### Student Focused Planning

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Practice</th>
<th>Reference</th>
<th>Effect size</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
  - ES = 0.334 – small/moderate effect  
ES for specific intervention components:  
- Student goals – ability to identify goals prior to IEP conference (Cohen’s *d*)  
  - ES=1.207 – large effect  
- Student verbal contributions (probe questions)–  
  - Identifies learning strengths  
    - ES=1.515 – large  
  - Identifies learning weaknesses  
    - ES=0.937 – large  
  - Identifies goals  
    - ES=0.966 – large  
  - Identifies choices for learning  
    - ES=0.418 – moderate  
  - Clarifies test performance  
    - ES=0.102 – small  
  - Statements/questions about IEP  
    - ES=0.401 – moderate  
  - Statement/questions about school  
    - ES=0.455 – moderate  
- Student verbal contributions (rest of conference)  
  - Identifies learning strengths  
    - ES= -0.440 – adverse effect (in favor of control group)  
  - Identifies learning weaknesses  
  - ES= -0.504 – adverse effect (in favor of control group)  
  - Identifies goals  
    - ES= 0.146 – small effect  

Note: (Participants included students with learning disabilities)
  - ES=0.000
- Clarifies test performance
  - ES=0.282 – small
- Statements/questions about IEP
  - ES=0.431 – moderate
- Statement/questions about school
  - ES=0.098 – small
- Conference length
  - ES= -0.311 – adverse effect (in favor of control group)
  
| | | Unable to calculate overall ES due to use of various types of ES calculations |
| | | ES for specific intervention components: |
| | | - Who started and led IEP meetings (Phi)
  - ES = .57 – large effect (students in IV were more likely to start meeting)
  - ES = .35 – moderate effect (btwn Self-directed IEP and students leading their meetings)
- Length of meeting (Cohen’s $d$)
  - ES = -0.136 – no effect (Yr 1 BL and Yr 2 control)
  - ES = 0.278 – small effect (Yr2 control & IV; both lasted approx. same length)
- Percentage of intervals IEP team members talked ($n^2$; Cohen’s $d$)
  - ES = 0.24 – small effect (Yr1 BL & Yr2 control; family members talked more)
  - ES = .15 – large effect (Yr1 BL & Yr2 control; SDIEP and students talking)
  - ES = .031 – small effect (Yr1 BL & Yr2 control; SDIEP and sped teachers talking) |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Practice</th>
<th>Reference</th>
<th>Effect size</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>ES = 0.334 – small/moderate effect</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
|                                     |                                                                           | ES for specific intervention components:  
|                                     |                                                                           | Student goals – ability to identify goals prior to IEP conference (Cohen’s $d$)  
|                                     |                                                                           | ES=1.207 – large effect                                                       |
|                                     |                                                                           | Student verbal contributions (probe questions)–  
|                                     |                                                                           | o Identifies learning strengths  
|                                     |                                                                           | ▪ ES=1.515 – large                                                           |
|                                     |                                                                           | o Identifies learning weaknesses  
|                                     |                                                                           | ▪ ES=0.937 – large                                                           |
|                                     |                                                                           | o Identifies goals  
|                                     |                                                                           | ▪ ES=0.966 – large                                                           |
|                                     |                                                                           | o Identifies choices for learning  
|                                     |                                                                           | ▪ ES=0.418 – moderate                                                       |
|                                     |                                                                           | o Clarifies test performance  
|                                     |                                                                           | ▪ ES=0.102 – small                                                          |
|                                     |                                                                           | o Statements/questions about IEP  
|                                     |                                                                           | ▪ ES=0.401 – moderate                                                       |
|                                     |                                                                           | o Statement/questions about school                                           |
• ES = 1.53 – large effect  
ES for specific intervention components:  
• Omissions (Cohen’s $d$)  
  o ES = 2.445 – large effect (students in IV made statistically significant lower numbers of information omission errors)  
• Location errors  
  o ES = 1.466 – large effect (students in IV made statistically significant lower numbers of information) |
### Teaching Functional Math Skills (general practice)


(Participants included students with mild mental retardation and moderate mental retardation)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Component</th>
<th>ES Score</th>
<th>Effect Size</th>
<th>Pre/Post</th>
<th>Combined Scores</th>
<th>Level of Retardation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Grocery</strong></td>
<td>4.098</td>
<td>large</td>
<td>pre/post</td>
<td>combined</td>
<td>both mild and moderate groups</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Restaurant</strong></td>
<td>2.192</td>
<td>large</td>
<td>pre/post</td>
<td>moderate</td>
<td>group</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1.381</td>
<td>large</td>
<td>pre/post</td>
<td>mild</td>
<td>group</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Generalization from simulated instruction to community settings (only for students in S+C group) – assessed prior to CBI

- **Grocery**:
  - ES = 0.469 – moderate effect (based on simulated instruction both groups performed better prior to CBI)
  - Combined scores b/c no significant difference btwn level of retardation

- **Restaurant**:
  - Cannot calculate ES
  - Did no report M and SD b/c no
### Acquisition and maintenance of grocery and laundry skills following CBI:

- **Grocery:**
  - ES = 2.922 – large effect (combined for all groups b/c all groups performed better after CBI)
  - No significant difference bwtn S+C group and C group; no significant difference bwtn level of retardation

- **Restaurant:**
  - Cannot calculate ES
  - No M and SD provided; graphs only
  - Students with moderate MR made minimal improvement
  - Students with mild MR did improve

### Teaching Grocery Shopping (specific practice)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(Participants included students with mild mental retardation and moderate mental retardation)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### ES for specific intervention components:

- **Acquisition of simulated tasks by participants with mild and moderate retardation**
  - **Grocery (Cohen’s d):**
    - ES = 4.098 – large effect (pre/post; combined for both mild and moderate groups)
    - Combined scores b/c no significant difference bwtn level of retardation

- **Generalization from simulated instruction to community settings (only for students in S+C group) – assessed prior to CBI**
  - **Grocery:**
    - ES = 0.469 – moderate effect (based on simulated instruction both groups performed better prior to CBI)
- Grocery:  
  o ES = 2.922 – large effect (combined for all groups b/c all groups performed better after CBI)  
  o No significant difference btwn S+C group and C group; no significant difference btwn level of retardation  
ES for specific intervention components: Acquisition of simulated tasks by participants with mild and moderate retardation  
- Restaurant:  
  o ES = 2.192 – large effect (pre/post; moderate group)  
  o ES = 1.381 – large effect (pre/post; mild group)  
  o Did not combine scores b/c significant difference btwn level of retardation  
Generalization from simulated instruction to community settings (only for students in S+C group) – assessed prior to CBI  
- Restaurant:  
  o Cannot calculate ES  
  o Did no report M and SD b/c no significant change following simulated instruction  
  o Only significant main effect was level of retardation  
Acquisition and maintenance of restaurant skills following CBI:  
- Restaurant: |

**ES for specific intervention components:**

- **Grocery (Cohen’s *d*):**
  - ES = 4.098 – large effect (pre/post; combined for both mild and moderate groups)
  - Combined scores b/c no significant difference btwn level of retardation
- **Laundry:**
  - ES = 2.744 – large effect (pre/post; moderate group)
  - ES = 4.404 – large effect (pre/post; mild group)
  - Did not combine scores b/c significant difference btwn level of retardation
- **Restaurant:**
  - ES = 2.192 – large effect (pre/post; moderate group)
  - ES = 1.381 – large effect (pre/post; mild group)
  - Did not combine scores b/c significant difference btwn level of retardation

- Cannot calculate ES
- Did no report M and SD b/c no significant change following simulated instruction
- Only significant main effect was level of retardation
• Janitorial:
  o ES = 1.984 – large effect (pre/post; combined for both mild and moderate groups)
  o Combined scores b/c no significant difference btwn level of retardation
Generalization from simulated instruction to community settings (only for students in S+C group) – assessed prior to CBI
• Grocery:
  o ES = 0.469 – moderate effect (based on simulated instruction both groups performed better prior to CBI)
  o Combined scores b/c no significant difference btwn level of retardation
• Restaurant:
  o Cannot calculate ES
  o Did no report M and SD b/c no significant change following simulated instruction
  o Only significant main effect was level of retardation
• Laundry:
  o Cannot calculate ES
  o No M and SD provided; graphs only
  o Students with moderate MR made minimal improvement
  o Students with mild MR did improve
• Janitorial
  o Cannot calculate ES
  o No M and SD provided; graphs only
  o Students with moderate MR made minimal improvement
  o Students with mild MR did improve
Acquisition and maintenance of grocery and
• Janitorial:  
  o ES = 1.984 – large effect (pre/post; combined for both mild and moderate groups) |
### Teaching Employment Skills using Community-Based Instruction (specific practice)

- **Laundry:**
  - $ES = 2.744$ – large effect (pre/post; moderate group)
  - $ES = 4.404$ – large effect (pre/post; mild group)
  - Did not combine scores b/c significant difference btwn level of retardation
- **Janitorial:**
  - $ES = 1.984$ – large effect (pre/post; combined for both mild and moderate groups)
  - Combined scores b/c no significant difference btwn level of retardation |

### Generalization from simulated instruction to community settings (only for students in S+C group) – assessed prior to CBI

- Janitorial
  - Cannot calculate ES
  - No M and SD provided; graphs only
  - Students with moderate MR made minimal improvement
  - Students with mild MR did improve

### Acquisition and maintenance of grocery and laundry skills following CBI:

- Janitorial
  - Cannot calculate ES
  - No M and SD provided; graphs only
  - Students with moderate MR made minimal improvement
  - Students with mild MR did improve
difference between level of retardation
Generalization from simulated instruction to community settings (only for students in S+C group) – assessed prior to CBI

- Laundry:
  - Cannot calculate ES
  - No M and SD provided; graphs only
  - Students with moderate MR made minimal improvement
  - Students with mild MR did improve

- Janitorial
  - Cannot calculate ES
  - No M and SD provided; graphs only
  - Students with moderate MR made minimal improvement
  - Students with mild MR did improve

Acquisition and maintenance of grocery and laundry skills following CBI:

- Laundry:
  - $ES = 2.153$ – large effect (combined for all groups b/c all groups performed better after CBI)
  - No significant difference between S+C group and C group; no significant difference between level of retardation

- Janitorial
  - Cannot calculate ES
  - No M and SD provided; graphs only
  - Students with moderate MR made minimal improvement
  - Students with mild MR did improve

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Program Structure</th>
<th>Reference</th>
<th>Effect size</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Provide Community-Based Instruction</td>
<td>Bates, P. E., Cuvo, T., Miner, C. A., &amp; Korabek, C. A. (2001). A simulated and community-based</td>
<td>Unable to calculate overall ES due to lack of M and SD for specific components</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Participants included students with mild mental retardation and moderate mental retardation)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Practice</th>
<th>Cohen’s $d$</th>
<th>Level of Retardation</th>
<th>Combined Scores</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Grocery</td>
<td>ES = 4.098</td>
<td>Both mild and moderate</td>
<td>No significant difference</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Laundry</td>
<td>ES = 2.744</td>
<td>Moderate group</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ES = 4.404</td>
<td>Mild group</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Did not combine scores b/c significant difference</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Restaurant</td>
<td>ES = 2.192</td>
<td>Moderate group</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ES = 1.381</td>
<td>Mild group</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Did not combine scores b/c significant difference</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Janitorial</td>
<td>ES = 1.984</td>
<td>Combined for both mild and moderate</td>
<td>No significant difference</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Generalization from simulated instruction to community settings (only for students in S+C group) – assessed prior to CBI
• Grocery:
  o ES = 0.469 – moderate effect (based on simulated instruction both groups performed better prior to CBI)
  o Combined scores b/c no significant difference b/t水平 of retardation
• Restaurant:
  o Cannot calculate ES
  o Did no report M and SD b/c no significant change following simulated instruction
  o Only significant main effect was level of retardation
• Laundry:
  o Cannot calculate ES
  o No M and SD provided; graphs only
  o Students with moderate MR made minimal improvement
  o Students with mild MR did improve
• Janitorial
  o Cannot calculate ES
  o No M and SD provided; graphs only
  o Students with moderate MR made minimal improvement
  o Students with mild MR did improve

Acquisition and maintenance of grocery and laundry skills following CBI:
• Grocery:
  o ES = 2.922 – large effect (combined for all groups b/c all groups performed better after CBI)
  o No significant difference b/t水平 of retardation
• Laundry:
| Structure Program to Extend Services Beyond Secondary School (Specific Practice) | Izzo, M. V., Cartledge, G., Miller, L., Growick, B., & Rutkowski, S. (2000). Increasing employment earnings: Extended transition services that make a difference. Career Development for Exceptional Individuals, 23, 139-156. (Participants included students with learning disabilities and mental retardation) | Overall ES for intervention:

- $ES = 0.588$ – moderate effect

ES for specific intervention components:
Quarterly mean employment earnings for 8 quarters following program completion (Cohen’s $d$):
- Quarter 1:
  - $ES = 0.754$ – moderate effect
- Quarter 2:
  - $ES = 0.749$ – moderate effect
- Quarter 3:
  - $ES = 0.680$ – moderate effect
- Quarter 4:
  - $ES = 0.585$ – moderate effect
- Quarter 5:
  - $ES = 0.648$ – moderate effect

- $ES = 2.153$ – large effect (combined for all groups b/c all groups performed better after CBI)
- No significant difference btwn S+C group and C group; no significant difference btwn level of retardation
- Restaurant
  - Cannot calculate ES
  - No M and SD provided; graphs only
  - Students with moderate MR made minimal improvement
  - Students with mild MR did improve
- Janitorial
  - Cannot calculate ES
  - No M and SD provided; graphs only
  - Students with moderate MR made minimal improvement
  - Students with mild MR did improve
Check and Connect (specific practice)  

Unable to calculate overall ES b/c M and SD were not provided only ES

- Quarter 6:
  - ES = 0.372 – small effect
- Quarter 7:
  - ES = 0.649 – moderate effect
- Quarter 8 =
  - ES = 0.359 – small effect

- Cohort Dropout Rate (Phi & Cramer’s V)
  - ES = .18 – large effect (students in IV less likely to drop out)
- Patterns of attendance (students demonstrating persistent attendance compared to similar peers)
  - ES = .22 – small/moderate effect (yr3)
  - ES = .32 – moderate effect (yr4)
  - ES = .48 – large effect (yr5)
- Patterns of attendance (students w/out interrupted attendance)
  - ES = .46 – large effect (yr4)
- Mobility (remain in one educational setting for w/in 1 yr)
  - ES = .17 – small effect (yr 1)
  - ES = .35 – moderate effect (yr 4)
  - ES = .52 – large effect (yr 5)
- Mobility: treatment students were more likely to have persistent attendance
  - ES = .41 – large effect (yr 2)
- Mobility: control students were more likely to remain in one educational setting
  - ES = .21 – small/moderate effect (yr 3)
- Cohort completion rates
ES = .14 – small effect (yr 4; more likely to be enrolled in educational program or completed HS)

ES = .53 – large effect (yr 5; went on to complete HS)

**SPED transition program**
- ES = .26 – moderate effect (written IEP after 9th grade)
- ES = .30 – moderate effect (more likely to participate in IEP)
- Articulated goals or related activities in 3 of 5 transition areas:
  - Post-secondary education – ES = .33 – moderate effect
  - Community participation – ES = .34 – moderate effect
  - Recreation & leisure – ES = .32 – moderate effect

**Subgroup analysis**
- ES = .35 – moderate effect (primary EBD label were less likely to remain out of school; yr 4)
- ES = .24 – small/moderate effect (yr 1; remain in one educational setting)
- ES = .34 – moderate effect (yr 4; remain in one educational setting)
- ES = .37 – moderate effect (yr 4; AA males; one educational setting)
- ES = .33 – moderate effect (yr 4; Non-AA males; one educational setting)
- ES = .24 – small/moderate effect (yr 4; Non-AA males; less likely to drop out)
- ES = .37 – moderate effect (yr 4;
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Non-AA males; less likely to be put out of school</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>o ES - .39 – moderate effect (yr 4; Non-AA males; more likely to have IEP transition related goals)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>o ES = .54 – large effect (females; ability to articulate IEP goals in 4 out of 5 transition areas:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>▪ Jobs &amp; job training – ES = .54 – large effect</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>▪ Postsecondary education – ES = .48 – large effect</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>▪ Community participation – ES = .61 – large effect</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>▪ Home living – ES = .49 – large effect</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Effect Size Guidelines**

Cohen’s *d*:
- (a) equal to 0.80 or greater as large effects,
- (b) equal to or close to 0.50 as moderate effects
- (c) equal to or less than 0.20 as small effects.

Phi/ Cramer’s *V*:
- (a) 0.50 large effect
- (b) 0.30 moderate effect
- (c) 0.10 small effect

*n*²:
- (a) 0.10 large effect
- (b) 0.06 moderate effect
- (c) 0.01 small effect