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Agenda
• 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

Thank you…
Commitment to 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 Assistant Sec. Rehabilitation

Comprehensive, Integrated, Three-Tiered Model of Prevention
(Lane, Kalberg, & Menzie, 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

Academic ◇ Behavioral ◇ Social

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

Session 1: 2 hours
- Ci3T model overview

Session 2: Full day
- Focusing on the primary tier
- Student team development

Session 3: 2 hours
- Focusing on the secondary tier
- Building Tier 2 supports

Session 4: Full day
- Building Tier 3 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 and staff; build reactive plan

Finalize and share expectation matrix and teaching & reinforcing components

Screeners; complete assessment schedule

Share Ci3T plan; complete PIRS; complete secondary grid

Share revised Ci3T plan; complete Ci3T Feedback Form

Implementation

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

Primary Prevention (Tier 1)
≈80%

Secondary Prevention (Tier 2)
≈15%

Tertiary Prevention (Tier 3)
≈5%
Comprehensive, Integrated, Three-Tiered Model of Prevention
(Lane, Kalberg, & Menzies, 2009)

Tertiary Prevention (Tier 3)
≈15%
Secondary Prevention (Tier 2)
≈80%
Primary Prevention (Tier 1)

Academic Behavioral Social

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

Ci3T Primary Plan: Roles and Responsibilities

all stakeholder groups
Procedures for Teaching
Faculty and Staff:

Students:

Parents/Community:

https://youtu.be/b4swsa_knYE

Procedures for Reinforcing
Faculty and Staff:

Students:

Parents/Community:

Donation Coupon for:
1 box of Macaroni and Cheese to Community Food Drive
Essential Components of Primary Prevention Efforts

- Social Validity
- Treatment Integrity
- Systematic Screening

Academic Behavior

School Demographics
Student Demographic Information
Screening Measures
SRSS-IE

Student Outcome Measures - Academic

Student Outcome Measures - Behavior

Program Measures
- Social Validity - PIRAS
- Schoolwide Evaluation Tool (SET)
- UPI Treatment Integrity

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

- Tertiary Prevention (Tier 3)
- Secondary (Tier 2) Intervention Grids

≈15%
≈80%
≈5%
Comprehensive, Integrated, Three-Tiered Model of Prevention
(Lane, Kalberg, & Menzies, 2009)

**Tertiary Prevention (Tier 3)**

Tertiary (Tier 3) Intervention Grids

**Secondary Prevention (Tier 2)**

**Primary Prevention (Tier 1)**

Academic Behavioral Social

≈80%

≈15%

≈5%

Implementation Science

Adapted from Fixsen & Blasé, 2005

- **Exploration & Adoption**
  - We think we know what we need so we are planning to move forward (evidence-based)

- **Installation**
  - Let’s make sure we’re ready to implement (capacity infrastructure)

- **Initial Implementation**
  - Let’s give it a try & evaluate (demonstration)

- **Full Implementation**
  - That worked, let’s do it for real (investment)

- **Sustainability & Continuous Regeneration**
  - Let’s make it our way of doing business (institutionalized use)

What screening tools are available?

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Steal</td>
<td>0-3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low Academic Achievement</td>
<td>0-3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lie, Cheat, Sneak</td>
<td>0-3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Negative Attitude</td>
<td>0-3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Behavior Problems</td>
<td>0-3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aggressive Behavior</td>
<td>0-3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peer Rejection</td>
<td>0-3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Student Risk Screening Scale
Middle School Fall 2004 - Fall 2011

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) M (SD)</th>
<th>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 (7.01)</td>
<td>L &lt; M, H</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In-School Suspensions</td>
<td>0.08 (0.38)</td>
<td>0.35 (1.04)</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 &lt; 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 &lt; 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>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</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)

### SRSS-IE for Elementary Schools
**SRSS-IE for Middle and High Schools**

**SRSS-IE: Cut Scores**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Elementary School</th>
<th>Middle and High School</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>SRSS-E7</strong></td>
<td><strong>SRSS-I5</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Items 1-7</td>
<td>Items 8-12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0-3 = low risk</td>
<td>0-3 = low risk</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4-8 = moderate risk</td>
<td>4-8 = moderate risk</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9-21 = high risk</td>
<td>9-21 = high risk</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0-1 = low risk</td>
<td>2-3 = moderate risk</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4-8 = moderate risk</td>
<td>4-15 = high risk</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**ES Fall**

SRSS-E7 Results – All Students

- F14: N = 34, 67.9%
- F15: N = 59, 56.8%
- F16: N = 76, 52.6%
- F17: N = 29, 8.5%

- Low Risk (0-3): 76.8%
- Moderate (4-8): 76.8%
- High (9-21): 82.6%
### ES Fall
**SRSS-I5 Results – All Students**

- **Screening Time Point**
  - Low Risk (0-1)
  - Moderate (2-3)
  - High (4-15)

- **% of Students Screened**
  - F14: 20%
  - F15: 40%
  - F16: 60%
  - F17: 80%

- **N** values:
  - N = 55
  - N = 90
  - N = 37
  - N = 64

### HS Fall
**SRSS-E7 Results – All Students**

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

- **% of Students Screened**
  - F15: 89.56%
  - F16: 91.29%
  - F17: 8.02%
  - F18: 6.18%
  - F19: 2.42%

- **N** values:
  - N = 29
  - N = 96
  - N = 1404

### HS Fall 2016
**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>9th</td>
<td>397</td>
<td>361 (90.93%)</td>
<td>29 (7.30%)</td>
<td>7 (1.76%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10th</td>
<td>428</td>
<td>381 (89.02%)</td>
<td>32 (7.48%)</td>
<td>15 (3.50%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11th</td>
<td>396</td>
<td>363 (91.67%)</td>
<td>24 (6.06%)</td>
<td>9 (2.27%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12th</td>
<td>317</td>
<td>299 (94.32%)</td>
<td>10 (3.15%)</td>
<td>8 (2.52%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Examining your screening data ...

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

See Lane, Mencies, Bruhn, and Crobabri (2011)
Social Skills Improvement System – Performance Screening Guide
Spring 2012 – Total School


Student Risk Screening Scale
Middle School Fall 2004 – Fall 2011

Lane & Oakes

Examining your screening data ...
...
See Lane, Menian, Bruhn, and Cribborth (2011)
Examining Academic and Behavioral Data: Elementary School Level


Low-Intensity Strategies

- Opportunities to Respond
- Behavior Specific Praise
- Active Supervision
- Instructional Feedback
- High P Requests
- Precorrection
- Incorporating Choice

Schoolwide Positive Behavior Support

Low Intensity Strategies

Higher Intensity Strategies

Assessment

Opportunities to Respond

Behavior Specific Praise

Active Supervision

Instructional Feedback

High P Requests

Precorrection

Incorporating Choice

Self-monitoring

Behavior Contracts

Assessment

Opportunities to Respond

Behavior Specific Praise

Active Supervision

Instructional Feedback

High P Requests

Precorrection

Incorporating Choice

Self-monitoring

Behavior Contracts

Assessment
Examining your screening data ...

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

See Lane, Menzies, Bruhn, and Crnobori (2011)
BASC$^2$ – Behavior and Emotional Screening Scale
Spring 2012

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subgroup</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Sixth</th>
<th>Seventh</th>
<th>Eighth</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>624</td>
<td>219</td>
<td>202</td>
<td>203</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Percent of Students</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>80%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subgroup</th>
<th>Normal</th>
<th>Elevated</th>
<th>Extremely Elevated</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>624</td>
<td>219</td>
<td>203</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Percent of Students</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>85.42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>87.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>82.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36.21</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subgroup</th>
<th>Normal</th>
<th>Elevated</th>
<th>Extremely Elevated</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>533</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Percent of Students</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>10.74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.33</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subgroup</th>
<th>Normal</th>
<th>Elevated</th>
<th>Extremely Elevated</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>624</td>
<td>219</td>
<td>203</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Percent of Students</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3.85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.46</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subgroup</th>
<th>Normal</th>
<th>Elevated</th>
<th>Extremely Elevated</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>533</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Percent of Students</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>80%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

Sample Secondary Intervention Grid

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Support</th>
<th>Description</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>Successful completion of behavior contract</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-monitoring</td>
<td>Students self-monitor and record their academic production (completion/accuracy) and on-task behavior each day.</td>
<td>Passing grade on the report card in the academic area of concern</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subgroup</th>
<th>Behavior Contract</th>
<th>Self-Monitoring</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>Average SRSS - mod to high risk Academic: 2 or more missing assignments with in a grading period</td>
<td>Students who score in the abnormal range for H and CP on the SDQ, course failure or at risk on CBM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sixth</td>
<td>Work completion, or other behavior addressed in contract Treatment Social Validity</td>
<td>Work completion and accuracy in the academic area of concern; passing grades Treatment Social Validity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seventh</td>
<td>Students who score in the abnormal range for H and CP on the SDQ</td>
<td>Passing grade in the academic area of concern</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eighth</td>
<td>Students who score in the abnormal range for H and CP on the SDQ</td>
<td>Students who score in the abnormal range for H and CP on the SDQ</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Lane and Oakes 2013
Instructional Choice

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>OSI: Secondary Tier 2 Intervention Grid</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Description</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students and across small group choices</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>during reading</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>instruction. During language arts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>assignments, choices offered by teacher</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>in general education classroom</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academic improvement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(student &amp; teacher completed)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


Daily Behavior Report Cards

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Daily Behavior Report Cards</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>School-wide Data</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Positive Action: Tier 2 Groups</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students and across small group choices</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>during reading instruction. During language arts assignments, choices offered by teacher in general education classroom</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academic improvement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(student &amp; teacher completed)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Positive Action: Tier 2 Groups

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Positive Action: Tier 2 Groups</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Entry Criteria</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Positive Action: Tier 2 Groups</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students and across small group choices</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>during reading instruction. During language arts assignments, choices offered by teacher in general education classroom</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academic improvement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(student &amp; teacher completed)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Comprehensive, Integrative, Three-Tiered Models of Support

Assess, Design, Implement, and Evaluate

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

Functional Assessment-Based Interventions

Adults, Design, Implement, and Evaluate

Schoolwide Positive Behavior Support

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

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

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

Approximately 80%

PBIS Framework
Validated Curricula

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

Academic
Behavioral
Social

Changes in Harry's Behavior

Baseline 1    Intervention 1  Baseline 2    Intervention 2

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)
Upcoming Professional Development

Professional Development to Support You
Alumni Center

Check Ci3T.org under professional learning for registration links!