day and this interaction may have helped build a relationship between the two. However, it may be difficult for a teacher to do in her classroom, as she has many other tasks that need to be completed prior to school starting and at the end of the day which could result in time constraints to conduct the meetings. Because CICO with self-monitoring only worked for one student in this study, without additional reinforcement, it might be necessary to have additional support staff to assist with meetings or developing more effective reinforcement systems across the day.

It is important to discuss some limitations to this study. One limitation to note is the self-monitoring goal and how it impacted the points they earned. When the students started to
complete the DPRs during the day, they were trained in the same manner as the teachers. As they watched the videos in the training, the students were honest about how the student in the video did and what they would score for the rating. Then, the students completed their own ratings for the day. When Leslie’s teacher was checking the DPRs during the check-out meeting, she was noticing that Leslie was scoring herself lower than what the teacher was scoring her. When the teacher asked Leslie about why she scored herself lower, she would respond explaining that she was engaging in behaviors that were in direct opposition of the school expectations. However, the teacher was reporting that she didn’t see many of the behaviors that the students stated they exhibited. An example of this would be the teacher scored Leslie a two for being safe, which meant she followed the expectations perfectly for that subject area. Leslie scored herself a one on the rating scale for being safe. This would mean that she engaged in unsafe behaviors a couple times during that time period. When asked about it, Leslie said that she was tipping her chair back a couple times during the lesson. The teacher did not observe the student engage in this behavior, so she scored based on what she observed. When this would occur, the teachers would praise the students for being honest and it seemed that students continued to be honest in their scores throughout. On another note, when Andy was scoring himself, he was scoring himself a bit higher than his teacher was scoring. While the direct observation was just a glimpse of the whole day, these data were showing that he was off-task less than the teacher was scoring him on the DPR. Because of this, the teacher and Andy were not meeting the self-monitoring goal. This made it a bit more difficult for students to meet the 80% requirement for self-monitoring. Future studies could use momentary time sampling to help avoid this issue. This would give the student and teacher a chance to observe a specific time to rate themselves on, rather than using a whole time period in which the teacher may miss some behaviors or change their scores based on earlier impressions of how often the behavior was occurring.
Another limitation would be the DPR itself. The students that were in this study had clear behaviors that did not follow the “Be Responsible” school expectation. The DPR that was used during this study included points for three school expectations. Because these students were in need of tier 2 interventions, they did not have intense behaviors (requiring tier 3 services) and mainly lost points in the “Be Responsible” expectation, which was directly related to the student’s on-task/off-task behavior. The students were rarely losing points in the other areas, so if they scored perfect scores on the other expectations, the students needed less than half of the “Be Responsible” points to meet their goal. This made it possible for students to engage in off-task behaviors and still meet the criteria to receive reinforcement at the end of the day. Due to this occurrence, future research could focus on just one school expectation that seems to be a problem for the student and only calculate those points to earn the reinforcer at the end of the day. This could individualize the intervention and put an emphasis on specific behaviors that each student is having difficulty with to reduce or improve.

Along with the expectations on the DPR, the rating scale for the DPR can be somewhat subjective. In the rating scale, the words used for each of the ratings were, “some”, “best”, and “try harder”. These words if not defined clearly could mean different things for both the student and the teacher. For the students, they could have felt that they were trying their “best” during a certain time period, but the teacher did not feel like they were giving their best, they were only giving “some effort”, so the scores would not match well. When this was trained, the teachers and students attempted to be more objective by determining the number of times the student needed to be prompted, but it was not included in the scale and was not used at all times. Future research should try to make the rating scale more objective and include prompts to the student or frequency of off-task behavior. This would make the daily progress report not only more
objective but create more accurate data at the end of the day with less discrepancies across the student teacher dyad.

It is also of relevance to note that the instruction for each day differed slightly depending on the class material for that day. Some days, the teacher used more group interactions to help the students discuss the topic at hand, which seemed to be a time in which the students had higher on-task behavior. This might be because they were allowed to talk with peers and be out of their seats for this activity. During whole-group instruction, in which the teacher was at the front of the class explaining the concept and students were sitting at their desks listening, off-task behavior appeared to be higher. Other times, the students would do fluency questions independently, which meant they had a certain amount of time to get a certain number of questions completed correctly. Since the students were having the most trouble during math, the researcher came at the same time every day, but could not control for the activities the teacher had planned for the day. In addition, the student’s seats were changing periodically throughout the study. The teacher changed the seats from day to day or weekly. This meant that sometimes students were sitting independently or with a group of students. It appeared that off-task behavior would increase or decrease, depending on the seating arrangement, including where and who the students sat by.

In a number of studies (Miller et al., 2015; Sanchez et al., 2015; Smith et al., 2015), a fading procedure or a maintenance plan was completed to fade out the feedback the student received during the day or remove the intervention to observe if the behavior maintained over time. Because student’s off-task behavior had decreased, but students were not meeting the self-monitoring goal or the DPR goal, it was not possible to fade the feedback throughout the day in this study. Future research should evaluate how to fade out the teacher feedback while ensuring students are self-monitoring with fidelity. Given the results of this study, it is possible that self-
monitoring could be utilized to increase on-task behavior in students that need tier 2 support. However, further studies should continue to replicate this idea to identify if this is a viable option for CICO.
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Appendix A: Ticket Reinforcer Menu Responsible Reptile Ticket Opportunities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Tickets</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I did my homework.</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I got my sheet signed.</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I met my goal!</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I had a perfect day!</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Redeem tickets for:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Tickets</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5 min. Class Dance Party</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 min. Drawing Time for Class</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 min. Extra Recess</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 Dollar Bonus for Class</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Special Class Activity</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Class Trip to Treasure Box</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Class Technology Time</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Class Trip to Principal’s Treasure Box</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Appendix B: Treatment Fidelity

#### Check-in Meeting

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Step</th>
<th>Teacher Role</th>
<th>+ / -</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>Get 2 new DPR’s for current day</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>Put the date on the DPR</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>Write the student’s name and the teacher’s name</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>Write the point goal for the day</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>Tell the student the goal for the day</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td>Review what they can earn</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.</td>
<td>Review the expectations for the day</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.</td>
<td>Review the ratings they could receive</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.</td>
<td>Give DPR to student and end meeting</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Check-Out Meeting

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Step</th>
<th>Teacher Role</th>
<th>+ / -</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>Ask for student’s DPR from the day</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>Check which intervals the student and teacher matched for the day</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>Inform student if they got the 3 extra bonus points for accuracy</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>Add up teacher scores for the students</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>Tell student whether they reached point goal for the day</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td>If they did reach goal: Give them a reward and praise</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>If they did not reach goal: Review why and what they can do for the next day</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.</td>
<td>Give student DPR to take home to get signed by parent</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix C: Daily Progress Report

Name: ___________________             Date: _______________

I need ____ points and ___% to reach my goal.

Points Received/Possible: ___/54
Percent: ___

Rating scale: 2=Tried My Best  1=Some Effort  0= Will Try Harder Tomorrow

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Morning</th>
<th>Reading Whole Group</th>
<th>S.S</th>
<th>Writing</th>
<th>Specials</th>
<th>Math</th>
<th>Science</th>
<th>IRLA</th>
<th>Lunch</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Be Respectful</td>
<td>2 1 0</td>
<td>2 1 0</td>
<td>2 1 0</td>
<td>2 1 0</td>
<td>2 1 0</td>
<td>2 1 0</td>
<td>2 1 0</td>
<td>2 1 0</td>
<td>2 1 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Be Responsible</td>
<td>2 1 0</td>
<td>2 1 0</td>
<td>2 1 0</td>
<td>2 1 0</td>
<td>2 1 0</td>
<td>2 1 0</td>
<td>2 1 0</td>
<td>2 1 0</td>
<td>2 1 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Be Safe:</td>
<td>2 1 0</td>
<td>2 1 0</td>
<td>2 1 0</td>
<td>2 1 0</td>
<td>2 1 0</td>
<td>2 1 0</td>
<td>2 1 0</td>
<td>2 1 0</td>
<td>2 1 0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total Tickets Earned:
Goal Achieved: Y (2 ticket)    N
Perfect Day?     Y (1 ticket)    N
HW Complete? Y (1 ticket)    N
Signed Form?     Y (1 ticket)    N

Teacher Comments: _____________________________________________________________
_____________________________________________________________________________
_____________________________________________________________________________

Parent Signature(s) and Comments:
_____________________________________________________________________________
_____________________________________________________________________________

to problem behavior in schools: The behavior education program. New York: Guilford Press.
Appendix D: Teacher Check-In, Check-Out Social Validity Questionnaire

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

1. Problem behaviors have decreased since enrollment in Check-In, Check-Out with self-monitoring.
   
   Strongly Disagree  1  2  3  4  5  
   
   Strongly Agree

2. Appropriate classroom behaviors have increased since enrollment in Check-In, Check-Out with self-monitoring.
   
   Strongly Disagree  1  2  3  4  5  
   
   Strongly Agree

3. It was relatively easy (e.g., amount of time/effort) to implement Check-In, Check-Out with self-monitoring.
   
   Strongly Disagree  1  2  3  4  5  
   
   Strongly Agree

5. The Check-In, Check-Out with self-monitoring. process for this student was worth the time and effort.

   Strongly Disagree  1  2  3  4  5  
   
   Strongly Agree

6. I would recommend that other schools use the Check-In, Check-Out with self-monitoring. process with similar students.

   Strongly Disagree  1  2  3  4  5  
   
   Strongly Agree

7. It was relatively easy to implement reinforcement after 20 min of work.  N/A

   Strongly Disagree  1  2  3  4  5  
   
   Strongly Agree

8. Reinforcement after 20 min helped to decrease off-task behaviors in the classroom.  N/A

   Strongly Disagree  1  2  3  4  5  
   
   Strongly Agree

Please list any other comments or concerns.

Appendix E: Student Check-In, Check-Out Social Validity Questionnaire

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Somewhat Disagree</th>
<th>Somewhat agree</th>
<th>Strongly agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I liked checking in with my teacher before school and after.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I found it helpful to get feedback from my teacher throughout the day.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I found it helpful to rate myself during the day and see if I got the</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>same as my teacher.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I knew how to rate myself each subject area.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>It helped me stay focused in class more</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I was more motivated to do my work while doing this</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I liked earning an activity after for 20 min for being responsible</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N/A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I want to keep earning an activity after I complete 20 minutes of being</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>responsible N/A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Appendix F: Sample IOA

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Task Status</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>69</td>
<td>Off Task</td>
<td>Off task</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>79</td>
<td>On Task</td>
<td>On task</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>89</td>
<td>On Task</td>
<td>On task</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>99</td>
<td>On Task</td>
<td>On task</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>109</td>
<td>On Task</td>
<td>On task</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>119</td>
<td>On Task</td>
<td>On task</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>129</td>
<td>On Task</td>
<td>On task</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>139</td>
<td>On Task</td>
<td>On task</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>149</td>
<td>On Task</td>
<td>Off task</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>159</td>
<td>Off Task</td>
<td>Off task</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>169</td>
<td>Off Task</td>
<td>Off task</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>179</td>
<td>Off Task</td>
<td>Off task</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix G: IRB Approval

10/24/2018

Mollie McDermitt
CFBH-Child and Family Behavioral Health
18002 Richmond Place Drive APT 2427
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Title: Evaluating Check-in/Check-out With a Self-Monitoring Component
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As the principal investigator of this study, it is your responsibility to conduct this study in accordance with IRB policies and procedures and as approved by the IRB. Any changes to the approved research must be submitted to the IRB for review and approval via an amendment. Additionally, all unanticipated problems must be reported to the USF IRB within five (5) business days.
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USF Institutional Review Board
Appendix H: Teacher Consent Form

Informed Consent to Participate in Research Involving Minimal Risk and Authorization to Collect, Use and Share Your Health Information

Pro # 00036504

You are being asked to take part in a research study. Research studies include only people who choose to take part. This document is called an informed consent form. Please read this information carefully and take your time making your decision. Ask the researcher or study staff to discuss this consent form with you, please ask him/her to explain any words or information you do not clearly understand. We are asking you to take part in a research study called:

Evaluating Check-in/Check-out with a Self-Monitoring Component

The person who is in charge of this research study is Mollie McDermott. This person is called the Principal Investigator. However, other research staff may be involved and can act on behalf of the person in charge. She is being guided in this research by Dr. Kimberly Crosland.

The research will be conducted at the Pasco County school that the teacher teaches at.

Purpose of the study

The purpose of this study is to find out if Check-in/Check-out with Self-monitoring will decrease problem behavior and increase appropriate behavior in the classroom.

Why are you being asked to take part?

We are asking you to take part in this research study because we believe that Check-in/Check-out with Self-Monitoring could benefit your student in the classroom. Check-in/Check-out allows students and teacher to discuss student behavior at the beginning of the day, throughout the day, and at the end of the day. Self-monitoring allows the student to monitor his or her own behavior during the day. By combining these two components together, we will be able to see how well the student understands the expectations and how his or her behavior changes over time. We would like to see if this can increase the amount of appropriate behavior your child is engaging in and decrease the amount of problem behavior they are engaging in in the classroom. This could also increase the amount of teaching or learning time due to the decrease of problem behavior in the classroom.

Study Procedures:

If you take part in this study, you will be asked to:
Researchers may ask your students questions for verbal assent.
The student will fill out a reinforce survey to find out items or activities that are preferred for that student.
Meet with the student at the beginning of the day for a few minutes to discuss what the student’s goal for the day is, give the student their behavior report card for that day, what the student is working for, and how the student can earn the reinforcer.
Meet with the student at the end of the day for a few minutes to give feedback about their day, compare behavior report cards and give reinforcers that were chosen earlier in the day, if earned.
Meet briefly with the student during the day after each subject area to let the student know what they got for that subject area.
Monitor and rate the student’s behavior during each subject area.
The students will monitor their own behavior based on the school PBIS expectations. They will use the rating scale on their behavior report cards to rate how well they followed expectations during the subject area.
The expected duration of this study will be 8 to 15 weeks, with the primary investigator meeting with your student 1 to 3 times a week.
Check-in and Check-out meetings will last from 2-5 minutes each day and feedback throughout the day will take 1 minute. This would be a total of about 11 hours over the 8 to 15 weeks.
The research will take place at the school where the teacher teaches.

Total Number of Participants
20-22 individuals will take part in this study at USF

Alternatives / Voluntary Participation / Withdrawal
You do not have to participate in this research study.

Benefits
The potential benefits to your classroom include:
  • More instructional time
  • A less disruptive classroom

Risks or Discomfort
This research is considered to be minimal risk. That means that the risks associated with this study are the same as what you face every day. There are no known additional risks to those who take part in this study.

Compensation
You will receive no payment or other compensation for taking part in this study.

Costs
It will not cost you anything to take part in the study.
Privacy and Confidentiality

We will do our best to keep your records private and confidential. We cannot guarantee absolute confidentiality. Your personal information may be disclosed if required by law. Certain people may need to see your study records. These individuals include:

- The research team, including the Principal Investigator, study coordinator, research nurses, and all other research staff.
- Certain government and university people who need to know more about the study, and individuals who provide oversight to ensure that we are doing the study in the right way.
- Any agency of the federal, state, or local government that regulates this research.
- The USF Institutional Review Board (IRB) and related staff who have oversight responsibilities for this study, including staff in USF Research Integrity and Compliance.

We may publish what we learn from this study. If we do, we will not include your name. We will not publish anything that would let people know who you are.

Your personal information collected for this research will be kept as long as it is needed to conduct this research. Once your participation in the research is over, your information will be stored in accordance with applicable policies and regulations. Your permission to use your personal data will not expire unless you withdraw it in writing. You may withdraw or take away your permission to use and disclose your information at any time. You do this by sending written notice to the Principal Investigator at the following address:

While we are conducting the research study, we cannot let you see or copy the research information we have about you. After the research is completed, you have a right to see the information about you, as allowed by USF policies.

If you have concerns about the use or storage of your personal information, you have a right to lodge a complaint with the data supervisory authority in your country.

You can get the answers to your questions, concerns, or complaints

If you have any questions, concerns or complaints about this study, or experience an unanticipated problem, call Mollie McDermott at (941) 320-9066 or email at mcdermott@mail.usf.edu.

If you have questions about your rights as a participant in this study, or have complaints, concerns or issues you want to discuss with someone outside the research, call the USF IRB at (813) 974-5638 or contact by email at RSCH-IRB@usf.edu.

Consent to Take Part in this Research Study
And Authorization to Collect, Use and Share Your Health Information for Research

I freely give my consent to take part in this study. I understand that by signing this form I am agreeing to take part in research. I have received a copy of this form to take with me.
Study ID: Pro00036504 Date Approved: 10/23/2018

Signature of Person Taking Part in Study

Printed Name of Person Taking Part in Study

Statement of Person Obtaining Informed Consent

I have carefully explained to the person taking part in the study what he or she can expect from their participation. I confirm that this research subject speaks the language that was used to explain this research and is receiving an informed consent form in their primary language. This research subject has provided legally effective informed consent.

Signature of Person obtaining Informed Consent

Date

Printed Name of Person Obtaining Informed Consent
Appendix I: Student Consent Form

Parental Permission for Children to Participate in Research Involving Minimal Risk and Authorization to Collect, Use and Share Your Health Information

Information for parents to consider before allowing your child to take part in this research study

Pro #: 00036504

The following information is being presented to help you and your child decide whether or not he/she wishes to be a part of a research study. Please read this information carefully. If you have any questions or if you do not understand the information, we encourage you to ask the researcher.

We are asking you to allow your child to take part in a research study called: Evaluating Check-in/Check-out with a Self-Monitoring Component

The person who is in charge of this research study is Mollie McDermid. This person is called the Principal Investigator. However, other research staff may be involved and can act on behalf of the person in charge. She is being guided in this research by Dr. Kimberly Crosland.

The research will be conducted at the Pasco County school that the child attends.

Purpose of study:
The purpose of this study is to find out if Check-in/Check-out with Self-monitoring will decrease problem behavior and increase appropriate behavior in the classroom.

Why is your child being asked to take part?
We are asking your child to take part in this research study because we believe that Check-in/Check-out with Self-Monitoring could benefit your child in the classroom setting. Check-in/Check-out allows students and teacher to discuss student behavior at the beginning of the day, throughout the day, and at the end of the day. Self-monitoring allows the student to monitor his or her own behavior during the day. By combining these two components together, we will be able to see how well the student understands the expectations and how his or her behavior changes over time. We would like to see if this can increase the amount of appropriate behavior your child is engaging in and decrease the amount of problem behavior they are engaging in in the classroom. This could also increase the amount of teaching or learning time due to the decrease of problem behavior in the classroom.

Study Procedures:
If your child takes part in this study, s/he will be asked to:
Researchers may ask your child questions for verbal assent.
Your child will fill out a reinforce survey to find out items or activities that are preferred for him or her.
Meet with your child at the beginning of the day for a few minutes to discuss what the goal for the day is, give him or her the behavior report card for that day, what he or she is working for, and how her or she can earn the reinforcer.
Meet with your child at the end of the day for a few minutes to give feedback about their day, compare behavior report cards and give reinforcers that were chosen earlier in the day, if earned.
Meet briefly with your child during the day after each subject area to let your child know what they got for that subject area.
Monitor and rate your child’s behavior during each subject area.
The students will monitor their own behavior based on the school PBIS expectations. They will use the rating scale on their behavior report cards to rate how well they followed expectations during the subject area.
The expected duration of this study will be 8 to 15 weeks, with the primary investigator meeting with your child 1 to 3 times a week.
Check-in and Check-out meetings will last from 2-5 minutes each day and feedback throughout the day will take 1 minute. This would be a total of about 11 hours over the 8 to 15 weeks.
The research will take place at the school where the teacher teaches.

Total Number of Participants

20-22 individuals will take part in this study at USF

Alternatives / Voluntary Participation / Withdrawal

If you decide not to let your child take part in this study, that is okay. Instead of being in this research study your child can choose not to participate. You should only let your child take part in this study if both of you want to. You or child should not feel that there is any pressure to take part in the study to please the study investigator or the research staff.

If you decide not to let your child take part:

- Your child will not be in trouble or lose any rights he/she would normally have.
- You child will still get the same services he/she would normally have.

You can decide after signing this informed consent form that you no longer want your child to take part in this study. We will keep you informed of any new developments which might affect your willingness to allow your child to continue to participate in the study. However, you can decide you want your child to stop taking part in the study for any reason at any time. If you decide you want your child to stop taking part in the study, tell the study staff as soon as you can.

Benefits

The potential benefits to your child include:

- More instructional time
- More attention and feedback from the teacher
- A less disruptive classroom
Risks or Discomfort
There are no known risks to those who take part in this study.

Compensation
Your child will receive no payment or other compensation for taking part in this study.

Costs
It will not cost you anything to let your child take part in the study.

Privacy and Confidentiality
We will do our best to keep your child’s records private and confidential. We cannot guarantee absolute confidentiality. Your child’s personal information may be disclosed if required by law. Certain people may need to see your child’s study records. These individuals include:

- The research team, including the Principal Investigator, study coordinator, research nurses, and all other research staff.
- Certain government and university people who need to know more about the study, and individuals who provide oversight to ensure that we are doing the study in the right way.
- Any agency of the federal, state, or local government that regulates this research
- The USF Institutional Review Board (IRB) and related staff who have oversight responsibilities for this study, including staff in USF Research Integrity and Compliance.

We may publish what we learn from this study. If we do, we will not include your child’s name. We will not publish anything that would let people know who your child is.

Your child’s personal information collected for this research will be kept as long as it is needed to conduct this research. Once your child’s participation in the research is over, their information will be stored in accordance with applicable policies and regulations. Your permission to use your child’s personal data will not expire unless you withdraw it in writing. You may withdraw or take away your permission to use and disclose your child’s information at any time. You do this by sending written notice to the Principal Investigator at the following address:

While we are conducting the research study, we cannot let you see or copy the research information we have about your child. After the research is completed, you have a right to see the information about you, as allowed by USF policies.

If you have concerns about the use or storage of your child’s personal information, you have a right to lodge a complaint with the data supervisory authority in your country.

You can get the answers to your questions, concerns, or complaints.
If you have any questions, concerns or complaints about this study, please contact Mollie McDermitt at 941-320-9069 or email at mcdermit@mail.usf.edu.
If you have questions about your child’s rights, or have complaints, concerns or issues you want to
Consent for My Child to Participate in this Research Study & Authorization to Collect, Use & Share His/Her Health Information for Research

I freely give my consent to let my child take part in this study. I understand that by signing this form I am agreeing to let my child take part in research. I have received a copy of this form to take with me.

Signature of Parent of the Child Taking Part in Study  Date

Name of Child Taking Part in Study

Printed Name of Parent of the Child Taking Part in Study

Statement of Person Obtaining Informed Consent

I have carefully explained to the person taking part in the study what he or she can expect from their child’s participation. I confirm that this research subject speaks the language that was used to explain this research and is receiving an informed consent form in their primary language. This research subject has provided legally effective informed consent.

Signature of Person Obtaining Informed Consent  Date

Printed Name of Person Obtaining Informed Consent