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Agenda

- Overview of Ci3T models of prevention
- Data-informed professional learning design
- Systematic behavior screening tools
- Data-informed decision making

Our Journey...

....an evolution
The Journey of Comprehensive, Integrated, Three-tiered (Ci3T) Models of Prevention

Primary Prevention (Tier 1)
≈80%

Secondary Prevention (Tier 2)
≈15%

Tertiary Prevention (Tier 3)
≈5%

Comprehensive, Integrated, Three-tiers Model of Prevention (Lane, Kalberg, & Menesics, 2009)

Academic Behavioral Social

Comprehensive, Integrated, Three-tiers Model of Prevention (Lane, Kalberg, & Menesics, 2009)

Tertiary Prevention (Tier 3)
≈15%

Secondary Prevention (Tier 2)
≈80%

Primary Prevention (Tier 1)
≈80%

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

- Tertiary Prevention (Tier 3)
  - ≈15%

- Secondary Prevention (Tier 2)
  - ≈15%

- Primary Prevention (Tier 1)
  - ≈80%

Academic Behavioral Social

Session 1:
- 2 hours
  - Ci3T model overview

Session 2:
- Full day
  - Building the primary prevention plan

Session 3:
- 2 hours
  - How to monitor the plan
  - Student team members attend

Session 4:
- Full day
  - Building Tier 2 supports

Session 5:
- 2 hours
  - Building Tier 3 supports
  - Student team members attend

Session 6:
- Full day
  - Preparing to implement

Homework:
- Share overview with faculty
- Build reactive plan
- Finalize and share expectation matrix and teaching & reinforcing components
- Share screeners; complete assessment schedule
- Share revised Ci3T plan; complete Ci3T Feedback Form

Pre-Training Activities:
- Team member selection
- Schoolwide Expectations Survey for Specific Settings (SESSS)

Source: Lane, Oakes, Royer, & Cantwell, 2016
Academic Component

Why?
- Academic performance influences student behavior
- Teachers’ behavior will reflect students’ behavior

How?
- Academic expectations should be stated clearly and enforced consistently
- Expectations foster an environment which sets the stage for productive academic time
- Academic engagement is related to lower levels of problem behavior
- Consider procedures:
  - High traffic areas
  - Praise / corrective statement ratio
  - Starting activities
  - Closing activities

Behavioral Component:
Positive Behavioral Interventions and Supports (PBIS)

A Framework, Not a Curriculum

- Establish, clarify, and define expectations
- Teach all students the expectations, planned and implemented by all adults in the school
- Give opportunities to practice
- Reinforce students consistently, facilitate success
- Consider rules, routines, and physical arrangements
- Monitor the plan using school-wide data to identify students who need more support
- Monitor student progress

Social Skills (Character Education) Component

- School-based programs designed to promote the character development of students (Person, Moidduddin, Angus, & Malone, 2009).
- The goal is to raise children to become morally responsible, self-disciplined citizens (Berkowitz & Bier, 2005).
- Social skills programs teach students about basic human values including honesty, kindness, courage, equality, and respect.

Considerations:
- Evidence-based program
- Selected according to the 11 principles of effective character education (Zickhain, Schap, & Lewis, 2007).
- Implemented throughout the school district to facilitate consistency
Ci3T Blueprint

- Ci3T Blueprint A Primary (Tier 1) Plan
  - Roles and responsibilities
  - Procedures for teaching
  - Procedures for reinforcing
  - Procedures for monitoring
- Ci3T Blueprint B Reactive Plan
- Ci3T Blueprint C Expectation Matrix
- Ci3T Blueprint D Assessment Schedule
- Ci3T Blueprint E Secondary (Tier 2) Intervention Grid
- Ci3T Blueprint F Tertiary (Tier 3) Intervention Grid

## Ci3T Primary Plan: Roles and Responsibilities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mission Statement</th>
<th>School Ci3T Primary Plan</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Program Statement</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School-wide Expectations</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Area A: Student Responsibilities</td>
<td>Students:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Area B: Behavior Expectations</td>
<td>Students:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Area C: Social Emotional Expectations</td>
<td>Students:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty and Staff</td>
<td>(Ensure alignment with goals)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**all stakeholder groups**
### C3T Professional Learning Series

**Session 1:**
- 2 hours
- Ci3T model overview

**Session 2:**
- Full day
- Building the primary prevention plan
- Student team members attend

**Session 3:**
- 2 hours
- How to monitor the plan
- Student team members attend

**Session 4:**
- Full day
- Building Tier 2 supports

**Session 5:**
- 2 hours
- Building Tier 3 supports
- Student team members attend

**Session 6:**
- Full day
- Preparing to implement Ci3T Professional Learning Series

---

### Homework

- Share overview with faculty
- Build reactive plan

---

### Implementation Pre-Training Activities

- Team member selection
- Schoolwide Expectations Survey for Specific School Settings (SESSS)

---

### Interpreting the SESSS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NUMBER</th>
<th>PERCENTAGE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Number of school personnel who returned the survey</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number and percentage of total school personnel who rated the behavior as critical for student success</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


---

### Assessing Social Validity

- Primary Intervention Rating Scale (PIRS)
- A formal way for faculty and staff to provide feedback
- Results used to guide professional development and Ci3T plan revisions each year

---

---
Assessing Social Validity

• Ci3T Feedback Form
• Purpose: to obtain information that will aid in determining the effectiveness and usefulness of the Ci3T plan for your school

全面、综合、三阶段预防模型
(Lane, Kalberg, & Menvies, 2009)

- 主要预防 (Tier 1)
- 次级预防 (Tier 2)
- 三级预防 (Tier 3)

Ci3T 一级预防计划：教学程序

Ci3T 一级预防计划：强化程序

Ci3T 一级预防计划：监视程序

全面、综合、三阶段预防模型
(Lane, Kalberg, & Menvies, 2009)
Comprehensive, Integrated, Three-Tiered Model of Prevention
(Lane, Kalberg, & Menzies, 2009)

Primary Prevention (Tier 1)
Secondary Prevention (Tier 2)
Tertiary Prevention (Tier 3)

Tertiary Prevention (Tier 3) Intervention Grids

Low-Intensity Strategies

Communication:
Soliciting Feedback, Sharing Progress, Providing Professional Learning

Social Validity
Treatment Integrity
Systematic Screening
Using Data to Monitor Our Plan: Sharing Schoolwide Data with Faculty and Staff

Sample Data: Grade Point Average First Semester Over Time 2008 - 2010

Using Data to Monitor Our Plan: Sharing Student Performance Data with Faculty and Staff
These numbers represent the total numbers for the school as a whole divided by the number of schools days in a given quarter.

SAMPLE DATA:
ELEMENTARY SCHOOL ATTENDANCE: QUARTER 1 2005-2006 TO QUARTER 1 2006-2007

SAMPLE DATA:
ELEMENTARY SCHOOL DISCIPLINE: QUARTER 1 2005-2006 TO QUARTER 1 2006-2007

Considerations

Psychometrically Sound

Socially Valid

If social validity is lacking, even psychometrically strong tools are likely to remain unused by educators.
Behavior Screening Tools

www.ci3t.org

Systematic Screener for Behavior Disorders

Available from Pacific Northwest Publishing

(3SBD 2nd ed.; Walker, Severson, & Feil, 2014)
### Source:
Lane, Menear, Oakes, Kalberg, Melnick & Sorrell, 2012. Figure 2.2: Final Systematic Screening for Behavioral Disorders (SSBD) results comparing the percentage of students nominated and exceeding normative criteria for both internalizing and externalizing disorders over a three year period.

### Table: SSBD Results – Winter 2007 through Winter 2009

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Screening Time Point</th>
<th>Externalizing</th>
<th>Internalizing</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Winter 2007</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Winter 2008</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Winter 2009</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Nominated But Did Not Exceed Criteria</th>
<th>Exceeded Normative Criteria</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>6.18%</td>
<td>3.50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.18%</td>
<td>8.90%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: The numbers represent totals for the students for whom the SSBD was completed.

### Source:
SSBD Results – Winter 2007 through Winter 2009

### Chart: Sample Data – SSBD

2007-2011 Risk Status for Nominated Students

- **Externalizing**
  - Winter 2007: 13
  - Winter 2008: 63
  - Winter 2009: 57

- **Internalizing**
  - Winter 2007: 17
  - Winter 2008: 12
  - Winter 2009: 12

Note: The numbers represent totals for the students for whom the SSBD was completed.
### SAMPLE DATA: SSBD
#### WINTER 2009-2010
#### CRITICAL NEED COMPARISON BY GRADE LEVEL

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Grade Level</th>
<th>Total Number of Students Screened</th>
<th>Students Nominated</th>
<th>Students w/ Critical Need</th>
<th>Critical Internalizing</th>
<th>Critical Externalizing</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>K</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1st</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>*16/ 81</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>*10</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Students missing

---

### SSBD Data Over Time
#### Comparing Fall 2007 to Winter 2007

- Fall 2007:
  - Externalizing: 6.23% (20)
  - Internalizing: 5.17% (24)
- Winter 2007:
  - Externalizing: 3.65% (17)
  - Internalizing: 1.29% (6)

**At Risk: Int.** and **At Risk: Ext.**

---

### Student Risk Screening Scale

Available from ci3t.org and mibsi.org

(SRSS; Drummond, 1994)
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
- Low Academic Achievement
- Lie, Cheat, Sneak
- Negative Attitude
- Behavior Problems
- Aggressive Behavior
- Peer Rejection

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


Figure 4. Middle school behavior screening data over time at the fall time point. Adapted from Figure 4.6 p. 127 Lane, K. L., Menzies, H. M., Oakes, W. P., & Kalberg, J. R. (2012). Systematic screenings of behavior to support instruction: From preschool to high school. New York, NY: Guilford Press.
### Sample Data: SRSS by Grade

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Grade Level</th>
<th>Number of Students in Grade Level</th>
<th>Low (0-3)</th>
<th>Moderate (4-8)</th>
<th>High (9+)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>K</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>73 (73.74%)</td>
<td>16 (16.16%)</td>
<td>10 (10.10%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1st</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>85 (85.00%)</td>
<td>9 (9.00%)</td>
<td>6 (6.00%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>89 (89.90%)</td>
<td>9 (9.09%)</td>
<td>1 (1.01%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Percentage refers to the percentage of the grade level population screened.

### Sample Data: SRSS

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Low (n = 422) M (SD)</th>
<th>Risk Moderate (n = 51) M (SD)</th>
<th>High (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 (7.91)</td>
<td>L &lt; 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 &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 = 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 = 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) M (SD)</th>
<th>Risk Moderate (n = 52) M (SD)</th>
<th>High (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, 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, M = H</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Lane, Kalberg, Parks, & Carter, 2008)
Student Risk Screening Scale (SRSS; Drummond, 1994 and Lane & Menzies, 2009)

STUDENT RISK SCREENING SCALE-IE

12 items scale for use at the elementary, middle, and high schools
Subscale scores used for interpretation. No total scale score.

SRSS-IE: Cut Scores
- Enter “practice” data into that one sheet so that the total scores and conditional formatting are tested.
- 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.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Elementary School</th>
<th>Middle and High School</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SRSS-E7</td>
<td>Items 1-7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0-3 = low risk</td>
<td>0-3 = low risk</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4-8 = moderate risk</td>
<td>2-3 = moderate risk</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9-21 = high risk</td>
<td>4-15 = high risk</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0-3 = low risk</td>
<td>9-21 = high risk</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Elementary School Levels:

Middle and High School Levels:
Sample ... Winter  
SRSS-E7 Results – All Students  

Sample ... Winter 2014  
SRSS-E7 Comparison by Grade Level
Sample ... Winter
SRSS-I5 Results – All Students

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Screening Time Point</th>
<th>N = 27</th>
<th>N = 48</th>
<th>N = 210</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>% of Students Screens</td>
<td>76.99%</td>
<td>80%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>W14</th>
<th>W15</th>
<th>W16</th>
<th>W17</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>78.99%</td>
<td>13.45%</td>
<td>7.56%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Sample ... Winter 2014
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>58</td>
<td>48 (82.76%)</td>
<td>7 (12.07%)</td>
<td>3 (5.17%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1st</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>37 (71.15%)</td>
<td>9 (17.31%)</td>
<td>6 (11.54%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>43 (72.88%)</td>
<td>12 (20.34%)</td>
<td>4 (6.78%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3rd</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>57 (91.94%)</td>
<td>4 (6.45%)</td>
<td>1 (1.61%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4th</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>52 (77.61%)</td>
<td>7 (10.45%)</td>
<td>8 (11.94%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5th</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>45 (76.27%)</td>
<td>9 (15.25%)</td>
<td>5 (8.47%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Strengths and Difficulties Questionnaire

Available from sdqinfo.org

(SDQ; Goodman, 1997)

SDQ: Screening Results by Domain
Elementary School Winter 2009

SDQ Results: 2nd Grade Students
* = number of students not rated (or missing items)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Domain</th>
<th>Number of Students Screened</th>
<th>Normal</th>
<th>Borderline</th>
<th>Abnormal</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total Difficulties</td>
<td>N=77 +5</td>
<td>n=6</td>
<td>n=3</td>
<td>n=25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emotional Symptoms</td>
<td>N=78 +5</td>
<td>n=1</td>
<td>n=3</td>
<td>n=11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conduct Problems</td>
<td>N=78 +5</td>
<td>n=5</td>
<td>n=7</td>
<td>n=34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hyperactivity</td>
<td>N=78 +5</td>
<td>n=5</td>
<td>n=5</td>
<td>n=22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peer Problems</td>
<td>N=77 +6</td>
<td>n=4</td>
<td>n=1</td>
<td>n=11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prosocial Behavior</td>
<td>N=78 +5</td>
<td>n=1</td>
<td>n=3</td>
<td>n=11</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

BASC³ Behavioral and Emotional Screening Scale©
Available from Pearson Education, PsychCorp™
(BASC³ BESS; Kamphaus & Reynolds, 2015)

BASC² – Behavior and Emotional Screening Scale
Spring 2012

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subgroup</th>
<th>Normal (%)</th>
<th>Elevated (%)</th>
<th>Extremely Elevated (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>85.42</td>
<td>10.74</td>
<td>3.85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sixth</td>
<td>85.42</td>
<td>10.74</td>
<td>3.85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seventh</td>
<td>87.67</td>
<td>8.68</td>
<td>3.65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eighth</td>
<td>92.18</td>
<td>4.46</td>
<td>2.46</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


Social Skills Improvement System – Performance Screening Guide
Available from Pearson Education, PsychCorp™
(SSS- PSG; Elliott & Gresham, 2007)
Social Skills Improvement System – Performance Screening Guide
Spring 2012 – Total School

Adequate progress Moderate Difficulties Significant Difficulties

Reading Skills Math Skills Prosocial Behavior Motivation to Learn

Adequate progress Moderate Difficulties Significant Difficulties

N = 489 n = 436
N = 490 n = 490
N = 490 n = 490
N = 489 n = 489

Lane, K. L., Oakes, W. P., & Magill, L. (2013). Primary prevention efforts: How do we implemented and monitor the Tier 1 component of our Comprehensive, Integrated, Three-Tiered (Ci3T) Model?

Social, Academic, and Emotional Behavior Risk Screener
Available from Fastbridge Learning
(SAEBRS; Kilgus, Chafouleas, & Riley-Tillman, 2013)

SAMPLE DATA: SAEBRS
Large Urban Elementary – Fall Screening Data

Fall 2015 Scores Schoolwide

SAEBRS SCALE
Not identified as at-risk Identified as at-risk

Note: we present the percentage of students by risk category on the total scale and each subscale, as we find the two-step approach to evaluate interpretation to be the most defensible.

Source: Kilgus, Kilpatrick, Taylor, Ekland, & von der Embse, 2016 (in prep)
Data Inform Decision Making

www.ci3t.org
Professional Learning
Levels of Review and Response

- Schoolwide data
  - decisions related to primary prevention efforts
- Grade/ Department/ Class
  - implications for teachers’ practice
- Individual student
  - decisions about student-based interventions

Working with your screening data

Review
Reflect
Refine

Social Skills Improvement System – Performance Screening Guide
SAMPLE DATA Winter 2013 – Total School

Adequate progress
Moderate Difficulties
Significant Difficulties

Elementary AIMSweb Reading Grade 5
Fall, Winter, Spring Benchmarks

Student Risk Screening Scale
Fall 2004 – 2012
Middle School

Student Risk Screening Scale (SRSS)
Examining Academic and Behavioral Data: Middle and High School Levels


Comprehensive, Integrative, Three-tiered (Ci3T) Models of Support

Assess, Design, Implement, and Evaluate

Low-Intensity Strategies for Academics and Behavior

Supporting Behavior for School Success: A Step-by-Step Guide to Key Strategies

Examine screening and other schoolwide data for decision making

Instructional Choice

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Support</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Schoolwide Data: Entry Criteria</th>
<th>Data to Monitor</th>
<th>Exit Criteria</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Instructional Choice</td>
<td>Within-and-across-task choices offered during instruction (e.g., language arts assignments, math lessons)</td>
<td>Behavior:  - SRSS-E7 score: Moderate (4-6)  - SRSS-I5 score: Moderate (2-3)  - Rating of 1, 2, or 3 on the Motivation to Learn subscale of the SSiS-PSG  - Two or more office discipline referrals (ODRs) within a grading period</td>
<td>AND/OR:  - Progress reports; Successful Learning Behaviors - Targeted for growth  - Gradebook: 2+ incomplete assignments</td>
<td>Student measures:  - Academic engaged time  - Percentage of work completed  - Motivation to Learn subscale of the SSiS-PSG  - Student &amp; teacher post/post survey</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Self-Monitoring

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Support</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Schoolwide Data: Entry Criteria</th>
<th>Date to Monitor Progress</th>
<th>Exit Criteria</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Self-monitoring strategy</td>
<td>Implemented by student and teacher to improve academic performance</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Work completion and accuracy of the academic area of concern or target behavior named in the self-monitoring plan, or passing grade on progress report or report card in the academic area of concern, or target behavior named in the self-monitoring plan.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Behavior</td>
<td>SRSS-E7 score: Moderate (4-8)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>☐ SRSS-E7 score: Low (1-3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SRSS-I5 score: Moderate (2-3)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>☐ SRSS-I5 score: Low (1-2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SRSS-E7 score: High (9-21)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>☐ Passing grade on progress report or report card in the academic area of concern, or target behavior named in the self-monitoring plan.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2 or more office discipline referrals (ODR)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>☐ Passing grade on progress report or report card in the academic area of concern, or target behavior named in the self-monitoring plan.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academic</td>
<td>Progress report: 1 or more course failures</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>☐ Progress report: Targeted for growth for academic learning behaviors.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>or</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>☐ AMT/ESD: intense or strategic level (math or reading)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>or</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>☐ AMT/ESD: intense or strategic level (math or reading)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>or</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>☐ Progress report: Targeted for growth for academic learning behaviors.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Validity: Teacher</td>
<td>BP-15</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>☐ BP-15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Student: CIRF</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>☐ Treatment integrity: Implementation &amp; treatment integrity checklists.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Treatment Integrity:</td>
<td>Implementation &amp; treatment integrity checklists</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>☐ Treatment integrity: Implementation &amp; treatment integrity checklists.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Increased Rates of Reinforcement**

**Intensive Reading Intervention with Self-Monitoring**

Small group Reading Instruction with Self-Monitoring


First Grade Students’ Self-Monitoring Form


Screening ... Considering the Logistics & C3T in Action
Learning outcomes:
- Examine students’ overall performance
- Inform low-intensity teacher-level interventions
- Connect students to Tier 2 and 3 supports.

Kathleen.Lane@ku.edu
Wendy.Oakes@asu.edu