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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

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

- **Tier 1**: Emotional prevention (90%) - School/classroom-wide systems for all students, staff, & settings
- **Tier 2**: Secondary prevention (15%) - Specialized group systems for students at risk
- **Tier 3**: Tertiary prevention (=5%) - Specialized individual systems for students with high risk

Goal: Prevent Harm
Goal: Reverse Harm
Goal: Reduce Harm
The Journey of Comprehensive, Integrated, Three-tiered (Ci3T) Models 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 (95%)

Academic ◇ Behavioral ◇ Social

District & State Standards, High Quality Instruction
Reading Street
Positive Behavior Interventions and Supports (PBIS)
Behavioral Component: Positive Behavioral Interventions and Supports (PBIS)

**A Framework, Not a Curriculum**

- Establish, clarify, and define expectations
- Teach all students the expectations, planned and implemented by all adults in the school
- Give opportunities to practice
- Reinforce students consistently, facilitate success
- Consider rules, routines, and physical arrangements
- Monitor the plan using school-wide data to identify students who need more support
- Monitor student progress


### ELEMENTARY Settings

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Classroom</th>
<th>Hallway</th>
<th>Cafeteria</th>
<th>Playground</th>
<th>Bathroom</th>
<th>Bus</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Establish, Clarify, Define Expectations</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Arrive to class on time</td>
<td>- Remain in school for the whole day</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Follow directions</td>
<td>- Bring your required materials</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Use kind words and actions</td>
<td>- Exercise self-control</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Control your temper</td>
<td>- Keep hands to yourself</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Cooperate with others</td>
<td>- Make your choices quickly</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Use an inside voice</td>
<td>- Eat your own food</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Use a quiet voice</td>
<td>- Choose a seat and stick with it</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Walk on the right side of the hallway</td>
<td>- Wash up after the field trip</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Keep hands to yourself</td>
<td>- Throw away any trash properly</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Use manners</td>
<td>- Report any problems to your teacher</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Listen to and follow adult requests</td>
<td>- Talk quietly with others</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Respect other people’s personal space</td>
<td>- Use self-control</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Follow the rules of the game</td>
<td>- Remain in seat after you enter the bus</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Use the restroom and then return to class</td>
<td>- Use self-control</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Stay in your own bathroom stall</td>
<td>- Remain seated during the bus ride</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Little talking</td>
<td>- Follow bus driver rules</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Use kind words towards the bus driver and other students</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Listen to and follow the bus driver’s rules</td>
<td>- Remain in seat after you enter the bus</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**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 (85%)
The Five Social and Emotional Learning Core Competencies

(CASEL, 2013)

Outcomes Associated with Social Skills Training

(CASEL, 2013)

Social Component:
Examples of Schoolwide Programs

Positive Action
www.positiveaction.net
- Improves academics, behavior, and character
- Curriculum-based approach
- Effectively increases positive behaviors and decreases negative behaviors
- 6-7 units per grade

Optional components:
- Site-wide climate development
- Drug education
- Alcohol and drug prevention

Connect With Kids
connectwithkids.com
- A curriculum using real stories presented through documentary-style videos, non-fiction books, teaching guides and patient resources
- Customizable units are:
  - Attendance and achievement
  - Bullying and violence prevention
  - Character and life-skills
  - Digital citizenship
  - Alcohol and drug prevention
  - Health and Wellness

(CASEL, 2013)
Top 10 School-related Social Skills

- Listens to Others
- Follows Directions
- Follows Classroom Rules
- Ignores Peer Distractions
- Asks for Help
- Takes Turns in Conversations
- Cooperates With Others
- Controls Temper in Conflict Situations
- Acts Responsibly With Others
- Shows Kindness to Others

(Lane et al. 2004, 2007; Gresham & Elliott, 2008)

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%

Academic Behavioral Social

CI³T Professional Learning Series
Lawrence Public Schools ... Ci3T Training & Implementation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Phase</th>
<th>Year</th>
<th>2013-14</th>
<th>14-15</th>
<th>15-16</th>
<th>16-17</th>
<th>17-18</th>
<th>18-19</th>
<th>19-20</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Elementary School</td>
<td>Ci3T Training</td>
<td>Implementation Year 1</td>
<td>Implementation Year 2</td>
<td>Sustain and Develop Practices</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Middle and High Schools</td>
<td>Ci3T Training</td>
<td>Implementation Year 1</td>
<td>Implementation Year 2</td>
<td>Sustain and Develop Practices</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College and Career Center</td>
<td>Ci3T Training</td>
<td>Implementation Year 1</td>
<td>Implementation Year 2</td>
<td>Sustain and Develop Practices</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

USD 497 MTSS-Ci3T Model of Support

USD 497 School Board Priorities: The Foundation
Ci3T Primary Plan: Roles and Responsibilities

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)

**Tertiary (Tier 3) Intervention Grids**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tertiary Intervention</th>
<th>Support</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Schoolwide Penetration</th>
<th>Behavioral</th>
<th>Social</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Implementation Science**  
(Applied from Harris & 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)
Transparency, Access, & Collaboration
Benefits of Ci3T Models

Introducing Ci3T ... working collaboratively and efficiently
Systematic Screening Tools & Screening Logistics
Using Screening Data to Inform Instruction
Tier 1 practices
Teacher-delivered practices
Tier 2 and 3 supports
Action Plans: Moving Forward
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

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

Note. The numbers represent totals for the students for whom the SSBD was completed.
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

<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 *5</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

**Sample Data: SSBD**
**Winter 2009-2010**
**Critical Need Comparison by Grade Level**
The SRSS is a 7-item mass screener used to identify students who are at risk for antisocial behavior. It 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

Available from ci3t.org and mi6bli.org
(SRSS; Drummond, 1994)
Student Risk Screening Scale
Fall 2004 – 2012
Middle School

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Screening Time Point</th>
<th>Low</th>
<th>Moderate</th>
<th>High</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fall 2004</td>
<td>77.00</td>
<td>86.00</td>
<td>86.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fall 2005</td>
<td>89.79</td>
<td>93.08</td>
<td>90.55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fall 2006</td>
<td>94.28</td>
<td>91.25</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fall 2007</td>
<td>17.00</td>
<td>11.00</td>
<td>11.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fall 2008</td>
<td>7.87</td>
<td>6.29</td>
<td>7.77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fall 2009</td>
<td>6.11</td>
<td>3.58</td>
<td>6.35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fall 2010</td>
<td>6.00</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>2.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fall 2011</td>
<td>2.34</td>
<td>0.63</td>
<td>1.68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fall 2012</td>
<td>1.34</td>
<td>2.15</td>
<td>2.40</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Percentage of Students


Figure 4. Middle school behavior screening data over time at the fall time point. Adapted from Figure 4.6 p. 127 Lane, K. L., Menzies, H. M., Oakes, W. P., & Kalberg, J. R. (2012). Systematic screenings of behavior to support instruction: From preschool to high school. New York, NY: Guilford Press.

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 (M (SD))</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 (M (SD))</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 (M (SD))</td>
<td>3.35 (0.52)</td>
<td>2.63 (0.65)</td>
<td>2.32 (0.59)</td>
<td>M = H</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Course Failures (M (SD))</td>
<td>0.68 (1.50)</td>
<td>2.78 (3.46)</td>
<td>4.17 (3.49)</td>
<td>L &lt; 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 (M (SD))</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 (M (SD))</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 & Mentes, 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>Elementary School</th>
<th>Middle and High School</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SRSS-E7</td>
<td>SRSS-I5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Items 1-7</td>
<td>Items 8-12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0-3 = low risk</td>
<td>0-1 = 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 Level:

Middle and High School Levels:

Sample Elementary School Fall (Externalizing)
SRSS-E7 Results – All Students

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Screening Time Point</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Low Risk (0-3)</th>
<th>Moderate (4-8)</th>
<th>High (9-21)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>F14</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>6.79%</td>
<td>19.64%</td>
<td>74.58%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F15</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>5.64%</td>
<td>15.38%</td>
<td>78.98%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F16</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>8.69%</td>
<td>34.48%</td>
<td>56.83%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F17</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>4.55%</td>
<td>22.73%</td>
<td>72.72%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

% of Students Screened

F14: N = 34
F15: N = 99
F16: N = 29
F17: N = 22
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 Middle and High School Scoring
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>Elementary School</th>
<th>Middle and High School</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SRSS-E7</td>
<td>SRSS-I5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Items 1-7</td>
<td>Items 8-12</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- 0-3 = low risk
- 4-8 = moderate risk
- 9-21 = high risk

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Elementary School Level:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Middle and High School Levels:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Sample High School Fall (Externalizing) SRSS-E7 Results – All Students

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Screening Time Point</th>
<th>% of Students Screened</th>
<th>Low Risk (0-3)</th>
<th>Moderate (4-8)</th>
<th>High (9-21)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>F15</td>
<td>2.64%</td>
<td>2.64%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F16</td>
<td>4.18%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F17</td>
<td>6.18%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F18</td>
<td>8.02%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F19</td>
<td>10.02%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<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 (Externalizing) 2016 SRSS-E7 Comparison by Grade Level
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>
<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>n</th>
<th>Significance</th>
<th>Testing L:M</th>
<th>L:H</th>
<th>M:H</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Externalizing</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grade point average</td>
<td>Low 3.56 (0.47)</td>
<td>3.07 (0.58)</td>
<td>2.74 (0.61)</td>
<td>1,670</td>
<td>279</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>L &gt; M &gt; H</td>
<td>1.01</td>
<td>1.72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Course failures</td>
<td>0.18 (1.15)</td>
<td>1.37 (2.12)</td>
<td>2.78 (3.03)</td>
<td>1,830</td>
<td>328</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>L &lt; M &lt; H</td>
<td>0.74</td>
<td>1.84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nurse visits</td>
<td>4.01 (16.20)</td>
<td>6.67 (11.65)</td>
<td>9.66 (11.65)</td>
<td>1,830</td>
<td>328</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>M = H</td>
<td>0.17</td>
<td>0.35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Office discipline referrals</td>
<td>0.03 (2.44)</td>
<td>0.17 (6.63)</td>
<td>0.75 (2.13)</td>
<td>1,830</td>
<td>328</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>L &lt; M &lt; H</td>
<td>0.42</td>
<td>1.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In-school suspensions</td>
<td>0.11 (0.89)</td>
<td>0.67 (2.74)</td>
<td>1.56 (3.22)</td>
<td>1,830</td>
<td>328</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>L &lt; M &lt; H</td>
<td>0.42</td>
<td>1.30</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>Risk</th>
<th>Low M (SD)</th>
<th>Moderate M (SD)</th>
<th>High M (SD)</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>Significance</th>
<th>Testing L:M</th>
<th>L:H</th>
<th>M:H</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Internalizing</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grade point average</td>
<td>Low 3.51 (0.51)</td>
<td>3.33 (0.55)</td>
<td>3.16 (0.64)</td>
<td>1,642</td>
<td>167</td>
<td>224</td>
<td>L &gt; M &gt; H</td>
<td>0.35</td>
<td>0.66</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>1,820</td>
<td>181</td>
<td>256</td>
<td>L &lt; M, H</td>
<td>0.23</td>
<td>0.46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nurse visits</td>
<td>4.32 (16.39)</td>
<td>4.85 (6.92)</td>
<td>6.77 (9.58)</td>
<td>1,820</td>
<td>181</td>
<td>256</td>
<td>M = H</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td>0.16</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>1,820</td>
<td>181</td>
<td>256</td>
<td>N.S</td>
<td>0.21</td>
<td>0.29</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>1,820</td>
<td>181</td>
<td>256</td>
<td>L &lt; M, H</td>
<td>0.33</td>
<td>0.24</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>Total Difficulties</td>
<td>N=77</td>
<td>n=40 (51.95%)</td>
<td>n=12 (15.58%)</td>
<td>n=25 (32.47%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emotional Symptoms</td>
<td>N=78</td>
<td>n=64 (82.05%)</td>
<td>n=3 (4.10%)</td>
<td>n=11 (14.10%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conduct Problems</td>
<td>N=78</td>
<td>n=37 (47.44%)</td>
<td>n=7 (9.07%)</td>
<td>n=34 (43.59%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hyperactivity</td>
<td>N=78</td>
<td>n=51 (65.38%)</td>
<td>n=5 (6.41%)</td>
<td>n=22 (28.21%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peer Problems</td>
<td>N=77</td>
<td>n=54 (70.13%)</td>
<td>n=11 (14.29%)</td>
<td>n=12 (15.58%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prosocial Behavior</td>
<td>N=78</td>
<td>n=64 (82.05%)</td>
<td>n=3 (4.10%)</td>
<td>n=11 (14.10%)</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

Percent of Students

Subgroup
Normal Elevated Extremely Elevated

Total 85.42 3.85 2.46
Sixth 87.67 3.65 5.45
Seventh 82.18 5.45 12.38
Eighth 86.21 4.86 11.33


Social Skills Improvement System – Performance Screening Guide
Available from Pearson Education, PsychCorp™
(SSS- PSG; Elliott & Gresham, 2007)
Social, Academic, and Emotional Behavior Risk Screener

Available from Fastbridge Learning

(SAEBS; Kilgus, Chafouleas, & Riley-Tillman, 2013)

SAMPLE DATA: SAEBS
Large Urban Elementary - Fall Screening Data

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 sub-scale interpretation is the most defensible.

SOURCE: Kilgus, Kilpatrick, Taylor, Eklund, & von der Embse, 2016 (in prep)
Screening ...
Considering the Logistics & Ci3T in Action

Starting the year with Ci3T...
Screening Practices
  • District system ...
  • Preparing...
  • Previewing ...
  • Dedicating time ...
  • Reminding ...
  • Supporting ...
  • Following through ...
  • Summarizing ...
  • Using data to inform instruction...
Sample Middle School: Fall
SRSS-E7 Results – All Students

Screening Time Point

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

Communication and Continuous Improvement
Agenda

Introducing Ci3T ... working collaboratively and efficiently
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, Bruhn, and Croborti (2011)

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


Student Risk Screening Scale
Middle School Fall 2004– Fall 2011

Lane & Oakes
Data-Informed Decision Making

Implementation ...
Data-Informed Decision Making

00:00
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, Integrative, Three-tiered (CI3T) Models of Support

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

Low-Intensity Strategies

Behavior Specific Praise: Using specific, appropriate, and contingent praise to provide feedback to a student on his or her behavior or work. Examples:
  o "Nicole, great job using your graphic organizer to review the vocabulary words."  
  o "You were really focused during your group work today, great job!"

Opportunities to Respond: Providing 4-6 opportunities per minute for students to respond individually, orally, written, or symbol.
  o "Show me thumbs up or thumbs down if..."  
  o "Show me on your white board what..."  
  o "All together now, what is..."

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

Supporting Behavior for School Successes

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

For an effective strategy implementation:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Low-Intensity Strategy</th>
<th>Lincoln Elementary On-Site Expert</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Behavior Specific Praise</td>
<td>Eric Common, Behavior Specialist</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mark Buckman, Special Education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Grant Allen, Parent Volunteer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Opportunities to Respond</td>
<td>David Royer, Administration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Emily Cantwell, 5th Grade</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Scarlett Lane, 3rd Grade</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mallory Messenger, Counselor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instructional Choice</td>
<td>Abbie Jenkins, 2nd Grade</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Scarlett Lane, 3rd Grade</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Bryan Simmons, PE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Liane Joffe, Kindergarten</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)

![Diagram showing the Three-Tiered Model of Prevention]

#### Secondary (Tier 2) Intervention Grids

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Support</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Schoolwide Entry Criteria</th>
<th>Exit Criteria</th>
<th>Social Validity</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 treatment integrity. Treatment needs addressed.</td>
<td>Successful completion of behavior contract.</td>
<td>Treatment integrity</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>Performance at or above 80% in the academic area of concern.</td>
<td>Passing grade on the report card in the academic area of concern.</td>
<td>Social validity</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- Treatment: [Lane, Kalberg, & Menzies (2009), pp. 131-137, Boxes 6.1-6.4]
<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 with self-monitoring</td>
<td>Small group reading instruction (30 min., 3 days per week). Students monitored their participation in the reading instructional tasks. Students used checklists of reading lesson components each day to complete and compare to teachers' rating. K – 1.</td>
<td>Students who: <strong>Behavior:</strong> Fall SRSS at moderate (4 -8) or high (9 – 21) risk <strong>Academic:</strong> Fall AIMSweb LNF at the strategic or intensive level</td>
<td>AIMweb reading PSF and NWF progress monitoring probes (weekly). Daily self-monitoring checklists</td>
<td>Meet AIMweb 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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Grade</th>
<th>Teacher</th>
<th>Site</th>
<th>Comment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Treatment Integrity

Social Validity

Monitor student progress

Sample Elementary Intervention Grid: PA

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Support</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>School-wide Data Entry Criteria</th>
<th>Data to Monitor Progress</th>
<th>Exit Criteria</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Positive Action (PA) - counselor led small group</td>
<td>Students and/or school personnel will lead small group Positive Action sessions for approximately 30-45 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 range from 8 to 12 students.</td>
<td>Student: SSiS-Rating Scale (Pre/Post)</td>
<td>Student measures: 1) Academic: SSiS-Rating Scale (Pre/Post) 2) Behavioral: SRS-7: E7 score: Moderate (4-8) and/or SRS-7: E6 score: Mixed -</td>
<td>Behavioral: SRS-7 score: Moderate (4-8) and/or SRS-7: E6 score: Mixed -</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Sample Elementary Intervention Grid: SSiS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Social Skills Improvement System (SSiS)</th>
<th>Classwide Intervention Program</th>
<th>Schoolwide Data: Entry Criteria</th>
<th>Data to Monitor Progress:</th>
<th>Exit Criteria</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Counselor-Led Small Group SSiS sessions</td>
<td>acering-classwide small group</td>
<td>Students will acquire new socially appropriate 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).</td>
<td><strong>Grade 2 or 3</strong></td>
<td><strong>SRSS-E7 and I5 scores are in the low risk category (0 – 3) on the next screening time point.</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Active Supervision**

https://eclic.shs.acf.hhs.gov/safety-practices

<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>READ 180 Stage C Reading Intervention</td>
<td>Students participate in a 10 min reading instructional block during their study hall period. Students meet in the computer lab for participation in the online portion 20 min daily. Instruction is relevant to high school students. Students use a progress management system to monitor and track their own progress. Instruction is taught by special education teachers and general education teachers with training in the READ 180 Curriculum.</td>
<td><strong>Students in grades 9 – 12</strong></td>
<td><strong>Meeting individual READ 180 reading goals:</strong> (1) Reading performance basic to below basic on state assessment (but above 4th grade reading level)</td>
<td><strong>Students must instructional reading goals.</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Social Validity:</strong></td>
<td>Students and teachers complete surveys.</td>
<td><strong>SRSS score in the low risk category (0 – 3) on the next screening time point.</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></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>Mentoring Program (Sophomores/Juniors/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) I-DB/11% 12th grade; (2) Behavior: SRSS High (9-21) or Moderate (4-8) by either 2nd or 7th period teacher ODR ≥ 2 Absences ≥ 5 days in one grading period; (3) Academic: GPA ≥ 2.75</td>
<td>Student Measures: (1) Increase of GPA at mid-term and semester report cards; (2) Decrease of ODR mentioned weekly; (3) Reduced absences (less than one per quarter) Treatment Integrity: Mentors complete weekly monitoring checklists to report meeting time and activities. Social Validity: Pre and post surveys for the students and mentors.</td>
<td>Yearlong support Students who no longer meet criteria next fall Seniors: graduation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Targeted Algebra II Study Hall</td>
<td>Direct, targeted instruction of Algebra II learning targets by math teachers. Time will be used to re-teach concepts, provide one-on-one or small group instruction and offer greater supports for students struggling to pass the graduation requirement course. 50 min per day until exit criteria is met.</td>
<td>(1) 12th grade; (2) Algebra 11 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</td>
<td>Algebra II Grade increases to satisfactory level (above 75%).</td>
<td>Algebra II Grade increases to satisfactory level (above 75%).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

Tertiary (Tier 3) Intervention Grids

Primary Prevention (Tier 1)
≈80%
Secondary Prevention (Tier 2)
≈15%
Tertiary Prevention (Tier 3)
≈5%

SAMPLE TERTIARY (Tier 3) INTERVENTION GRID

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Support 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>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 Strengths and Difficulties (SDQ) subscales: Emotional Symptoms, Conduct Problems, Hyperactivity, or Peer Problems, or earned more than 5 office discipline referrals (ODR) for major events during a grading period</td>
<td>Data will be collected on both the (a) target (problem) behavior and (b) replacement (desirable) behavior identified by the team in an ongoing basis.</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>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academic</td>
<td>Identified at highest risk for school failure: recommended for retention; or scored far below basic on state-wide or district-wide assessments.</td>
<td>Weekly teacher report on academic status. ODR data collected weekly. Treatment Integrity. Social Validity.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Changes in Harry’s Behavior

Agenda

Introducing C3T ... working collaboratively and efficiently
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

(Law & Oakes, 2012)

District Decision Makers

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

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

Session 1: 2 hours
- Ci3T model overview

Session 2: Full day
- Planning the primary prevention plan
- Student team members attend

Session 3: 2 hours
- Monitor the plan
- Student team members attend

Session 4: Full day
- How to monitor the plan
- Student team members attend

Session 5: 2 hours
- Building Tier 2 supports
- Student team members attend

Session 6: Full day
- Building Tier 3 supports
CI3T: Tertiary Prevention
CI3T: Secondary Prevention
CI3T: Primary Prevention

Session 1:
Overview of CI3T
Prevention Models
Setting a Purpose
Establish team meetings and roles

Session 2:
Mission and Purpose
Establish Roles and Responsibilities
Procedures for Teaching
Procedures for Reinforcement
Rewrite Plan
Session 3:
Procedures for Monitoring
Session 4:
Revise Primary Plan using Stakeholder feedback
Prepare presentation
Session 5:
Overview of Teacher focused Strategies
Overview of Student focused Strategies
Using data to determine
Draft the Secondary Intervention Grid based on existing supports
Session 6:
Final revisions of CI3T Plan based on stakeholder feedback
Draft Tertiary Prevention Intervention Grids
Design Implementation Manual and Plan for roll out to faculty, students, and parents

MTSS: CI3T Training Series
Implementation Stages of Tier 2 and 3 within CI3T

Additional Professional Development on Specific Topics
Core Content Curriculum
Reading, Math, Writing
Instructional Techniques to Improve Students’ Motivation; General Classroom Management Practices; Core Content Instructional Supports
Functional Assessment-based Interventions
Reading, Math, Writing
Benchmarking and Progress Monitoring Tools
Student Driven Interventions, Strategies, & Practices
Check In - Check Out
Additional Tier 3 Supports

2016-2017 Professional Learning Opportunities

Let’s talk… and make plans!
1. What did I learn?
2. How will I take this information back to my faculty, staff, and parents?

00:00
Thank you
Kathleen.Lane@KU.edu
www.ci3t.org