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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, & Meneses, 2009)

Tier 3
Tertiary Prevention (=5%)

Tier 2
Secondary Prevention (=15%)

Tier 1
Primary Prevention (=40%)

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)

Tier 3
Tertiary Prevention (~5%)

Tier 2
Secondary Prevention (~15%)

Tier 1
Primary Prevention (~40%)

Positive Action

A Strong, Respectful Partnership...

USD 497
Lawrence Public Schools

University of Kansas

Arizona State University

Florida State University

California State University, Los Angeles

CI3T Professional Learning Series

Session 1: 2 hours
- Team worst-case scenario
- Cooperative Classroom Design

Session 2: Full day
- Building the primary prevention plan

Session 3: 2 hours
- Develop a practical PBIS framework from assessment

Session 4: Full day
- Building Tier 1 supports

Session 5: 2 hours
- Building Tier 2 supports

Session 6: Full day
- Preparing to implement
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

USD 497 School Board Priorities: The Foundation
Academic ◇ Behavioral ◇ Social Validated Curricula PBIS Framework Validated Curricula

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

Tertiary (Tier 3) Intervention Grids
Secondary Prevention (=15%)

Tertiary Intervention
Support
• Social Skills
• Emotional Regulation
• Behavioral Education
• Mental Health
• Academic Skills

Implementation Science
Adapted from Horner & Marx, 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)

A Clear Commitment to Supporting Implementation...
Low-Intensity Strategies

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

Communication and Continuous Improvement

- Ci3T District Leadership Team
- Ci3T School Leadership Team
- Ci3T School Leadership Team
- Ci3T School Leadership Team

Communication:
Soliciting Feedback, Sharing Progress,
Providing Professional Learning

- Social Validity
- Treatment Integrity
- Systematic Screening
2016-2017 Professional Learning Opportunities

Building Capacity & Supporting Sustainability
Professional Learning Offerings for 2016-2017

District Communication with Stakeholders
District Ci3T Updates and Information Sharing
USD 497 MTSS-Ci3T Model of Support

- Positive Behavioral Interventions and Supports (PBIS) Framework
- Primary Support (Tier 1)
- Secondary Support (Tier 2)
- Tertiary Support (Tier 3)

Validated Core Resource
Blended Learning Environments
Personalized Learning
Differentiation

Validated Curricula
ELA Math

Celebrate Your Success!

Ci3T in Missouri

KU ASU
SPECIAL SCHOOL DISTRICT
Academic, Behavioral, and Social/Emotional Outcomes
Leadership Team
Facilitator Expectations (Roles)

Ci3T in Alabama

KU ASU
IES Institute of Education Sciences

Kris Weingaertner-Hartke, Planning and Development Director
Dr. Lisa Powers, Area Coordinator
Carla Vasser, Area Coordinator
Tina Maksche, Area Coordinator
Matt Berry, PBIS Facilitator
Alice Bowers, Literacy Coach
Scott Crooks, Measure and Assessment
Tricia Diebold, MTSS/PBIS Data Specialist
Taryn Gaskill, PBIS Facilitator
Ryan Guffey, PBIS Facilitator
Judy Hyatt, Literacy Coach
Mary Lowe, Facilitator
Tina Payne, Facilitator
Lainie Sgouros, Data Coach
Tamara Timko, Facilitator
Bridget Thomas, PBIS Facilitator

Critical Features of Ci3T
Academic, Behavioral, and Social/Emotional Outcomes
Leadership Team
Explicit Expectations for all Teaching and Reinforcing
Assessment & Monitoring
Feedback Loops

Ci3T in Alabama

KU ASU
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Carla Vasser, Area Coordinator
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Matt Berry, PBIS Facilitator
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Scott Crooks, Measure and Assessment
Tricia Diebold, MTSS/PBIS Data Specialist
Taryn Gaskill, PBIS Facilitator
Ryan Guffey, PBIS Facilitator
Judy Hyatt, Literacy Coach
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Tina Payne, Facilitator
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Critical Features of Ci3T
Academic, Behavioral, and Social/Emotional Outcomes
Leadership Team
Explicit Expectations for all Teaching and Reinforcing
Assessment & Monitoring
Feedback Loops
District Decision Makers

Positive, Productive Playing Fields for Future Inquiry...

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

Tier 3: Tertiary Prevention (≤5%)
Goal: Reduce Harm
Specialized individual systems for students with high risk

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

Tier 1: Primary Prevention (≥85%)
Goal: Prevent Harm
School/classroom-wide systems for all students, staff, and settings

Academic  ◇  Behavioral  ◇  Social
Developing the evidence-base

Psychometric Studies of the Student Risk Screening Scale – Internalizing and Externalizing (SRSS-IE)

SRSS-IE...


<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Rotated Factor Pattern (Promax)</th>
<th>Rotated Factor Pattern (Promax)</th>
<th>Rotated Factor Pattern (Promax)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Externalizing 1</td>
<td>Internalizing 2</td>
<td>h²</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Steal</td>
<td>.76 *</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Lie, cheat, sneak</td>
<td>.68 *</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>.43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Behavior Problem</td>
<td>.69 *</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>.42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Peer rejection</td>
<td>.49 *</td>
<td>.24</td>
<td>.44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Low academic achievement</td>
<td>.49 *</td>
<td>.24</td>
<td>.44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Negative Attitude</td>
<td>.69 *</td>
<td>.17</td>
<td>.59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Aggressive behavior</td>
<td>.67 *</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>.43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Emotionally Flat</td>
<td>.73 *</td>
<td>.31</td>
<td>.53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Shy; withdrawn</td>
<td>.19</td>
<td>.69 *</td>
<td>.58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Sad; depressed</td>
<td>.16</td>
<td>.69 *</td>
<td>.58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Anxious</td>
<td>.16</td>
<td>.69 *</td>
<td>.58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Lonely</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>.80 *</td>
<td>.64</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 5: Exploratory Factor Analysis SRSS-IE12: Rotated Factor Pattern Matrix and Communality Estimates

Note: h² are communality estimates, the sum of the square factor loadings on all factors for a given variable to show how much variance each variable captures. SRSS = Student Risk Screening Scale.

---

**Teacher Invitation Letter**

If you decide to participate, you will use this invitation with other study materials. The packet contains all of the information you need to participate. All study materials will be secured in this envelope and returned to your school office. Please return ALL materials – used and unused.

---

**SRSS-IE: Cut Scores**

- **Elementary School**
  - SRSS-E7: Items 1-7
  - SRSS-I5: Items 8-12
  - Cut Scores:
    - 0-3 = low risk
    - 4-8 = moderate risk
    - 9-21 = high risk

- **Middle and High School**
  - SRSS-E7: Items 1-7
  - SRSS-I6: Items 4, 8-12
  - Cut Scores:
    - 0-3 = low risk
    - 4-5 = moderate risk
    - 6-18 = high risk

---

*Elementary School Levels:*

*Middle and High School Levels:*
SRSS-IE... for Middle and High Schools

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>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>a</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>n</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Externalizing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grade point average</td>
<td>3.56 (0.47)</td>
<td>3.07 (0.58)</td>
<td>2.74 (0.61)</td>
<td>L &gt; M &gt; H 1.01 1.72 0.56</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Course failures</td>
<td>0.38 (1.15)</td>
<td>1.37 (2.12)</td>
<td>2.78 (3.01)</td>
<td>L &lt; M &lt; H 0.74 1.84 0.60</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>L &lt; M, H 0.17 0.35 0.32</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Office discipline referrals</td>
<td>0.03 (0.24)</td>
<td>0.17 (0.63)</td>
<td>0.75 (2.13)</td>
<td>L &lt; M &lt; H 0.42 1.38 0.51</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In-school suspensions</td>
<td>0.11 (0.89)</td>
<td>0.67 (2.74)</td>
<td>1.56 (5.22)</td>
<td>L &lt; M &lt; H 0.42 1.30 0.31</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>
<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>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>n</td>
<td>n</td>
<td>n</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Internalizing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<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 0.35 0.66 0.28</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1,642</td>
<td>167</td>
<td>224</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>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>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nurse visits</td>
<td>4.32 (16.59)</td>
<td>4.85 (6.92)</td>
<td>6.77 (9.58)</td>
<td>L &lt; H 0.03 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>
</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>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>
</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 0.33 0.24 -0.09</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1,820</td>
<td>181</td>
<td>250</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.
Data-Informed Decision Making

Implementation ...
Data-Informed Decision Making

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

Tier 3
Tertiary Prevention (=5%)

Tier 2
Secondary Prevention (=15%)

Tier 1
Primary Prevention (=50%)

Academic ○ Behavioral ○ Social
Low-Intensity Strategies

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

Instructional Choice

Increasing Opportunities to Respond
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>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>Work completion, or other behavior addressed in contract</td>
<td>Treatment Integrity Social Validity</td>
<td>Successful completion of behavior contract</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>
<td>Students who score in the abnormal range for PI and CF on the SDQ; Academic: course failure or at risk on CBM</td>
<td>Work completion and accuracy in the academic area of concern; passing grades</td>
<td>Passing grade on the report card in the academic area of concern</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Lane, Kalberg, & Menzies (2009), pp. 131 - 137, Boxes 6.1 - 6.4
Intervention

- Self-Regulated Strategy Development (SRSD; Harris & Graham, 1996)
- Behavioral Component
- 3 days a week; 30-min sessions delivered 1:1 by a research assistant
- Fidelity collected more than 33% of sessions


Comprehensive, Integrated, Three-Tiered Model of Prevention

(Lane, Kalberg, & Mendes, 2009)
### SAMPLE TERTIARY (Tier 3) INTERVENTION GRID

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Support</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Schoolwide Data</th>
<th>Entry Criteria</th>
<th>Data to Monitor</th>
<th>Exit Criteria</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Functional Assessment Based Intervention</td>
<td>Individualized interventions developed by the behavior specialist and PBS team</td>
<td>Students who: Behavior scored in the high risk category on the Student Risk Screening Scale (SRSS), or scored in the clinical range on one following Strengths and Difficulties Questionnaire sub-scales: Emotional Symptoms, Conduct Problems, Hyperactivity, or Prosocial Behavior; - earned more than 5 office discipline referrals (ODR) for major events during a grading period OR Academic 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>The function-based intervention will be faded once a functional relation is demonstrated using a validated single case methodology design (e.g., withdrawal design) and the behavioral objectives specified in the plan are met.</td>
<td>Treatment Integrity Social Validity</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

A Clear Commitment to Responsible Inquiry...
Issues and Strategies for Accessing Researchable School Settings
Walker, Fornes, & Lane (2015)

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

Managing the Research Implementation Process Effectively
Walker, Fornes, & Lane (2015)
Conducting Studies

- **Goals**
  - Meaningful, lasting change
  - Responsible inquiry
- **Organize on the front side**
  - Management plan
  - Resources
- **Team approach**
  - Involve motivated, capable persons who will follow through
  - Delegate
- **Respect the relationship with the community**
  - Develop and adhere to a management plan
  - Remember you are a guest
  - Build the school’s and community’s capacity to sustain evidence-based practices
  - Give back to the community

Collaborations

- **Work with people whom you value, respect, and trust**
  - Goals
  - Ethics
  - Establish expectations
  - Follow through
  - Be gracious

- **Team**
  - Management plan
  - Resources
  - Involve motivated, capable persons who will follow through
  - Delegate
Dream the life you want to live and the contributions you want to make ... then arrange the contingencies to fulfill your dreams (Lane, 2017).

This two-day forum for school, state, district, and regional Leadership Teams and other professionals has been designed to increase the effectiveness of PBIS implementation.

Sessions are organized by strands that support initial through advanced implementation in a full range of education settings, and assist state level planning to improve school quality and student success. Featuring sessions specific to Juvenile Justice, Alternative Educational Settings, Mental Health, and Family partnerships.

October 4-5, 2018

PBIS: Celebrating Positive & Safe Learning Environments

Hilton Chicago
720 S. Michigan Avenue

Registration opens April 3rd. For more information, visit the Upcoming Events page at www.pbis.org in March.

SAVE THE DATE October 4-5, 2018