



DATA-BASED DOSAGE & TITRATION CHECKLIST

From the CEU "30–40 Hours of ABA: Dosage, Titration, and the Data Behind Service Intensity" ·
Instructors: Sean Yocum, MA, BCBA, LBA; Michael Carrero, BCBA, LBA

NO FLUFF. NO SUGAR-COATING. JUST RESULTS. · PRESENTED BY **HICKORY LEARNING GROUP**

RAD N BAD RULE

If the hours aren't driven by data, they aren't clinical. Titrate to progress, and back fidelity claims with IOA and integrity data.

HOW TO USE THIS: Run through this before you recommend hours, at each reauthorization, and before you increase or decrease service intensity.

IS THE RECOMMENDATION CLINICAL?

- ☐ List the specific goals that require this level of intensity
- ☐ Note the skill deficits and behaviors of concern, and how severe they are, from the assessment
- ☐ Consider caregiver availability and the family's priorities
- ☐ Ask yourself: would I recommend the same hours if reimbursement were outcome-based?

IS THE DATA TRUSTWORTHY?

- ☐ IOA collected on at least 20–33% of sessions per target, at 80% agreement or higher
- ☐ Procedural integrity data collected and graphed for key programs
- ☐ All trials recorded, not just the correct ones
- ☐ Operational definitions reviewed for drift

VISUAL ANALYSIS BEFORE DECISIONS

- ☐ Check level, trend, and variability, not just the last 3 data points
- ☐ Is the data stable? Draw a stability envelope (for example, ± 10 –20% of the median) and count how many points fall inside it
- ☐ Check whether the trend is real: look at the raw numbers behind the percentages
- ☐ Look for confounds: staff changes, schedule changes, illness

TITRATION AND GRADUATION PLAN

- ☐ Base titration criteria on mastery of goals and generalization probes, not a fixed percentage alone
- ☐ Specify how hours shift to caregiver training as goals are met
- ☐ Set a review schedule, every authorization period at minimum
- ☐ Spell out discharge or transition criteria

DOCUMENT

- ☐ The data behind each dosage decision
- ☐ Who reviewed it, and when
- ☐ The caregiver's input and agreement

THE RECEIPTS · REFERENCES

- Eldevik, S., Hastings, R. P., Hughes, J. C., Jahr, E., Eikeseth, S., & Cross, S. (2009). Meta-analysis of early intensive behavioral intervention for children with autism. *Journal of Clinical Child & Adolescent Psychology*, 38(3), 439–450. <https://doi.org/10.1080/15374410902851739>
- Fryling, M. J., Wallace, M. D., & Yassine, J. N. (2012). Impact of treatment integrity on intervention effectiveness. *Journal of Applied Behavior Analysis*, 45(2), 449–453. <https://doi.org/10.1901/jaba.2012.45-449>
- Linstead, E., Dixon, D. R., Hong, E., Burns, C. O., French, R., Novack, M. N., & Granpeesheh, D. (2017). An evaluation of the effects of intensity and duration on outcomes across treatment domains for children with autism spectrum disorder. *Translational Psychiatry*, 7(9), Article e1234. <https://doi.org/10.1038/tp.2017.207>
- Lovaas, O. I. (1987). Behavioral treatment and normal educational and intellectual functioning in young autistic children. *Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology*, 55(1), 3–9. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0022-006x.55.1.3>
- Vollmer, T. R., Sloman, K. N., & St. Peter Pipkin, C. (2008). Practical implications of data reliability and treatment integrity monitoring. *Behavior Analysis in Practice*, 1(2), 4–11. <https://doi.org/10.1007/bf03391722>

This handout supports the asynchronous CE event and does not replace clinical judgment, the BACB Ethics Code for Behavior Analysts, or applicable laws and funder requirements. It contains no client-identifying information.