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• Using Screening Data ...
  • implications for primary prevention efforts
  • implications for teachers
  • implications for student-based interventions at Tier 2 and Tier 3
Challenging Times

- Students with emotional and behavioral disorders (EBD) represent a diverse and challenging group of students to teach (Forness, Freeman, Paparella, Kauffman, & Walker, 2011)
- Historically as a field we have viewed behavioral and social challenges to be within individual deficits (Landrum & Tankersley, 2013)
- Relyed on reactive approaches to address these challenges (Horner & Sugai, 2015)

Michael Yudin urged educators and educational system leaders to “pay as much attention to students’ social and behavioral needs as we do academics”...

2014 National PBIS Leadership Conference, Michael Yudin, Assistant Secretary for the Office of Special Education and Rehabilitation of the United States Department of Education

Comprehensive, Integrated, Three-Tiered Model of Prevention (Lane, Kalberg, & Menzie, 2009)
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Positive Action
### Primary Intervention Plan

#### Statement

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Purpose Statement</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### School-Wide Expectations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area I: Academics Responsibilities (Students will:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Faculty and Staff will:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parents will:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administrators will:</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Area I: Academics

**Responsibilities**

- Students will:
- Faculty and Staff will:
- Parents will:
- Administrators will:

**Area II: Behavior**

**Responsibilities**

- Students will:
- Faculty and Staff will:
- Parents will:
- Administrators will:

**Area III: Social Skills**

**Responsibilities**

- Students will:
- Faculty and Staff will:
- Parents will:
- Administrators will:

---

Lane & Oakes 2012

---

Lane and Oakes 2013
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area A: Academic Responsibilities</th>
<th>Area B: Behavioral Responsibilities</th>
<th>Area C: Social Skills Responsibilities</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Parents will:</strong></td>
<td><strong>Parents will:</strong></td>
<td><strong>Parents will:</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Provide learning materials and resources</td>
<td>• Be knowledgeable with school-wide expectations</td>
<td>• Support student’s regular education and academic success</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Present daily/weekly lesson plans</td>
<td>• Support student’s problem solving</td>
<td>• Support student’s social success</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Be familiar with school-wide expectations and academic success</td>
<td>• Support student’s emotional well-being</td>
<td>• Communicate with school staff</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Return written homework</td>
<td>• Support student’s behavior plan</td>
<td>• Communicate with school staff</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Be present at school functions</td>
<td>• Support student’s social skills</td>
<td>• Communicate with school staff</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Be familiar with school-wide expectations and academic success</td>
<td>• Support student’s special education plan</td>
<td>• Communicate with school staff</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Return written homework</td>
<td>• Support student’s emotional well-being</td>
<td>• Communicate with school staff</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Be present at school functions</td>
<td>• Support student’s social skills</td>
<td>• Communicate with school staff</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Be familiar with school-wide expectations and academic success</td>
<td>• Support student’s emotional well-being</td>
<td>• Communicate with school staff</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Additional Tips:**
- **Facilitate:** Discuss the school’s expectations with the student individually.
- **Stimulate:** Ensure the student has the necessary tools and resources to succeed.
- **Paraphrase:** Use non-verbal cues and gestures to support the student’s understanding.

**Adapted from:** Lane & Oakes 2013
Reactive Plan

1. Teach, Reinforce, and Retrack Appropriate behaviors “Teachable Moments” to students
2. Reinforce positive behaviors
3. Problem-solve with students “More Teachable Moments”
4. Continue building relationships
5. Communicate with parents and elicit their support

Essential Components of Primary Prevention Efforts

- Social Validity
- Treatment Integrity
- Systematic Screening
  - Academic
  - Behavior

Critical Information for school and district teams
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measure</th>
<th>Jan</th>
<th>Feb</th>
<th>Mar</th>
<th>Apr</th>
<th>May</th>
<th>Jun</th>
<th>Jul</th>
<th>Aug</th>
<th>Sep</th>
<th>Oct</th>
<th>Nov</th>
<th>Dec</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>School Demographics</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Demographic Information</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Screening Measures</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SSIS-II</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Outcome Measures - Academic</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<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>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Outcome Measures - Behavior</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<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>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Outcome Measures - Behavior</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<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>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Program Measures</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Validity - PIRIS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Schoolwide Evaluation Tool (SET)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CI31 Treatment Integrity</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**What screening tools are available?**

See Lane, Menzies, Oakes, and Kalberg (2012).

**Systematic Screener for Behavior Disorders**

(Systematic Screening - Behavior Disorders)
SSBD Screening Process

Stage 1: Teacher Screening
- Identify top 3 students with externalizing and internalizing behavior disorders

Stage 2: Teacher Rating
- Critical Events Index (CEI) and Combined Frequency Index (CFI) exceed normative criteria

Stage 3: Direct Observation and/or SARS
- Select pupils for further evaluation

Pre-referral interventions
- Child may be referred to Child Study Team

SSBD Results – Winter 2007 through Winter 2009

Risk Status of Nominated Students

Source: Lane, Menzies, Oakes, & Kalberg, 2012. Figure 2.2 WES Elementary Systematic Screening for Behavioral Disorders (SSBD): Walker & Severson, 1992 results comparing the percentage of students nominated and exceeding normative criteria for both externalizing and internalizing behavior disorders over a three-year period.
Student Risk Screening Scale (SRSS)

(Drummond, 1994)

The SRSS is a 7-item mass screener used to identify students who are at risk for antisocial behavior. It uses a 4-point Likert-type scale:
- never = 0,
- occasionally = 1,
- sometimes = 2,
- frequently = 3.

Teachers evaluate each student on the following items:
- Steal
- Lie, Cheat, Sneak
- Behavior Problems
- Peer Rejection
- Low Academic Achievement
- Negative Attitude
- Aggressive Behavior

Student Risk is divided into 3 categories:
- Low: 0 – 3
- Moderate: 4 – 8
- High: 9 – 21

(Date: 10/7/2016)

Student Name: Smith, Sally
Student ID: 11111
SRSS Score: Sum Items 1-7 (Range 0 - 21)
0 = Never
1 = Occasionally
2 = Sometimes
3 = Frequently

Use the above scale to rate each item for each student.

Score on Items:
- Steal
- Lie, Cheat, Sneak
- Behavior Problems
- Peer Rejection
- Low Academic Achievement
- Negative Attitude
- Aggressive Behavior

Student Risk Score: 7

(SRSS; Drummond, 1994)
Lane and Oakes 2013

**Student Risk Screening Scale**

Middle School Fall 2004 - Fall 2011

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Low Risk</th>
<th>Moderate Risk</th>
<th>High Risk</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2004</td>
<td>77.00%</td>
<td>17.00%</td>
<td>6.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005</td>
<td>86.00%</td>
<td>11.00%</td>
<td>3.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006</td>
<td>86.00%</td>
<td>7.87%</td>
<td>2.34%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007</td>
<td>89.79%</td>
<td>6.29%</td>
<td>0.63%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008</td>
<td>93.08%</td>
<td>7.77%</td>
<td>1.68%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009</td>
<td>90.55%</td>
<td>6.11%</td>
<td>1.34%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010</td>
<td>92.56%</td>
<td>3.71%</td>
<td>2.23%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011</td>
<td>94.06%</td>
<td>3.00%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Sample Data: SRSS**

Middle School Study 1: Behavioral & Academic Characteristics of SRSS Risk Groups

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Low Risk (n = 422) M (SD)</th>
<th>Moderate Risk (n = 51) M (SD)</th>
<th>High Risk (n = 12) M (SD)</th>
<th>Significance Testing</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ODR</td>
<td>1.50 (2.85)</td>
<td>5.02 (5.32)</td>
<td>8.42 (7.01)</td>
<td>L &lt; M, H</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In-School Suspensions</td>
<td>0.08 (0.38)</td>
<td>0.35 (1.64)</td>
<td>1.71 (2.26)</td>
<td>L &lt; M, H</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GPA</td>
<td>3.35 (0.52)</td>
<td>2.63 (0.65)</td>
<td>2.32 (0.59)</td>
<td>L = M, H, M &gt; H</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Course Failures</td>
<td>0.68 (1.50)</td>
<td>2.78 (3.46)</td>
<td>4.17 (3.49)</td>
<td>L &gt; M, H, M = H</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


**Student Risk Screening Scale**

High School: Behavioral & Academic Characteristics of SRSS Risk Groups

Non-Instructional Raters

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Low Risk (n = 328) M (SD)</th>
<th>Moderate Risk (n = 52) M (SD)</th>
<th>High Risk (n = 35) M (SD)</th>
<th>Significance Testing</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ODR</td>
<td>3.53 (5.53)</td>
<td>8.27 (7.72)</td>
<td>8.97 (9.39)</td>
<td>L &lt; M, H</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GPA</td>
<td>3.10 (0.82)</td>
<td>2.45 (0.84)</td>
<td>2.38 (0.88)</td>
<td>L &gt; M, H</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Elementary Level Results: ROC Curves**

**Externalizing AUC 0.952**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1 - Specificity</th>
<th>Sensitivity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>0.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>0.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>0.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>0.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

AUC = 0.952


**Internalizing AUC 0.802**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1 - Specificity</th>
<th>Sensitivity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>0.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>0.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>0.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>0.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

AUC = 0.802


**STUDENT RISK SCREENING SCALE-IE**

- **STUDENT NAME**
- **Validation Study**
  - Original SRSS-IE 14
  - 12 items retained for use at the elementary level
  - 14 items under development in middle and high schools
Convergent Validity: SRSS-E7, SRSS-I5, & SRSS-IE12 with the SSBD

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target as Measured by the SSBD</th>
<th>Student Condition According to the SSBD</th>
<th>SRSS-IE Comparison</th>
<th>ROC</th>
<th>Student Condition Comparison</th>
<th>Area Under the Curve (AUC)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>With Condition N</td>
<td>Without the Condition N</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Internalizing</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>1026</td>
<td>SRSS-I5</td>
<td>.849</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>SRSS-IE12</td>
<td>.818</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Externalizing</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>1026</td>
<td>SRSS-E7</td>
<td>.952</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>SRSS-IE12</td>
<td>.921</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. SSBD refers to the Systematic Screening for Behavior Disorders (Walker & Severson, 1992); SRSS-IE5 refers to the version with 5 times retained; SRSS-IE12 refers to the original 7 items from the SSBD, developed by Drummond (1994) combined with the new five items constituting the SRSS-IE5. The SRSS-E7 refers to the original 7 items constituting the SSBD.


SRSS-IE: SRSS-E7, SRSS-I5 Cut Scores

- Items 1-7 (The SRSS externalizing scale)
  0 – 3 low risk
  4 – 8 moderate risk (yellow)

- Items 8-12 (The SRSS-IE internalizing items)*preliminary cut scores for elementary only
  0 – 1 low risk
  2 – 3 moderate (yellow)
  4 – 15 high (red)

- Confirm the "Count" column is completed (students' numbered sequentially). Formulas are anchored by the "Count" column; it must contain a number for each student listed for accurate total formulas.

How do we score and interpret the SRSS-IE at the Elementary Level?

• Enter 'practice' data into that one sheet so that the total scores and conditional formatting are tested.
• Items 1-7 (The SRSS externalizing scale)
  0 – 3 low risk
  4 – 8 moderate risk (yellow)

• Items 8-12 (The SRSS-IE internalizing items)*preliminary cut scores for elementary only
  0 – 1 low risk
  2 – 3 moderate (yellow)
  4 – 15 high (red)
Sample Elementary School ... Fall 2015
SRSS-E7 Comparison by Grade Level

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Grade Level</th>
<th>N Screened</th>
<th>Low (0-3)</th>
<th>Moderate (4-8)</th>
<th>High (9-21)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>K</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>54 (83.08%)</td>
<td>7 (10.77%)</td>
<td>4 (6.15%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1st</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>45 (84.91%)</td>
<td>3 (5.66%)</td>
<td>5 (9.43%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>31 (67.39%)</td>
<td>8 (17.39%)</td>
<td>7 (15.22%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3rd</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>64 (94.12%)</td>
<td>4 (5.88%)</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4th</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>52 (91.23%)</td>
<td>5 (8.77%)</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5th</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>54 (87.10%)</td>
<td>8 (12.90%)</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Sample Elementary School ... Fall 2015
SRSS-I5 Comparison by Grade Level

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Grade Level</th>
<th>N Screened</th>
<th>Low (0-1)</th>
<th>Moderate (2-3)</th>
<th>High (4-15)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>K</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>49 (75.38%)</td>
<td>9 (13.85%)</td>
<td>7 (10.77%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1st</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>40 (75.47%)</td>
<td>9 (16.98%)</td>
<td>4 (7.55%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>36 (78.26%)</td>
<td>6 (13.04%)</td>
<td>4 (8.70%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3rd</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>60 (88.24%)</td>
<td>6 (8.82%)</td>
<td>2 (2.94%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4th</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>51 (89.47%)</td>
<td>5 (8.77%)</td>
<td>1 (1.75%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5th</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>53 (85.48%)</td>
<td>8 (12.90%)</td>
<td>1 (1.61%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Sample High School ... Fall 2015
SRSS Results – All Students

% of Students Screened

School F15 School F16 School F17 School F18 School F19
N = 1197
N = 29
N = 96
N = 1072

Screening Time Point
Low Risk (0-3) Moderate (4-8) High (9-21)

Sample High School ... Fall 2015
SRSS Comparison by Grade Level

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Grade Level</th>
<th>N (Screened)</th>
<th>Low (0-3)</th>
<th>Moderate (4-8)</th>
<th>High (9-21)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>9th</td>
<td>327</td>
<td>287 (87.77%)</td>
<td>32 (9.79%)</td>
<td>8 (2.45%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10th</td>
<td>318</td>
<td>271 (85.22%)</td>
<td>34 (10.69%)</td>
<td>13 (4.09%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11th</td>
<td>289</td>
<td>264 (91.35%)</td>
<td>19 (6.57%)</td>
<td>6 (2.08%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12th</td>
<td>263</td>
<td>250 (95.06%)</td>
<td>11 (4.18%)</td>
<td>2 (0.76%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Student Risk Screening Scale – Early Childhood (SRSS-EC)

Lane, Oakes, Menzies, Major, Allegra, Powers and Schatschneider (2015)
Examining your screening data ...

- Implications for primary prevention efforts
- Implications for teachers
- Implications for student-based interventions

See Lane, Menzies, Bruhn, and Crnobori (2013)
Examining your screening data...

...implications for primary prevention efforts

...implications for teachers

...implications for student-based interventions

See Lane, Menzies, Bruhn, and Crnobori (2011)

Teacher-Level Considerations

1. Instructional Considerations
2. General Classroom Management
3. Low-intensity Strategies

Student Risk Screening Scale- Internalizing & Externalizing (SRSS-IE)
Examining Academic and Behavioral Data: Elementary School Level


Examining Academic and Behavioral Data: Middle and High School Level

Comprehensive, Integrative, Three-tiered (CI3T) Models of Support

Assessment, Design, Implement, and Evaluate

Basic Classroom Management

Effective Instruction

Low Intensity Strategies

Behavior Contracts

Self-Monitoring

Functional Assessment-Based Interventions

Schoolwide Positive Behavior Support

Low Intensity Strategies

Higher Intensity Strategies

Assessment

Low-Intensity Strategies

- Opportunities to Respond
- Behavior Specific Praise
- Active Supervision
- Instructional Feedback
- High-p Requests
- Pre-correction
- Incorporating Choice

Consider a book study...
Build school site capacity
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Examining your screening data ... 
... implications for primary prevention efforts 
... implications for teachers 
... implications for student-based interventions

See Lane, Menzies, Bruhn, and Cricchi (2011)

Comprehensive, Integrated, Three-Tiered Model of Prevention (Lane, Kalberg, & Menzies, 2009)

Primary Prevention (Tier 1)
- Goal: Prevent Harm
  - School/classroom-wide systems for all students, staff, & settings
  - Validated Curricula
  - ~80%

Secondary Prevention (Tier 2)
- Goal: Reverse Harm
  - Specialized group systems for students at-risk
  - ~15%

Tertiary Prevention (Tier 3)
- Goal: Reduce Harm
  - Specialized individual systems for students with high-risk
  - ~15%

Academic Behavioral Social

PBIS Framework
Assess, Design, Implement, and Evaluate

Basic Classroom Management
Effective Instruction
Low Intensity Strategies
Behavior Contracts
Self-Monitoring

Functional Assessment-Based Interventions

Assessment

BASC² – Behavior and Emotional Screening Scale
Spring 2012

Step 1: Construct your assessment schedule

Step 2: Identify your secondary supports
- Existing and new interventions

Step 3: Determine entry criteria
- Academic screening scores, progress data, behavior screening scores, attendance data, etc.

Step 4: Identify outcome measures
- Pre and post tests, CBM, office discipline data, GPA, etc.

Step 5: Identify exit criteria
- Reduction of discipline contacts, academic success, reduction of truancies and absences, etc.

Step 6: Consider additional needs
## Examining Academic and Behavioral Data: Elementary School Level

**Behavior Contract**
- A written agreement between two parties used to specify the contingent relationship between the completion of a behavior and access to or delivery of a specific reward. Contract may involve administrators, teacher, parent, and student.

**Entry Criteria**
- Behavior: SBIS (mod to high risk)
- Academic: 2 or more missing assignments within a grading period

**Data to Monitor**
- Work completion, or other behavior addressed in contract

**Exit Criteria**
- Successful completion of behavior contract

**Self-Monitoring**
- Students will monitor and record their academic production (completion/accuracy) and on-task behavior each day.

---

## Examining Academic and Behavioral Data: Middle and High School Level

**Behavior Contract**
- A written agreement between two parties used to specify the contingent relationship between the completion of a behavior and access to or delivery of a specific reward. Contract may involve administrators, teacher, parent, and student.

**Entry Criteria**
- Behavior: SBIS (mod to high risk)
- Academic: 2 or more missing assignments within a grading period

**Data to Monitor**
- Work completion, or other behavior addressed in contract

**Exit Criteria**
- Successful completion of behavior contract

**Self-Monitoring**
- Students will monitor and record their academic production (completion/accuracy) and on-task behavior each day.

---
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### An illustration

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Support</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Schoolwide Data: Entry Criteria</th>
<th>Data to Monitor Progress</th>
<th>Risk Criteria</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Small group reading instruction with self-monitoring</td>
<td>Students who:</td>
<td>Fall SRSS at moderate (4-8) or high (9-21) risk</td>
<td>AIMSweb reading PSF and NWF progress monitoring probes (weekly). Daily self-monitoring checklists</td>
<td>Meet AIMSweb reading benchmark at next screening time point. Low Risk on SRSS at next screening time point.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Students monitored their participation in the reading instructional tasks. Students used checklists of reading lesson components each day to complete and compare to teachers’ rating.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Small group reading instruction (30 min, 3 days per week). Students monitored their participation in the reading instructional tasks. Students used checklists of reading lesson components each day to complete and compare to teachers’ rating.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

**First Grade Students’ Self Monitoring Form**

---

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Support</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Schoolwide Data</th>
<th>Data to Monitor</th>
<th>Exit Criteria</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>READ 180 Reading Intervention</td>
<td>Students participate in a 50 min reading instructional block during their study hall period. Students meet in the computer lab for participation in the online portion 20 min daily. Instruction is relevant to high school students. Students use a progress management system to monitor and track their own progress. Instruction is taught by special education teachers and general education teachers with training in the READ 180 Curriculum.</td>
<td>(1) Students in grades 9 – 12. (2) Reading performance basic or below basic on state assessment that above 4th grade reading level. (3) SRSS risk scores in the moderate range (4 – 8).</td>
<td>Students must meet instructional reading goals.</td>
<td>Students must meet instructional reading goals.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mentoring Program (Sophomores/Seniors)</td>
<td>Focus is on academic achievement, character development, problem-solving skills, improving self-esteem, relationships with adults and peers, and school attendance. Volunteer teachers serve as mentors; meeting weekly (30 – 60 min) with students during the school day.</td>
<td>(1) 10th-11th graders. (2) Behavior: SRSS: High (9-21) or Moderate (4-8) by either 2nd or 7th period teacher. ODR ≥ 2 Absences ≥ 5 days in one grading period Academic: GPA ≤ 2.75</td>
<td>Students no longer meet criteria</td>
<td>Students who no longer meet criteria are still receiving support.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


Support | Description | Schoolwide Data: Entry Criteria | Data to Monitor Progress | Exit Criteria
--- | --- | --- | --- | ---
Targeted Algebra II Study Hall | Direct, targeted instruction of Algebra II learning targets by math teachers. Time will be used to re-teach concepts, provide one-on-one or small group instruction and offer greater supports for students struggling to pass the graduation requirement course. | (1) 12th graders (2) Algebra II grade drops below a 75 at any point in the semester (3) Have study hall time available and permission of 5th period teacher (4) Self-selecting to engage in study hall | Student Measures: Algebra II classroom grades Daily class average if grade is ≤ 75 Treatment Integrity: Daily monitoring of the lesson content and student attendance Social Validity: Pre and Post Student Surveys | Algebra II Grade increases to satisfactory level (above 75%).
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Comprehensive, Integrative, Three-tiered (CI3T) Models of Support

Assess, Design, Implement, and Evaluate

Schoolwide Positive Behavior Support

Low-Intensity Strategies

Basic Classroom Management: Effective Instruction

Low-Intensity Strategies

Assess, Design, Implement, and Evaluate

Higher-Intensity Strategies

Behavior Contracts: Self-Monitoring

Functional Assessment-Based Interventions

Assess, Design, Implement, and Evaluate
Comprehensive, Integrated, Three-Tiered Model of Prevention

(Lane, Kalberg, & Menzies, 2009)

- **Primary Prevention (Tier 1):**
  - Goal: Prevent Harm
  - School/classroom-wide systems for all students, staff, & settings
  - Approx. 80% validated curricula

- **Secondary Prevention (Tier 2):**
  - Goal: Reverse Harm
  - Specialized group systems for students at-risk
  - Approx. 15%

- **Tertiary Prevention (Tier 3):**
  - Goal: Reduce Harm
  - Specialized individual systems for students with high-risk
  - Approx. 5%

Academic | Behavioral | Social

Goal: Reduce Harm

- Specialized individual systems for students with high-risk

- Changes in Harry’s Behavior


A Step-by-Step Process

Step 1: Construct your assessment schedule

Step 2: Identify your secondary supports
  - Existing and new interventions

Step 3: Determine entry criteria
  - Nomination, academic failure, behavior screening scores, attendance data etc.

Step 4: Identify outcome measures
  - Pre and post tests, CBM, office discipline data, GPA etc.

Step 5: Identify exit criteria
  - Reduction of discipline contacts, academic success, reduction of truancies and absences etc.

Step 6: Consider additional needs
Recommendations to Consider

- Recommendation #1: Build Stakeholders’ Expertise
- Recommendation #2: Develop the Structures to Sustain and Improve Practices
- Recommendation #3: Conduct Screenings in a Responsible Fashion
- Recommendation #4: Consider Legal Implications - know your state laws

(Lane & Oakes, 2012)
Overview with Faculty & Staff; Build Reactive Plan

Session 1:
2 hr CI3T Models: An Overview

Session 2:
Full day Building the Primary Prevention Plan

Session 3:
2 hr How to Monitor the Plan

Session 4:
Full Day How to Monitor the Plan

Session 5:
2 hr Building Tier 2 Supports

Session 6:
Full Day Building Tier 3 Supports

Prepare to implement

MTSS: CI3T Training Series

1: Two-Hour After School
2: Full Day
3: Two-Hour After School
4: Full Day
5: Two-Hour After School
6: Full Day

Primary Prevention Series
Secondary Prevention Series
Tertiary Prevention Series

The Professional Development Training Series

November
December
January
February
March

Core Content Curriculum
Check In - Check Out
Reading, Math, Writing Benchmarking and Progress Monitoring Tools
Student Driven Interventions, Strategies, & Practices

Week 1:
Week 2:
Week 3:
Week 4:
Week 5:

Functional Assessment - Based Interventions

Lane and Oakes 2013
USD 497 MTSS-Cl3T Model of Support

- High Support
- Medium Support
- Low Support

Support Intensity

Academic Behavioral Social

- Positive Behavioral Interventions and Supports (PBIS) Framework
- Primary Support (Tier 1)
- Secondary Support (Tier 2)
- Tertiary Support (Tier 3)

Validated Curricula

- ELA
- Math

CI3T – Comprehensive Integrated 3-Tiered Model of Prevention (Lane, Kalberg, & Menzies, 2009).

Validated Core Resource

2015-2016 Professional Learning Offerings

Monthly Faculty Presentations

JANUARY 2015

For Faculty & Staff During the Work Day
PBIS.org

- Very useful to find research on specific interventions
- PowerPoint presentations are available for some interventions
- Training modules are available on PBIS aspects and interventions
- Some tools and measures are available to be viewed
- Quick FAQs on secondary and tertiary interventions

Moving Forward ... thank you!

Learning outcomes:
Participants will learn how systematic screening data can be used to
1. examine students’ overall performance
2. inform low-intensity teacher-level interventions
3. connect students to Tier 2 and 3 supports.