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INTRODUCTION

The provision of psychological services to public school systems often requires the school psychologist to perform as a member of a multidisciplinary diagnostic-prescriptive team. The school psychologist is frequently charged with providing leadership to these teams, and often chairs subsequent Individualized Educational Planning Committees (IEPCs) for each student eligible for certain special services. Under Michigan law, a school psychologist also may function as a Supervisor of Ancillary Services (PA451, R.340.1752), and may thereby be charged with supervising, monitoring, and directing the activities of school psychologists, school social workers, speech therapists, physical therapists, occupational therapists, and other helping non-instructional professionals within the public schools. Finally, numerous programs which provide direct services to special education students are coordinated and directed by school psychologists. Since the school psychologist is becoming to some extent a manager of human services, it behoves us to inquire as to what in fact should be managed and how such management might be effected. To this end, this project will review general features of several management systems and will adapt the most relevant system into a functional management tool for the Kalamazoo Valley Intermediate School District's Valley Center for the Emotionally Impaired. Since this program is administered by a school psychologist, this specialist project will
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suggest approaches to management problems which may be utilized by other school psychologists functioning as service managers.

As the public school environment in which the school psychologist functions becomes increasingly more complex and challenging, there emerges increased demand for clear delineation of who is responsible to whom for what by when. This demand often is represented by the term "accountability", which suggests that certain personnel, services, programs, schools, administrators, and in fact Boards of Education, be held "accountable" to some other individual or group for their performance (Wynne, 1972). This demand for accountability has resulted in many requests for much information regarding the salient features of all educational services and their general products. Unfortunately, the data collection process and the reporting out of these data at local, intermediate, and state levels is woefully inadequate, both in terms of quantity and quality. For example, in Michigan, statewide academic assessment of K-8 students occurs only at the 4th and 7th grade levels, and emphasizes norm-referenced data. This provides educators with little information on how rapidly new information is incorporated into each student's repertoire. It further fails to provide any functional analyses of such academic behavior changes relative to changes in instructional strategies and services.

Another example of high cost-low value data collection vehicles is the annual reporting to the state and federal departments of education of volumes of process-oriented data reflecting the numbers of
handicapped students served, by age and impairment category. These "student counts" determine, in part, the total amount of federal and state funds available to each local, intermediate, and state educational agency. It is clear from this author's experience with both state and federal financial/educational audits that little attempt is made to analyze the input of such dollars on the performance of the students who have been presumed to have benefited.

In an attempt to satisfy some accountability requirements, Management by Objectives (Odiorne, 1965) formats have been incorporated into the administration of public education (Kennedy, 1970). The Management by Objectives (MBO) concept embraces several of the features of the science of human behavior, applied behavior analysis, as well as several essential elements of effective management of business, industry and the military. In these respects, MBO focuses on the learner (or service provider, as necessary) and clearly establishes what generally is to be accomplished, what in particular will occur (and by when), who will be responsible for implementation and monitoring and what evaluation strategy will be employed.

The MBO approach is typically applied to administrators rather than "front-line" personnel such as teachers. For example, Caldwell-West Caldwell Schools in New Jersey have incorporated MBO for their administrative staff; however, MBO was not installed at the direct instructional level for fear of infringing on the teacher's academic freedom (Anderson, 1974). It seems that any zealous attempt to incorporate an effective tool developed primarily by the military (and
later adopted by industry) into the management of front-line educators typically fails to take into account a fundamental difference between the production of wheel bearing, soldiers or administrative services, and the production of human helping services; namely, the time-honored autonomy and academic freedom of the helper (i.e., teacher). The natural resistance to change of these autonomous educators coupled with demanding teacher unions which force rigid compliance to the limitations of Master Contracts, limit the effectiveness of a MBO system, and render it more process-oriented, precisely contrary to the intent of the MBO.

Finally, in its proper (and intended) form, a MBO system must be all-encompassing. For example, the school board should establish district goals, and the chief administrator (e.g., Superintendent) should develop goals and objectives aimed at meeting the Board's goals. Similarly, the upper, middle, and lower management should develop a network of enabling goals and objectives, as should all personnel on payroll in that district. This generally results in a well-integrated and managed system. But what if the Board fails to set district goals? What if upper management is not supportive of the MBO system? What if the line manager wishes to establish a MBO system just for his/her department? And how can we develop a MBO system that is product oriented (i.e., stresses changes in student/teacher behavior as a result of system implementation) while still preserving the professional autonomy and intellectual independence of the front-line teacher and aide?

In many respects, school psychologists function at times like
managers; they must organize and support a variety of assessment/implementation systems in order that an array of appropriate educational services are provided according to the unique needs of both the recipient and provider. The extent to which they are successful at this may be determined by (1) the relevancy of established goals and objectives to the mission of the service agency (schools); (2) the quality, quantity and relevancy of data provided by Management Information Systems (MIS) (Blumenthal, 1969), and (3) the school psychologists' ability to safeguard the unique autonomy of the human service providers for which the manager has responsibility.

Burian (1976) has developed a modified MBO/MIS system which seems to satisfy our requirements. He refers to this system as a Service Management by Objectives (SMBO)/Service Management Information, Guidance, and Evaluation System (SMIGES). The uses of the term "Service" is meant to suggest and emphasize a focus on the management and results of human services provided to resolve human problems, rather than the production of goals through primarily operating a management system. Burian (1976, II-5) defines SMBO as "an organized approach to human service agency planning, decision making, action and evaluation which focuses attention and effort on the outcomes of organized activity and appraises effectiveness on the basis of outcomes." SMBO systems as well as other management systems which carefully consider the product (outcome) of services might lend themselves well to the school psychologist faced with the challenges previously described. Burian (1976, II-4-5) provides a brief survey
of such systems, the essence of which follows (with educational applications articulated by the present author).

The Bureaucratic Approach is the most common manner of organizing and clarifying personnel roles, rules, and formalizing structures of authority. These are for the most part provided to the school psychologist at the outset; Master Contracts, school law, state and federal mandates all provide the general context in which the school psychologist must operate. Unfortunately, this approach does not typically provide for flexibility and innovation which is often required in order to meet the needs of the ultimate benefactors of services, the students. The ensuing compartmentalization of staff, students, and services in such a large agency as the public schools ultimately results in an emphasis on process rather than product, as even the most casual examination of federal, state and local reporting forms will reveal. The emphasis on numbers of handicapped students by impairment categories and ages, the number of staff hired to provide services to these groups and even the mean number of performance objectives completed per student, all fail to reasonably relate to the assessment of the quality and relevance of instruction and treatment. However, this approach through its rigidity and well defined roles protects (perhaps too well) all who participate, including the students.

Another management approach may be termed "Human Relations." This approach deals primarily with interpersonal relations within an agency, and with optimizing communications between personnel, depart-
merits, divisions, etc. Essentially a supplemental approach, it is typically combined with some other approach (e.g., bureaucratic) and therefore results in some of their shortcomings. In the end, it would seem that both the good and the bad are borrowed to such an extent that we "feel good" about ourselves, yet are unable to formulate clear goals and objectives which are sensitive to the needs of our students.

The Planning, Programming, Budgeting Systems (PPBS) clearly articulate the relative value (cost) of various service alternatives, and facilitate effective management of these services. However empirical and objective PPBS is, it fails to incorporate within its system a method of identifying, prioritizing, and achieving goals and objectives. It offers the budget as a first step, rather than an intermediate or enabling step. The MBO approach utilizes various concepts from the other management systems, and adds one critical new dimension: goals and objectives. It emphasizes the relative importance of authority, rules, roles, and fiscal accountability, while underscoring the function of goal/objective accomplishment as a reinforcement for performance. This concept seems to offer potential utility to the school psychologist.

However, the MBO approach is generally most successful when complemented with a myriad of other systems, such as effective research and development systems, well-developed budgeting and accounting services, technological expertise, well-tested management information systems, and other highly sophisticated management techniques. Such
support systems are rarely found in human service organizations (Burian, 1976, II-7). The organizational climate in many of our public schools does not favor the development (or implementation) of such MBO systems.

Another problem in implementing a MBO system in the schools is defining the problem which has occasioned the relevant goals and objectives. In industrial and commercial applications the ultimate problem is how to maximize or increase profit. In education (or any human service field), the ultimate problem is less clear, and for the most part can be only indirectly assessed. One example is who is the client — the student or the community? The student — or various groups of students? Often the ultimate problem is defined as the rendering of service, irrespective of outcome. Such ambiguities may arm educators who are ambivalent or hostile to MBO with ammunition with which they can battle the implementation of such systems within their schools.

Burian's (1976) SMBO model places an emphasis on the concerns of clients (students) and professionals (educators) who access, use, and/or operate human service agencies (public schools) and on the concerns of relevant supporting communities. In this respect, it is more applicable to use within education than "standard" MBO systems. However, the present author suggests that the application of SMBO systems within public education differs from similar applications within other human service areas (e.g., community mental health services) in several ways.
First, clients may access certain human services because they have been thwarted in attempting to obtain certain objectives, goals or other reinforcers. Students do not participate in public schools for those reasons; rather, they do so because attendance is mandated by law (at least until age 16). Second, the relevant communities do not always support the schools; local millage elections have (in recent years) resulted in little or no gains in services to the recipients of our school tax dollars. There is little correspondence, then, between the demands and needs of the community, and those of the recipients (students). The climate for change is therefore not as conducive to progress in education as it is in the private sector.

Nevertheless, the schools are mandated by law to provide certain services to students residing within certain geographical boundaries. As long as both the students and the schools are mandated to interact on a regular basis, it would seem as though a SMBO system might be very appropriate, when coupled with several other systems. A potentially effective SMBO program would seem to be one that was adopted system-wide, from the Board of Education on down to the lowest possible level of service (as would be the case with a standard MBO system). However, since the emphasis in a SMBO system is placed on service management, such a limitation might allow a SMBO system to be installed at only one or two levels of management/service. If this is in fact feasible, the SMBO concept would become of even greater utility than previously envisioned, and would become parti-
cularly attractive to many service providers, such as school psychologists.

This paper seeks to explore the utility of the SMBO system as applied to a small component of one division of one of the 58 Intermediate School Districts in Michigan.

Before proceeding with the present design, let us review the essential features of a SMBO system; these five major components and their relationships are presented below:

- Goal & Obj. Setting
- Planning and Designing
- Budgeting
- Service Provision Process
- Service Management Information, Evaluation, & Guidance System (SMIGES)

Primary emphasis is on the setting of goals and objectives, upon which all subsequent processes depend. Management information (so-called "feedback loops") is provided by the SMIGES. A secondary feature of the SMBO is the explicit relationship between the process of setting goals and objectives, and the process of providing direct services. Each has input and output into the other; each can therefore be modified by the other.

Once the organization (agency, school, etc.) has stated its rationale for its existence and has articulated the human problem(s) it sets out to resolve (i.e., provides a purpose or mission statement), a series of goals may be established. Through progress on these
goals (and their related objectives), one infers to what extent the organizational purpose has been achieved.

Goal statements, descriptions of the current situation, and a delineation of "barriers" which currently prevent goal attainment are woven together in the definition of the presenting problem(s). The difference(s) between the described goals and the current situation establishes "need"; the "barriers" to problem resolution are the factors or conditions which prevent goal achievement from the current situation. The removal or alteration of these barriers to the extent necessary to effect the long term goal(s) thus becomes the focal point of organizational activities.

Although various services or program designs may be suggested, their absence (or inclusion) is not incorporated in the problem definition. This prevents a self-justification trap from being set; such a trap results in organizations viewing themselves as an end rather than a means to an end.

Once the problem statement has been developed modality goal statements are formulated. A modality goal indicates in general terms what desired state of affairs or condition is to result from the provision of modality services. Modality services might be considered (1) social work, (2) school psychological services, (3) classroom-based activities, (4) home-school intervention, (5) parent/student counseling.

Modality objectives are specific statements of outcomes which
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represent progress toward the related goal(s) or barrier removal within a given time frame. Although these modality objectives may be empirically monitored, they provide only an indirect and inferential evaluation of goal and purpose achievement.

After modality goals and objectives have been identified, they are linked to the direct service level by service goals and objectives for each case, project, or incident of service. Service goals, like modality goals, are general statements which specify a general condition intended as the result of a particular case, project, or service. The service objective is a further refinement, specifying precisely the outcomes to be reached within a given time frame. They are agreed upon early in the service process by both the service provider and the service recipient. The service objective must be stated in measureable terms, and must provide a measurement system which assesses results at a specific time. The data obtained from such systems may be aggregated across cases, projects or incidents of service to indicate progress on modality objectives and thus reveal progress toward goal achievement.

Three types of objectives have been identified with the SMBO framework: substantive, operations, and developmental. All three types should be present in a complete operationalization of SMBO.

Substantive objectives are those which relate to the substance or reason for existence of the organization, and are further related to problem resolution outcomes.
Operations objectives relate to the effectiveness of the procedures and strategies used in implementing the program.

Developmental objectives are related to activities which are aimed at increasing organizational capacity to meet and resolve substantive problems that are not currently being met.

Finally, objectives may be formulated in terms of outcome (products) and output (processes). Organizations are typically interested in both types, perhaps because volume of service (output) is more nearly under direct control than its product or outcome, which on the other hand, remains of paramount importance.

The development of a plan of implementation is critical to the designing of SMBO systems. This plan should include what steps should be taken by whom, as well as timelines for the completion of each step. Strong administrative leadership is also crucial (Burian, 1976, II-21), for it is at the administrative level that modality goals and objectives are first formulated. These goals and objectives are then reviewed by line staff, and returned to administrative personnel for final adjustments.

The planned staff participation, often through the formation of committees, inservice training sessions, or team meetings, also is crucial if staff commitment and support for implementation is to be gathered.

Burian provides a 12-step process for implementing the SMBO approach (Burian, 1976, II-22 - II-25). Summary of this process follows.
STEP I: ESTABLISH TOP MANAGEMENT AND BOARD COMMITMENT TO IMPLEMENTATION OF SMBO APPROACH.

The basic premiss is that commitment at the highest administrative and governing levels is crucial to effective implementation. It is this premiss that the present paper seeks to challenge, for it poses a serious limitation on the utility of the SMBO approach. Our contention is that the SMBO approach can be incorporated into select components of an existing organizational system, and that the highest administrative commitment required is that of the immediate supervisor of the administrator in charge of each component which adopts the SMBO approach.

STEP II: ORIENT STAFF TO THE FRAMEWORK AND INTENTION TO CARRY IT OUT.

During this step staff are informed as to the essential features of the SMBO approach and the agency's commitment to implement the approach.

STEP III: ESTABLISH PLAN FOR IMPLEMENTATION OF SMBO APPROACH IN AGENCY.

At this point a general plan of action should be developed, with timelines and responsibilities for carrying out the various related tasks clearly specified. The extent of the detail of these plans is directly proportional to the extent of staff participation.

STEP IV: DEVELOP TOP MANAGEMENT UNDERSTANDING AND SKILL IN THE WRITING OF AGENCY PURPOSE, PROGRAM GOAL & OBJECTIVE STATEMENTS.

Again, (and contrary to Burian), we argue that "top management" consists of the lowest-level manager who directly controls and/or
assumes responsibility for the operation of a SMBO approach.

STEP V: ORIENT LINE MANAGEMENT AND CHECK OUT PROGRAM GOALS AND OBJECTIVES WITH LINE MANAGEMENT.

(and)

STEP VI: ORIENT LINE STAFF AND CHECK OUT PROGRAM GOALS AND OBJECTIVES.

This is in keeping with the pyramidal heirarchy of most systems. "Front line" people are critical members of the "team". They and their immediate supervisors need to be fully informed with respect to program goals and objectives, and should be afforded the opportunity to participate in the adjustment of such goals and objectives. At the same time, line managers and staff should practice writing service goals and objectives which relate to program goals and objectives. An agency-wide committee should also be formed to coordinate the development and implementation of the project. This committee should be comprised of top management, line management and line staff.

STEP VII: DEVELOP MEASUREMENT CRITERIA AND INSTRUMENTATION.

The development committee should prepare measurement criteria and instrumentation required for collecting and processing data related to both output and outcome objectives. This will produce a working draft of the SMIGES.

STEP VIII: REFINE TOTAL SYSTEM AND PREPARE FOR TESTING

and
STEP IX: TEST THE SYSTEM

These steps are self-explanatory. Burian suggests a testing period of from 30 to 90 days. Although appropriate for large stratified systems, it seems reasonable to be satisfied with a far shorter period in small systems, or in systems which produce a large volume of output/outcome data, since the effects of the SMBO/SMIGES will be more readily apparent.

The development committee should make any necessary adjustments in the system prior to moving on to the next step.

STEP X: FULL SCALE IMPLEMENTATION OF THE SMBO SYSTEM

(self-explanatory)

STEP XI: EVALUATION OF THE SYSTEM

Quarterly evaluation should be undertaken with respect to

1. the time required of each staff by the system
2. procedural effectiveness
3. other difficulties related to implementation

STEP XII: ADJUSTMENT OF SYSTEM

Although minor adjustments may be made quarterly, major adjustments should be made at the end of the first year of operation in relation to the experience gained.

Again, it remains this author's contention that shorter intervals may suffice for smaller systems or those which produce a high volume of output/outcome data. This contention applies to time parameters indicated within both Steps XI and XII.
METHOD

Setting

The formulation of a SMBO/SMIGES was made in relation to the Valley Center for the Emotionally Impaired, a federally-funded special education/mental health county-wide program operated by the Kalamazoo Valley Intermediate School District (KVISD). Valley Center operates three self-contained classrooms for seriously emotionally impaired children and adolescents ranging from eight to sixteen years of age. No more than eight children are contained within each classroom. Each classroom is staffed by a certified teacher of the emotionally impaired and up to two aides (Assistant Teaching Therapists, or A.T.T.s). Each of three part-time aides provides 1.5 hours of service per day. A shop instructor provides one hour of instruction four days per week. In addition, two Home-School Interventionists (HSIs) provide outreach services to the families of the students. Administrative services are comprised of the program administrator, or "Coordinator" (the present author), and secretary.

Financial reporting functions are provided by the business office and data processing divisions of KVISD.

One HSI was assigned to Valley Center from Family and Children Services through a contract with the Kalamazoo County Community Mental Health Board, and was required to follow mental health data recording procedures. Data summaries of mental health services
were provided by the Western Regional Office (WRO) of the Michigan Department of Mental Health.

Subjects

All of the above Valley Center staff were involved in this project by virtue of their employment. In addition, the Assistant Superintendent for Special Education at KVISD provided the authority under which project activities were undertaken, since she was the Valley Center Coordinator's immediate supervisor.

Procedure

After reviewing all SMBO materials, the 12-step implementation process recommended by Burian was followed.

STEP I: ESTABLISH TOP MANAGEMENT AND BOARD COMMITMENT TO IMPLEMENTATION OF SMBO APPROACH.

Since the KVISD utilizes individual staff performance objectives as one component of its management system, the Valley Center Coordinator established (in conjunction with the Assistant Superintendent for Special Education) a performance objective that called for the initial development and implementation of a SMBO/SMIGES pilot system at Valley Center. This objective was established in the winter of 1978 and the initial SMBO design was developed by June, 1978.

STEP II: ORIENT STAFF TO THE FRAMEWORK AND INTENTION TO CARRY IT OUT.
In the spring of 1978 (and at various other times through November of 1980) all staff were inserviced with respect to general features of the SMBO system. This was accomplished at several of the regularly-scheduled team meetings attended by all Valley Center staff. Furthermore, SMBO goals and objectives were published in the Valley Center Administrative Manual.

STEP III: ESTABLISH PLAN FOR IMPLEMENTATION OF SMBO APPROACH IN AGENCY.

Also in the spring of 1978, the teachers, the original HSI and one A.T.T. worked with the Coordinator in targeting a plan, timelines and responsibilities for implementing the SMBO. By June of 1978, the A.T.T. was to have met with the teachers in establishing the Valley Center Educational Component's Goal and Output/Outcome Objectives. By the same time, the HSI was to have completed similar activities related to the Home-School Intervention Component, and the Coordinator was to have completed similar activities related to the Valley Center Evaluation Component.

STEP IV: DEVELOP TOP MANAGEMENT UNDERSTANDING AND SKILL IN THE WRITING OF AGENCY PURPOSE, PROGRAM GOAL AND OBJECTIVE STATEMENTS.

In keeping with our present SMBO model, the Valley Center Coordinator was considered "Top Management" for the purpose of this step. He had previously received graduate training in this area through several systems courses offered within the Department of Psychology at Western Michigan University.
STEP V: ORIENT LINE MANAGEMENT AND CHECK OUT PROGRAM GOALS AND OBJECTIVES WITH LINE MANAGEMENT.

The staff indicated in Step III were subsequently trained in SMBO goal and objective setting procedures, using the format suggested by Burian (1976). Once program and service goals and objectives were refined for each of the three Valley Center components (Classroom, Home-School Intervention and Evaluation), they were shared with personnel from the other components.

STEP VI: ORIENT LINE STAFF AND CHECK OUT PROGRAM GOALS AND OBJECTIVES.

By the end of the summer of 1978, all remaining staff were provided with copies of the SMBO goals and objectives. Input from line staff was obtained both informally and during team meetings. The coordination and implementation of the SMBO was executed by the agency-wide committee indicated in Step III. Later, in 1980, the committee was comprised of one teacher, one HSI, one A.T.T. and the Coordinator.

STEP VII: DEVELOP MEASUREMENT CRITERIA AND INSTRUMENTATION.

The measurement criteria were articulated in all component objectives. The instrumentation varied according to the relative ease with which verification could be established for each output/outcome event. Thus, simple check sheets sufficed for some tasks, and more complex data entries and calculations were required for others. The various SMIGES so developed may be found in both the...
Results section and Appendix.

STEPS VIII AND IX: REFINE THE TOTAL SYSTEM AND TEST THE SYSTEM.

This was accomplished during the fall of 1978, and required little effort due to adequate program development and the relatively small size of the total operation. Subsequent steps followed quickly.

STEPS X - THROUGH - XII: FULL SCALE IMPLEMENTATION, EVALUATION, AND ADJUSTMENT OF THE SYSTEM.

These steps were begun in 1979 and are currently being undertaken at Valley Center since they are part of an ongoing process which constantly updates and adjusts the Valley Center service delivery systems.
The development and application of a SMBO system should produce three basic results: first, an analysis of initial problems and solutions, resulting in an initial array of relevant goals and objectives; second, the measurement and analysis of the impact of activities undertaken to accomplish the initial goals and objectives; and third, the current refinement of all goals and objectives in response to the data obtained from prior activities.

The first and third basic results constitute the main text of the Valley Center SMBO system which is included in Appendix A. The three major components (Classroom, Home-School Intervention and Evaluation) are presented in the manner outlined by Burian (1976) and modality goals and objectives are articulated. Immediately following each component outline is the current SMIGES related to that component. Three types of SMIGES are presented: an input type denoted by "/I"; an output or report type denoted by "/R"; and a combination type denoted by "/I-R". The latter type (/I-R) provides for the incorporation of simple low-volume data directly into an output report, thereby eliminating a separate input instrument.

The Classroom and Home-School Intervention Components are both the substantive type, while the Evaluation Component is essentially of the operations type. Included also is a new developmental-type component, the Specials Component, which will be implemented during winter, 1981.
When a goal or objective has been modified over time the resulting change has been included and the year of modification indicated. The resulting document is therefore a synthesis of separate SMBOs from 1978 through 1980-81.

Inspection of the Classroom Component SMBO reveals no changes in the problem analysis and goal statement since the inception of this component, suggesting an accurate initial assessment of these SMBO features. The substantive objectives which follow, however, evidence several changes over time.

The modifications to the second output objective guarantees the provision of a minimum number of service goals and objectives related specifically to student academic weaknesses. This proactive change was made in the absence of data necessitating such change; the modification should decrease the likelihood that academic areas are overlooked in the future.

The change in the third output objective results from a dramatic decrease in time available to carry out these checks due to the quadrupling of the number of students enrolled since the initiation of this objective. Likewise, the alterations to the fourth output and outcome objectives reflect a decrease in time available for meetings due to the same increase in student population. As the student population increases, there are increased demands on staff time due to the concommitant increases in service planning, diagnostic-prescriptive work, record keeping, etc.
The primary change in the fifth output objective provides more flexibility in arranging academic periods, without altering the total direct contact time between certificated teachers and students.

The change in the fifth outcome objective establishes the Individualized Educational Plan as preeminent in establishing instructional content areas, classes and services as mandated by PL94-142.

The addition of the Coordinator to the Classroom Component staff allocation corrects a previous oversight within the document, and does not reflect a substantive function or role change.

The Classroom Component SMIGES is summarized in three sections (I-III), each of which require special data input forms (SMIGES/I). The SMIGES/R, Section I relates to the first two sets of objectives for this component. The SMIGES/I, Section I provides a format and means with which data may be processed and referred back to the SMIGES/R, Section I. The resulting data may be entered and reported for any of the existing classrooms, and may also be aggregated across all classrooms using the "combined" function of the SMIGES/R. In addition, provision is made for a fourth classroom ("X") should future expansion become necessary.

The SMIGES/I-R, Section II relates to the third and fourth sets of objectives and reports data obtained from SMIGES/I, Section II. In addition, data may be directly entered into the SMIGES/I-R form, as previously indicated. Similarly, SMIGES/I-R, Section III
relates data obtained from SMIGES/I, Section III (located on line 15 of the preceding SMIGES/I, Section II) to the fifth and sixth set of objectives. Again, additional data may be directly entered into the SMIGES/I-R.

The SMIGES/I, R and I-R formats are new for 1980-81. In previous years data have been collected on a variety of instruments and were reviewed as needed. This created filing problems and often made the compilation of particular groups of data difficult, at best.

In addition to program goals and objectives, many service goals and objectives were established for each student. Located in Appendix B are sample goal and objective sheets used with each student. These instruments also contain some of the goals and objectives set by the HSIs. Related to these goals and objectives are subordinant prescriptive programs with their highly specific objectives, intervention plans, monitoring procedures, etc. A sample prescriptive program may be found in Appendix C.

Inspection of the Home-School Intervention Component SMBO reveals characteristics similar to those previously described for the Classroom Component. However, the changes between 1978-80 and 1980-81 were of such magnitude that their related sets of objectives have been separated into parts C and D.
The early program objectives reflect the developmental nature of the Home-School Intervention Component. Emphasized is the establishment of services, the definition of what constitutes services, and the delineation of the amount of services to be delivered to service targets. The various objectives identified within part C of this SMBO were generated by the first Valley Center HSI who brought with him considerable clinical skill but limited behavioral training. Although he worked closely with the Coordinator in preparing these objectives, they remain heavily process oriented rather than product oriented. Nevertheless, services were initiated according to plan and nearly all objectives were satisfactorily met. A sample of the data obtained will be provided elsewhere in this section where we will discuss the second type of basic result of SMBO implementation.

For the 1980-81 school year, new outcome and output objectives were formulated and are included under part D of this component. As a result of previous experience with HSI service provision, more flexibility was built into the average minimum number of contact hours with families and students. Experience revealed that certain families were in more need of services than other families and service rendition should therefore be shifted to meet these moment-to-moment changes in the needs of our service population. These changes are reflected in output objectives 1, 2, and 4 of this part.

New for this year will be receiving system feedback from both parents and local educators regarding their satisfaction with Valley
Center HSI services. The instruments utilized in this process may be found in Appendix D. The information obtained from these questionnaires will allow Valley Center to respond to the changing needs of these parents and educators.

Many of the outcome measures have been altered to provide more objective and empirical verification of service impact without interfering with the more clinically oriented services which need to be provided from this component from time to time.

The SMIGES relating to the Home-School Intervention Component share a format similar to that utilized with the Classroom Component. As with the education component, the SMIGES/R indicates specifically the objective number and type referred to. The SMIGES/I similarly relate to specific objectives identified in the SMIGES/R by number and corresponding letter (e.g., 1.a). This statement is provided near the end of the SMIGES/I to the right of the term "reference objective". As with all other Valley Center SMIGES/I, line 0 indicates the title or subject area to which the instrument relates. Line 1 requests the name of the worker. Line 2 either provides a time frame within which the data input must be made or requests another due date (to be established by the Coordinator and/or worker). Line 3 requires the actual date of submission. This is the actual calendar date that the completed SMIGES/I is turned in to the Valley Center office.

In Student Contact SMIGES/I, line 2 indicates that time units must be in quarter hours. Thus, 4 units represent one hour, 6
units represent 1.5 hours, etc. This is in conformance with the data units required by the Michigan Department of Mental Health (DMH), where Valley Center also reports data. Quarter hour unit reporting on the SMIGES/I permits the data to be easily transferred from the DMH sheets, and dividing the total hours of service by four produces the real time equivalent.

Since many emotionally impaired students emit high rates of inappropriate behavior during activities that are less structured than special education classrooms, a new Specials Component SMBO was developed. This SMBO authorized a curriculum committee to oversee the development of a cohesive and effective organization of "specials" (i.e., art, music, gym, shop, etc.). It further provides several objectives which (when met) will provide a structure to previously loosely structured activities.

Outcome objective 2 indicates that a quiz will be given to all staff regarding the Specials Component SMBO. This quiz is included at the end of the Evaluation Component SMBO, since it is also used in measuring one of the objectives in the latter component.

The SMIGES/I-R for the Specials Component is a simple document which should be sufficient for our purposes. Objective 1.a) is monitored across the school year by providing the frequency of meetings each month in the top boxes (proceeding left to right, from October through June), and by entering the total hours in session each month in the bottom boxes. The double vertical lines
separate the trimesters which in turn are averaged and displayed in the two columns on the right. The 1. e) objective makes provision for handling additional specials as they arise.

Lastly, the Evaluation Component ties all the SMBO sets together through Valley Center central management. The Evaluation Component SMBO is unique in that it systematizes its own establishment. It calls for the development and application of a SMBO approach for nearly all of the Valley Center operation and provides the mechanism for realizing that goal. In its present form, it is misnamed; it provides data collection, processing and reporting services in addition to data analysis and evaluation of services. These latter services are emphasized in the component title, for the provision of these services are paramount in the provision of managerial guidance.

Initially developmental (like the Home-School Intervention Component), the test of time has resulted in enough changes in its objectives to warrant separate sections (parts C and D). Although the SMIGES/I, R and I-R forms are newly developed, it is instructive to utilize them to sample data obtained from previous years. By doing so, it will make clear the relationship of the resulting data to the modifications made to the program objectives.

In table 1 are the data resulting from the 1978 - 79 school fiscal year. The SMIGES/R format provides the second type of basic results anticipated from the development and application of the
SMIGES/R: EVALUATION COMPONENT - 1979

Goal: Valley Center will be guided by an evaluation component that will identify goals and objectives, guide services, evaluate their results, and modify goals, objectives and strategies as needed.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Objective Number Type</th>
<th>DESCRIPTION</th>
<th>Date Completed</th>
<th>CRITERION MET?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 Output</td>
<td>a) A SMBO/SMIGES will be established for 90% of V.C. operations and all staff by November of each year.</td>
<td>% Oper.</td>
<td>Yes/No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>All Staff</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 Outcome</td>
<td>b) 80% of program/staff objectives met by 1) June for school staff and 2) September for mental health staff.</td>
<td>%_ 67 %_</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>% 9-79</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Output</td>
<td>a) 1) 100% of staff will be trained in SMBO by September 30 annually. 2) All HSIs will also be trained in SMIGES by September 30 annually.</td>
<td>%_ 60 %_</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>% 9-30-79</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Outcome</td>
<td>b) 1) V.C. passes KCCMHB audit by July 1 of each year audit occurs. 2) 85% of V.C. staff have input and role in development of SMBO by September 30 annually.</td>
<td>% 6-79</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>% 9-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Objective Number Type</td>
<td>DESCRIPTION</td>
<td>Date Completed</td>
<td>CRITERION MET?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Output</td>
<td>a) Suprasystems will be sent requested data within time frames established.</td>
<td>Date of Report: 11-26-80</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Outcome</td>
<td>b) 80% of the V.C. decisions made by these suprasystems will support the modification and guidance of V.C. by the data obtained by this component.</td>
<td>Date of Report: 11-26-80</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
SMBO approach (viz., the measurement and analysis of the activities undertaken to accomplish the initial goals and objectives).

The table shows only partial success for the first two sets of objectives. The first objective, 1. a), shows all staff had individual performance objectives established by November (as per KVISD standard practice), but that only 75% of Valley Center operations had an established SMBO subsystem. The expansion of the length of the Valley Center school day provided a further expanded period in which the systematic management of services was required. This culminated in the new Specials Component SMBO which in turn will permit Valley Center to meet the requirements of this objective. The language used in the new program objective D.1), should decrease the probability that any component of Valley Center will operate without a SMBO subsystem in place.

The results of the next objective, 1.b), indicates failure on the part of the Educational Component to meet criterion, while the Home-School Intervention Component was successful in exceeding criterion. A possible explanation for this discrepancy will be discussed later. This objective was deleted from the Evaluation Component; individual component criteria for success are now included within the SMBOs for each component, where resulting data will provide better guidance within each component.

The first part of the second objective, 2.a), was successful in generating HSI training in SMIGES, but only 60% of all staff had been trained in SMBO by September 30, 1979. These latter data
likely obtain due to a) new staff being hired after the target date, b) a lack of specification of when the inservice training should occur, and c) a lack of specification of criterion levels of staff performance with respect to skills imparted through this objective. These difficulties are spoken to in the revised (1981) objective D.2). The new SMIGES/I pertaining to quizzes provides data collection related to this objective. These quizzes are included in the latter part of Appendix A.

The second part of objective 2, 2.b), is shown by Table 1 to have again been partially met; although Valley Center received a very favorable audit report resulting from the Kalamazoo County Community Health Board's June audit, less than half the anticipated staff had actual input into the annual SMBO development for 1978-79. However, nearly all staff did have such involvement during the initial development of each component, when such involvement is crucial. Since it is reasonable to seek and expect less staff involvement during maintenance of the SMBO, this objective was dropped for 1980.

Both the third output and outcome objectives were satisfactorily completed, and because of their critical nature, have been retained in part D under objective 4.

A new objective for 1980-81 has been included. This objective, D.3, will facilitate the generation of timely data reports which will be crucial to the effectiveness of the new SMIGES.

A further analysis of the second type of basic results
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obtained from SMBO development and application is facilitated by comparing HSI data obtained in the fall of 1978 with similar data obtained in the fall of 1979. Tables 2 and 3 provide the new SMIGES/R as the vehicle for such an analysis across one HSI (A). Both tables employ data obtained for 50 work days, as represented on Department of Mental Health data sheets. Both tables indicate initial establishment of the SMBO for this component (this objective was later dropped due to a lack of current relevance). The outcome objective, 1,b), was also satisfactorily achieved for the worker since as half of the HSI work force he would be expected to serve half the anticipated students.

The second output objective, 2.a), was not met by the HSI in 1978, while he exceeded the maximum range of direct student contact as measured by objective 3.a)1). In this latter objective, 165.5 hours of service were provided, while only 59 hours were provided to families during this same period. An adjustment can be observed the following year, where both criteria were met. In 1979, 123.5 hours of direct student contact were recorded, and 77.25 hours of family services were obtained. Since the client caseload remained constant, a more appropriate shift in services was therefore obtained and made evident through the SMIGES/R.

Although the related outcome objective, 2.b), was met both years, it was judged too vague to be of value and was subsequently dropped.

The criterion amount of case conference time with teacher,
**SMIGES/R: HOME-SCHOOL INTERVENTION COMPONENT - 1978**

Goal: This component will produce demonstrable gains in client functioning at home, and will facilitate the generalization of therapeutic gain to and from both home and school(s).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Objective Number</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>DESCRIPTION</th>
<th>Date Completed</th>
<th>CRITERION MET?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Output</td>
<td>a) SMBO approved by 04/14/XX. 78</td>
<td>4/11/78</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Outcome</td>
<td>b) SMBO designed for 16 students, 80% of which serviced by 09/30/XX.*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>*8 students per HSI</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Output</td>
<td>a) Mean of 1-1.5 hrs/week in contact with each family.</td>
<td>Date of Report: 11/30/78</td>
<td>Mean hrs/wk all famil:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Outcome</td>
<td>b) Improve family communications and functioning within 6 months of goal identification for 80% of the V.C. families.</td>
<td>Y-T-D Av: 100% fam. dem. gains w/in 6 mo. Date of Report: 11/30/78</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

*Note: Pages 33 and 34 are not visible in the image.*
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Objective Number</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>DESCRIPTION</th>
<th>Date Completed</th>
<th>CRITERION MET?</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Output</td>
<td>a) 1) Direct contact with each student 1.5-2 hours per week. 2) Meet with each classroom teacher at least .5 hours per week.</td>
<td>Date of Report: 11/30/78</td>
<td>MEAN AVERAGE PER WEEK:</td>
<td>1) 2.1</td>
<td>2) 1.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Outcome</td>
<td>b) 1) Affective and 1 social goal established by the end of 30-day diagnostic period for 90% of students. 2) 70% goal attainment by graduation.</td>
<td>Date of Report: 11/30/78</td>
<td></td>
<td>1) X</td>
<td>2) N/A % N/A %</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2 (cont.)
SMIGES/R: HOME-SCHOOL INTERVENTION COMPONENT - 1979

Goal: This component will produce demonstrable gains in client functioning at home, and will facilitate the generalization of therapeutic gain to and from both home and school(s).

HSI A Data inclusive 9/10/79 - 11/16/79 10 school weeks (50 school days)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Objective Number</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>DESCRIPTION</th>
<th>Date of Report</th>
<th>CRITERION MET?</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 Output</td>
<td>a) SMHO approved by 04/14/XX.</td>
<td>Date Completed: 4/11/78</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 Outcome</td>
<td>b) SMHO designed for 16 students, 80% of which serviced by 09/30/XX.*</td>
<td>Date: 9/30/79</td>
<td>8 Stu.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>*8 students per HSI</td>
<td>100 % Srvd.</td>
<td></td>
<td>100 % Srvd.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Output</td>
<td>a) Mean of 1-1.5 hrs/week in contact with each family.</td>
<td>Mean hrs/wk all fam: 1.0 (0.97)</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Outcome</td>
<td>b) Improve family communications and functioning within 6 months of goal identification for 80% of the V.C. families.</td>
<td>Y-T-D Av: 100 % fam. dem. gains w/in 6 mo.</td>
<td>Date of Report: 11/30/79</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Objective Number Type</td>
<td>DESCRIPTION</td>
<td>Date Completed</td>
<td>CRITERION MET?</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>----</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Output</td>
<td>a) 1) Direct contact with each student 1.5-2 hours per week. 2) Meet with each classroom teacher at least .5 hours per week.</td>
<td>Date of Report: 11/30/79</td>
<td>MEAN AVERAGE PER WEEK: 1)</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>(1.54)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2)</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Outcome</td>
<td>b) 1) Affective and 1 social goal established by the end of 30-day diagnostic period for 90% of students. 2) 70% goal attainment by graduation.</td>
<td>Date of Report: 11/30/79</td>
<td>1)</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2)</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 3 (Cont.)
represented in objective 3.a)2) was met both years, but was far in excess of the target established for 1978; it was subsequently reduced by about 33% in 1979.

During both years this HSI met criterion 3.b)1) for establishing service goals and objectives within the specified time frames. Since these processes may be monitored by other subsystems, this objective was replaced by other outcome measures that more closely reflect student achievement (see the 1981 revision). Likewise, the low rate of Valley Center graduations renders objective 3.b)2) insensitive to student achievement, and was replaced by new objectives that should be more informative in relation to changes in such achievement.
DISCUSSION

The operationalization of the SMBO approach within Valley Center has been shown to organize and direct services in a manner which makes select staff and program components accountable to other select staff and program components for human services rendered. In the process, it provides several important functions. First, it establishes an agency mission and agency wide goals and objectives for accomplishing this mission. The mobilization and direction of agency resources in a systematic and goal-oriented manner is likely to facilitate a concentrated and successful attack on the presenting barriers to problem resolutions.

Second, it provides monitoring of services and service outcomes through the SMIGES. The clearer and more frequent SMIGES reports tend to produce more favorable results than less clear and less frequent reports. The higher level of performance of the Home-School Intervention Component in comparison to the Educational Component (Table 1, objective 1.b)) might be due, in part, to the quality and quantity of information provided to those components. The HSIs were required, as mental health workers, to generate an accounting in fifteen minute intervals of their work activities throughout the day. Various codes representing different services and activities were utilized throughout the reporting process and monthly computer print-outs summarized several service dimensions. Similar data input/output operations were not provided the teachers.
and it was difficult for them to monitor their collective services and service outcomes. Although this did not prevent the teachers from providing quality services (resulting in many of their students meeting their individual educational goals and objectives), the lack of a highly effective monitoring system might have led to the difficulties at least one teacher experienced in meeting some of her responsibilities.

Another important function suggested by the above is one of providing prompts to both the service providers and the manager. Precisely articulated SMIGES instruments such as the new SMIGES/R, I, and I-R often can serve as a reminder or prompt which in turn occasions the behaviors to be monitored. This also could have been a contributing factor in the difference between the 1979 HSI-teacher data.

A fourth function of the system is the provision of supplemental (or primary) data which complements other existing data/management systems. For example, although the Department of Mental Health had a management information system in place, its requirements and features did not satisfy all the needs of Valley Center. Similarly, the data systems in place for KVISD and those of the state and federal governments also did not obtain, process or provide all of the types of information required by Valley Center. Only by developing a SMBO/SMIGES approach were the unique requirements of Valley Center met. If the number of students, staff, funding sources, requested reports and/or resulting volume of data increases dramat-
ically, Valley Center will likely explore combining all date require­ments into one computer-assisted SMIGES. This would result in the most efficient and effective management information system, and could potentially offer low-cost high-value information, guidance and evaluation services.

Besides the emerging four functions of the Valley Center SMBO, several important features of the system have been recognized. One such feature is the ease with which the system may be adjusted or modified to meet new problems or requirements. For example, when it became evident that the entire Valley Center operation needed to be covered within the context of the SMBO approach a new component was quickly formed (viz. the Specials Component). When certain objectives were no longer relevant, they were readily dropped. When existing information (or "feedback") systems appeared inadequate, they were replaced by more viable alternatives. Furthermore, once a short-term resolution to a problem (or barrier) is effected, intermediary steps toward long-term resolution may naturally follow. For example, while the new Specials Component may soon result in more appropriate behavior of Valley Center students in environments which were previously loosely structured, the fact remains that these same environments will now have some important new controlling features. These features (e.g., physical structure, rules, systematically applied contingencies of reinforcement, desk sheets, etc.) will have altered the environment substantially. Since our goal is to produce socially appropriate behavior in less structured
educational activities than those conducted in the special education classroom, we recognize that the new Specials Component will have to facilitate the generalization of therapeutic gain from the Valley Center specials to those of other schools. This process can be achieved by modifying the program and service goals and objectives accordingly. In this manner, the stimulus conditions present during a special could be gradually altered (or faded) across time to more nearly approximate those present in the school district eventually to receive the student. In like fashion, schedules of reinforcement could be altered (in general, thinned) to similarly approximate those present in the local school district.

The Valley Center SMBO model provides clear evidence of accountability, another important feature of the SMBO approach. For example, it is clear that the HSI is responsible for the objectives and related activities articulated in the Home-School Intervention Component. Inspection of the SMIGES also reveals the Coordinator and/or HSI as responsible for monitoring the objectives established in that component. Furthermore, the Coordinator is responsible to the KVISD Assistant Superintendent for Special Education for the development of the SMBO approach within Valley Center.

All of the above was accomplished without sacrificing the professional autonomy of the service provider. The SMBO system provided the context in which treatment and teaching took place; the particular treatment/teaching modality or strategy was always determined at the lowest effective level of direct service, namely,
by the HSI, teacher or assistant teaching therapist.

Perhaps of greatest importance is the demonstration of the incorporation of the SMBO approach into only one part of a relatively large organization. The KVISD is a service agency employing over 300 employees serving nine constituent local school districts. The Special Education division, the largest within KVISD, operates four center-based programs, of which Valley Center is the smallest. Nevertheless, the SMBO system at Valley Center operates in nearly the same manner as similar approaches might in larger service units. This feature of the SMBO approach suggests a model which could be emulated within parts of other special education systems.

For example, the application of SMBO by a school psychologist coordinating a variety of direct services requires but a simple extension of the present model. Similar approaches to the coordination or provision of indirect (consultative) services may seem less clear, but seem feasible. Consider the school psychologist who is responsible for ancillary personnel, and is charged with the task of inservicing staff. By fully specifying the areas of difficulty which his task is addressing, establishing problem resolution goals, assessing the present situation and analyzing barriers to problem resolutions, the school psychologist can create an operational framework within which appropriate inservice training can be formulated. By establishing a small committee of his/her staff and charging that committee with the responsibility for establishing the goals and objectives related to inservice training, the school
psychologist can obtain support and commitment to the inservice training amongst staff. By establishing accountability for this task and monitoring related activities, the school psychologist provides staff with valuable experience and training in writing objectives, measuring results and evaluating strategies. These same principles and techniques could then be applied by staff to many of their varied tasks and areas of responsibilities. The resulting "spin-offs" or benefits tangential to the original goal may be as varied or extensive as the school psychologist (or staff) either intends or allows.

As with any avenue of inquiry, old questions generate new ones. Valley Center is a relatively new program, staffed by young energetic staff that are generally supportive of data-based programming. Will a systematic replication of this model applied to an older program staffed with more conservative personnel indifferent to data-based programming yield similar results? Since the KVISD is not unionized, would the SMBO approach work in a strong union shop situation? Finally, can the indirect services application suggested above be successfully effectuated?

While these questions remain to be answered, the need for cost-effective service delivery continues and the present SMBO approach suggests a fruitful avenue to explore.
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APPENDICES
APPENDIX A

SMBO/SMIGES
This document presents a four-ply SMBO model utilized by Valley Center. The contents of this model represent the combined input of Valley Center staff, and accurately reflect many of the goals, objectives, and activities of Valley Center. In order to reflect the changes this system has incurred over time, dashed lines have been typed through those parts that have been eliminated and new parts have been underscored. The date of the change is indicated in parentheses following the change(s). Dates provided refer to school years (e.g., 1980 represents September, 1979 through June, 1980), unless otherwise noted.

Agency Purpose
Promote optimal educational, social and affective health of behaviorally dysfunctional KVISD students and their relevant family systems.
CLASSROOM COMPONENT

I. Problem Focus

A. Area of Difficulty - Some EI students exhibit severe behaviors which are incompatible with progress in academics, interpersonal relations and self management skills.

B. Problem Resolution Goal - All KVISD students will make progress in academics, interpersonal relations and self management skills.

C. Present Situation - Some EI students have regressed in less restrictive EI placements.

D. Barriers to Problem Resolution

1. Initial evaluation of a student's behavior (social, self management, academic, pre-vocational and vocational) may have been inadequate for the development of a comprehensive individualized educational program (IEP).

2. Although the initial student behavior evaluation may have been adequate, a teaching strategy sufficiently correlated with that evaluation may not have been developed.

3. Teaching strategies once developed may not have been correctly or fully implemented.
4. Data-based behavioral methods for frequently evaluating the adequacy of student performance and updating specific performance objectives have not been established county wide.

5. Educational programs for the EI have not sufficiently emphasized academic behavior.

6. EI programs lack manpower resources that foster adequate individualized attention.

II. Program Goals/Objectives

A. Program Title - Valley Center Classroom Component

B. Program Goal - The Valley Center Classroom Component will encourage the development of age appropriate in-class behavior so that each student can return to the regular classroom.

C. Program Objectives

1. Output - Within 20 school days of placement in the program, criterion-referenced tests (BESI and/or BRIGANCE), and/or informal inventories, and/or norm-referenced tests (PIAT, WOODCOCK and KEY MATH) if not previously administered, will be administered to each student. Data on the frequency and/or duration of at least three problem behaviors will be recorded across fourteen school days for 90% of all students. The Coordinator and/or teacher will be (1980) respon-
sible for assuring test administration.

**Outcome** - Within 20 school days of placement in the program, protocol and data on problem behaviors will be submitted to the ageney (1980) coordinator. Coordinator is responsible for monitoring and evaluation.

2. **Output** - Within 25 school days of placement in the program, the student's teacher will develop six individual performance objectives and a strategy for reaching each of those objectives. At least two of these will be in academic areas in response to needs identified under Objective 1 (above). The (1981) coordinator is responsible for monitoring.

**Outcome** - Within 25 school days of placement in the program the student's teacher will develop one performance objective and one strategy based on the results obtained from #1 objectives. Implement at least one strategy for each of the objectives identified. The (1980) coordinator is responsible for monitoring.

3. **Output** - There will be bi-weekly-monthly quarterly (1981) reliability checks by A.T.T.'s of the permanent products and teaching techniques indicated in each strategy. The agency coordinator is responsible for monitoring and success. (All changes 1979)

**Outcome** - 90% of the strategies will be utilized as
written during each of the checks. A.T.T. reliability checks will be used to evaluate. The agency coordinator is responsible for success and monitoring. (All changes 1979)

4. Output - Relevant staff for each student will meet for at least (1981) .5 hours on a bi-monthly tri-monthly (1980) semi-annual (1981) basis following the implementation of the student's IEP to review his/her progress on individual objectives. Staff will also discuss needed changes in objectives and teaching strategies. The agency coordinator is responsible for monitoring and success. (1981)

Outcome - Updated objectives and teaching strategies will be incorporated in the student's IEP within five school days of the bi-monthly tri-monthly (1980) semi-annual (1981) review meetings. At least 70% of the student's short term objectives will be met every 6 months each year (1980). The agency (1981) coordinator is responsible for monitoring and success.

5. Output - Certificated teachers will provide at least 25 hours of academic instruction per school week over the entire course of the school year. (1981) Each student will be scheduled for at least 5 periods (40 minutes each) of academic training per school day. The agency (1981) coordinator is responsible for
monitoring.

Outcome - Each student will receive training in English, spelling, reading, math, handwriting, career education and/or physical education daily according to the Individualized Educational Plan established for that student. (1981) Agency coordinator is responsible for monitoring and evaluation.

6. Output - During FY78 (1979) Valley Center will serve a maximum of 8 students per classroom with a total of three classrooms. Agency Coordinator is responsible for monitoring.

Outcome - Valley Center will at no time have a staff to student ratio in any one classroom which exceeds 3:8. Agency coordinator is responsible for monitoring.

III. Program Activities

Activity 1: Testing and behavioral evaluation.

Activity 2: Writing performance objectives and teaching strategies.

Activity 3: Reliability checks of strategy permanent products.

Activity 4: Updating IEP's.

Activity 5: Teaching academics.

IV. Staff Allocation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Position</th>
<th>% of Time on this Program</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Teachers</td>
<td>95%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. A.T.T.s</td>
<td>87%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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3. Home-School Interventionists 5%
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Section I

Goal: This component will encourage the development of age appropriate in-class behavior so that each student can return to the regular classroom.

Data Source: [ ] Classroom A  [ ] Classroom B  [ ] Classroom C  [ ] Classroom X  [ ] Combined

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Objective Number</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>DESCRIPTION</th>
<th>Date Completed</th>
<th>CRITERION MET?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 Output</td>
<td>a)</td>
<td>Educational testing will be completed for each student within 20 days of placement.</td>
<td>Date of Rep.: _____ No. of new students since last report: _____</td>
<td>a)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>b)</td>
<td>Baseline data on 3 problem behaviors over 14 school days of treatment will occur for 90% of all students following placement.</td>
<td></td>
<td>b) ____% ____%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 Outcome</td>
<td>c)</td>
<td>Within 20 days of placement test results and baseline data will be submitted to Coordinator.</td>
<td>STUDENTS A B C D Start Date Elapsed Days</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Mean Elapsed Days Mean Elapsed Days</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Output</td>
<td>a)</td>
<td>The teacher will develop 6 student performance (service) objectives &amp; strategies for each student within 25 days of placement.</td>
<td>a) Elapsed Days</td>
<td>Mean Elapsed Days</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>b)</td>
<td></td>
<td>No. of P.O.'s</td>
<td>Mean</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Objective Number Type</td>
<td>DESCRIPTION</td>
<td>Date Completed</td>
<td>CRITERION MET?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Output (continued)</td>
<td>b) At least 2 of the above will be in academic areas identified under 1.a) above.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Outcome</td>
<td>c) Teacher implements at least one prescription for each of the objectives stated in 2.a) above within 25 days of placement.</td>
<td>STUDENTS A</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Objective

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Objective</th>
<th>TYPE</th>
<th>DESCRIPTION</th>
<th>Date Completed</th>
<th>CRITERION MET?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3 Output</td>
<td>a)</td>
<td>Coordinator carries out quarterly reliability checks of teaching techniques.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>b)</td>
<td>90% of strategies (techniques) will be utilized as written during each check.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 Output</td>
<td>a)</td>
<td>Relevant staff meet .5 hours periodically (semi-annually) to review student progress for each student.</td>
<td>1st 2nd</td>
<td>1st 2nd</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 Outcome</td>
<td>b)</td>
<td>Updated objectives and strategies incorporated in students' plan within 5 school days of the review (4.a)</td>
<td>Date of Report:</td>
<td>By Student*:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>c)</td>
<td>70% each students objectives will be met each year.</td>
<td>June, 198__</td>
<td>A % B % C %</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*If combined data source, provide mean of means only.*
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Objective Number Type</th>
<th>DESCRIPTION</th>
<th>Date Completed</th>
<th>CRITERION MET?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4 Outcome (continued)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>By Student*:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>D %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>E %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>F %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>G %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>H</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>I %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Means*: %</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*If combined data source, provide mean of means only.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Objective Number</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>DESCRIPTION</th>
<th>Date Completed</th>
<th>CRITERION MET?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Output</td>
<td>a) Teachers provide 25 hours of academic instruction per week over course of school year.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Outcome</td>
<td>b) The requirements of each student's Individualized Education Plan (IEP) as stated in PL94-142 are met.</td>
<td>Date of Report:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Output</td>
<td>a) Each classroom will serve a maximum of 8 students, with at least 3 classrooms operating.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Outcome</td>
<td>b) At no time will V.C. classrooms exceed a 3:8 staff:student ratio.</td>
<td>Date of Report:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
SMIGES/I: CLASSROOM COMPONENT

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>STUDENT</th>
<th>DATE ENROLLED</th>
<th>REFERENCE OBJ.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0 Section: I-Diagnostic/Prescriptive</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 Classroom:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Date to submit by:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Date of submission:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>S</strong></td>
<td><strong>D</strong></td>
<td><strong>R</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 STUDENT</td>
<td>DATE ENROLLED</td>
<td>REFERENCE OBJ.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 Target date for diagnostic completion (+20):</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 Date completed:</td>
<td>Verify:</td>
<td>1.a)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 CRITERION MET?</td>
<td>1.a)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9 Target date for baseline completion (+14):</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 Number of behaviors baselined (3):</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11 Date completed:</td>
<td>Verify:</td>
<td>1.b)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12 CRITERIA MET?</td>
<td>1.b)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13 Target date for data submission (+20):</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14 Date submitted to Coordinator:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15 CRITERION MET?</td>
<td>ELAPSED DAYS:</td>
<td>1.c)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16 Target date for developing 6 P.O.s (+25):</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17 No. of academic P.O.s (2):</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18 Date completed:</td>
<td>Verify:</td>
<td>2.b)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19 CRITERIA MET?</td>
<td>ELAPSED DAYS:</td>
<td>2.b)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20 Target date for implementing 6 strategies (+25):</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21 Date completed:</td>
<td>Verify:</td>
<td>2.c)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22 CRITERION MET?</td>
<td>ELAPSED DAYS:</td>
<td>2.c)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23 END</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
SMIGES/I: CLASSROOM COMPONENT

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section: II - Supplemental</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Classroom:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date to submit by:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date of submission:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enter 1 for first half, 2 for second half Semi-Annual Review:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section: III - Supplemental</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Students</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

END
I. Problem Focus

A. Area of Difficulty - Family and school systems are currently not facilitating the development of desirable social and affective skills in some E.I. individuals. This is reflected, in part, by their regression or behavioral deterioration in school.

B. Problem Resolution Goal - The family and school systems will produce desirable social and affective skills in all students.

C. Present Situation - Unavailable to certain E.I. individuals within other schools and local mental health services (1981) is an effective approach which integrates the family system and the social system in a coordinated, comprehensive program to facilitate the development of desirable social and affective skills.

D. Barriers to Problem Resolution

1. Lack of human resources to facilitate coordinated programming between school and family system.

2. Currently school personnel do not have the opportunity to engage in continuing therapeutic intervention with parents and other members of the family system. (This is commonly seen as the role of the Community Mental Health system.)
3. Family resistance to outside intervention to modify its established communication and role patterns.

4. Lack of an educational environment conducive to those students learning the desired social and affective skills.

5. Deficiencies in some home environments to teach or maintain the desired social and affective skills.

II. Program Goals/Objectives

A. Program Title - Valley Center Home-School Intervention Component.

B. Program Goal - This component will produce demonstrable gains in client (Valley Center student) functioning at home, and will facilitate the generalization of therapeutic gain to and from both home and Valley Center to and from receiving local classrooms or programs.

C. Program Objectives: 1978-80

1. Output - The Valley Center program will design and mobilize an intensely coordinated Home-School Intervention Component for KVISD E.I. students, their family systems and the sending school systems. An SMBO on the Valley Center HSI Component submitted to and approved by the Valley Center Program Director by April 14, 19XX will demonstrate attainment of this objective.

   Outcome - This component will be designed for 16 stu-
dents and will have serviced 80% of these students by September 30, 19XX; evaluated by the Program Director.

2. **Output** - The HSI will work with each Valley Center family 1 - 1½ hours per week supplying the family with information, guidance, support and modeling of desired social and affective skills to improve family communications, overall family functioning and support of Valley Center student's educational, social and affective gains; evaluated by the Program Director.

**Outcome** - By 6 months after the establishment of HSI and Valley Center family goals, progress will have been made on 80% of those goals; evaluated by the Program Director.

3. **Output** - Valley Center shall provide an environment which will promote the development of desirable social and affective skills in Valley Center students. The HSI will work with each Valley Center student on an individual or group basis between 1½ - 2 hours per week. The HSI will meet with each Valley Center classroom teacher (and/or teaching assistants) a minimum of 1/2 hour per week to coordinate with them the classroom, HSI, and home approaches to achieving
established affective and social goals; evaluated by Program Director.

Outcome - In at least 90% of all cases, at least one social and one affective goal, mutually agreeable to the HSI and Valley Center student will have been established by the end of each Valley Center student's 30 day diagnostic period; 70% of these goals will be met prior to graduation from Valley Center as averaged across all such graduated students.

D. Program Objectives: 1981

As a result of data analysis over the preceding years of operation and the addition of a third classroom with eight more clients, new program objectives were required. These were generated according to standard SMB0 procedures involving both HSIs and the Coordinator, and are represented by the following eight output and outcome objectives.

1. Output - The HSI will work with family units a mean average minimum of 12 hours/week over the course of the worker's contract period. During these contacts, the HSI will carry out goal and service planning, direct home interventions, parent training, and/or other services necessitated by the array of presenting problems. The Coordinator will be responsible
for monitoring and measurement.

**Outcome** - At least 70% of parents who regularly access HSI services will report increased satisfaction with their ability to ameliorate family/client problems, by September 30, 1981. The Coordinator will be responsible for monitoring and measurement.

2. **Output** - The HSI will directly work with each client (Valley Center student) at least four times per month over the course of the worker's contract. During these contacts, the HSI will involve the client in goal setting and service planning, individual and group counseling, activity therapy, and/or other services appropriate to the client's condition. The HSI and Coordinator will be responsible for monitoring and measurement.

**Outcome** - Each client participating for more than 3 months will have attained at least 3 of his performance objectives related to this goal by September 30, 1981. Monitored and measured by the HSIs and Coordinator.

3. **Output** - HSIs will include parents as well as educators in service planning and treatment for each client in 80% of those instances in which common problems are present at both home and at school. This objec-
tive will be met by September 30, 1981 as monitored and measured by the HSI and Coordinator.

**Outcome** - In each case where a common problem exists both at home and at school, at least one performance (service) objective relevant to the problem(s) will be attained by clients participating in Valley Center for more than 4 months. This will be accomplished by September 30, 1981 and will be measured and monitored by the HSI and Coordinator.

4. **Output** - The HSI will average at least two contacts per month with each local classroom teacher and/or local contact educator for 90% of that portion of the HSI's caseload which is attending classes in his/her local schools, averaged over the school year. The HSI will additionally respond to any requests for service generated by these local educators according to prescribed procedures over the same period. This objective will be monitored and evaluated by the HSI and Coordinator.

**Outcome** - 90% of the local educators identified above when randomly sampled by the Coordinator through written questionnaires will indicate satisfaction with the timelines and appropriateness of Valley Center HSI services. This objective will be measured across the school year.
III. Program Activities

Activity 1: Initial contact with parents, student and local contact people.

Parent Handout (1980)

Student Handout (1980)

Activity 2: Parent/student tour of Valley Center - introduction to staff.

Activity 3: Establishment of working relationship.

Assessing family's needs.

Referral or other organizational needs.

Eco Chart.

Time commitment - working commitment.

Establishment of mutual goals & service planning.

Activity 4: Communication skills.

Magic Circles

Inter-Change activities

Increase affective vocabulary

Values clarification

Active listening skills

Activity 5: Child management skills.

Parent training in behavioral techniques

Performance contracting

Individual family therapy/counseling

Individual client therapy & counseling
Activity 6: Direct home intervention, environmental manipulation, case management, referral and follow-up services.

IV. Staff Allocation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Position</th>
<th>% of Time on This Program</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. HSI (KVISD)</td>
<td>95%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. HSI (Mental Health)</td>
<td>95%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Coordinator</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Goal: This component will produce demonstrable gains in client functioning at home, and will facilitate the generalization of therapeutic gain to and from both home and school(s).

Data Source: [ ] HSI-A  [ ] HSI-B  [ ] HSI-X  [ ] Combined

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Objective Number</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>DESCRIPTION</th>
<th>Date Completed</th>
<th>CRITERION MET?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 Output</td>
<td>a)</td>
<td>HSI will work with families a mean average of 12 hours per week over length of contract.</td>
<td>Date of Report:</td>
<td>Mean hours to date:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 Outcome</td>
<td>b)</td>
<td>70% of parents regularly receiving services report decrease in family/client problems at home by September 30, 1981.</td>
<td>Date of Report:</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Output</td>
<td>a)</td>
<td>HSI will work with each student at least 4 times per month over length of contract.</td>
<td>Date of Report:</td>
<td>Range:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Outcome</td>
<td>b)</td>
<td>Students participating more than 3 months will achieve 3 HSI performance objectives by September 30, 1981.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Output</td>
<td>a)</td>
<td>Parents and educators involved in 80% of service planning and treatment regarding problems common to both home &amp; school, by September 30, 1981.</td>
<td></td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Objective Number Type</td>
<td>DESCRIPTION</td>
<td>Date Completed</td>
<td>CRITERION MET?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Outcome</td>
<td>b) Students participating more than 4 months will achieve one performance objective related to common home-school problems, by September 30, 1981.</td>
<td></td>
<td>No. of Stu: No. of Stu:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Range (P.O.s met) Range (P.O. met)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>__ to __ to __</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 Output</td>
<td>a) 2 contacts per month (average) with local educator for each student concurrently enrolled in V.C. &amp; local school, over 90% of caseload. (Throughout year.)</td>
<td>Date of Report:</td>
<td>average average contact per month over % of cases. contact per month over % of cases.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>___ ___</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 Outcome</td>
<td>b) 90% of local educators will report satisfaction with V.C. HSI services across school year.</td>
<td>Date of Report:</td>
<td>___ % ___ %</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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0 Section: Family Contacts
1 HSI:
2 Date to submit by:
3 Date of submission:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Family</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>hours</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>hours</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>hours</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>hours</th>
<th>TOTALS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

25 Totals
26 Reference Objective: 1.a)
27 END
**SMIGES/I: HOME-SCHOOL INTERVENTION COMPONENT**

Section: Student Contacts

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Student</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Contact</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Contact</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Contact</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Contact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Total:

Contact range: __ to ___

Reference Objective: 2.a)

END
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>STUDENT</th>
<th>Home</th>
<th>School</th>
<th>Date Intervention Started:</th>
<th>4-month criterion met?</th>
<th>( )SAR ( ) Other Objective Met</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Section: Common Home/School Problems

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>HSI:</th>
<th>Date to Submit by:</th>
<th>Date of Submission:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Semi-Annual Review (SAR) Objective No. related to common problem: ____________

STUDENT Home School Date Intervention Started: 4-month criterion met? ( )SAR ( ) Other Objective Met

TOTALS: % of Totals: ______% ______% ______% ______% ______% ______% ______%

Reference Objectives: 3. a) b)

END
**SMIGES/I: HOME–SCHOOL INTERVENTION COMPONENT**

0 Section: Local educator contacts  
1 HSI:  
2 Submit by end of month.  
3 Date of submission:  
4 Students | Contact Type (Tchr., SSW, etc.) | Date | Contact Type | Date | Total  
---|---|---|---|---|---  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22 Total:  
23 Total Caseload: | Mean per Student:  
24 % of total caseload represented above ____%  
25 Reference objective: 4.a)  
26 END
I. Problem Focus

A. Area of Difficulty - Valley Center students have long histories of inappropriate behavior during less structured class periods in which "specials" are held (e.g., music, art, gym, etc.).

B. Problem Resolution Goal - All Valley Center students will function appropriately during less structured school activities.

C. Present Situation - Students incur large numbers of fines, warnings, suspensions, or early school terminations ("exits") during less structured activities.

D. Barriers to Problem Resolution

1. School personnel teaching or supervising special activities ("specials") have little or no training in dealing with seriously emotionally impaired students.

2. Few rules or expectations exist during specials in comparison to the well-structured emotionally impaired classroom.

3. Little effort is made to simulate the structure of the classroom during specials, and gradually fading such structure while maintaining appropriate social behavior.
4. At Valley Center, specials occur at times when the Valley Center certified teachers are on lunch break, thereby limiting contact with professional personnel who have effective instructional control over the students.

5. There is a lack of a systematic curriculum which would maintain the interest of students during the specials.

II. Program Goals/Objectives

A. **Program Title** - Valley Center Specials Component

B. **Program Goal** - This component will facilitate the development, maintenance and generalization of appropriate social behavior within loosely structured school activities.

C. **Program Objectives**

1. **Output** - The Valley Center Curriculum Committee will meet at least twice each month for 1.5 hours each meeting over the school year in order to develop, evaluate and modify the student management techniques and structure utilized during specials. The committee membership shall vary from year to year, but shall include a Valley Center teacher, A.T.T., HSI and Coordinator. Monitored by Coordinator.
Outcomes

a. A uniform set of rules of student conduct will be posted in each of the specials areas by February 1, 1981.

b. A standard student conduct evaluation form will be implemented by February 1, 1981 across all specials for daily monitoring and consequation. This form will be consistent with (and similar to) that which is used in the Valley Center classrooms.

c. The physical space comprising each specials area will be engineered by February 1, 1981 so that 70% of the design elements of the Valley Center classrooms will be identified as evident in each specials area.

d. The Valley Center Curriculum Committee will approve all curricula to be used with Valley Center students during specials prior to the implementation of such curricula.

The Valley Center Coordinator will be responsible for monitoring and meeting the requirements of this objective.

2. Output - The Valley Center Coordinator will ensure that all staff are inserviced with respect to their responsibilities related to the preceding objective.

Outcome - All staff will score 80% or better on a written quiz sampling their knowledge of the management techniques and structure of the specials classes. This objective will be accomplished by January 20, 1981, and will be executed and monitored by the Coordinator and Valley Center certificated teachers.

III. Program Activities

Activity 1: Convene Valley Center Curriculum Committee and set service goals, objectives and timelines.

Activity 2: Seek and review curricula.

Activity 3: Establish and post rules of conduct.

Activity 4: Develop and implement evaluation form for students.

Activity 5: Devise and modify physical arrangement of specials workspace.

Activity 6: Inservice staff on new procedures.

Activity 7: Test staff on new procedures.

IV. Staff Allocation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Position</th>
<th>% of Time on This Program</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Teacher</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. HSI</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. ATTs</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Coordinator</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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SMIGES/I-R: SPECIALS COMPONENT

Goal: This component will facilitate the development, maintenance and generalization of appropriate social behavior within loosely structured school activities.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Objective Number Type</th>
<th>DESCRIPTION</th>
<th>Months:</th>
<th>[F]=Frequency</th>
<th>[D]=Total Duration</th>
<th>Mean Average Per Trimester</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 Output</td>
<td>a) Curriculum Committee meets 2X/mo. for 1.5 hrs. min./session over school year.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 Outcome</td>
<td>b) Post set of rules by 1/1/81</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>c) Standard conduct form implemented by 2/1/81 across all specials.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>d) 70% of physical design elements of classroom evident in all specials by 2/1/81.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>e) Curriculum Committee approves curriculum prior to implementation.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Date Completed
CRITERION MET:
Yes
No

PE Approval
PE Implement
Shop Approval
Shop Implement

---

Yearly Means:
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Objective Number Type</th>
<th>DESCRIPTION</th>
<th>Date Completed</th>
<th>CRITERION MET:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Yes  No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 Outcome (continued)</td>
<td>Music/Art Appr.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Music/Art Impl.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Output</td>
<td>a) All staff inserviced by 1/15/81</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Outcome</td>
<td>b) All staff score 80% or better on quiz on or before 1/20/80.</td>
<td></td>
<td>% %</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
EVALUATION COMPONENT

I. Problem Focus
   A. **Areas of Difficulty** - Without a guided service delivery system, effective and efficient helping services will be difficult to achieve.
   B. **Problem Resolution Goal** - Effective, efficient, and relevant services would be rendered by Valley Center at all time.
   C. **Present Situation** - Only annual data reporting is required, and these data are not well related to conclusions regarding outcomes, or realignment of services, resources, or priorities that might be required to meet changing needs.
   D. **Barriers to Problem Resolution** -
      1. No systematic evaluation model in use at any severely emotionally impaired centers in our area.
      2. Staff unfamiliar with SMBQ and guided services.
      3. No data-based internal guidance evaluation system at Valley Center.

II. Program Goals/Objectives
   A. **Program Title** - Valley Center Evaluation Component
   B. **Program Goal** - Valley Center will be guided by an evaluation component that will identify goals and objectives, guide services, evaluate their results, and modify goals, objectives and strategies as needed.
C. Program Objectives: 1978-80

1. Output - By November, 19XX (updated annually), a SMBO will be established for 90% of Valley Center operations and all staff, as will a SMIGES. Program Coordinator will monitor and be responsible for this objective.

Outcome - 80% of the objectives for program and staff will be achieved by June for school personnel and September for mental health personnel (1980). Program Coordinator responsible for monitoring and success.

2. Output - 100% of Valley Center staff will receive in-service training in SMBO by September 30, 1978 19XX (updated annually) by Program Coordinator; in addition, at least one two (1979) HSIs will be similarly trained in SMIGES.

Outcome - (a) Valley Center will pass audit by KCCMHB by July 1, 1978 19XX (updated annually). (b) 85% of Valley Center staff will have input on and role in the development and thrust of agency activities, goals and objectives, by September 30, 1978 19XX (updated annually). Coordinator will monitor and ensure success of this objective.
3. Output - Valley Center Advisory Board Committee (1980), upper and middle managers of relevant suprasystems (KVISO/KCCMHB), Michigan Department of Education and Michigan Department of Mental Health, will be informed of V6EG and the SMIGES (1981) data and recommendations upon request at regular intervals (1980) throughout the project year, commencing on or by April 15, 1978. Program Coordinator will be responsible for implementation.

Outcome - 80% of the aforementioned receiving system(s) decisions related to Valley Center (1981) will support V6EG recommendations related to (1981) the guidance and modification of Valley Center as suggested by the data obtained through the evaluation component. This objective will be accomplished at variable times throughout the year; Coordinator is responsible for implementation and monitoring.

D. Program Objectives: 1981

1. Output - By September 15, 19XX (updated annually), the Coordinator will review the agency mission, goals and objectives, data requirements and existing management systems with staff, and establish targets for SMBO/SMIGES revision for the new school year.
Outcome - By October 7, 19XX (updated annually as of 1982; November 26, 1980 target date for 1981), a SMBO/SMIGES will be established for the entire Valley Center program in relation to that school year. The Coordinator will be responsible for this objective.

2. Output - All full time staff will receive inservice training regarding general features of the SMBO/SMIGES semi-annually (October and February). The Coordinator will be responsible for this objective.

Outcome - Each full time staff will score 100% on quizzes sampling general knowledge of the most recent relevant SMBO's and use of SMIGES input forms. These quizzes will occur in the month subsequent to inservice training. The Coordinator is responsible for monitoring.

3. Output - Staff will provide all of the data requested on the SMIGES input forms within 90% of the timelines indicated. The Coordinator will be responsible for monitoring.

Outcome - The aggregated data will be current for 90% of the SMIGES report forms throughout the fiscal year. Coordinator will be responsible for monitoring.

4. Output - Valley Center Advisory Committee, upper and middle managers of relevant suprasystems (KVISO/KCCMHB),
Michigan Department of Education and Michigan Department of Mental Health, will be informed of the SMIGES data and recommendations upon request throughout the project year, commencing on or by April 15, 1978. Program Coordinator will be responsible for implementation.

Outcome - 80% of the aforementioned receiving systems decisions related to Valley Center will support the guidance and modification of Valley Center as suggested by the data obtained through the evaluation component. This objective will be accomplished at variable times throughout the year; Coordinator is responsible for implementation and monitoring.

III. Program Activities

Activity 1: Design, implement and update SMBO.

Activity 2: Design, implement and update SMIGES.

Activity 3: Design, implement and update reporting system.

IV. Staff Allocation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Position</th>
<th>% of Time on This Program</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Coordinator</td>
<td>20% 30% (1979)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A.T-T (Aide)</td>
<td>40% (1979)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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SMIGES/I-R: EVALUATION COMPONENT

Goal: Valley Center will be guided by an evaluation component that will identify goals and objectives, guide services, evaluate their results, and modify goals, objectives and strategies as needed.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Objective Number</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>DESCRIPTION</th>
<th>Date Completed</th>
<th>CRITERION MET?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Output</td>
<td>a) By September 15 staff will review SMBO/SMIGES and will recommend any revisions.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Outcome</td>
<td>b) By November 26 (1980) and October 7 (1981), new SMBO/SMIGES will be submitted to staff.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Output</td>
<td>a) All full time staff review inservice training on new SMBO/SMIGES in 1) October 2) February.</td>
<td>a) ___________</td>
<td>_______ _______</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>b) ___________</td>
<td>_______ _______</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Outcome</td>
<td>b) Each full time staff will score 100% on quizzes sampling general knowledge of most recent SMBO/SMIGES; to occur in the month subsequent to inservice training.</td>
<td>a) ___________</td>
<td>_______ _______</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>b) ___________</td>
<td>_______ _______</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Objective Number Type</td>
<td>DESCRIPTION</td>
<td>Date Completed</td>
<td>CRITERION MET?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Output</strong> 3</td>
<td>a) Staff will input all SMIGES data within 90% of timelines.</td>
<td>Date of Report: ________</td>
<td>To Date: ______ %</td>
<td>To Date: ______ %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Outcome</strong> 3</td>
<td>b) The aggregate data for 90% of the SMIGES reports will be current.</td>
<td>Date of Report: ________</td>
<td>To Date: ______ %</td>
<td>To Date: ______ %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Output</strong> 4</td>
<td>a) V.C. suprasystems will be sent requested data within timeframes established.</td>
<td>Date of Report: ________</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Outcome</strong> 4</td>
<td>b) 80% of the V.C. decisions made by these suprasystems will support the modification &amp; guidance of V.C. by the data obtained by this component.</td>
<td>Date of Report: ________</td>
<td>______ %</td>
<td>______ %</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
SMIGES/I: EVALUATION COMPONENT

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Staff</th>
<th>Quiz Date</th>
<th>Score</th>
<th>Retake Scores:</th>
<th>Completion Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>HNM</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HBM</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EAF</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EZF</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EMF</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AVM</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ABF</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AOM</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AMM</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AGM</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A__</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Section: Quizzes; Specials

AVM
ABF
AOM
AMM
AGM
A__

Objective Reference: 2.b)

END
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Staff</th>
<th>Form</th>
<th>Due Date</th>
<th>Submission Date</th>
<th>Criteria Met?</th>
<th>Form Complete?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Totals:**

% met within timelines: **__%**

Reference Objective: 3.a)

END
**SMIGES/I: EVALUATION COMPONENT**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Suprasystem Identifier</th>
<th>Date of Request</th>
<th>Desc. of Data Req.</th>
<th>Return date req.</th>
<th>Report Date</th>
<th>Criterion Me</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Reference Objective: 3.a) Underline lines 4-20 above in which programmatic, systemic or fiscal changes resulted.

Enter the % of changes which resulted from the analysis of data obtained from this component: ____%

Enter the % of changes consonant with those recommended by Valley Center?: ____%

Reference Objective: 3.b) END
Quiz on SMBO/SMIGES:
Classroom Component
1980-81

Name __________________________  Date _________________

1. The goal of this component is (check one)
   ___ a. to provide special education
   ___ b. to encourage age-appropriate behavior
   ___ c. to encourage age-appropriate in-class behavior
   ___ d. to provide basic educational services to seriously
       E.I.
   ___ e. to return students to the "regular" classroom
   ___ f. a & c
   ___ g. c & e

2. Indicate which of the following is false.
   ___ a. BESI is not a cow at Valley Center, but a
       criterion-referenced test.
   ___ b. 95% is an acceptable level of staff performance in
       relation to the implementation of instructional
       strategies as written.
   ___ c. Within 25 days of placement at Valley Center, pro-
       tocol and data on problem behaviors will be
       submitted to the Coordinator.
   ___ d. Each student must meet 70% of his/her short term
       objectives each year.
3. What words to these initials represent:
   a. SMBO ____________________________________________
   b. SMIGES ____________________________________________

4. List at least 3 forms or documents which serve to collect (or verify the collection of) data useful to the SMIGES:
   a. _____________________________________________________
   b. _____________________________________________________
   c. _____________________________________________________

5. Where would you find service goals and objectives?
   ______________________________________________________

6. Have you submitted (and discussed) your current performance objectives to (and with) your immediate supervisor?
   _____ Yes _____ No

7. Where would you go to find more information on the Valley Center SMBO/SMIGES as they relate to the educational component? (select one)
   _____ a. Valley Center Administrative Manual
   _____ b. Valley Center Inservice Manual
   _____ c. Both
Quiz on SMBO/SMICES:

Home-School Intervention Component

1980-81

Name ______________________________  Date ______________

1. The goal of this component is (check one):
   ___ a. to produce demonstrable gains in the student's behavior both at home and at school.
   ___ b. to produce gains in the child's behavior at home.
   ___ c. to produce demonstrable gains in therapeutic parenting skills.
   ___ d. to increase family functioning and decrease family/client problems.
   ___ e. a & c
   ___ f. c & d
   ___ g. a, c & d

2. Indicate which of the following is false.
   ___ a. at least 80% of parents must report increased satisfaction with their ability to resolve family/client problems.
   ___ b. 70% of the clients participating for more than 3 months will attain 3 or more of his/her performance objectives by the end of the fiscal year.
   ___ c. When problems common to home and school exist, at least one performance objective relevant to the
problem(s) will be attained within 4 months.

   d. The HSI will meet with individual (or groups of) local educators at least once every three months in relation to 90% of the participating Valley Center clients.

   e. Among the activities related to the HSI SMBO are parent training, individual therapy, case management, and liaison work with the Kalamazoo County Community Mental Health Board.

   f. Specifically excluded from HSI activities is follow-up on students screened out of the Valley Center program.

3. What words do these initials represent:
   a. SMBO ________________________________
   b. SMIGES ________________________________

4. List at least 3 forms or documents which serve to collect (or verify the collection of) data useful to the SMIGES:
   a. ________________________________
   b. ________________________________
   c. ________________________________

5. Where would you find service goals and objectives?

________________________________________
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6. Have you submitted (and discussed) your current performance objectives to (and with) your immediate supervisor?
   _____ Yes   _____ No.

7. Where would you go to find more information on the Valley Center SMBO/SMIGES as they relate to the educational component? (select one)
   _____ a. Valley Center Administrative Manual
   _____ b. Valley Center Inservice Manual
   _____ c. Both
Quiz on SMBO/SMIGES:
Specials Component
1980-81

Name ________________________ Date ________________

1. The goal of this component is (check one):
   ___ a. to provide special activities for special students.
   ___ b. to produce favorable behavioral gains in loosely structured classrooms.
   ___ c. to produce favorable behavioral gains in loosely structured school activities.
   ___ d. to facilitate maintenance and generalization of appropriate social behavior to the classroom.
   ___ e. to facilitate maintenance and generalization of appropriate social behavior to other loosely structured school activities.
   ___ f. b & d
   ___ g. c & e
   ___ h. c & d

2. Indicate which of the following is false.
   ___ a. The Curriculum Committee will meet 1.5 hours each month.
   ___ b. The Curriculum Committee will design and implement curricula.
   ___ c. A uniform set of rules of conduct will be posted
in all areas of Valley Center by February 1, 1981.

d. Desk sheets from the classrooms will be used during specials.

e. The physical space used during specials will be structured in some way such that 70% of the design elements of the Valley Center classroom will be identifiable.

f. Staff must score 80% or better on a written quiz covering the management and structure of specials.
APPENDIX B

Service Goals and Objectives
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Staff</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Goal</th>
<th>Date Met</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>EPPC</td>
<td>6/78</td>
<td>KRPH</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>Morris will maintain appropriate classroom behavior.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>EPPC</td>
<td>6/78</td>
<td>KRPH</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>Morris will raise academic performance one grade level per year.</td>
<td>5/79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>EPPC</td>
<td>6/78</td>
<td>KRPH</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>Morris will develop good eye-hand coordination.</td>
<td>12/78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>V.C.</td>
<td>7/78</td>
<td>Noblet</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>Morris will be able to identify with this worker, reasonable goals to work on at home.</td>
<td>8/78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>V.C.</td>
<td>7/78</td>
<td>Noblet</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>Morris will increase the rate with which he follows his mother's directions at home.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>V.C.</td>
<td>7/78</td>
<td>Noblet</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>Morris will refrain from threatening others when he becomes upset at home.</td>
<td>2/79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>V.C.</td>
<td>8/78</td>
<td>Ashby</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>Morris will use necessary spelling rules to spell 4th grade words correctly.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>V.C.</td>
<td>8/78</td>
<td>Ashby</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>Morris will compute multiplication problems.</td>
<td>8/78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>V.C.</td>
<td>8/78</td>
<td>Ashby</td>
<td>A-C</td>
<td>Morris will be able to locate and use information in reference materials.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>V.C.</td>
<td>8/78</td>
<td>Ashby</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>Morris will develop a short essay using correct punctuation and capitalization.</td>
<td>12/78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>V.C.</td>
<td>9/78</td>
<td>Ashby</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>Morris will compute long division problems.</td>
<td>12/78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L-T</td>
<td>SHORT TERM OBJECTIVE</td>
<td>PRESCRIPTION</td>
<td>PE = Percent Expected</td>
<td>PA = Percent Achieved</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Given 10 division problems with 4 digit numbers divided by 2 digit numbers, Morris will compute with 90% accuracy.</td>
<td>1. Sullivan Programmed Division Bk. 5 2. Skill Sheets 3. Final Test</td>
<td>90%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Given 10 division problems with 5 digit numbers divided by 3 digit numbers, Morris will compute with 90% accuracy.</td>
<td>1. Sullivan Programmed Division Bk. 5 2. Skill Sheets 3. Final Test</td>
<td>90%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Morris will correctly write in cursive upper case letters with 85% accuracy.</td>
<td>1. Daily Drill 2. Daily Quiz 3. Points for accuracy</td>
<td>85%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Given a telephone book, Morris will demonstrate the following skills: a) use guide words to find 10 listings, b) locate 10 businesses in yellow pages, c) list 3 things to say when reporting an emergency.</td>
<td>1. Alphabetizing (Bonine) 2. Guide Words (Bonine) 3. Using a Telephone Book 4. Learning Center 5. Final Test</td>
<td>80%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Given 40 words with VCCV or VCV letter patterns, Morris will be able to divide words into syllables with 80% accuracy.</td>
<td>1. Kottmeyer Basic Goals in Spelling 2. Skill Sheets 3. Flash Cards 4. Final Test</td>
<td>80%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Morris will draw correct conclusions after reading a short reading selection by answering inference questions with 60% accuracy.</td>
<td>1. Drawing Conclusions C 2. Inference Questions 3. Reading for Concepts C 4. Points given for accuracy on work</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX C

Sample Prescriptions
Objective #18.1

Given a 30-item test over the following geometric concepts, Morris will achieve 80% accuracy:

a. Connect 2 points to show a segment.
b. Use the letters of the end points to name a segment.
c. Distinguish between a segment and a line.
d. Identify a pair of lines as parallel or intersecting.
e. Name angles.
f. Identify right angles.
g. Identify polygons, triangles, quadrilaterals, pentagons, and hexagons.
h. Identifying congruent polygons.
i. Identifying parallelograms.
j. Identifying rectangles and squares.

A. Baseline Data

Scott Foresman Skill Assessment - 44%

B. Prescription

1. Each math period will involve a 15 minute oral presentation from Scott Foresman Math Book 4, Level 20, pages 68-77.

2. Each oral presentation will be followed by a 20-minute written assignment using the new skills.

3. Flashcards involving geometric concepts will be used randomly throughout the week to reinforce previously learned skills.

C. Reinforcement

1. Chips/stamps will be given for correct responses during discussion.

2. 1-10 chips/stamps will be given for accurate completion of written assignments or skill lessons.

\[
\begin{align*}
100\% & \quad = 10 \text{ chips/stamps} \\
50\% & \quad = 5 \text{ chips/stamps} \\
10\% \text{ or below} & \quad = 1 \text{ chip/stamp}
\end{align*}
\]
D. **Recording**

1. Accuracy percentages will be recorded daily on Progress Report by student.

2. Weekly average will be computed by teacher or A.T.T. and posted weekly on Level Graph.

MA
**Objective #20.1**

While on an off-grounds activity, Morris will show self-control by staying with the group and not becoming verbally or physically aggressive 80% of the time.

**A. Baseline Data**

On the last 2 off-grounds activities, Morris had to be physically restrained after repeated attempts to leave the group.

**B. Prescription**

1. **Phase I: Week #1 and Week #2**
   a. Morris will not be allowed to participate in any off-grounds activities for the first week.
   b. Morris will select an off-grounds activity for the succeeding week. Morris, Bob, A.T.T. and teacher will all go on an off-grounds field trip the following week.
   c. Morris and the teacher will develop a special field trip checksheet to evaluate Morris' ability to maintain self-control while on the outing.
   d. Reinforcement:
      1. If Morris achieved 80% on his field trip checksheet: a) he will be allowed to make a 10 minute tape cassette to be sent to his mom; b) he will earn the opportunity for either Rollerworld or swimming off-grounds for the following week (week #3).
      2. If Morris does not achieve 80% on his field trip checksheet: a) checksheet & back-up reinforcers will be evaluated and revised.

2. **Phase II: Week #3**
   a. Morris will earn the opportunity to go to either Rollerworld or swimming, and be evaluated on his "Self-Control Checksheet."
b. Reinforcement:
   1. If Morris achieves 80% on his "Self-Control Checksheet:"
      a) he will be allowed to make a 10 minute phone call to his mom the following day;
      b) he will earn the opportunity for both Rollerworld and swimming for the following week (week #4).
   2. If Morris does not achieve 80% on his field trip checksheet, he will continue to earn the opportunity for only 1 off-grounds activity the following week. This off-grounds activity will be either Rollerworld, Bowling, swimming or if deemed necessary by teacher, a one-on-one off-grounds. Additional off-grounds cannot be added unless 80% criteria has been met on Morris' "Self-Control Checksheet."

3. Phase III
   a. Morris will earn the opportunity to attend both regularly scheduled off-grounds (Rollerworld/bowling and swimming).
   b. Reinforcement:
      1. If Morris achieved 80% on both "Self-Control Checksheets":
         a) he will be able to go out to lunch with the classroom teacher;
         b) he will continue earning the opportunity to attend all off-grounds activities.
      2. If Morris does not achieve 80% on both checksheets, Morris will return to Phase II.

C. Recording
   1. Percentage on "Self-Control Checksheets" will be computed and plotted on level graph weekly.

MA
APPENDIX D

Questionnaires
Dear Parent:

From time to time we at Valley Center must take stock of ourselves and see if we provide you with services to meet your needs.

You can help us by taking a few minutes of your time to fill out the attached questionnaire. If you would like your Valley Center Home-School Interventionist to help explain it to you, please see him at his very next visit.

After you have completed the questionnaire, please send it back in the enclosed postage envelope.

Your help is greatly appreciated. Please feel free to call or write us if you have any questions or concerns.

Sincerely,

[Signature]

James R. Eyst
Valley Center Coordinator
VALLEY CENTER PARENT QUESTIONNAIRE

(You and any of your immediate family may work together in filling this out.)

1. Your Home-School Interventionist is _____________________________.

   How much do you value (like) his services? (Check 1)

   ( ) He is usually very helpful. I definitely wish to continue working with him.
   ( ) He is helpful. I think I should continue with him.
   ( ) He is helpful every now and then. I see no reason to quit meeting, though.
   ( ) He is seldom helpful. I'm not sure we should continue our meetings.
   ( ) I don't wish to meet any longer.

2. Has your family situation improved because of his work with you? (Check 1)

   ( ) Very much so.
   ( ) Somewhat better.
   ( ) Very little.
   ( ) Not at all.
   ( ) Things are worse now.

3. Has your child had problems at home while living with you?

   ( ) Yes
   ( ) No. If no, go on to number 5.

4. Has your Valley Center Home-School Interventionist's involvement with your child improved his behavior at home?

   ( ) Very much so.
   ( ) Somewhat better.
   ( ) Very little improvement.
   ( ) Not at all.
   ( ) His behavior is worse now.

5. Please rank the following services according to how important they are to you. 1 = most important, 2 = next most important, and so on. Put the number you feel is best in the box opposite the service.

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.
[ ] work with your and your child together
[ ] family counseling
[ ] individual counseling (for you)
[ ] referrals to other agencies
[ ] information about how well your child is doing in school
[ ] working on home programs for improving your child’s behavior

6. All in all, are you satisfied with your Home-School Intervention services?

( ) yes
( ) somewhat
( ) no
( ) don’t know yet

7. Please feel free to make any comments, concerns or criticisms here, related to our services.

Thank you for filling this out. Have a nice day!

YOUR NAME (optional) ____________________ Date ____________
Dear Educators:

From time to time we at Valley Center may take stock of our lives and ask if we provide you with information to meet your needs.

You can help us by taking a few minutes of your time to fill out the attached questionnaire. After you have completed it, please send it back in the enclosed envelope through regular mail.

Your help is greatly appreciated. Please feel free to call or write if you have any questions or concerns.

Sincerely,

[Signature]

Valley Center Coordinator

A Special Education Mental Health Assessment Program is supported by the Michigan Department of Education and is funded by the Kalamazoo County Community Mental Health Board and the Michigan Association for Emotionally Disturbed Children, Kalamazoo, 1967.
VALLEY CENTER EDUCATOR QUESTIONNAIRE

Your Home-School Interventionist (HSI) is ________________.

1. Has his contacts with you been frequent enough?
   ( ) too frequent
   ( ) just about right
   ( ) not frequent enough

2. Has he been available to you when you need him?
   ( ) always
   ( ) usually
   ( ) not usually

3. Has he been responsive to your needs (or specific problems)?
   ( ) yes
   ( ) no

4. Has the HSI provided you with specific information you have requested in a timely manner?
   ( ) yes
   ( ) no
   ( ) not applicable

5. All in all, are you satisfied with the services offered by your Home-School Interventionist?
   ( ) yes
   ( ) somewhat
   ( ) no
   ( ) don't know yet

6. How can we be more helpful to you (i.e., what changes would you like to see in our service)? Please feel free to make any comments, concerns or criticisms that are related to our services.

Thank you for filling out this questionnaire. Have a nice day!

NAME (Optional) ______________________  Date ________________
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