## FBA and BIP Technical Adequacy Tool for Evaluation (TATE): Scoring Form

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Component</th>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Scoring Guide</th>
<th>Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Part I. FUNCTIONAL BEHAVIOR ASSESSMENT</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Data Gathering and Hypothesis Development</td>
<td>1. Input is collected from multiple people/sources to complete the functional behavior assessment. <strong>Check all that apply.</strong> There was a list of names (signatures) indicating multiple sources</td>
<td>0 = unable to determine</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Student interview □ Parent interview □ Teacher interview □ Rating Scales □ Direct Observations □ Team members participating listed</td>
<td>1 = 1 source/person or list of signatures with no detail</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Record Review □ Efficient FBA (problem-solving, ERASE, etc.) □ Other</td>
<td>2 = two or more sources with supporting details</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2. Problem behaviors are identified and operationally defined. (Easily observable and measurable). If more than one behavior is identified, it is clear which behaviors will be the focus of the FBA <strong>Although there is “messiness”, the definition is one that could be observed if one was in the classroom looking for the “failure to complete” behavior. In addition, the same definition is written in the hypothesis for the behavior and is also collected for baseline data; thus we will assume that this is the observable definition of the behavior titled “failure to complete”.</strong></td>
<td>0 = no problem behavior identified; 1 = behaviors are identified but definitions are ambiguous or subjective</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>List problem behavior(s): Failure to complete and turn in assignments: When writing, Bart starts an assignment and may write 2 sentences, then stares into space for several seconds, whisper to peers sitting nearby, and rarely finishes and turns in completed work.</td>
<td>2 = ALL identified behaviors are operationally defined.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3. Baseline data on the problem behaviors are collected and detailed or summarized. The data are in addition to office discipline referrals (ODR), in-school suspension (ISS), and/or out of school suspension (OSS) data. <strong>Baseline data provided primarily related to missed assignments (name of target behavior)-while it is not collecting data on the definition of the behavior, it is keeping alignment with the title of the behavior (failure to complete work). There is some analysis or summary, but we are unable to determine the time range for tracking missing assignments. Is it across the entire time range or did it occur within one week as a clump? The method would be “product”.</strong></td>
<td>0 = unable to determine</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>□Target Behavior □Method □Time Frame □Analysis</td>
<td>1 = data collected, but omits at least one of the essential details</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4. Setting events (i.e., slow triggers; antecedent events that provide the context or “set the stage” for a higher likelihood of problem behavior) are considered, identified (if present) and the contingency to the problem behavior is described. <strong>List setting events (slow triggers):</strong> No indication that setting events were considered. <strong>Although the team may have determined that no setting events were slow triggers for Bart’s problem behavior, there is no indication that this was discussed to either confirm or rule out a setting event pattern.</strong></td>
<td>0 = unable to determine, OR no indication setting events were considered</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Distant event _______ Environmental, social, or physiological events _______</td>
<td>1 = identified, no contingency</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>□identified, AND contingency described, OR clear indication no setting events exist</td>
<td>2 = identified, AND contingency described, OR clear indication no setting events exist</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Directions:** Score each item using the FBA/BIP TATE Rubric
5. Antecedent events (immediate triggers) that precede and predict the occurrence of problem behavior are identified and specified.

List antecedents (triggers): prompted by an adult to work on writing, independent work, English, Science; Promted by an adult to work is similar to the examples listed in the rubric for a score of ‘2’.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Component</th>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Scoring Guide</th>
<th>Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>6. Antecedent events in which problem behavior is least likely to occur (or appropriate behavior is more likely to occur) are identified and specified.</td>
<td></td>
<td>0 = none, OR not antecedents 1 = identified, lacks detail 2 = identified AND detailed</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

List antecedents: PE Lacks the detail that would be necessary to help determine hypothesis and develop intervention.

7. Consequences (i.e., how others respond immediately after problem behavior occurs) are identified.

List consequence(s): PE Lacks the detail that would be necessary to help determine hypothesis and develop intervention.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Component</th>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Scoring Guide</th>
<th>Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>7. Consequences (i.e., how others respond immediately after problem behavior occurs) are identified.</td>
<td></td>
<td>0 = none, OR not consequences 1 = identified, lacks detail 2 = identified AND detailed</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

List consequence(s): PE Lacks the detail that would be necessary to help determine hypothesis and develop intervention.

8. An identifiable hypothesis or summary statement that includes three essential components (i.e., antecedent events, behavior, function) is present and linked to the antecedent events and consequences listed in the FBA.

Check each component present in the hypothesis and the presence of its link to the FBA data

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Component</th>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Scoring Guide</th>
<th>Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>8. An identifiable hypothesis or summary statement that includes three essential components (i.e., antecedent events, behavior, function) is present and linked to the antecedent events and consequences listed in the FBA.</td>
<td></td>
<td>0 = no identifiable hypothesis, OR no link to FBA data 1 = statement missing 1 or 2 components, OR includes all 3 components but the antecedents or function are not valid, OR only partial link to FBA data 2 = includes all 3 components AND all components are linked</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Check each component present in the hypothesis and the presence of its link to the FBA data

Antecedent events: PE Lacks the detail that would be necessary to help determine hypothesis and develop intervention.

Description of problem behavior: When Bart is prompted by an adult to finish and activity/assignment, he will start an assignment and may write 2 sentences, then will stare off into space for several seconds, whisper to peers sitting nearby, and rarely finishes and turns in completed work in order to avoid/non-preferred activities and assignments. The hypothesis has all 3 components (antecedent, problem behavior, function); however, we are unable to determine the link to the FBA data for the function (specifically since no consequence events were provided that could confirm that the behavior is escape maintained). Therefore, this is scored a ‘1’.

Function of behavior: PE Lacks the detail that would be necessary to help determine hypothesis and develop intervention.

Hypothesis: When Bart is prompted by an adult to finish and activity/assignment, he will start an assignment and may write 2 sentences, then will stare off into space for several seconds, whisper to peers sitting nearby, and rarely finishes and turns in completed work in order to avoid/non-preferred activities and assignments. The hypothesis has all 3 components (antecedent, problem behavior, function); however, we are unable to determine the link to the FBA data for the function (specifically since no consequence events were provided that could confirm that the behavior is escape maintained). Therefore, this is scored a ‘1’.

9. Function of behavior is one identified in research literature, provides specificity, and is linked to FBA data.

- Positive reinforcement—To get/obtain (attention, tangible, sensory stimulation) ______
- Negative reinforcement—To escape/avoid/delay (tasks, attention,, tangibles; painful/uncomfortable stimuli) ______

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Component</th>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Scoring Guide</th>
<th>Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>9. Function of behavior is one identified in research literature, provides specificity, and is linked to FBA data.</td>
<td></td>
<td>0 = no function identified, OR no hypothesis, OR function not in research literature 1 = function identified in research literature, not linked to FBA data</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The function is present and is a function recognized in the literature; however, we are unable to determine whether it is linked to the FBA since there were no consequence behaviors listed.

**Component**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Scoring Guide</th>
<th>Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>10. Behavior plan is developed in a timely manner (e.g., within 30 days) upon completion of the FBA. <strong>Same date</strong> The document is continuous and it is assumed that the FBA/BIP were both completed on the same date.</td>
<td>0 = no dates, OR &gt;60 days 1 = &gt;30 days 2 = ≤30 days</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Hypothesis developed from the FBA is included or referenced on the behavior plan. <strong>Document is one seamless form</strong> This item gets a “2” because the document is one form and it is inferred that the hypothesis on page 1 is the same one used to generate the interventions.</td>
<td>0 = no hypothesis, OR substantially different 1 = similar (1-2 components) 2 = identical (3 components)</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. A minimum of one strategy that directly addresses and modifies antecedent events listed in the “when” component of the FBA hypothesis (Item 8) is identified and described in enough detail for implementation. List antecedents in hypothesis writing, independent work, English, Science-antecedent section; hypothesis included “promoted by an adult to work” List strategy(ies): increase supervision; change class schedule These could be potential antecedent strategies; however, it is unclear how these 2 strategies could modify the “when” in the hypothesis. Due to the antecedents lacking in detail, it is difficult to know whether increased supervision would actually modify the “promoted by an adult” antecedent. The Intervention plan details describe switching writing and PE classes to provide increased supervision, but it again does not provide enough information to let us know how this strategy would link and modify the “when”</td>
<td>0 = none identified, OR no link with hypothesis, OR not antecedent strategies 1 = identified, linked, NOT sufficient detail 2 = identified, linked, AND sufficient detail</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. A minimum of one socially valid replacement behavior that will be taught to the student is identified, linked to FBA hypothesis (item 8), and described in enough detail for implementation. List replacement behavior(s) to be taught: Complete assignments within timeframes assigned by Bart’s teacher List intervention strategies to teach replacement behavior <strong>none was checked on the form</strong> This item gets a zero because no replacement behavior intervention was described.</td>
<td>0 = none identified, different function, OR function not identified in research literature. 1 = identified, linked, NOT sufficient detail 2 = identified, linked, AND sufficient detail.</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
14. A minimum of one strategy that will reinforce the replacement behavior and provide the same outcome/function as did the problem behavior is identified, and described in enough detail to implement.

Function identified in hypothesis: *avoid work*

List reinforcement strategy(ies): *Provide down time*  This item receives a score of “0 because the BIP did not identify a replacement behavior. (see note under item 13 in the Rubric). If they had identified a replacement behavior and then provided “down time” contingent upon the replacement behavior, this could have been scored a ‘1’.

15. A minimum of one strategy that eliminates the maintaining consequences identified in the hypothesis is described with sufficient detail to implement (i.e., changes the way others respond to problem behavior).

Function identified in hypothesis: *avoid work*

List strategies: *prompt appropriate behavior; acknowledge when student does right thing.*  This item gets a ’generous 1”. Prompt appropriate behavior is similar to redirect to replacement behavior, although the BIP did not identify a replacement behavior. It does lack detail, thus it does not get a 2. However, this specific strategy could be developed with more detail and if redirected to work, would no longer allow him to avoid work.

Component | Item | Scoring Guide | Score
--- | --- | --- | ---
16. A need for a crisis plan is considered, justified, and described with sufficient detail if a need is indicated. *No indication that a crisis plan was considered.*  Although the behavior as described appears to be one that would not need a crisis plan, the team would still want to determine whether the behavior is one that is harmful, and if no, then confirm that a crisis plan is not necessary.

0 = not addressed OR need identified but no plan
1 = procedures unclear
2 = specific procedures identified, OR no need indicated.

0

17. A specific plan for collecting monitoring data on both the problem and replacement behaviors following implementation of the behavior plan is included. *No plan indicated*

When/How often  Who  Method  Review date

This item is scored ‘0’ due to no follow-up progress monitoring plan included on FBA/BIP.

0

18. A specific plan for collecting fidelity data on BIP implementation is included. *Review schedule for schedule change; Mr. Stage provide information from interview*

When/How often  Who  Method  Review date

0 = no plan, OR unable to determine
1 = partial plan, lacks details, AND/OR does not address both problem and replacement behaviors
2 = plan fully described AND addresses both problem and replacement behaviors.

0
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subscale</th>
<th>Score Obtained</th>
<th>Score Possible</th>
<th>Percent Obtained</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I. Functional Behavior Assessment</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II. Behavior Intervention Plan</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>28%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Product Score</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>39%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>