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• Introduction to Ci3T & Systematic Screening
• Systematic Screening Tools & Screening Logistics
• Using Screening Data to Inform Instruction
  • Tier 1 practices
  • Teacher-delivered strategies
  • Tier 2 and 3 supports
• Action Plans: Moving Forward

Thank you... For Your Commitment

• 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

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
≈80%

Secondary Prevention (Tier 2)
Goal: Reduce Harm
School/classroom-wide systems for all students, staff, & settings
≈15%

Tertiary Prevention (Tier 3)
Goal: Reverse Harm
Specialized individual systems for students with high-risk
≈5%

Validated Curricula
PBIS Framework

The Journey of Comprehensive, Integrated, Three-tiered (Ci3T) Models of Prevention
Comprehensive, Integrated, Three-Tiered Model of Prevention
(Lane, Kalberg, & Menzies, 2009)
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Positive Behavior Interventions and Supports (PBIS)
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Lawrence Public Schools ... CI3T Training & Implementation

Phase 2013-14 14-15 15-16

Elementary School
CI3T Training
Implementation Year 1
Implementation Year 2
Sustain and Develop Practices

Middle and High Schools
CI3T Training
Implementation Year 1
Implementation Year 2
Sustain and Develop Practices

College and Career Center
CI3T Training
Implementation Year 1
Implementation Year 2
Sustain and Develop Practices

USD 497 MTSS-CI3T Model of Support
Ci3T Primary Plan: Roles and Responsibilities

all stakeholder groups

Ci3T Primary Plan: Procedures for Teaching

Ci3T Primary Plan: Procedures for Reinforcing

Ci3T Primary Plan: Procedures for Monitoring
Communication:
Soliciting Feedback, Sharing Progress, Providing Professional Learning

Social Validity
Treatment Integrity
Systematic Screening

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

Tier 3
Tertiary Prevention (~5%)

Tier 2
Secondary Prevention (~15%)

Secondary (Tier 2) Intervention Grids

Secondary Intervention Grid

Behavioral ○ Social

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

Tertiary (Tier 3) Intervention Grids

Secondary Prevention (~15%)

Tertiary Intervention

Behavioral ○ Social
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)
Systematic Screener for Behavior Disorders

Available from Pacific Northwest Publishing

(SSBD 2nd ed.; Walker, Severson, & Feil, 2014)

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 Behavior 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

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 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
- Negative Attitude
- Behavior Problems
- Aggressive Behavior
- Peer Rejection

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

(SRSS; Drummond, 1994)
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 (7.91)</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 &gt; 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 &gt; M, H, M &gt; 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 &gt; 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 for Internalizing and Externalizing

Available on ci3t.org
(SRSS-IE; 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

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

Elementary School Levels:

Middle and High School Levels:
Sample Elementary School Fall (Externalizing)  
SRSS-E7 Results – All Students

Sample Elementary School: Fall (Internalizing)  
SRSS-I5 Results – All Students

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>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>
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>Subscale/Variable</th>
<th>Elementary School</th>
<th>Middle and High School</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SRSS-E7</td>
<td>SRSS-I5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grade point average</td>
<td>3.56(0.47)</td>
<td>3.07(0.58)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Course failures</td>
<td>0.18(1.15)</td>
<td>1.37(2.12)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nurse visits</td>
<td>4.01(16.20)</td>
<td>6.67(8.65)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Office discipline referrals</td>
<td>0.03(0.19)</td>
<td>0.17(0.63)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In-school suspensions</td>
<td>0.11(0.89)</td>
<td>0.67(2.74)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Within the Moderate and High risk levels, sub-scales are not statistically different. M = moderate risk. N.S = post hoc comparisons suggest no statistically significant differences.
### Table 3. continued
Middle School: Behavioral and Academic Characteristics of Risk Groups According to Fall SRSS-IE Subscale Scores

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subscale/Variable</th>
<th>Low Risk (M ± SD)</th>
<th>Moderate Risk (M ± SD)</th>
<th>High Risk (M ± SD)</th>
<th>Significance Testing</th>
<th>Effect Size</th>
<th>L-M</th>
<th>L-H</th>
<th>M-H</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Grade point average</td>
<td>3.51 (0.51)</td>
<td>3.33 (0.55)</td>
<td>3.16 (0.64)</td>
<td>L &gt; M &gt; H</td>
<td>0.35</td>
<td>0.66</td>
<td>0.28</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Course failures</td>
<td>0.52 (1.42)</td>
<td>0.86 (1.85)</td>
<td>1.22 (2.06)</td>
<td>L &lt; M, H</td>
<td>0.23</td>
<td>0.46</td>
<td>0.18</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nurse visits</td>
<td>4.32 (16.59)</td>
<td>4.85 (6.92)</td>
<td>6.77 (9.56)</td>
<td>L &lt; H</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td>0.16</td>
<td>0.22</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Office discipline referrals</td>
<td>0.06 (0.40)</td>
<td>0.17 (1.24)</td>
<td>0.19 (0.75)</td>
<td>N.S.</td>
<td>0.21</td>
<td>0.29</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In-school suspensions</td>
<td>0.18 (1.10)</td>
<td>0.67 (3.59)</td>
<td>0.45 (1.47)</td>
<td>L &lt; M, H</td>
<td>0.33</td>
<td>0.24</td>
<td>-0.09</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note: SRSS-IE = Student Risk Screening Scale for Internalizing and Externalizing Behaviors; H = high risk; L = low risk; M = moderate risk. N.S. = post hoc comparisons suggest no statistically significant differences.*
Examining your screening data ...

... implications for Tier 1 practices
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See Lane, Meneses, Bruhn, and Crnobori (2011)
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Exposing Academic and Behavioral Data: Elementary School Level


Examining Academic and Behavioral Data:
Elementary School Level

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Opportunities to Respond</th>
<th>Behavior Specific Praise</th>
<th>Active Supervision</th>
<th>Instructional Feedback</th>
<th>High Request</th>
<th>Precorrection</th>
<th>Incorporating Choice</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Low-Intensity Strategies

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Behaviors: Specific Praise</th>
<th>Behavior Specific Praise</th>
<th>Active Supervision</th>
<th>Instructional Feedback</th>
<th>High Request</th>
<th>Precorrection</th>
<th>Incorporating Choice</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

| Opportunities to respond | Creating frequent opportunities for students to respond to teacher inquiries. Teachers should provide approximately four to eight opportunities per class hour, offering verbal, written, or visual feedback, as well as correction or guidance. |

| Choice and Preferred Activities | Offering students the opportunity to choose which instructional activity they wish to complete. This increases on-task behavior and decreases problem behaviors. |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Low-Intensiy Strategies</th>
<th>Lawrence High School Experts</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>BE Chrost, Administration</td>
<td>Beth Williams, Learning Coach/MC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jake S., Physical Education</td>
<td>Laura Kitzler, Physical Education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Katie W., Emotional Support</td>
<td>Mike Hayner, Special Education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John T., Special Education</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2/16/2018
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Comprehensive, Integrated, Three-Tiered Model of Prevention
(Lane, Kalberg, & Menzies, 2009)

Sample Secondary Intervention Grid

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Support</th>
<th>Description</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>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-monitoring</td>
<td>Students will monitor and record their academic production (completion, accuracy) and on-task behavior each day.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Schoolwide Entry Criteria</th>
<th>Work to Progress</th>
<th>Exit Criteria</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Behavior: SRISS - mod to high risk Academic: 2 or more missing assignments with in a grading period</td>
<td>Work completion, or other behavior addressed in contract</td>
<td>Successful completion of behavior contract</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academic: course failure or at risk on GSEM</td>
<td>Treatment Integrity</td>
<td>Social Validity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Behavioral: students who score in the abnormal/range for H and CP on the SDQ; Academic: course failure or at risk on GSEM</td>
<td>Work completion and accuracy in the academic area of concern; passing grades; treatment integ</td>
<td>Social Validity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-monitoring: Students will 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>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Lane, Kalberg, & Menzies (2009). pp. 131 – 137, Boxes 6.1 – 6.4
### Small group Reading Instruction with Self-Monitoring

<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>Small group reading instruction</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: Fall SRSS at moderate (4 – 8) or high (9 – 21) risk Academic: 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

[Image of First Grade Students’ Self Monitoring Form]


Treatment Integrity
Social Validity
Monitor student progress

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

SAMPLE TERTIARY (Tier 3) INTERVENTION GRID
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)
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 and staff; Build reactive plan

Homework
Finalize and share expectation matrix and teaching & reinforcing components

Homework
Share screeners; Complete assessment schedule

Homework
Share revised Ci3T plan; Complete Ci3T Feedback Form

Implementation: Start of Tier 2 and 3 within Ci3T
Learning & Growing Together: Respectful, Responsible Partnerships

Kathleen.Lane@ku.edu
www.ci3t.org