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 The [National Center for Intensive Interventions](https://intensiveintervention.org/) (NCII) supports implementation of intensive intervention in literacy, mathematics, and behavior for students with severe and persistent learning and/or behavioral needs. On their website, they house several databases, called [Tools Charts](https://intensiveintervention.org/tools-charts/overview), to help teams make decisions about academic and behavior screening tools, interventions, and progress monitoring tools. Before adding a product to their Tools Charts, a Technical Review Committee uses an extensive and rigorous multi-level [review process](https://intensiveintervention.org/about-charts-review-process). There is a submission process for each individual intervention that follows an annual timeline.

 Several SIM authors have submitted the research studies they have conducted on their published Learning Strategy to be reviewed by NCII reviewers for the Academic *or* Behavior Interventions Tools Charts. To help all Learning Strategies appear together on the Academic Interventions Tool Chart, authors are using a common title ‘Learning Strategies Curriculum: Name of the Learning Strategy.’ In 2018, information related to the Assignment Completion and Essay Test-Taking Strategies was reviewed, rated, and posted on the Academic Interventions Tools Chart. In 2021, an exciting 12 more Learning Strategies have undergone this review process and are now present on either the Academic or Behavior Interventions Tools Chart. Across the board, the SIM Learning Strategies reviewed thus far have received positive ratings. See Table 1 for a rating summary.

 The Tools Chart displays [ratings](https://intensiveintervention.org/sites/default/files/2020_AI_Rating_Rubric.pdf) from the expert reviewers. Below is an oversimplified explanation of the ratings, which in actuality are very specific per the established criteria for 1) participants, 2) design, 3) fidelity of implementation, 4) targeted measures, 5) broader measures, and 6) results. When viewing the summary of ratings, note that years ago, when some of the strategy studies were conducted, a measure of fidelity of instruction was not required to publish a research article. Of course, the researchers taught the strategy as it was specified in the manual; however, this information was not available in the published articles. They would not have produced the outcomes that resulted if they had not taught the strategy with fidelity. Another important piece of background information is that the criteria were very strict with regard to participants for the Self-Advocacy Strategy and the LEARN Strategy—they had to be solely students with behavior disabilities (BD) or students with emotional disabilities (ED); however, both of these strategies were taught in inclusive classrooms during the original validation studies. The rating scale is as follows:

Full bubble = Convincing evidence

Half bubble = Partial evidence

Empty bubble = No evidence

***Table 1.*** **Rating Summary for Learning Strategies Found on the NCII Academic Interventions Tools Chart**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Learning Strategy | Rating Summary | Explanation, if needed |
| Assignment Completion Strategy | All full bubbles except “Fidelity of Instruction”  | No measure was collected for whether the strategy was taught according to the manual. |
| Commas Strategies | All full bubbles |  |
| Essay Test-taking Strategy | All full bubbles except a half bubble for “Targeted measure”  | The interscorer correlation for the measure was 0.79. Anything above 0.80 would have received a full bubble.  |
| Fundamentals in the Sentence Writing Strategy | All full bubbles except a half bubble for “Fidelity of Instruction”  | No measure was collected for whether the strategy was taught according to the manual. |
| Inference Strategy | All full bubbles |  |
| LINCS Vocabulary Strategy | All full bubbles except a half bubble for design  | Classes were randomly assigned, not individual students |
| LEARN Strategy | Half bubbles for “Participants,” “Design,” and “Broader Measure”  | * Not all students had behavior disabilities (the classes were inclusive).
* Classes were randomly assigned, not individual students.
* The sociometric measure was not acceptable as a broader measure since there was no way to determine reliability (this measure involved student ratings).
 |
| Strategic Instruction Multiplication with Regrouping | All full bubbles except an open bubble for “Broader Measure”  | A Broader measure was not present. |
| Strategic Instruction Multiplication with Regrouping Standard Algorithm | All full bubbles except an open bubble for “Broader Measure”  | A Broader measure was not present. |
| Punctuation Strategies | All full bubbles |  |
| Test-Taking Strategy | All full bubbles except a half bubble for “Fidelity of Instruction” and an open bubble on “Broader Measure”  | * No measure was collected for whether the strategy was taught according to the manual .
* Students’ course grades were not accepted as a Broader measure.
 |
| Self-Advocacy Strategy | Full bubbles except for an open bubble for “Participants,” a half bubble for “Fidelity of instruction,” and a half bubble for “Broader Measure”  | * Not all students had behavior disabilities (the classes were inclusive)
* No measure was collected for whether the strategy was taught according to the manual.
* Students’ goals were not considered fully acceptable because students created them and there was no way to determine reliability of that measure.
 |
| Word Identification Strategy | All full bubbles |  |
| Word Mapping Strategy | All full bubbles except a half bubble for design. | The classes were randomly assigned, not the individual students. |

 NCII’s approach to intensive intervention is called data-based individualization (DBI). From their website, “DBI is a research-based process for individualizing and intensifying interventions through the systematic use of assessment data, validated interventions, and research-based adaptation strategies. DBI is the technical term for what many good teachers do naturally through the problem-solving process: [they] frequently review student data and make changes to their teaching, based on what works for students. DBI, however, makes this process systematic, explicit, and tailored to meet the needs of individual students through a multi-step process that gradually intensifies instruction and support.” Aligned with this approach, NCII has recently launched a new resource called the [Academic Intervention Taxonomy Brief](https://intensiveintervention.org/tools-charts/academic-intervention-taxonomy-briefs) to accompany interventions found on the Tools Charts. The purpose of a Taxonomy Brief is to support teachers as they determine how to increase the intensity of an intervention. The Taxonomy Briefs provide guidance on seven dimensions (strength, dosage, alignment, attention to transfer, comprehensiveness, behavioral or academic support, and individualization. Thus far, two SIM Learning Strategies have Taxonomy Briefs posted on the NCII website: Strategic Instruction Multiplication with Regrouping and Strategic Instruction Multiplication with Regrouping Standard Algorithm.

 All submissions to NCII require substantial effort on the part of the Learning Strategy researchers; thus, it will take time for more strategies to be posted on their Tools Chart. In the meantime, the NCII Tools Chart will help new audiences discover SIM Learning Strategies as evidence-based academic interventions and will support the SIM Network by providing evaluative ratings to share with their school- and district-leadership teams.