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• Comprehensive, Integrated, Three-tiered (Ci3T) Models of Prevention
• The Importance of Systematic Screening
• 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, & 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)
- Academic
- Behavioral
- Social

Secondary Prevention (Tier 2)
- Academic
- Behavioral
- Social

Tertiary Prevention (Tier 3)
- Academic
- Behavioral
- Social
Comprehensive, Integrated, Three-Tiered Model of Prevention
(Lane, Kalberg, & Menzies, 2009)

Tertiary Prevention (Tier 3)

15% Secondary Prevention (Tier 2)

Approximately 80% Primary Prevention (Tier 1)

Academic | Behavioral | Social

District & State Standards
High Quality Instruction

Positive Behavior Interventions and Supports (PBIS)
Comprehensive, Integrated, Three-Tiered Model of Prevention
(Lane, Kalberg, & Menzies, 2009)

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

~80% Academic
~15% Behavioral
~5% Social

Positive Action
Consultation

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

Purpose Statement

School-Wide Expectations

Area I: Academic Responsibilities

Students will:

Faculty and Staff will:

Parents will:

Administrators will:

*see Expectation Matrix

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

Southwest Middle School (Primary)

Positive Behavior Interventions and Supports (PBIS)

What do I need to know?

Area I: Academic Responsibilities

Students:
- Introduce
- Orient to Class
- Daily Essential Academic Experience
-Daily Math and Reading Experience
- Daily Interactive Academic Experience

Area II: Behavior Responsibilities

Students:
- State school-wide expectations
- Test expectation for own strengths and weaknesses
- Tell an adult about any unsafe behaviors

Faculty and Staff:
- Display posters with school wide expectations
- Foster a safe environment for all students
- Model, teach, and revisit school-wide expectations
- Provide behavior specific praise and reinforcemnt to students who display expectations
- Facilitate communication with parents
- Support Positive Behavioral Interventions and Supports (PBIS) Framework
- Implement proactive and reactive plan with fidelity: use behavior specific praise with ROW WORPS, reinsert behavioral expectation, reteach expectation and follow rest of the plan
- Conduct, report, and use screening and assessments (see Assessment Schedule)
What do I need to know?

Sample Elementary:

Area 1: Academic Responsibilities
- Faculty and Staff:
  - 3/7/2016
  - Lane and Oakes 2013

Area 2: Behavior Responsibilities
- Faculty and Staff:
  - Sample Elementary

Area 3: Social Skills Responsibilities
- Faculty and Staff:
  - Sample Elementary

Sample Elementary:

Lane and Oakes 2013
Procedures for Reinforcing

Faculty and Staff:

Students:

Parents/Community:

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

---

**Reactive Plan**

1. Teach, Remind, and Reinforce 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

What screening tools are available?

See Lane, Menzies, Oakes, and Kalberg (2012)
**SSBD Screening Process**

1. **STAGE 1: TEACHER SCREENING**
   - Focus on Externalizing and Internalizing Behavioral Disorders
   - Select 3 Highest-Ranked Pupils on Externalizing and Internalizing Behavior Criteria

2. **STAGE 2: TEACHER RATING**
   - Critical Events Index and Combined Frequency Index
   - Exceed Normative Criteria on CEI and CFI

3. **STAGE 3: DIRECT OBSERVATION AND/or SARS**
   - Selected Pupils in Classroom and on Playground
   - Exceed Normative Criteria on AET and PSB

PASS GATE 1

PASS GATE 2

PASS GATE 3

Child may be referred to Child Study Team

**SSBD Results – Winter 2007 through Winter 2009**

Risk Status of Nominated Students:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Externalizing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nominated</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Did Not Exceed Criteria</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Internalizing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nominated</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Did Not Exceed Criteria</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Results computed based on total students screened.
Student Risk Screening Scale (SRSS)

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

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

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

(Drummond, 1994)
Student Risk Screening Scale (Drummond, 1994)

Student Name: Smith, Sally
Student ID: 11111
Score: 0 0 1 0 2 1 3

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>Risk 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=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=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, M H 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 (n = 328)</th>
<th>Moderate (n = 52)</th>
<th>High (n = 35)</th>
<th>Significance Testing</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>M (SD)</td>
<td>M (SD)</td>
<td>M (SD)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<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, M = H</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

#### Externalizing AUC 0.952

Elementary Level
Results: ROC Curves

Elementary Level
Results: ROC Curves

### 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>Area Under the Curve (AUC)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Internalizing</td>
<td>With Condition</td>
<td>SRSS-I5</td>
<td></td>
<td>.849</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Without Condition</td>
<td>SRSS-IE12</td>
<td></td>
<td>.818</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>21</td>
<td>1026</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Externalizing</td>
<td>With Condition</td>
<td>SRSS-E7</td>
<td></td>
<td>.952</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Without Condition</td>
<td>SRSS-IE12</td>
<td></td>
<td>.921</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>51</td>
<td>1026</td>
<td></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 items retained. SRSS-I14 refers to the version with 5 items retained. SRSS-I14 refers to the original 7 items from the SRSS developed by Drummond (1994) combined with the new five items constituting the SRSS-IE5. SRSS-IE12 refers to the original 7 items constituting the SRSS.


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

- Enter 'practice' data into that one sheet so that the total scores and conditional formatting are tested.
- Items 1-7 (The SRSS externalizing scale)
  - 0-1 = low risk
  - 2-3 = moderate risk (yellow)
  - 4-5 = high risk (red)
- Items 8-12 (The SRSS-IE internalizing items) preliminary cut scores for elementary only
  - 0-1 = low risk
  - 2-3 = moderate risk (yellow)
  - 4-5 = high risk (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?

- All scores will be automatically calculated.
- SRSS scores are the sum of items 1–7 (range 0–21).
- Internalizing scores are the sum of items 8–12 (range 0–15).

**Sample Elementary School ... Fall SRSS-E7 Results – All Students**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Low (0-3)</th>
<th>Moderate (4-8)</th>
<th>High (9-21)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>F14</td>
<td>N=25</td>
<td>6.96%</td>
<td>4.54%</td>
<td>9.57%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F15</td>
<td>N=86</td>
<td>21.04%</td>
<td>9.97%</td>
<td>4.87%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F16</td>
<td>N=250</td>
<td>61.25%</td>
<td>85.78%</td>
<td>13.92%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F17</td>
<td>N=300</td>
<td>85.78%</td>
<td>13.92%</td>
<td>13.92%</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 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>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 Results – All Students

% of Students Screened

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School</th>
<th>Low Risk (0-1)</th>
<th>Moderate (2-3)</th>
<th>High (4-15)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>F14</td>
<td>N = 72</td>
<td>N = 54</td>
<td>N = 23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F15</td>
<td>N = 101</td>
<td>N = 85</td>
<td>N = 43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F16</td>
<td>N = 204</td>
<td>N = 188</td>
<td>N = 209</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F17</td>
<td>N = 430</td>
<td>N = 346</td>
<td>N = 197</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>
</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>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**

<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>
The Student Risk Screening Scale for Early Childhood: An Initial Validation Study

Lane, Oakes, Menzies, Major, Allegra, Powers and Schatschneider (2015)

Screening ...
Considering the Logistics & Ci3T in Action
Examining your screening data ... 

... implications for primary prevention efforts 

... implications for teachers 

... implications for student-based interventions

See Lane, Mences, Bruhn, and Cricobor (2011)

Social Skills Improvement System – Performance Screening Guide 
Spring 2012 – Total School

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subscale</th>
<th>Adequate progress</th>
<th>Moderate Difficulties</th>
<th>Significant Difficulties</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>n = 489</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reading Skills</td>
<td>43.35</td>
<td>11.04</td>
<td>45.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Math Skills</td>
<td>47.96</td>
<td>4.49</td>
<td>50.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prosocial Behavior</td>
<td>56.12</td>
<td>7.14</td>
<td>36.73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Motivation to Learn</td>
<td>55.42</td>
<td>6.34</td>
<td>38.24</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

Assess, Design, Implement, and Evaluate

Basic Classroom Management Effective Instruction
Low Intensity Strategies
Behavior Contracts Self-Monitoring
Functional Assessment-Based Interventions

Assessment

Low-Intensity Strategies

Opportunities to Respond
Behavior Specific Praise
Active Supervision
Instructional Feedback
High p Requests
Prevention
Incorporating Choice


Build school site capacity
Examining your screening data...

... implications for primary prevention efforts
... implications for teachers
... implications for student-based interventions

See Lane, Menissi, Bruhn, and Crnobori (2011)
Comprehensive, Integrated, Three-Tiered Model of Prevention
(Lane, Kalberg, & Menzies, 2009)

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

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

Goal: Reduce Harm
Specialized individual systems for students with high-risk
=10%
Tertiary Prevention (Tier 3)

PBIS Framework
Validated Curricula

Academic, Behavioral, Social

Comprehensive, Integrative, Three-tiered (CI3T) Models of Support
Assess, Design, Implement, and Evaluate

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

Behavior and Emotional Screening Scale
Spring 2012

BASC² – Behavior and Emotional Screening Scale

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subgroup</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Sixth</th>
<th>Seventh</th>
<th>Eighth</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>N = 624</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>n = 219</td>
<td>85.42</td>
<td>87.67</td>
<td>82.18</td>
<td>86.21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>n = 202</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N = 533</td>
<td>80.07</td>
<td>86.88</td>
<td>5.45</td>
<td>11.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>n = 624</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>n = 203</td>
<td>10.74</td>
<td>12.38</td>
<td>2.46</td>
<td>3.85</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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

Examining Academic and Behavioral Data: Middle and High School Level

**Sample Secondary Intervention Grid**

<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><strong>Behavior Contract</strong></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><strong>Self-monitoring</strong></td>
<td>Students will monitor and record their academic production (completeness/accuracy) and on-task behavior each day.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Passing grade on the report card in the academic area of concern</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**An Illustration**

<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><strong>Small group reading instruction with self-monitoring</strong></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. K - 1.</td>
<td>Students who: <strong>Behavior:</strong> Fall SRSS at moderate (4 - 8) or high (9 – 21) risk. <strong>Academic:</strong> Fall AIMSweb LNF at the strategic or intensive level.</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>
</tbody>
</table>

---

First Grade Students’ Self Monitoring Form

Treatment Integrity
Social Validity
Monitor student progress

Support | Description | Schoolwide Data: Entry Criteria | Data to Monitor Progress: | Exit Criteria
--- | --- | --- | --- | ---
READ 180 (Stage C) Reading Intervention | Students participate in a 10 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. | (1) Students in grades 9 – 12 | (1) Students must instructional reading goals | (1) Students must instructional reading goals | (1) Students must instructional reading goals | (2) Reading performance basic or below basic or State Assessment (but above 4th grade reading level) | (3) SRSS risk score in the moderate range (4 – 8) | (4) SRSS score in the low risk category (0 – 3) on the next screening time point. | (5) Curriculume-based Assessments | (6) Assessment of class attendance | (7) Completion of weekly checklists for activities completed. | (8) Student and teacher feedback surveys. | (9) Student and teacher feedback surveys. | (10) Student and teacher feedback surveys. | (11) Student and teacher feedback surveys. | (12) Student and teacher feedback surveys. | (13) Student and teacher feedback surveys. | (14) Student and teacher feedback surveys. | (15) Student and teacher feedback surveys. | (16) Student and teacher feedback surveys. | (17) Student and teacher feedback surveys. | (18) Student and teacher feedback surveys. | (19) Student and teacher feedback surveys. | (20) Student and teacher feedback surveys.
### Targeted Algebra II Study Hall

**Description:** 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.

- 50 min per day until exit criteria is met.

**Schoolwide Data:**
- Entry Criteria:
  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

**Data to Monitor Progress:**
- Algebra II classroom grades
  - Daily class average if grade is ≤ 75

**Exit Criteria:**
- Yearlong support
  - Students who no longer meet criteria next fall
  - Seniors: graduation


### Mentoring Program (Sophomores, Juniors, Seniors)

**Focus:** 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.

**Entry Criteria:**
- (1) 10th/11th/12th graders
- (2) Algebra II Grade drops below a 75 at any point in the semester

**Data to Monitor Progress:**
- Algebra II classroom grades
  - Daily class average if grade is ≤ 75

**Exit Criteria:**
- Yearlong support
  - Students who no longer meet criteria next fall
  - Seniors: graduation

Comprehensive, Integrated, Three-Tiered Model of Prevention

(Lane, Kalberg, & Menzies, 2009)

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

≈15%

Secondary Prevention (Tier 2)

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

≈80%

Primary Prevention (Tier 1)

Academic Behavioral Social

PBIS Framework

Validated Curricula

Changes in Harry’s Behavior

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

Getting Started with Systematic Screening ...
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

share

Overview with Faculty & Staff; Build Reactive Plan

Session 1:
2 hr
CI3T Models: An Overview
Share Overview, Mission, & Staff, Roles & Responsibilities

Session 2:
Full Day
Building the Primary Prevention Plan

Session 3:
2 hr
How to Monitor the Plan
Share Screeners, Protocols & Monitoring Schedule

Session 4:
Full Day
Building Tier 2 Supports
Share CI3T Plan, Evaluation & Secondary Grid

Session 5:
2 hr
Building Tier 3 Supports
Share revised CI3T plan; Complete CI3T Feedback Form

Session 6:
Full Day
Prepare to Implement Finalize & Share

MTSS: CI3T Training Series

- Additional Professional Development on Specific Topics
- Core Content Curriculum
- Check In - Check Out
- Reading, Math, Writing, Instructional Coaching, and Program Monitoring Tools
- Additional Tier 3 Supports

Lane and Oakes 2013
The Professional Development Training Series


USD 497 MTSS-CI3T Model of Support

2015-2016 Professional Learning Offerings

Lane and Oakes 2013
Monthly Faculty Presentations

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.