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Introduction

- The practice and science of consultation is challenged by one fundamental reality: the delivery of an intervention to a client – and hence, its measured effects -- is controlled in large part by a consultee.

- In consultation, treatment fidelity as a construct and an experimental variable is fraught with conceptual and methodological issues.
Conceptualizing Treatment Integrity

- The degree to which a consultant adheres to a particular consultation model – question is whether the consultation procedures are followed as intended by a consultant.
- The degree to which one or more specific procedures within the consultation process are implemented (e.g., feedback/modeling) – question is whether we can influence treatment integrity by a consultee.
- The degree to which a consultee delivers an agreed-upon intervention to a child – question is whether the intervention, as designed and delivered by a consultee, influences child outcomes.
Defining Fidelity as an Independent and Dependent Variable

- Consultation Procedural Integrity can be conceptualized as an independent variable
  - Implementation of consultation procedures, or elements of consultation, as designed

- Treatment Plan Implementation can be conceptualized as a:
  - Dependent variable (does consultation lead to TPI fidelity?)
  - Independent variable (does TPI lead to child behavior change?)
  - Mediating variable (does TPI mediate the relationship between consultation and child outcomes?)
Difficulties Operationalizing the Construct

- Contextual realities of consultation services and intervention delivery in applied settings contribute to unplanned variations in core aspects of a treatment (what it involves, how it is delivered, who is responsible, how much is enough)
- Complicates a researcher’s ability to determine the intervention’s integrity with specificity
Difficulties Measuring the Construct

- Measurement issues abound in relation to feasibility, reliability, and validity of assessment
  - What and how much of an intervention to measure (match to active treatment components; all components may not be created equal)?
  - When to measure, and by whom?
  - How to measure qualitative features of intervention delivery?

- A standardized, reliable, agreed upon method for measuring integrity in consultation has yet to be determined
Why is Treatment Integrity an Important Construct in Consultation?

- Degradations in treatment integrity can create substantial threats to internal validity in an intervention study.
- Conclusions regarding change in the DV as a function of the IV are completely dependent upon the IV being implemented with integrity, but...
- There are no absolutes – issues of quality and quantity in delivery of intervention are prevalent.
Why is Treatment Integrity an Important Construct in Consultation?

- As treatments change, the effects on outcomes can be expected to change.
- Concerns are pronounced when implementation of an intervention is controlled by someone other than the psychologist (e.g., teacher, parent).
- We know more about how to develop effective interventions than how to ensure TIP.
Symposium Overview

• Paper I: Ann Schulte and colleagues, North Carolina State University
  ◦ Multidisciplinary perspectives on treatment fidelity: Implications for consultation

• Paper II: Michelle Swanger-Gagne and colleagues, University of Nebraska-Lincoln
  ◦ Treatment implementation integrity of interventions facilitated by CBC

• Paper III: Sylvia Rosenfield & Todd Gravois, University of Maryland
  ◦ Evaluating the treatment integrity of IC teams

• Discussant:
  ◦ Thomas R. Kratochwill, University of Wisconsin-Madison