

Student Screening & Target Selection

Project STAIR

Technical Report 9

Erica N. Mason | Leanne Ketterlin Geller

Southern Methodist University | University of Missouri | University of Texas at Austin

The research reported here is supported by the U.S. Department of Education, Office of Special Education Programs (OSEP), award H326M170006. The opinions expressed are those of the authors and do not represent views of the Institute or the U.S. Department of Education.

Copyright © 2022. Southern Methodist University. All rights reserved. This publication, or parts thereof, may not be used or reproduced in any manner without written permission.

This document is available in alternative formats upon request.

Student Screening & Target Selection

Purpose

The purpose of this technical report is to describe the process of screening and selecting students to participate in this study, by site.

Method

Site 1

Following the second Core PD, teachers used students' school-administered Spring 2019 STAR Math scores to identify students who scored in the 10th percentile or below. In addition, teachers were encouraged to consider other student factors that might indicate the student would benefit from intensive academic intervention. Other student factors included whether the student had an IEP in the area of mathematics, had historically received failing grades in mathematics classes, or the teacher's professional judgment and formative assessment data. Teachers selected students they believed would be appropriate participants and only sent consent forms home with those students (approximately 3–4 student per teacher). Teachers communicated with families about potential participation prior to sending consent forms home with students.

The recruitment and consenting process did not differ between control and treatment teachers.

Site 2

Following the second Core PD, teachers used students' school-administered Spring 2019 STAR Math scores to identify students who scored in the 10th percentile or below. In addition, teachers were encouraged to consider other student factors that might indicate the student would benefit from intensive academic intervention. Other student factors included whether the student had an IEP in the area of mathematics, had historically received failing grades in mathematics classes, or the teacher's professional judgment and formative assessment data. Teachers sent consent forms home with 10–15 students who

either met the STAR 10th percentile criterion or were otherwise identified by their teacher as potentially benefiting from intensive academic intervention. Students were provided two copies of the consent form, one to keep at home and one to return to school. If students returned the consent form to school, regardless of whether they accepted or declined to participate in the study, they received a small prize.

When student consent forms were returned, teachers completed the researcher-created Screening Decision Making Form (see Appendix A). The form asks teachers to record the name of the universal mathematics screener used, to identify the students who were at risk or underperforming based on the universal screener, and to articulate how teachers determined the students were at risk or underperforming. Next, teachers completed a section with basic information about consented students including the student's name, what class period they were enrolled in with the teacher, the name of the class, whether the student had an IEP goal in mathematics, and other indications the student had intensive needs in mathematics.

Once teachers had completed the Screening Decision Making Form, they worked with their coaches to narrow down the consented students who would participate in the study. Considerations for participation beyond the initial screening process included consistent attendance and speculated willingness to participate in weekly progress monitoring. Teachers made the final decision about which 2–3 students would participate in the study.

The recruitment and consenting process did not differ between control and treatment teachers.

APPENDIX A

**Screening Decision Making
Form**

Teacher name:

What universal screener are you using?

Who are the students who are at risk or underperforming based on your universal screening data?

How did you determine this?

Which students are eligible for Project STAIR? Please complete the questions below for each student.

Student name _____

Period taught _____ Class name _____

Does the student have an IEP goal in math? _____ List specifics if available.

What percentile are they on the universal screener? _____ Are they in the lowest performing group? _____

Does the student have intensive needs in math? _____

Student name _____

Period taught _____ Class name _____

Does the student have an IEP goal in math? _____ List specifics if available.

What percentile are they on the universal screener? _____ Are they in the lowest performing group? _____

Does the student have intensive needs in math? _____

Student name _____

Period taught _____ Class name _____

Does the student have an IEP goal in math? _____List specifics if available.

What percentile are they on the universal screener? _____Are they in the lowest performing group? _____

Does the student have intensive needs in math

