

Speaker 1 ([00:00](#)):

Not enough guidance to publish guidance on how to grapple with the problems that going to so document. So if you're okay with us recording the conversation, McKay has a recorder on right now and just want to say that out loud. I did get this approved think actually I submitted an application I haven't checked as Anec study. It's not exactly we and then we're going to send back an email summary of our discussion points there. Should agree with our interpretation of what today. So kind of like, well the muse for this conversation stem from the fact that Mandy, Casey Clay and I recently got an IS development grant London. We've been allowed to in the next four or five years, four years developed an intervention and serendipitously with enough work to go around that a lot of us are doing the same sorts of stuff across the same three research sites that we got together at some point during year one talking about experimental design and the contributions we wanted to make along the process.

Speaker 1 ([01:14](#)):

And the epiphany came up or the fact was pointed out that there's an opportunity contribute to a 5 3 1 if the intervention is good, there's potential here for us to create an evidence-based practice. So for the uninitiated, which I would imagine is no one Ralph Warner proposed one long time ago that you can consider a practice or an intervention evidence-based with at least five different research studies conducted by at least three different research groups generated a positive about across at least 20 different participants it seems like within our grasp right now. But there are various interrelated but distinct definitions of evidence-based practice which exists right now. And one of them that we looked at came from Jessica Steinbrenner and she added this clause that says three different investigators or research groups. And as Casey Mandy and I looked at each other, we kind of came to the conclusion that we would probably consider a single research group.

Speaker 1 ([02:23](#)):

And so we may not be able to meet the spirit of the law of three different research sites given that we're all collaborating in some ways have a conflict of interest in the design of the Senate. So our question now is like, man, wouldn't it be great if we put in some protections that would allow us to generate evidence that approximated this standard or not standard, but the suggestion despite the fact that we are not in defendant but we're not exactly sure where to start with that process. There's a bunch of questions we had and it seems most functional. Maybe just throw 'em all up here and I'll stop for a second. I think I,

Speaker 2 ([03:04](#)):

No, it's good.

Speaker 1 ([03:05](#)):

Okay.

Speaker 2 ([03:05](#)):

Yeah, so the idea is that you're given money. We work given money from the federal government to conduct research over four years and to not be able to generate an evidence-based practice within that timeframe seems problematic. And so the idea was if you have multi-site collaborators required by funding agencies for example, how can those collaborators be leveraged in a way to actually produce an

evidence-based practice or can they be, or are they so interdependent that we can't have replication? Which is really what this is getting at

Speaker 3 ([03:39](#)):

Is

Speaker 2 ([03:39](#)):

We want replication. And so it's problematic when only one research team can achieve optimal results and nobody can replicate those findings. And so the question is really about replication, really about independence, but also about taking this snail's pace at which evidence-based practices are developed and accelerating. So here's some things to think about. So you're going to tell us what to do. So we have a bunch of questions. Feel free to respond to any of them. Our original question, was we a group or are we independent research sites who worked together to develop this technology? And so how would you operationalize a research group or how should it feel to be operational in the research group?

Speaker 4 ([04:29](#)):

How often do you have shared lab meetings across Zoom or whatever Are you having standing meetings? That to me, a lot of it has to do with if you establish a protocol and maybe you resolve protocol issues together but you're trying to do your data collection and your analysis separately, that seems like independent enough because the protocol is intervention in a lot of ways. There's other parts of the protocol about how you identify for and stuff like that. But if you've got a shared protocol but you're doing your best to sort of do the day-to-day stuff independently and only asking questions when you hit a roadblock to make sure that you find something like, oh, this word we used, we don't know how to operationalize it in a clear way or we're not sure you agree, we need to all arrive at a shared conclusion. That part document that. That's to me that's reasonably independent, means you need to publish your papers instead of one, don't put all your names on everybody.

Speaker 3 ([05:40](#)):

I was going to say being dependent might actually be better evidence that this one thing because you're doing something and then you're doing something and then you're doing, there's probably so many differences just accidentally your decision making is different than your decision making. But if you're dependent in your decision making right, then it is like that actually works, then we can't say that could run through that. That's the question then can't be, but we at least know it's one fact,

Speaker 2 ([06:13](#)):

Right? Unless the decision making becomes part of the independent variable that then is replicated,

Speaker 5 ([06:20](#)):

Went to the, I've been thinking about this question in light of adaptations and how organic those happen is really interesting. And then the question seems to be is that ability to share collaboration around adaptation document that is detailed that is to pass on to a truly research group. Does that perhaps out value creating independence to make this, what I would say is it could be subjective indicator of what an evidence based, and I know that's not the question you asked.

Speaker 6 ([06:56](#)):

I think you are the definition of a researcher group. Honestly based on what you described, you're collaborating and developing it and evaluating it. To me that sounds like a research group, but I do wonder if maybe this is what Jen were kind of referring to. If you did develop it, evaluate it together and then evaluate it separately and independently at your own sites, if that could then the decision making might be similar, but you're doing replication independent of one another. I guess it's still, but you're not doing those studies together, those follow up studies.

Speaker 2 ([07:44](#)):

So maybe it's not the topography of the group, right? But it is the role of what's happening within the group

Speaker 6 ([07:50](#)):

In the initial development you're functioning as a research group and then in the follow up replication studies, you're functioning independently. I don't know what Horder would say about that or Jessica Steinbrenner, but I just wonder if that kind of capitalizes upon best of both.

Speaker 1 ([08:11](#)):

So assuming then that we couldn't help

Speaker 2 ([08:13](#)):

Christ,

Speaker 7 ([08:14](#)):

I continue got four years developing together, right? More collaboration, share them, study their I would you want spirit collaboration develop a short amount of time. But that last year, that collaboration that,

Speaker 1 ([09:14](#)):

So I think that there's been unanimous across both groups conclusion that we are a similar, that was our instinct. We just wanted be here.

Speaker 7 ([09:29](#)):

Oh sorry, I

Speaker 1 ([09:33](#)):

You already, the exclamation and then the idea that we would eventually break off and do this thing independently also aligns with maybe one potential page of where we would go then now we're at to this point, what is the value added of independence? How do you define given that if we report that we are a research group and that we branched off in to do independent research projects, questions that have come up is how do we ensure independence? What matters about independence? Should there be some sort of discounting 5, 3 20 across three actually independent research groups? Does that give you full standard of evidence and do we get a silver standard? There's all sorts of questions that show up during the as a result of that you want talk?

Speaker 8 ([10:27](#)):

Yeah, I was going to say, I'm finding help try to orient myself to why the multiple groups rules there and it's there because we want the practice itself on something that one individual, one group brings to the table. So that probably comes from things people to report in a detailed way in manuscript

Speaker 7 ([10:51](#)):

You

Speaker 8 ([10:51](#)):

Are learning this for your training and you all collaborate together. I think you shared that special call with each other and going separate ways after that can't take away the

Speaker 7 ([11:02](#)):

Shared.

Speaker 8 ([11:03](#)):

Yeah,

Speaker 3 ([11:04](#)):

It's like the development and the protocol. The assessment almost feels not that important to me. And you've done all this work to get a really good protocol together. All

Speaker 9 ([11:20](#)):

Along the lines value the text of the rigor of the methodology defined together if people are able to replicate it across independent sites. But then there's also bias, and that's a big word that I can't give you specific examples right now, but some of these biases result in positive outcomes that you're not quite capturing. But some of these biases do not. And so I think that's also the added value of independent studies part of collaborating throughout and diverging with help and not communicating to help. But I think you've already introduced a lot of bias as part of the initial collaboration to begin with and it's going to be so difficult.

Speaker 8 ([12:15](#)):

As an example, a master student who replicated study have been effective and they weren't able to get those same results. So I start conceptualize, well the original person who ran it was this tenured professor who had this experience speaking and maybe had great examples and detailed examples. Whereas this graduate student, even though they're doing the same steps, they're providing an example from her to fidelity. Maybe their example's not as good, they haven't had the 30 years of experience, but if that grad student had done the zoom call with the professor Rich, oh yeah, the example I gave was this that's now influencing it. And that was something that wasn't in the original written out necessarily.

Speaker 1 ([12:52](#)):

And to be clear, the ation of the project is we would love for a novice practitioner to go through our intervention and make the same sorts of decisions. That one piece of when you make decisions the way that I make decisions, you get The second question is, I agree we can't get rid of bias. Are the protections in place? I was

Speaker 9 ([13:25](#)):

Just thinking of one, having mass assessors all the time throughout and then maybe people that are completely disconnected to the research and having that across

Speaker 3 ([13:42](#)):

Folks

Speaker 9 ([13:43](#)):

That are actually measuring behavior for example. And maybe you increase rigor in other ways, right? You have not 33% either way, but a hundred percent. I dunno. These other cases where you dial it up in terms of the rigor.

Speaker 2 ([13:58](#)):

I think one of the things that part of this notion of independence is that when you have one team or a group who has had similar training and they're able to replicate whatever they have developed and then you have another team independently who cannot replicate, even though that first team has 200 papers on the topic, that's this issue of what is independent enough and what is the conflict of interest within that team. And is it because there's these nuanced decisions that aren't being documented? Or is it because it really doesn't replicate? Right.

Speaker 9 ([14:33](#)):

And back to the question on teams, I also think that teams are students of folks, but then lot the different sites that replicate that, they're in my opinion still part of that original team.

Speaker 4 ([14:48](#)):

So the five three coming will got dropped from the divers four one and in five, oh there was all this stuff about what constitutes a study because especially in reporting data or you've got one, two studies that are subs sample and one that is the whole sample. And so they've moved to a much harder to use but sort of little better approach to just sample overlap. So if you've got overlapping data, you're doing the same study overlapping, let's say students really not going to but overlap. I guess I don't, I'm not sure that I'm that concerned about you should have this three sites with probably a bunch of kids. I don't know that I'm that concerned about whether you're an independent student. Yeah, I mean I answered the question about how you become dependent, but I don't know that I care from my perspective of somebody who not doing the research but is interested in I don't

Speaker 1 ([15:53](#)):

Yeah, but what works clearing how pricing this out when we set 300 participants, we can't do that. This is within our,

Speaker 4 ([16:02](#)):

Well there's some stuff for practice guys, a small number together an incredible tier.

Speaker 4 ([16:17](#)):

And the thing is, that's stuff about what the WC considers. I mean it doesn't exist in one thing. Let's be, it's gone. I don't have a job, it's gone. Right? So it not we even get it back. It's not even thing. So I dunno, I'm not saying don't worry about it at all, but I'm just telling you what you just talked about. Sounds pretty good to me for producing something that I wouldn't say, I wouldn't say it's going to work for everybody in every context, but in terms of what can we set out to do

Speaker 3 ([16:54](#)):

Evidence? Does Mandy have special sauce? And that's my, yes.

Speaker 10 ([17:00](#)):

I think I heard two clear functions of independent research team. One is everything in the protocol there are the extended training package. Is that really what it takes to get the effect? Or is there more like what Anne talked about this morning that seems critical to me if we're going to imagine that somebody else might get similar results to you, the research. And the second is, could there be some kind of an unconscious bias somewhere in the research group without no ill intent, but we're just kind of seeing it this way and we know those things exist. So having it replicated, pardon?

Speaker 3 ([17:43](#)):

Hey, this did also, so are we more worried about a research group just doing a single study about that particular thing?

Speaker 10 ([17:52](#)):

I think I'm more worried if it's between one lab

Speaker 3 ([17:56](#)):

And

Speaker 10 ([17:56](#)):

Then going to another lab may not perfect, but may have other biases and wouldn't have the ownership that the originators of the intervention have. I mean when it's my kid, when it's my kid, I see 'em differently. Sometimes better, sometimes worse, but differently.

Speaker 1 ([18:16](#)):

It seems like the second thing is easier to control for than the first year.

Speaker 10 ([18:20](#)):

Yes.

Speaker 1 ([18:20](#)):

So I think that I could probably come up with a series of guidelines that are analogous that fidelity allow to protect

Speaker 10 ([18:33](#)):

Masking

Speaker 1 ([18:36](#)):

Maybe with the time we have left that is there, what guidance would you give us that help us protect us from ourselves? But let me just say you wrote down everything in a protocol is what it takes to get the effect. So maybe the problem is that 70% of what got the effect is what's written in the protocol and 30% is made collaboration. We really want to erase that and make it a hundred percent. So if we were to be a research group that did research dependently, what steps could we take that would allow us to raise ourselves in the equation and produce compelling evidence of effect that prevented against rev one, which is the secret sauce in the recipe. Are you adding that after?

Speaker 2 ([19:33](#)):

Do you even know you're adding

Speaker 1 ([19:34](#)):

Or you even know you're adding? Are you asking joke? You can do

Speaker 2 ([19:38](#)):

The field. The

Speaker 6 ([19:39](#)):

Field. Yeah, I mean, but also us.

Speaker 11 ([19:44](#)):

I think that you have to, I'm thinking about all these things are great and they're fun and it sounds like research study itself, but I think the true marker is whether you just take a protocol, hand it to somebody, they go and then it works. So you could go all of those things and it still wouldn't be effective in the classroom or you could do none of it, hand it to them and then it's a whole problem. Grand slam. You could have all the bias in the world and whether it mattered to not would in how that would, I think that's the functional outcome, all of it. You can do all of these things. It's still not too function. Outcome. I wonder if it's working accurate instead of think you're suggesting. I understand why that way.

Speaker 6 ([20:44](#)):

So Matt, you're saying you still need those other external researchers to replicate it. It's

Speaker 1 ([20:53](#)):

Kind of about external. Can we recruit truly naive participants?

Speaker 3 ([20:57](#)):

Well it helps that you're doing audience.

Speaker 1 ([21:02](#)):

Yeah. So if we explore, so yeah, that's the question is if we recruit people in our graduate programs that are in year one, semester one, and we say instead of getting champion classes, is that enough or is it still a problem that we've go watch CD for a while and then here's a kid with a problem. Apply what you've learned after you've graduated from the automated training series. If we got compelling demonstrations

across Mandy, Casey, and I, under those circumstances, does that upgrade our, and it's consistent. Does that upgrade us from a silver to a gold standard? I think

Speaker 4 ([21:49](#)):

You're better off, I don't know, funding is the problem here, but you're better off finding a new faculty member who's not part of your tradition and saying, here's our protocol. You and a graduate student are going to go do your own, find three kids and do this and see what happens.

Speaker 2 ([22:09](#)):

Have you guys heard of the special education Research accelerator or Sarah? So that's what it is designed to do, but on R ct. So what we probably need to develop as a collective is Sarah for a single case essentially, which may also fit low resources. But then you were asking me earlier, who wants to just replicate other people's work? All of us, our own ideas,

Speaker 1 ([22:32](#)):

Your

Speaker 4 ([22:32](#)):

Question journals where registered replication is a much lower bar for publication. You say you tell them, here's how I'm going to do it, here's how I'm going to report it. And if you do the study based on the protocol, what you've described, once they've accepted the register application, you have to do, the actual review of the study is much more expedited because you sort of established that it's a value. And I don't know that there are any, I don't know if there are any journalists that take single case science that do register replications, but there might be. And so if you can find a journal that takes the registered replication, you've got a new founding member, what they want more than anything as a hub, they want, they want to get pubs out so they can get tenure. So if you can work with some junior faculty member to do register application and they know once they're done, they're going to have a publication. That is a huge motivation.

Speaker 7 ([23:29](#)):

Yeah. Advice

Speaker 4 ([23:34](#)):

You give them support on just the protocol, just described the protocol for the research. And then once they go out, and you may not be authors on this video, right? You're just helping them sort of set up the framework and then you just say, go do it. That's a way of getting it done.

Speaker 7 ([23:52](#)):

I one thing in terms of if you're thinking about how do we protect ourselves against or how do we perceive and proceed as objectively as possible under and just documenting, these are the places where we are collaborating. These were the places that we try might be way to proceed. Never makes into manuscript that,

Speaker 3 ([24:22](#)):

Yeah, OSF is helpful for that. You could document everything.

This transcript was exported on Mar 18, 2026 - view latest version [here](#).

Speaker 9 ([24:39](#)):

I'm

Speaker 3 ([24:40](#)):

Supposed to go do the H.