Systematic Screening to Support School Success!
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- Comprehensive, Integrated, Three-Tiered (CI3T) Models of Prevention
- The Importance of Systematic Screening
- The Importance of Planning and Implementation
- The Importance of Your Commitment
Thank you … Commitment to All Students

- 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).
- Relied 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.

A Clear Commitment to Meeting All Students’ Academic, Behavioral, and Social Needs
Comprehensive, Integrated, Three-Tiered Model of Prevention (Lane, Kalberg, & Menzies, 2009)

Goal: Reduce Harm
Specialized individual systems for students with high risk

Goal: Prevent Harm
School/classroom-wide systems for all students, staff, & settings

Goal: Reverse Harm
Specialized group systems for students at-risk

Primary Prevention (Tier 1)
≈80%

Secondary Prevention (Tier 2)
≈15%

Tertiary Prevention (Tier 3)
≈5%

PBIS Framework
Validated Curricula

Behavioral Social
Primary Intervention Plan

Statement
Purpose Statement
School Wide Expectations

Area I: Academics
Responsibilities
Students will:

Area II: Behavior
Responsibilities
Students will:

Area III: Social Skills
Responsibilities
Students will:

Faculty and Staff will:

Parents will:

Administrators will:

Lane & Oakes 2012
Procedures for Reinforcing

Faculty and Staff:

Students:

Parents/Community:

Donation Coupon for:
1 box of MacGel and Cheese to Community Food Drive
Ticket Examples

Reactive Plan

Essential Components of Primary Prevention Efforts

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measure</th>
<th>Aug</th>
<th>Sep</th>
<th>Oct</th>
<th>Nov</th>
<th>Dec</th>
<th>Jan</th>
<th>Feb</th>
<th>March</th>
<th>April</th>
<th>May</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

### School Demographics

- [ ]

### Student Demographic Information

- [ ]

### Screening Measures

- [ ]

### Student Outcome Measures - Academic

- [ ]

### Student Outcome Measures - Behavior

- [ ]

### Program Measures

- [ ]

---

**What screening tools are available?**

See Lane, Menzies, Oakes, & Kalberg (2012)

### Systematic Screener for Behavior Disorders

[SGB 2nd ed.; Walker, Swanson, & Fall, 2014]
SSBD Screening Process

Pool of Regular Classroom Students

STAGE 1: TEACHER SCREENING
- Rating of Externalizing and Internalizing Behaviors
- Stage 1: Highest ranked pupils on externalizing and internalizing behavioral disorders

STAGE 2: TEACHER RATING
- Critical Events Index
- Combined Frequency Index
- Stage 2: pupils exceeding normative criteria on CEI and CFI

STAGE 3: DIRECT OBSERVATION
- AET and PSB
- Stage 3: selected pupils in classroom and on playground exceeding normative criteria

Pre-referral Intervention(s)
Child may be referred to Child Study Team

PASS GATE 1
PASS GATE 2
PASS GATE 3

SSBD Results – Winter 2007 through Winter 2009
Risk Status of Nominated Students

DATE
TEACHER NAME

0 = Never
1 = Occasionally
2 = Sometimes
3 = Frequently

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

Student Name
Student ID
Smith, Sally 11111

Student Risk Screening Scale (SRSS)

Student Risk Screening Scale (Drummond, 1994)

The SRSS is a 7-item mass screener used to identify students who are at risk for antisocial behavior.

Uses 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
- Aggressive Behavior
- Low Academic Achievement
- Negative Attitude
- Peer Rejection

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

Student Name | Student ID | Date | Teacher Name | 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | SRSS Score: Sum Items 1-7 (Range 0 - 21)
---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---
Smith, Sally | 11111 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 2 | 1 | 3 | **7**

Percentage of Students

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Low (n = 422)</th>
<th>Moderate (n = 51)</th>
<th>High (n = 12)</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&gt;M=H</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In-School Suspensions</td>
<td>0.08 (0.38)</td>
<td>0.35 (1.04)</td>
<td>1.71 (2.26)</td>
<td>L&gt;M&lt;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&gt;M, 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>

(Lane, Parks, Kalberg, & Carter, 2007)

---

### STUDENT RISK SCREENING SCALE
High School: Behavioral & Academic Characteristics of SRSS Risk Groups
Non-Instructional Raters

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Low (n = 328)</th>
<th>Moderate (n = 52)</th>
<th>High (n = 35)</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 (0.62)</td>
<td>2.45 (0.64)</td>
<td>2.38 (0.88)</td>
<td>L &lt; M, H</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Lane, Kalberg, Parks, & Carter, 2008)

---

**STUDENT RISK SCREENING SCALE-IE**

12 Items retained for use at the elementary level
44 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 Area Under the Curve (AUC)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>With Condition N</td>
<td>Without the Condition N</td>
<td>SRSS-E7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Internalizing</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>1026</td>
<td>8.49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>8.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Externalizing</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>1026</td>
<td>9.52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>9.21</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. SSBD refers to the Systematic Screening for Behavior Disorders (Walker & Severson, 1992); SRSS-IE refers to the Systematic Risk Screening Scale for Internalizing and Externalizing Behaviors Scale. SRSS-E7 refers to the original 7 items constituting the SRSS developed by Drummond (1994) and the 5 added items are from the SSBD. The AUC values of the SRSS-IE are based on the data provided by the authors of the SRSS. The AUC values for the SRSS-E7 and SRSS-I5 are based on the data provided by the authors of the SRSS. The AUC values for the SRSS-IE12 are based on the data provided by the authors of the SRSS. The AUC values for the SRSS-E7 and SRSS-I5 are based on the data provided by the authors of the SRSS. The AUC values for the SRSS-IE12 are based on the data provided by the authors of the SRSS.

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

- Enter practice data into the 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)
  - 9 – 21 high risk (red)
- 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?
Sample Elementary School … Fall 2015
SRSS-E7 Results – All Students

% of Students Screened by Screening Time Point
- Low Risk (0-3)
- Moderate (4-8)
- High (9-21)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School</th>
<th>Low Risk (0-3)</th>
<th>Moderate (4-8)</th>
<th>High (9-21)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>F14</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F15</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F16</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F17</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Sample Elementary School … Fall 2015
SRSS-E7 Comparison by Grade Level

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Grade Level</th>
<th>N Screened</th>
<th>Low Risk (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>0 (0%)</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>
</tbody>
</table>

Sample Elementary School … Fall 2015
SRSS-E7 Comparison by Grade Level

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Grade Level</th>
<th>N Screened</th>
<th>Low Risk (0-3)</th>
<th>Moderate (4-8)</th>
<th>High (9-21)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<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>Screened Categories</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Low (0-1)</td>
<td>Moderate (2-3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>49 (75.38%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1st</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>40 (75.47%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>36 (78.26%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3rd</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>60 (88.24%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4th</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>51 (89.47%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5th</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>53 (85.48%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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>
</tbody>
</table>
Sample High School … Fall 2015

SRSS Comparison by Grade Level

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Grade Level</th>
<th>N = 1197 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>

Examining your screening data

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

See Lane, Menzies, Bruth, & Czobor (2011)
Examining your screening data

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

See Lane, Menacker, Brulle, & Creton (2011)
Comprehensive, Integrative, Three-tiered (CI3T) Models of Support

Assess, Design, Implement, Evaluate

Behavior Contracts
Self-Monitoring
— Functional Assessment-Based Interventions

Basic Classroom Management
Effective Instruction
Low Intensity Strategies

Higher Intensity Strategies

Schoolwide Positive Behavior Support
Low Intensity Strategies
Higher Intensity Strategies

Student Risk Screening Scale- Internalizing & Externalizing (SRSS-IE)

Examining Academic and Behavioral Data: Elementary School Level

Teacher-Level Considerations

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

Low-Intensity Strategies

- Opportunities to Respond
- Gathering Positive Feedback
- Active Supervision
- High-p Requests
- Precorrection
- Self-monitoring
- Incorporating Choice

Examining your screening data

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

See Lane, Menzies, Bruhn, & Cvetkovic (2011)

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

Goal: Reduce Harm
- Specialized individual systems for students with high-risk

Goal: Reverse Harm
- Specialized group systems for students at-risk

Goal: Prevent Harm
- School/classroom-wide systems for all students, staff, & settings

Primary Prevention (Tier 1)
- =80% Validated Curricula

Secondary Prevention (Tier 2)
- =15% PBIS Framework

Tertiary Prevention (Tier 3)
- <1% Specialized Individual systems for students with high-risk

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

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
Assess, Design, Implement, and Evaluate

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
  ● 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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Support</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Schoolwide Data: Entry Criteria</th>
<th>Data to Monitor Progress</th>
<th>Exit Criteria</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Behavior Contract</td>
<td>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 administrator, teacher, parent, and student.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Successful completion of behavior contract</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Validity</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-monitoring</td>
<td>Students self-reflect and record their performance (accuracy) and on-task behavior each day.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### An illustration

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Support</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Schoolswide Data: Entry Criteria</th>
<th>Date to Monitor Progress</th>
<th>Exit Criteria</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Small group reading instruction</td>
<td>Students who: <strong>Behavior</strong>: Fall SRSS at moderate (4-8) or high (9-21) risk; <strong>Academic</strong>: Fall AIMSweb LNT at the strategic or intensive level</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Must AIMSweb reading benchmark at next screening time point. Low risk on SRSS at next screening time point.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: SRSS = Social and Relationship Survey System; AIMSweb = Academic Inventory Monitoring System; LNT = Level of Needs for Instruction; NWF = Nearest Neighbors for Fixtures; SDQ = Strengths and Difficulties Questionnaire; CBM = Classroom-Based Measurement; PSF = Progressive Screening Framework; CLT = Comprehensive Literacy Training; ** = at least three times per week; TD = at least twice a day.
**First Grade Students' Self Monitoring Form**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Teacher's Name</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Time</th>
<th>1. Did student come to the reading room when the teacher called him?</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Did student read his book?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Did student build words or practice sounds with the text?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Did student build letters sounds to read or spell words?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Did student practice high word?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Did student follow teacher's directions?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Will prompt the student to complete the checklist after each activity?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Will remove my checklist to the student's at the end of the intervention period?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Did student appropriate for considering the checklist and/or agreeing (i.e., give a checkmark for only fewer than 2 prompts), give a tick for having all but one check, etc.?</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Support**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Support</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Schoolwide Date: Entry</th>
<th>Date to Monitor Progress</th>
<th>Exit Criteria</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>READ 180 (Stage 1) Reading Intervention</td>
<td>Students participate in a 30 min reading instructional block during their study hall period. Students read in the computer lab for participation in the online portion 30 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 READ 180.</td>
<td>Students in grades 9 – 12.</td>
<td>Students meet instructional reading goals.</td>
<td>Students meet instructional reading goals.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Support Description: Schoolwide Data: Entry

**Mentoring Program**

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.

- **Selection Criteria:**
  1. 10th/11th/12th graders
  2. Behavior: SRSS: High (9‐21) or Moderate (4‐8) by either 2nd or 7th period teacher
  3. ODR ≥ 2
  4. Absences ≥ 5 days in one grading period

- **Academic:** GPA ≤ 2.75

- **Student Measures:**
  1. Increase of GPA at mid-term and semester report cards.
  2. Decrease of ODR monitored weekly.
  3. Reduced absences (fewer than one per quarter)

- **Treatment Integrity:** Mentors complete weekly mentoring checklists to report meeting time and activities.

- **Social Validity:** Pre and post survey for students and mentors.

- **Exit Criteria:** Students who no longer meet criteria.

---

**Targeted Algebra II Study Hall**

Direct, targeted instruction of Algebra II learning targets by math teachers.

- **Selection Criteria:**
  1. 12th graders
  2. Algebra II grade drops below a 75 at any point in the semester
  3. Study hall time available and permission of 5th‐period teacher
  4. Self‐selecting to engage in study hall

- **Student Measures:**
  1. Algebra II classroom grades
  2. Daily class average if grade is ≤ 75

- **Treatment Integrity:** Daily monitoring of the lessons covered and student attendance.

- **Social Validity:** Pre and Post Student Surveys

---

Support Description: Schoolwide Data: Exit

**Behavior Contracts**

- Assess, Design, Implement, and Evaluate

**Functional Assessment Based Interventions**

- Low Intensity Strategies

**Basic Classroom Management**

- Effective Instruction

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

- Assess, Design, Implement, and Evaluate

---

**References:**

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

Goal: Reduce Harm
Specialized individual systems for students with high-risk

Goal: Reverse Harm
Specialized group systems for students at-risk

Goal: Prevent Harm
School/classroom-wide systems for all students, staff, & settings

Primary Prevention (Tier 1)
≈80%
Validated Curricula

Secondary Prevention (Tier 2)
≈15%
PBIS Framework

Tertiary Prevention (Tier 3)
 ≈5%

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

SWIFT Center produced the data for this presentation under U.S. Department of Education, Office of Special Education Programs Grant No. H326Y120005. OSEP Project Officers Grace Zamora Durán and Tina Diamond served as the project officers. The views expressed herein do not necessarily represent the positions or policies of the Department of Education. No official endorsement by the U.S. Department of Education of any product, commodity, service or enterprise mentioned in this presentation is intended or should be inferred. This product is public domain. Authorization to reproduce it in whole or in part is granted. Please cite as: Lane, K. D. (2016, July). Systematic screening to support school success. Presented at the meeting of SWIFT 2016 National Professional Learning Institute, Arlington, VA.