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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)

Students with emotional & behavioral disorders (EBD)
ED <1%
EDB 12-20%
Shift to a systems level perspective
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)

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

Goal: Reverse Harm
Specialized group systems for students at risk

Goal: Prevent Harm
School/classroom-wide systems for all students, staff, & settings
The Journey of Comprehensive, Integrated, Three-tiered (Ci3T) Models of Prevention

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

Tier 1
Primary Prevention (~80%)
Academic • Behavioral • Social

Tier 2
Secondary Prevention (~20%)

Tier 3
Tertiary Prevention (~5%)

Positive Behavior Interventions and Supports (PBIS)

District & State Standards
High Quality Instruction

Reading Street

Validated Curricula
PBIS Framework

Validated Curricula
(Lane, Kalberg, & Menzies, 2009)
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


---

### Establish, Clarify, Define Expectations

<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>Establish, clarify, define expectations</td>
<td>Establish, clarify, define expectations</td>
<td>Establish, clarify, define expectations</td>
<td>Establish, clarify, define expectations</td>
<td>Establish, clarify, define expectations</td>
<td>Establish, clarify, define expectations</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

### Academic Behavioral Social Validated Curricula PBIS Framework Validated Curricula (Lane, Kalberg, & Menzies, 2009)

Comprehensive, Integrated, Three-Tiered Model of Prevention

(Lane, Kalberg, & Menzies, 2009)

---

### Comprehensive, Integrated, Three-Tiered Model of Prevention

(Tertiary Prevention (~5%))

(Tier 2 Secondary Prevention (~20%))

(Tier 1 Primary Prevention (~80%))

---

**Positive Action**

Academic Behavioral Social
The Five Social and Emotional Learning Core Competencies

Self-awareness
- Responsible Decision making

Social Awareness
- Relationship Skills

Self-management

Outcomes Associated with Social Skills Training

Explicit social-emotional learning (SEL) skills instruction

SEL skills acquisition
- Improved attitudes about self, others, and school

Positive social behavior
- Fewer conduct problems
- Less emotional distress
- Academic success

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:
  - Attendance and achievement
  - Bullying and violence prevention
  - Character and life skills
  - Digital citizenship
  - Alcohol and drug prevention
  - Health and Wellness
**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)

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

---

**Ci3T Professional Learning Series**

- Pre-training Activities
  - Tier member selection
  - Scholarly communication: Survey for optimal topics

- Session 1: 2 hours
  - Ci3T model overview

- Session 2: 2 hours
  - Building the primary prevention plan

- Session 3: 2 hours
  - How to implement the plan
  - Student Tier 2 supports

- Session 4: 2 hours
  - Building Tier 3 supports
  - Student Tier 2 supports

- Session 5: 2 hours
  - Preparing Tier 3 supports
  - Student Tier members attend

- Session 6: Full day
  - Preparing Tier 3 supports
  - Student Tier members attend

---
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Phase</th>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Year</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Elementary School</td>
<td>2013-14</td>
<td>14-15</td>
<td>15-16</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C3iT Training</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Implementation Year 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Implementation Year 2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sustain and Develop Practices</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Middle and High Schools</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C3iT Training</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Implementation Year 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Implementation Year 2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sustain and Develop Practices</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College and Career Center</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C3iT Training</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Implementation Year 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Implementation Year 2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sustain and Develop Practices</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**C3iT Primary Plan: Roles and Responsibilities**

*all stakeholder groups*
**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 Fixsen & Blasé, 2005

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

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

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

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

- **Sustainability & Continuous Regeneration**
  - Let’s make it our way of doing business (institutionalized use)
Transparency, Access, & Collaboration
Benefits of Ci3T Models
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What screening tools are available?

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)

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.

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 Normal Criteria</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Winter 2007</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Winter 2008</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Winter 2009</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

% computed based on total # students screened

Source: Lane, Marzouk, Gaken, & Volberg, 2012. Figure 2.2. Positive identification and intervention rates for both externalizing and internalizing behavior disorders over a three-year period.

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>Number of students</th>
<th>Level</th>
<th>2007</th>
<th>2008</th>
<th>2009</th>
<th>2010</th>
<th>2011</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>W 07</td>
<td>W 08</td>
<td>W 09</td>
<td>W 10</td>
<td>W 11</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>78</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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</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</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</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>3 (5.00%)</td>
<td>2 (3.33%)</td>
<td>1 (1.67%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Students missing
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 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
- 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 mibsi.org (SRSS; Drummond, 1994)
Student Risk Screening Scale
Fall 2004 – 2012
Middle School

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Screening Time Point</th>
<th>Percentage of Students</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4%</td>
<td>77.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20%</td>
<td>86.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40%</td>
<td>86.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60%</td>
<td>89.79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>80%</td>
<td>93.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100%</td>
<td>90.55</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Variable | Risk | Significance Testing
---|---|---
ODR | Low (n = 422) M (SD) = 1.50 (2.85) | Moderate (n = 51) M (SD) = 5.02 (5.32) | High (n = 12) M (SD) = 8.42 (7.01) L < M, H M = H
In-School Suspensions | 0.08 (0.38) | 0.35 (1.04) | 1.71 (2.26) L < M, H 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

| Variable | Risk | Significance Testing
|---|---|---
| ODR | Low (n = 422) M (SD) = 3.53 (5.53) | Moderate (n = 51) M (SD) = 8.27 (7.72) | High (n = 35) M (SD) = 8.97 (9.39) L < M, H M = H
| GPA | 3.10 (0.82) | 2.45 (0.84) | 2.38 (0.88) L > M, H M = H


STUDENT RISK SCREENING SCALE
High School: Behavioral & Academic Characteristics of SRSS Risk Groups
Non-Instructional Raters

| Variable | Risk | Significance Testing
|---|---|---
| ODR | Low (n = 326) M (SD) = 3.53 (5.53) | Moderate (n = 52) M (SD) = 8.27 (7.72) | High (n = 35) M (SD) = 8.97 (9.39) L < M, H M = H
| GPA | 3.10 (0.82) | 2.45 (0.84) | 2.38 (0.88) L > M, H M = H

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.

Available on ci3t.org
(SRSS-IE; Drummond, 1994 and Lane & Menzies, 2009)
**SRSS-IE for Elementary Schools**

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

**SRSS-IE: Cut Scores**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Elementary School</th>
<th>Middle and High School</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>SRSS-E7</strong></td>
<td><strong>SRSS-I5</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Items 1-7</td>
<td>Items 8-12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0-3 = low risk</td>
<td>0-1 = 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>Low Risk (0-3)</th>
<th>Moderate (4-8)</th>
<th>High (9-21)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>F1 4</td>
<td>N = 54</td>
<td>6.78%</td>
<td>5.64%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F1 5</td>
<td>N = 99</td>
<td>10.12%</td>
<td>15.19%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F1 6</td>
<td>N = 78</td>
<td>75.63%</td>
<td>75.19%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F1 7</td>
<td>N = 78</td>
<td>82.49%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- **% of Students Screened**
  - N = 20
  - N = 50

### Sample Elementary School: Fall (Internalizing)

**SRSS-I5 Results – All Students**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Screening Time Point</th>
<th>Low Risk (0-1)</th>
<th>Moderate (2-3)</th>
<th>High (4-15)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>F1 4</td>
<td>N = 55</td>
<td>10.93%</td>
<td>13.23%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F1 5</td>
<td>N = 90</td>
<td>17.88%</td>
<td>17.24%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F1 6</td>
<td>N = 359</td>
<td>77.23%</td>
<td>76.07%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F1 7</td>
<td>N = 359</td>
<td>82.49%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- **% of Students Screened**
  - N = 46
  - N = 77
  - N = 391

### Sample ... Winter 2014

**SRSS-I5 Comparison by Grade Level**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Grade Level</th>
<th>N Screened</th>
<th>Low Risk (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>
RESULTS:
SRSS-IE: **EXTERNALIZING** SUBSCALE ELEMENTARY

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Risk</th>
<th>Significance Testing</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Moderate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>M (SD)</td>
<td>n</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fall Externalizing</td>
<td>159</td>
<td>459</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Winter</td>
<td>115</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nurse Visits</td>
<td>6.14</td>
<td>3,256</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In-School Suspensions</td>
<td>0.052</td>
<td>3,256</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Lane, Delen et al. (2018)

RESULTS:
SRSS-IE: **INTERNALIZING** SUBSCALE ELEMENTARY

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Risk</th>
<th>Significance Testing</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Moderate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>M (SD)</td>
<td>n</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fall Internalizing</td>
<td>41.45</td>
<td>659</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Winter Internalizing</td>
<td>139.17</td>
<td>456</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nurse Visits</td>
<td>84.74</td>
<td>3,387</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In-School Suspensions</td>
<td>0.0342</td>
<td>3,387</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Lane, Delen et al. (2018)

SRSS-IE Middle and High School Scoring

---

---
### SRSS-IE: Cut Scores

<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>

Screening Data: High School Yrs1-3

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fall SRSSIE</th>
<th>Fall SRSSIE</th>
<th>Fall SRSSIE</th>
<th>Fall SRSSIE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Moderate</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Low</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016</td>
<td>80.28%</td>
<td>10.36%</td>
<td>9.36%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2017</td>
<td>90.18%</td>
<td>4.16%</td>
<td>5.66%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2018</td>
<td>90.91%</td>
<td>3.86%</td>
<td>5.23%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>WTR-SRSSIE</th>
<th>WTR-SRSSIE</th>
<th>WTR-SRSSIE</th>
<th>WTR-SRSSIE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Moderate</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Low</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016</td>
<td>87.25%</td>
<td>9.49%</td>
<td>3.26%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2017</td>
<td>86.14%</td>
<td>9.02%</td>
<td>4.85%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2018</td>
<td>88.79%</td>
<td>8.52%</td>
<td>2.69%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Strengths and Difficulties Questionnaire

Available from sdqinfo.org

(SDQ; Goodman, 1997)

SDQ: Screening Results by Domain
Elementary School Winter 2009

<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 6</td>
<td>n=40</td>
<td>n=12</td>
<td>n=25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emotional Symptoms</td>
<td>N=76 5</td>
<td>n=84</td>
<td>n=3</td>
<td>n=11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conduct Problems</td>
<td>N=76 5</td>
<td>n=37</td>
<td>n=7</td>
<td>n=34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hyperactivity</td>
<td>N=78 5</td>
<td>n=51</td>
<td>n=5</td>
<td>n=22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peer Problems</td>
<td>N=77 6</td>
<td>n=54</td>
<td>n=11</td>
<td>n=12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prosocial Behavior</td>
<td>N=78 5</td>
<td>n=84</td>
<td>n=3</td>
<td>n=11</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* = number of students not rated (or missing items)

BASC² Behavioral and Emotional Screening Scale

Available from Pearson Education, PsychCorp™

(BASC² BESS; Kamphaus & Reynolds, 2015)

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

Adequate progress Moderate Difficulties Significant Difficulties

- Reading Skills
- Math Skills
- Prosocial Behavior
- Motivation to Learn

Percent of Students

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.

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?
Screening ... Considering the Logistics & Ci3T in Action

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)

100% 3.8% N = 26 60.1% N = 55 16.3% N = 12

Ci3t.org/screening

Systematic Screening
Data sharing...

• Schoolwide data
  ...decisions related to primary prevention efforts

• Grade / Department / Class
  ...implications for teachers’ practice

• Individual student
  ...decisions about student-based interventions

---

Agenda

Introducing Ci3T ... working collaboratively and efficiently
Systematic Screening Tools & Screening Logistics
Using Screening Data to Inform Instruction
  Tier 1 efforts
  Teacher-delivered strategies
  Tier 2 and 3 supports
Action Plans: Moving Forward
Examining your screening data …

… implications for Tier 1 efforts
… implications for teacher-delivered strategies
… implications for Tier 2 and Tier 3 supports

See Lane, Menzies, Bruhn, and Crnobori (2011)
Examining your screening data ...

... implications for Tier 1 efforts

... 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

Assess, Design, Implement, and Evaluate


Examining Academic and Behavioral Data: Elementary School Level
Opportunities to Respond
Behavior Specific Praise
Active Supervision
Supporting Behavior for School Success
Instructional Feedback
High p Requests
Pre-correction
Incorporating Choice
Self-monitoring
Behavior Contracts

Low-Intensity Strategies

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Low-Intensity Strategy</th>
<th>Lincoln Elementary On-Site Expert</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Behavior Specific Praise: Identifying the specific expectation the student met. | • Eric Common, Behavior Specialist
  • Mark Buckman, Special Education
  • Grant Allen, Parent Volunteer |
| Opportunities to Respond: Providing 4-6 opportunities per minute for students to respond individually, choral, verbal, written, gesture, or symbol. | • David Royer, Administration
  • Emily Cartwell, 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. | • Abbie Jenkins, 2nd Grade
  • Scarlett Lane, 3rd Grade
  • Bryan Simmons, PE
  • Liane Johl, Kindergarten |

• "Nama, great job using your graphic organizer to draft your essay."
• "Justice, thank you for pushing in your chair to keep the walkway safe."
• "Show me thumbs or thumbs down if..."
• "Show me on your white board what..."
• "Turn to your elbow partner and say..."
• "All together now, what is..."
Examining your screening data …

... implications for Tier 1 efforts

... 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)
Small group reading instruction with self-monitoring

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Support</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Students who:</th>
<th>Exit Criteria</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<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>Students who: Behavior: Fall SRSS at moderate (4-8) or high (9-21) risk Academic: Fall AIMSweb LNF at the strategic or intensive level</td>
<td>AIMSweb reading PSF and NWF progress monitoring probes (weekly) Daily self-monitoring checklists Treatment Integrity Social Validity</td>
<td>Meet AIMSweb reading benchmark at next screening time point. Low Risk on SRSS at next screening time point.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


First Grade Students’ Self Monitoring Form

Sample Elementary Intervention Grid: PA

- Positive Action (PA) — counselor-led small group

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Social Skills Intervention Program</th>
<th>Student Measures</th>
<th>Exit Criteria</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Academic</td>
<td>SSiS Rating Scale (Pre/Post)</td>
<td>SRTS-SS: Moderate (H) and/or SRTS-M: Moderate</td>
<td>Review student progress at end of 24 sessions</td>
<td>Agreement on meeting/more than 24 sessions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Behavior</td>
<td>Daily behavior report (DBR)</td>
<td>Daily behavior report (DBR; Pre/Post)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social</td>
<td>SSiS Rating Scale (Pre/Post)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Support</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Description:***
- SSiS—Positive Action small group: 2-3 days per week for 3-5 sessions
- 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 versions).

**Exit Criteria:**
- Student is in grade 2 or fewer absences in school in first 3 months of intervention.
- Evidence of teacher implementation of Ci3T primary (Tier 1) (Pre/Post)
- I5 scores are in the low risk category
- E7 and I5 scores are warranted
- SSiS sessions are met or no further Positive Action small group sessions are needed
- Team agrees student has met or no further Positive Action small group sessions are needed
- No tardies
- Student: CIRP
- Teacher: IRP

**Administer:**
- I5 score:...
## Active Supervision

### Schoolwide Data:

#### Entry Criteria

1. Students in grades 9 – 12.
2. Behavior: SRSS: High (9-21) or Moderate (4-8) by either 2nd or 7th period teacher
3. ODR ≥ 2
4. Absences ≥ 5 days in one grading period
5. Academic: GPA ≥ 2.75

#### Data to Monitor

- Student Measures:
  - Increase of GPA at mid-term and semester report cards.
  - Decrease of ODR monitored weekly.
  - Reduced absences (lower than one per quarter)

- Treatment Integrity:
  - Mentors complete weekly monitoring checklists to report meeting time and activities.

- Social Validity:
  - Pre and post surveys for students and mentors.

#### Exit Criteria

- Students who no longer meet criteria next fall

### Support Description

Focus is on academic achievement, character development, problem-solving skills, building 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.

---

## READ 180 (Stage C)

### Reading Intervention

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.

#### Schoolwide Data:

#### Entry Criteria

1. Students in grades 9 – 12.
2. Reading performance basic or below basic on state assessment (but above 4th grade reading level).
3. SRSS risk score in the moderate range (4 – 8).

### Data to Monitor

- Student Measures:
  - Meeting individual READ 180 reading goals:
    - Progress Monitoring with Scholastic Reading Inventory
    - Writing Assessments
    - Formative assessments (vocabulary, comprehension and spelling)
    - Curriculum-based Assessments
    - Attendance in class

- Treatment Integrity:
  - Teachers monitor performance and attendance in class.
  - Completion of weekly checklists for activities completed.

- Social Validity:
  - Students and teachers complete surveys

#### Exit Criteria

- Students meet instructional reading goals.

---

**Note:**

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

Academic
Behavioral
Social

≈80%
≈15%
≈5%

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

Tertiary (Tier 3) Intervention Grids

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>Behavioral interventions developed by behavior specialist and PBS team</td>
<td>Students scored in the high risk category on the Student Risk Screening Scale (SRSS), or scored in the clinical range on one or more 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 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 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>
</tbody>
</table>
Changes in Harry’s Behavior

Agenda

Introducing Ci3T ... working collaboratively and efficiently
Systematic Screening Tools & Screening Logistics
Using Screening Data to Inform Instruction

- Tier 1 efforts
- 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
Let’s talk... and make plans!
1. What did I learn?
2. How will I share this information?