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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, & Menzie, 2009)

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

Tertiary Prevention (Tier 3)

=15%
Secondary Prevention (Tier 2)

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

PBIS Framework

Validation Curricula

Primary Prevention (Tier 1)

=80%

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

Academic Behavioral Social
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Our Journey…

....an evolution

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

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

Tier 3
Tertiary Prevention (≤5%)

Tier 2
Secondary Prevention (≤15%)

Tier 1
Primary Prevention/Early Intervention/Comprehensive, Integrated, Three-Tiered Model of Prevention

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

Tier 3
Tertiary Prevention (≤5%)

Tier 2
Secondary Prevention (≤15%)

Tier 1
Primary Prevention/Early Intervention

C3T Professional Learning Series
Lawrence Public Schools ... Ci3T Training & Implementation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Phase</th>
<th>2013-14</th>
<th>14-15</th>
<th>15-16</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Elementary School</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ci3T Training</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Implementation Year 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Implementation Year 2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sustain and Develop Practices</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Middle and High Schools</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ci3T Training</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Implementation Year 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Implementation Year 2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sustain and Develop Practices</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>College and Career Center</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ci3T Training</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Implementation Year 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Implementation Year 2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sustain and Develop Practices</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

USD 497 MTSS-Ci3T Model of Support

- **Academic**
- **Behavioral**
- **Social**

- **Positive Behavioral Interventions and Supports (PBIS) Framework**
- **Validated Curricula**
- **Blended Learning Environments**
- **Personalized Learning**
- **Differentiation**

USD 497 School Board Priorities: The Foundation

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

Secondary (Tier 2) Intervention Grids

Tertiary (Tier 3) Intervention Grids

Implementation Science
(Adapted from Nosheen & Murali, 2006)

- **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)
Transparency, Access, & Collaboration
Benefits of Ci3T Models
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What screening tools are available?

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

www.ci3t.org

Considerations

Psychometrically Sound

Socially Valid

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Screening Time Point</th>
<th>Nominated But Did Not Exceed Criteria</th>
<th>Exceeded Normative Criteria</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Winter 2007 (N=60)</td>
<td>47 (7%)</td>
<td>13 (21%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Winter 2008 (N=69)</td>
<td>59 (8.7%)</td>
<td>17 (25%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Winter 2009 (N=66)</td>
<td>60 (9.1%)</td>
<td>13 (20%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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 behaviors.

Sample Data – SSBD 2007-2011 Risk Status for Nominated Students

Externalizing

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Screening Time Point</th>
<th>Nominated But Did Not Exceed Criteria</th>
<th>Exceeded Normative Criteria</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Winter 2007 (N=60)</td>
<td>47 (7%)</td>
<td>13 (21%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Winter 2008 (N=69)</td>
<td>63 (9.2%)</td>
<td>9 (13%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Winter 2009 (N=66)</td>
<td>57 (8.6%)</td>
<td>11 (16%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: The numbers represent totals for the students for whom the SSBD was completed.
Sample Data – SSBD
2007-2011 Risk Status for Nominated Students
Internalizing

Number of students

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 *S</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>4 (5.56%)</td>
<td>1 (1.39%)</td>
<td>3 (4.17%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1st</td>
<td>66 *98/81</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>1 (1.54%)</td>
<td>0 (0.00%)</td>
<td>1 (1.54%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd</td>
<td>60 *10</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>3 (5.00%)</td>
<td>2 (3.33%)</td>
<td>1 (1.67%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Students missing

SSBD Data Over Time
Comparing Fall 2007 to Winter 2007

Student Risk Screening Scale (SRSS; 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
- Peer Rejection
- Low Academic Achievement
- Negative Attitude
- Aggressive Behavior

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

Available from ci3t.org and miblsi.org

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

Student Risk Screening Scale
Fall 2004 – 2012
Middle School

Variable
Low (n = 422) M (SD) Moderate (n = 51) M (SD) High (n = 12) M (SD) Significance Testing

ODR 1.50 (2.85) 5.02 (5.22) 8.42 (7.01) L=M=H
In-School Suspensions 0.08 (0.38) 0.35 (1.04) 1.71 (2.26) L=M=H
GPA 3.35 (0.52) 2.63 (0.65) 2.32 (0.59) L=M, H M=H
Course Failures 0.68 (1.50) 2.78 (3.46) 4.17 (3.49) L=M, H M=H


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

Lane, Parks, Kalberg, & Carter, 2007
### Student Risk Screening Scale

**High School: Behavioral & Academic Characteristics of SRSS**

**Risk Groups**

<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 (0.82)</td>
<td>2.45 (0.84)</td>
<td>2.38 (0.88)</td>
<td>L &gt; M, H</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

### 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.
**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**

- 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></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>Items 1-7</td>
<td>Items 8-12</td>
<td>Items 1-7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0-3 = low risk</td>
<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>
<td>4-8 = moderate risk</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9-21 = high risk</td>
<td>4-15 = high risk</td>
<td>9-21 = high risk</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Elementary School Levels:

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

% of Students Screened

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Screening Time Point</th>
<th>F14</th>
<th>F15</th>
<th>F16</th>
<th>F17</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Low Risk (0-3)</td>
<td>46%</td>
<td>48%</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>47%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moderate (4-8)</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>19%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High (9-21)</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>34%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

% of Students Screened

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Screening Time Point</th>
<th>F14</th>
<th>F15</th>
<th>F16</th>
<th>F17</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Low Risk (0-1)</td>
<td>71%</td>
<td>76%</td>
<td>77%</td>
<td>71%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moderate (2-3)</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>18%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High (4-15)</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>11%</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>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.

Elementary School Level:

Middle and High School Levels:
Sample High School Fall (Externalizing) 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>

Sample High School Fall (Internalizing) 2016
SRSS-I6 Results – All Students

Screening Time Point

Low Risk (0-3)  | Moderate (4-5)  | High (6-18)  

N = 87          | N = 64          | N = 1387      

% of Students Screened
0%  | 20%  | 40%  | 60%  | 80%  | 100%  

F16  | F17  | F18  | F19  

90.18%  | 4.16%  | 5.66%  

Sample High School Fall (Internalizing) 2016
SRSS-I6 Comparison by Grade Level

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Grade Level</th>
<th>N Screened</th>
<th>Low (0-3)</th>
<th>Moderate (4-5)</th>
<th>High (6-18)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>9th</td>
<td>397</td>
<td>353 (88.92%)</td>
<td>24 (6.05%)</td>
<td>20 (5.04%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10th</td>
<td>428</td>
<td>388 (90.65%)</td>
<td>14 (3.27%)</td>
<td>26 (6.07%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11th</td>
<td>396</td>
<td>353 (89.14%)</td>
<td>16 (4.04%)</td>
<td>27 (6.82%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12th</td>
<td>317</td>
<td>293 (92.43%)</td>
<td>10 (3.15%)</td>
<td>14 (4.42%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 3.

**Middle School: Behavioral and Academic Characteristics of Risk Groups According to Fall SRSS-IE Subscale Scores**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subscale/Variable</th>
<th>Risk</th>
<th>Low M (SD)</th>
<th>Moderate M (SD)</th>
<th>High M (SD)</th>
<th>Significance Testing</th>
<th>Effect Size</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Low Moderate</td>
<td>High</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>L/M L/H M/H</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Externalizing</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grade point</td>
<td>3.56 (0.47)</td>
<td>3.07 (0.58)</td>
<td>2.74 (0.61)</td>
<td></td>
<td>L &gt; M &gt; H 1.01 0.72</td>
<td>0.56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>average</td>
<td>1,670</td>
<td>279</td>
<td>84</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Course failures</td>
<td>0.38 (1.15)</td>
<td>1.37 (2.12)</td>
<td>2.78 (3.03)</td>
<td></td>
<td>L &lt; M &lt; H 0.74 1.84</td>
<td>0.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1,830</td>
<td>328</td>
<td>83</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nurse visits</td>
<td>4.01 (16.20)</td>
<td>6.67 (8.65)</td>
<td>9.66 (11.65)</td>
<td></td>
<td>L &lt; M, H 0.17 0.35 0.32</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1,830</td>
<td>328</td>
<td>93</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Office discipline</td>
<td>0.03 (0.24)</td>
<td>0.17 (0.63)</td>
<td>0.75 (2.13)</td>
<td></td>
<td>L &lt; M &lt; H 0.42 1.38 0.51</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>referrals</td>
<td>1,830</td>
<td>328</td>
<td>93</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In-school</td>
<td>0.11 (0.89)</td>
<td>0.67 (2.74)</td>
<td>1.56 (5.22)</td>
<td></td>
<td>L &lt; M &lt; H 0.42 1.30 0.31</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>suspensions</td>
<td>1,830</td>
<td>328</td>
<td>93</td>
<td></td>
<td></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.

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>Risk</th>
<th>Low M (SD)</th>
<th>Moderate M (SD)</th>
<th>High M (SD)</th>
<th>Significance Testing</th>
<th>Effect Size</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Low Moderate</td>
<td>High</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>L/M L/H M/H</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Internalizing</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grade point</td>
<td>3.51 (0.51)</td>
<td>3.33 (0.55)</td>
<td>3.16 (0.64)</td>
<td></td>
<td>L &gt; M &gt; H 0.35 0.66</td>
<td>0.28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>average</td>
<td>1,642</td>
<td>167</td>
<td>224</td>
<td></td>
<td></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></td>
<td>L &lt; M, H 0.23 0.46 0.18</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1,820</td>
<td>181</td>
<td>250</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nurse visits</td>
<td>4.32 (16.39)</td>
<td>4.95 (6.92)</td>
<td>6.77 (9.56)</td>
<td></td>
<td>L &lt; M, H 0.60 0.16 0.22</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1,820</td>
<td>181</td>
<td>250</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Office discipline</td>
<td>0.06 (0.40)</td>
<td>0.17 (1.24)</td>
<td>0.19 (0.75)</td>
<td></td>
<td>N.S. 0.21 0.29 0.02</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>referrals</td>
<td>1,820</td>
<td>181</td>
<td>250</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In-school</td>
<td>0.18 (1.10)</td>
<td>0.67 (3.59)</td>
<td>0.45 (1.47)</td>
<td></td>
<td>L &lt; M, H 0.33 0.24 -0.09</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>suspensions</td>
<td>1,820</td>
<td>181</td>
<td>250</td>
<td></td>
<td></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.
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><strong>Total Difficulties</strong></td>
<td>N=77</td>
<td>n=40</td>
<td>n=12</td>
<td>n=25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>66 (51.95%)</td>
<td>15 (15.88%)</td>
<td>32 (42.47%)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emotional Symptoms</td>
<td>N=78</td>
<td>n=54</td>
<td>n=3</td>
<td>n=11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>82.05%</td>
<td>3.85%</td>
<td>14.10%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conduct Problems</td>
<td>N=78</td>
<td>n=53</td>
<td>n=7</td>
<td>n=22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>67.38%</td>
<td>9.97%</td>
<td>28.21%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hyperactivity</td>
<td>N=78</td>
<td>n=51</td>
<td>n=5</td>
<td>n=11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6.41%</td>
<td>6.41%</td>
<td>14.10%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peer Problems</td>
<td>N=77</td>
<td>n=54</td>
<td>n=11</td>
<td>n=12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>70.13%</td>
<td>14.29%</td>
<td>15.58%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prosocial Behavior</td>
<td>N=78</td>
<td>n=54</td>
<td>n=11</td>
<td>n=11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>82.05%</td>
<td>3.85%</td>
<td>14.10%</td>
<td></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

```
---

```
Social Skills Improvement System – Performance Screening Guide

Available from Pearson Education, PsychCorp™

(SSIS-PSG; Elliott & Gresham, 2007)

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

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scale</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Total and Social</th>
<th>Total and Academic</th>
<th>Total and Emotional</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Students</td>
<td>69%</td>
<td>73%</td>
<td>76%</td>
<td>71%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Identified as at-risk</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>29%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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 subscale interpretation is the most defensible.

SOURCE: Kilgus, Kilpatrick, Taylor, Eklund, & von der Embse, 2016 (in prep)
Starting the year with Ci3T...

**Screening Practices**

- District system...
- Preparing...
- Previewing...
- Dedicating time...
- Reminding...
- Supporting...
- Following through...
- Summarizing...
- Using data to inform instruction...

---

**Data sharing...**

- Schoolwide data...decisions related to primary prevention efforts
- Grade/ Department/ Class...implications for teachers' practice
- Individual student...decisions about student-based interventions
Sample Middle School: Fall SRSS-E7 Results – All Students

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Screening Time Point</th>
<th>F15</th>
<th>F16</th>
<th>F17</th>
<th>F18</th>
<th>F19</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>% of Students Screened</td>
<td>82.81%</td>
<td>87.58%</td>
<td>13.30%</td>
<td>10.51%</td>
<td>3.89%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Communication and Continuous Improvement

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ci3T District Leadership Team</th>
<th>Ci3T School Leadership Team</th>
<th>Ci3T School Leadership Team</th>
<th>Ci3T School Leadership Team</th>
<th>Ci3T School Leadership Team</th>
<th>Ci3T School Leadership Team</th>
<th>Ci3T School Leadership Team</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>College &amp; Career</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Screening ... Ci3T leaders’ experiences

www.ci3t.org

Ci3T In Action
Establish clear procedures and supports

Screening Protocol Example

Site-level Coaching Protocol Example

Starting the year with Ci3T...

Procedures for Teaching

• Rolling out and regular teaching of our expectations ...
• Teaching schedule and responsibilities for Connect with Kids ...
• Professional learning on the systematic screening ...
• Support our teachers in learning low-intensity strategies ...

Source:
Lane, Oakes, Cantwell, Royer (2017)
Agenda

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

Examining your screening data ...

... implications for Tier 1 practices
... implications for teacher-delivered strategies
... implications for Tier 2 and Tier 3 supports

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


Student Risk Screening Scale
Middle School Fall 2004 – Fall 2011

Data-Informed Decision Making

A work in progress
Implementation ...
Data-Informed Decision Making

Examining your screening data ...
... implications for Tier 1 practices
... implications for teacher-delivered strategies
... implications for Tier 2 and Tier 3 supports

See Lane, Menchan, Bruhn, and Cimmet (2011)
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

Higher Intensity Strategies

Assessment


Examining Academic and Behavioral Data: Elementary School Level

Examining Academic and Behavioral Data: Elementary School Level

Low-Intensity Strategies

Opportunities to Respond
Behavior Specific Praise
Active Supervision
Instructional Feedback
High p Requests
Pre-correction
Incorporating Choice

Self-monitoring
Behavior Contracts
Behavior-Specific Praise: Identifying the specific expectation the student met.
- "Nicole, great job using your graphic organizer to draft your essay."
- "Justice, thank you for pushing in your chair to keep the walkway safe."

Opportunities to Respond: Creating frequent opportunities for students to respond to teacher names. Teachers should provide approximately four to six opportunities to respond per minute. The response can be individual, group, written, or indicated through a gesture or symbol.
- "Show me thumbs up or thumbs down..."
- "Show me on your whiteboard what..."
- "Turn to your elbow partner and say..."
- "All together now, what is..."

Instructional Choice: Providing within-task or between-task choices to increase academic engaged time and motivation.
- "Rafael, of these 3 tasks today, which would you like to work on first?"
- "Sue, do you want to work with colored pencils, crayons, or sparkly markers?"

Low-Intensity Strategy Lincoln Elementary On-Site Expert
- Behavior-Specific Praise: Using specific, appropriate, and congruent praise to provide feedback to a student on his or her behavior or work. Example: "Great job for doing thorough research on your assigned topic today!"
  - David Royer, Administration
  - Emily Cantwell, 5th Grade
  - Scarlett Lane, 3rd Grade
  - Mallory Messenger, Counselor

- Opportunities to Respond: Creating frequent opportunities for students to respond to teacher names. Teachers should provide approximately four to six opportunities to respond per minute. The response can be individual, group, written, or indicated through a gesture or symbol.
  - David Royer, Administration
  - Emily Cantwell, 5th Grade
  - Scarlett Lane, 3rd Grade
  - Mallory Messenger, Counselor

- Instructional Choice: Providing within-task or between-task choices to increase academic engaged time and motivation.
  - David Royer, Administration
  - Emily Cantwell, 5th Grade
  - Scarlett Lane, 3rd Grade
  - Mallory Messenger, Counselor
Monitoring Progress

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Treatment Integrity</th>
<th>Social Validity</th>
<th>Experimental Design</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Is it happening?</td>
<td>What do stakeholders think about the goals, procedures, and outcomes?</td>
<td>How well did this support work for this student?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Examining your screening data...

...implications for Tier 1 practices
...implications for teacher-delivered strategies
...implications for Tier 2 and Tier 3 supports

See Lane, Menzies, Bruhn, and Crnobori (2011)

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

Organizing Tiered Interventions
### 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><strong>Behavior:</strong> SRSS - 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 Treatment Integrity Social Validity</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 (completion/accuracy) and on-task behavior each day.</td>
<td><strong>Behavior:</strong> Students who score in the abnormal range for H and CP on the SDQ; <strong>Academic:</strong> course failure or at risk on CBM</td>
<td>Work completion and accuracy in the academic area of concern; passing grades; treatment Integrity Social Validity</td>
<td>Passing grade on the report card in the academic area of concern</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Luna, Kalberg, & Meneses (2009). pp. 131 –137, Boxes 6.1 – 6.4

---

### Secondary Tiered Interventions for Middle and High School Students

<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.</td>
<td><strong>Behavior:</strong> Fall SRSS at moderate (4 – 8) or high (9 – 21) risk <strong>Academic:</strong> Fall AIMSwet LNF at the strategic or intensive level</td>
<td>AIMSwet reading PSF and NWF progress monitoring probes (weekly) Daily self-monitoring checklists Treatment Integrity Social Validity</td>
<td>Ment AIMSwet reading benchmark at next screening time point. Low Risk on SRSS at next screening time point.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

<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.</td>
<td><strong>Behavior:</strong> Fall SRSS at moderate (4 – 8) or high (9 – 21) risk <strong>Academic:</strong> Fall AIMSwet LNF at the strategic or intensive level</td>
<td>AIMSwet reading PSF and NWF progress monitoring probes (weekly) Daily self-monitoring checklists Treatment Integrity Social Validity</td>
<td>Ment AIMSwet reading benchmark at next screening time point. Low Risk on SRSS at next screening time point.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

<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.</td>
<td><strong>Behavior:</strong> Fall SRSS at moderate (4 – 8) or high (9 – 21) risk <strong>Academic:</strong> Fall AIMSwet LNF at the strategic or intensive level</td>
<td>AIMSwet reading PSF and NWF progress monitoring probes (weekly) Daily self-monitoring checklists Treatment Integrity Social Validity</td>
<td>Ment AIMSwet reading benchmark at next screening time point. Low Risk on SRSS at next screening time point.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Sample Elementary Intervention Grid: PA**

**Support**
- Positive Action (PA) – counselor-led small group

**Description**
- Counselors and/or social workers will lead small group Positive Action sessions for approximately 30-40 min 2-3 days per week. Students will acquire new skills, learn how to engage more fully in instructional experiences, and learn how to meet more school-wide expectations. Small groups will run for up to 24 sessions (8 to 12 weeks depending on the number of sessions conducted per week) using a subset of Positive Action lessons appropriate for student skillsets as identified using Skills For Greatness (teacher, counselor, parent versions) and SSiS-Rating Scale (teacher and parent version).

**Data to Monitor**

- **Behavior**
  - SRSS-E7 score: Moderate (4-8) and/or
  - SRSS-I5 score: Moderate (2-3)
  - 2 or fewer absences in first 3 months of school
  - Evidence of teacher implementation of Ci3T primary (Tier 1) plan [treatment integrity: direct observation]
  - Parent permission

- **Academic**
  - Student is in grade 2 or 3

**Student measures**
- SSiS-Rating Scale (Pre/Post)
- Skills for Greatness (Pre/Post)
- Daily behavior report (DBR; daily)
- Attendance and tardies

**Social validity**
- Teacher: IRP-15
- Student: CIRP

**Treatment integrity**
- Tier 2 treatment integrity measures
- Ci3T TI: Direct observation (30 min if needed)

**Exit criteria**
- Review student progress at end of 24 sessions
- Team agrees goals have been met or no further Positive Action small group sessions are warranted
- SRSS-E7 and I5 scores are in the low risk category

---

**Sample Elementary Intervention Grid: SSIS**

**Support**
- Social Skills Improvement System (SSIS) – counselor-led small group

**Description**
- Counselors and/or social workers will lead small group SSIS sessions for approximately 30-40 min 2-3 days per week. Students will acquire new skills, learn how to engage more fully in instructional experiences, and learn how to meet more school-wide expectations. Small groups will run for up to 24 sessions (8 to 12 weeks depending on the number of sessions conducted per week) using a subset of SSIS lessons appropriate for student skillsets as identified using SSIS-Rating Scale (teacher and parent version).

**Data to Monitor**

- **Behavior**
  - SRSS-E7 score: Moderate (4-8) and/or
  - SRSS-I5 score: Moderate (2-3)
  - 2 or fewer absences in first 3 months of school
  - Evidence of teacher implementation of Ci3T primary (Tier 1) plan [treatment integrity: direct observation]
  - Parent permission

- **Academic**
  - Student is in grade 2 or 3

**Student measures**
- SSiS-Rating Scale (Pre/Post)
- Skills for Greatness (Pre/Post)
- Daily behavior report (DBR; daily)
- Attendance and tardies

**Social validity**
- Teacher: IRP-15
- Student: CIRP

**Treatment integrity**
- Tier 2 treatment integrity measures
- Ci3T TI: Direct observation (30 min if needed)

**Exit criteria**
- Review student progress at end of 24 sessions
- Team agrees goals have been met or no further SSIS small group sessions are warranted
- SRSS-E7 and I5 scores are in the low risk category

---

**Active Supervision**

- https://eclkc.ohs.acf.hhs.gov/safety-practices
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Support Description</th>
<th>Schoolwide Data:</th>
<th>Data to Monitor:</th>
<th>Exit Criteria</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>READ 180</strong> (Stage C) Reading Intervention</td>
<td>Students participate in a 50 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.</td>
<td>(1) Students in grades 9 – 12</td>
<td>Students must instructional reading goals. SKISS score in the low risk category (0 – 3) on the next screening time point.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Support Description 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:**

1. Student Measures: Algebra II classroom grades
2. Daily class average if grade is ≤ 75
3. Treatment Integrity: Daily monitoring of the lessons covered and student understanding
4. Social Validity: Pre and Post Student Surveys

**Exit Criteria**

1. Targeted Algebra II Grade increases to satisfactory level (above 75%).


<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Support Description</th>
<th>Schoolwide Data:</th>
<th>Data to Monitor:</th>
<th>Exit Criteria</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mentoring Program (Sophomores/Seniors)</td>
<td>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.</td>
<td>(1) 10th/11th/12th graders</td>
<td>Students who no longer meet criteria next fall</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Support Description Schoolwide Data:**

**Entry Criteria**

1. Behavior: SRSS: High (9-21) or Moderate (4-8) by either 2nd or 7th period teacher
2. ODR ≥ 2
3. Absences ≥ 5 days in one grading period
4. Academic: GPA ≤ 2.75

**Data to Monitor Progress:**

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)

**Exit Criteria**

1. Students complete weekly mentoring checklists to report meeting time and activities.


<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Support Description</th>
<th>Schoolwide Data:</th>
<th>Data to Monitor:</th>
<th>Exit Criteria</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Targeted Algebra II Study Hall | 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. | (1) 33A grades | Algebra II Grade increases to satisfactory level (above 75%).

**Support Description Schoolwide Data:**

**Entry Criteria**

1. 33A grades
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:**

1. Student Measures: Algebra II classroom grades
2. Daily class average if grade is ≤ 75
3. Treatment Integrity: Daily monitoring of the lessons covered and student understanding
4. Social Validity: Pre and Post Student Surveys

SAMPLE TERTIARY (Tier 3) 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>Functional Assessment Based Intervention</td>
<td>Individualized interventions developed by behavior specialist and PBS team</td>
<td>Students who: - scored in the high risk category on the Student Risk Screening Scale (SRSS), or scored in the clinical range on one of the following Strengths and Difficulties (SDQ) subscales: Emotional Symptoms, Conduct Problems, Hyperactivity, or Prosocial Behavior, - earned more than 5 office discipline referrals (ODR) for major events during a grading period OR identified at highest risk for school failure: recommended for retention; or scored far below basic on state-wide or district-wide assessments</td>
<td>Data will be collected on both the (a) target (problem) behavior and (b) replacement (desirable) behavior identified by the team on an ongoing basis. Weekly teacher report on academic status. ODR data collected weekly.</td>
<td>Treatment Integrity Social Validity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tertiary (Tier 3) Intervention Grids</td>
<td>Tertiary Prevention (Tier 3) Intervention Grids</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Comprehensive, Integrated, Three-Tiered Model of Prevention (Lane, Kalberg, & Menzies, 2009)
Changes in Harry’s Behavior

Agenda

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

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

District Decision Makers (Lane & Oakes, 2012)
CI3T Professional Learning Series

Session 1: 2 hours
- Overview of CI3T prevention models
  - Setting a purpose
  - Establishing team roles and responsibilities

Session 2: Full day
- Mission and purpose
- Establishing roles and responsibilities
- Procedures for teaching and reinforcing
- Procedures for monitoring

Session 3: 2 hours
- Procedures for monitoring

Session 4: Full day
- Revise primary plan using stakeholder feedback
- Prepare presentation

Session 5: 2 hours
- Overview of teacher-focused strategies
- Overview of student-focused strategies
- Using data to determine secondary intervention grid

Session 6: Full day
- Final revisions of CI3T plan based on stakeholder feedback
- Draft tertiary prevention intervention grids

Implementation: Start of Tier 2 and 3 within CI3T

Additional Professional Development on Specific Topics

- Core Content Curriculum
- Reading, Math, Writing
- Functional Assessment-based Interventions
- Student-driven interventions, strategies, and practices
- Check In - Check Out
- Additional Tier 3 Supports

2016-2017 Professional Learning Opportunities
Teacher Delivered
Strategies (T1 T2)
Tier 1
Tier 2
Tier 3

Moving Forward ...

thank you!
What are your
next steps?

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