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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, Assistant Secretary for the Office of Special Rehabilitation of the United States Department of Education
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Action Plans: Moving Forward

Comprehensive, Integrated, Three-Tiered Model of Prevention

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

- Tier 2: Secondary Prevention (1-15%)
  - 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, & settings

Validated Curricula PBIS Framework

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

(Lane, Kalberg, & Menzies, 2009)
The Journey of Comprehensive, Integrated, Three-tiered (Ci3T) Models of Prevention

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

Comprehensive, Integrated, Three-Tiered Model of Prevention

Tier 3: Tertiary Prevention (≥5%)

Tier 2: Secondary Prevention (≥15%)

Tier 1: Primary Prevention (≥30%)

District & State Standards, High Quality Instruction

Positive Behavior Interventions and Supports (PBIS)

Academic ◇ Behavioral ◇ Social
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

A Framework, Not a Curriculum

Academic ◇ Behavioral ◇ Social

Validated Curricula PBIS Framework Validated Curricula

Comprehensive, Integrated, Three-Tiered Model of Prevention

Larive, Kolberg, & Mercier, 2009
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The Five Social and Emotional Learning Core Competencies

- Self-awareness
- Self-management
- Responsible Decision making
- Social Awareness
- Relationship Skills

(CASEL, 2013)

Outcomes Associated with Social Skills Training

- Explicit social-emotional learning (SEL) skills instruction
- SEL skills acquisition
- Positive social behavior
- Fewer conduct problems
- Less emotional distress
- Improved attitudes about self, others, and school
- Academic success

(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

**Connect With Kids**
connectwithkids.com
- A curriculum using real stories presented through documentary-style videos, non-fiction books, teaching guides and patent resources
- Customizable units are:
  - 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)

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

Academic Behavioral Social

Primary Prevention
Secondary Prevention
Tertiary Prevention
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Lawrence Public Schools ... Ci3T Training & Implementation

### Phase 2013-14 14-15 15-16 16-17 17-18 18-19 19-20

#### 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

- **Support Intensity**
  - High
  - Low

- **Differentiation**
  - Personalized Learning

- **Blended Learning Environments**
  - Culturally Responsive Teaching

- **Validated Curricula**
  - ELA Math

USD 497 School Board Priorities: The Foundation

- **EXCELLENCE**
- **EQUITY**
- **ENGAGEMENT**

---

USD 497 High School Implementation Manual 2015-2016

- **Mult-Tiered Systems of Support**
- **Coordinated, Integrated, Tiered Model of Prevention**
Academic ◇ Behavioral ◇ Social

Validated Curricula PBIS Framework

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

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

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

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

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

- Let’s make it our way of doing business (institutionalized use)
Transparency, Access, & Collaboration
Benefits of Ci3T Models

Agenda
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

Systematic Screening

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.

Source: Lane, Venner, Stiles, & Gallang, 2017. Figure 2.2: Middle School Systematic Screening for Behavior Disorders (SSBD; Walker & Severson, 1992) results comparing the percentage of students nominated and exceeding normative criteria for both externalizing and internalizing behavior disorders over a three year period.

Source: Lane, Menzies, Oakes, & Kalberg, 2012. Figure 2.2: Elementary Systematic Screening for Behavior Disorders (SSBD; Walker & Severson, 1992) results comparing the percentage of students nominated and exceeding normative criteria for both externalizing and internalizing behavior disorders over a three year period.

% computed based on total # students screened.

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

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Low</th>
<th>Moderate</th>
<th>High</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2004</td>
<td>77.00</td>
<td>86.00</td>
<td>86.50</td>
<td>17.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005</td>
<td>89.79</td>
<td>93.08</td>
<td>90.55</td>
<td>11.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006</td>
<td>94.28</td>
<td>91.25</td>
<td>92.56</td>
<td>11.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


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) M (SD)</th>
<th>Moderate (n = 51) M (SD)</th>
<th>High (n = 12) M (SD)</th>
<th>Significance Testing</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ODR</td>
<td>1.50 (2.85)</td>
<td>5.02 (5.32)</td>
<td>8.42 (7.01)</td>
<td>L-M-H</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In-School Suspensions</td>
<td>0.08 (0.38)</td>
<td>0.35 (1.04)</td>
<td>1.71 (2.26)</td>
<td>L-M-H</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GPA</td>
<td>3.35 (0.52)</td>
<td>2.63 (0.65)</td>
<td>2.32 (0.59)</td>
<td>L-M-H, H</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Course Failures</td>
<td>0.68 (1.50)</td>
<td>2.78 (3.46)</td>
<td>4.17 (3.40)</td>
<td>L-M, M-H</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


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) M (SD)</th>
<th>Moderate (n = 52) M (SD)</th>
<th>High (n = 35) M (SD)</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>

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)
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 Item 1-7</td>
<td>SRSS-I5 Item 8-12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Items</td>
<td>SRSS-E7 Item 1-7</td>
<td>SRSS-I5 Item 8-12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0-3</td>
<td>0-1 low risk</td>
<td>0-1 low risk</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4-8</td>
<td>2-3 moderate risk</td>
<td>4-8 moderate risk</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9-21</td>
<td>4-15 high risk</td>
<td>9-21 high risk</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Elementary School Levels:

Middle and High School Levels:
SRSS-I5 Results – All Students

Elementary School - Fall

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Screening Time Point</th>
<th>N = 72</th>
<th>N = 85</th>
<th>N = 49</th>
<th>N = 45</th>
<th>N = 33</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>19.55%</td>
<td>23.55%</td>
<td>80.48%</td>
<td>80.56%</td>
<td>76.24%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5.44%</td>
<td>12.42%</td>
<td>13.66%</td>
<td>13.20%</td>
<td>10.54%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Fall 2017
SRSS-Externalizing Results: Grade level

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Grade Level</th>
<th>N Screened</th>
<th>Low (n %)</th>
<th>Moderate (n %)</th>
<th>High (n %)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3rd</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>39 (86.67%)</td>
<td>3 (6.67%)</td>
<td>3 (6.67%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4th</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>35 (76.09%)</td>
<td>10 (21.74%)</td>
<td>1 (2.17%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5th</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>53 (86.89%)</td>
<td>6 (9.84%)</td>
<td>2 (3.28%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

New Lessons Learned
SRSS-IE: An update on predictive validity at the elementary level

**Elementary Participants**  \( N = 4,465 \)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable / Level</th>
<th>% (n)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>52.86 (2,360)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>47.14 (2,105)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grade</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kindergarten</td>
<td>18.23 (814)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>First</td>
<td>15.99 (714)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Second</td>
<td>16.55 (799)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Third</td>
<td>17.78 (794)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fourth</td>
<td>17.18 (767)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fifth</td>
<td>14.27 (637)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethnicity/Race</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic</td>
<td>8.47 (378)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>72.81 (3,251)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black</td>
<td>6.61 (295)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian / Pacific Islander</td>
<td>4.55 (193)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Native American / Native Alaskan</td>
<td>4.32 (193)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mixed Races</td>
<td>11.40 (509)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Special education</td>
<td>16.84 (752)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Procedures**

- Fall
- Winter
- Spring

**RESULTS:**

**SRSS-IE: EXTERNALIZING Subscale Elementary**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Low ( M ) (SD)</th>
<th>Moderate ( M ) (SD)</th>
<th>High ( M ) (SD)</th>
<th>Significance Testing</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fall Externalizing</td>
<td>21 (30.6) (468)</td>
<td>24 (42.4) (2,047)</td>
<td>115.82 (46.4)</td>
<td>L &lt; M &lt; H</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nurse Visits</td>
<td>3.14 (6.81) (1,256)</td>
<td>2.22 (4.61) (820)</td>
<td>11.83 (3.89) (389)</td>
<td>L &lt; M &lt; H</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In-School Suspensions</td>
<td>0.0052 (0.08) (3,256)</td>
<td>0.0427 (0.30) (820)</td>
<td>0.1080 (0.46) (389)</td>
<td>L &lt; M &lt; H</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Lane, Oakes 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>M (SD)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>n</td>
<td>n</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fall Internalizing</td>
<td>0.04 (41.4)</td>
<td>139.12 (19.20)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>459</td>
<td>628</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Winter Internalizing</td>
<td>0.00 (41.4)</td>
<td>9.33 (12.22)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3,387</td>
<td>450</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Lane, Oakes et al. (2018)

SRSS-IE Middle and High School Scoring

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DATE:</th>
<th>Student Risk Screener: Internalizing and Externalizing Behaviors (SRSS-IE) MIDDLE AND HIGH SCHOOL USE +15, 2017</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TEACHER NAME:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PERIOD NOTED:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A. New</td>
<td>B. Teacher</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>L</em> = Low</td>
<td><em>M</em> = Moderate</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

SRSS-IE: Cut Scores

- Enter 'practice' data into that one sheet so that the total scores and conditional formatting are tested.
- Confirm the "Count" column is completed (students’ numbered sequentially).
- Formulas are anchored by the "Count" column; it must contain a number for each student listed for accurate total formulas.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Elementary School</th>
<th>Middle and High School</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SRSS-E7 Items 1-7</td>
<td>SRSS-E5 Items 8-12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SRSS-E7 Items 1-7</td>
<td>SRSS-E7 Items 4-8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

0-3 = low risk  
2-3 = moderate risk  
4-15 = high risk

0-3 = low risk  
4-5 = moderate risk  
6-18 = high risk


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) SRSS-I6 Results – All Students
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>

New Lessons Learned
SRSS-IE:
An update on predictive validity at the secondary level


Middle School Participants  N = 2,313

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable/ Level</th>
<th>% (n)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>53.40 (1,202)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>46.60 (1,049)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grade</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sixth</td>
<td>34.52 (777)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seventh</td>
<td>33.81 (761)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eighth</td>
<td>31.67 (713)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethnicity/Race</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic</td>
<td>8.17 (184)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>75.08 (1,690)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black</td>
<td>6.75 (152)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian / Pacific Islander</td>
<td>3.91 (88)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Native American / Native Alaskan</td>
<td>4.31 (97)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Special education</td>
<td>22.35 (503)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### SRSS-IE: **EXTERNALIZING** SUBSCALE

**MIDDLE SCHOOL**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Risk</th>
<th>Significance Testing</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Low M (SD)</td>
<td>Moderate M (SD)</td>
<td>High M (SD)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fall Externalizing</td>
<td>3.56 (0.47)</td>
<td>2.74 (0.84)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Winter</td>
<td>3.28 (0.79)</td>
<td>2.79 (1.72)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spring</td>
<td>1.61 (1.96)</td>
<td>9.66 (1.93)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Course Failures</td>
<td>0.38 (1.12)</td>
<td>0.75 (2.13)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nurse Visits</td>
<td>3.10 (1.51)</td>
<td>1.56 (3.22)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Office discipline referrals</td>
<td>0.03 (0.24)</td>
<td>L &lt; M &lt; H</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In-School Suspensions</td>
<td>0.11 (0.89)</td>
<td>L &lt; M &lt; H</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### SRSS-IE: **INTERNALIZING** SUBSCALE

**MIDDLE SCHOOL**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Risk</th>
<th>Significance Testing</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Low M (SD)</td>
<td>Moderate M (SD)</td>
<td>High M (SD)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GPA</td>
<td>3.51 (0.51)</td>
<td>3.16 (0.64)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fall Internalizing</td>
<td>0.52 (1.40)</td>
<td>0.19 (0.75)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Winter Internalizing</td>
<td>0.32 (1.63)</td>
<td>N.S.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Office discipline referrals</td>
<td>0.06 (0.40)</td>
<td>L &lt; M &lt; H</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In-School Suspensions</td>
<td>0.18 (1.10)</td>
<td>L &lt; M, H</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### High School Participants

N = 2,727

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable/ Level</th>
<th>% (n)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>52.89 (1,393)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>47.11 (1,241)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grade</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ninth</td>
<td>29.23 (770)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tenth</td>
<td>23.99 (632)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eleventh</td>
<td>25.06 (660)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Twelfth</td>
<td>21.72 (572)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethnicity/Race</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic</td>
<td>7.97 (210)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>76.23 (2,008)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black</td>
<td>6.45 (170)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian / Pacific Islander</td>
<td>2.92 (77)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Native American / Native Alaskan</td>
<td>4.92 (108)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mixed Races</td>
<td>9.98 (263)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Special Education</td>
<td>19.89 (524)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### SRSS-IE: **EXTERNALIZING** Subscale
#### HIGH SCHOOL

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Fall GPA</th>
<th>Winter GPA</th>
<th>Spring GPA</th>
<th>Course Failures</th>
<th>Nurse Visits</th>
<th>ODR</th>
<th>Suspensions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Low M (SD) n = 2,363</td>
<td>3.07 (0.7)</td>
<td>1.16 (0.7)</td>
<td>3.08 (0.7)</td>
<td>L &lt; M, H</td>
<td>M = H</td>
<td>L &lt; M, H</td>
<td>M = H</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moderate M (SD) n = 212</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>M = H</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High M (SD) n = 59</td>
<td>1.96 (0.6)</td>
<td></td>
<td>1.96 (0.6)</td>
<td>M = H</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### GPA Testing
- L < M, H
- M = H

### SRSS-IE: **INTERNALIZING** Subscale
#### HIGH SCHOOL

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Fall Internalizing</th>
<th>Winter Internalizing</th>
<th>Spring Internalizing</th>
<th>Course Failures</th>
<th>Nurse Visits</th>
<th>ODR</th>
<th>Suspensions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Low M (SD) n = 2,379</td>
<td>3.04 (0.8)</td>
<td>2.44 (0.8)</td>
<td>2.27 (1.0)</td>
<td>L &lt; M, H</td>
<td>M = H</td>
<td>L &lt; M, H</td>
<td>M = H</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moderate M (SD) n = 123</td>
<td>2.31 (1.0)</td>
<td>2.59 (2.6)</td>
<td>2.83 (3.2)</td>
<td>M = H</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High M (SD) n = 132</td>
<td>2.27 (1.0)</td>
<td>2.59 (2.6)</td>
<td>2.83 (3.2)</td>
<td>M = H</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### GPA Testing
- L < M, H
- M = H

---

Lane, Oakes, Cantwell et al. (2018)
Strengths and Difficulties Questionnaire

Available from sqdinfo.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>6</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emotional Symptoms</td>
<td>N=75</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conduct Problems</td>
<td>N=75</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hyperactivity</td>
<td>N=75</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peer Problems</td>
<td>N=77</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prosocial Behavior</td>
<td>N=78</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>11</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


Social, Academic, and Emotional Behavior Risk Screener
Available from Fastbridge Learning
(SAEBRS; Kilgus, Chafouleas, & Riley-Tillman, 2013)

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:

SAMPLE DATA: SAEBRS
Large Urban Elementary - Fall Screening Data

Source: Kilgus, Kilpatrick, Taylor, Ecklund, & 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 Data: High School Yrs1-3
Data sharing...

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

- Grade / Department / Class
  ...implications for teachers' practice

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

---

Communication and Continuous Improvement

---

Ci3t.org/screening

---
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, Mewies, Bruhn, and Crnobori (2011)
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, Menzies, Bruhn, and Crnodor (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


Examining Academic and Behavioral Data:
Elementary School Level

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

Self-monitoring
Behavior Contracts

Low-Intensity Strategies
### Behavior-Specific Praise
- Using specific, appropriate, and contrasting praise to provide feedback on a student’s on-task behavior or work. Example: “Nice, thank you for asking through responses to your assignment today.”

- Niama, 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 prompts. Teachers should provide approximately four to six opportunities to respond per minute. The response can be individual, choral, verbal, written, or indicated through a gesture or symbol.

- 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...

### Instructional Choice
- Providing within-task or between-task choices to increase academic engaged time and motivation.

- Ronaldo, of these 3 tasks today, which would you like to work on first?
- Suzi, do you want to work with colored pencils, crayons, or sparkly markers?

---

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Low-Intensity Strategy</th>
<th>Lincoln Elementary On-Site Expert</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Behavioral Specific Praise</td>
<td>Eric Common, Behavior Specialist</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mark Handman, 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 John, Kindergarten</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

### Table of Low-Intensity Strategies

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Low-Intensity Strategy</th>
<th>Lincoln Elementary On-Site Expert</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Behavioral Specific Praise</td>
<td>Eric Common, Behavior Specialist</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mark Handman, 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 John, 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)

Secondary (Tier 2) Intervention Grids

BASC² – Behavior and Emotional Screening Scale
Spring 2012

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subgroup</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Sixth</th>
<th>Seventh</th>
<th>Eighth</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Normal</td>
<td>85.42</td>
<td>87.67</td>
<td>82.18</td>
<td>86.21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elevated</td>
<td>10.74</td>
<td>8.68</td>
<td>12.38</td>
<td>11.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extremely Elevated</td>
<td>3.85</td>
<td>3.65</td>
<td>5.45</td>
<td>2.46</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

N = 624  n = 219  n = 202  n = 203
Comprehensive, Integrative, Three-tiered (CI3T) Models of Support

Assess, Design, Implement, and Evaluate

Behavior Contracts
Self-Monitoring
Functional Assessment-Based Interventions

Basic Classroom Management
Effective Instruction
Low Intensity Strategies

Assessment

Sample Secondary Intervention Grid

Support: Behavior Contract
Description: 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.

Support: Self-Monitoring
Description: Students will monitor and record their academic production (completion/accuracy) and on-task behavior each day.

Lane, Kalberg, & Mensen (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><strong>Small group reading instruction with self-</strong></td>
<td>Students who:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>monitoring</strong></td>
<td>Behavior: Fall SRSS at moderate (4 - 8) or high (9 - 21) risk Academic: Fall AIMSweb LNF at the strategic or intensive level</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>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></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>AIMSweb reading PSF and NWF progress monitoring probes (weekly). Daily self-monitoring checklists</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Treatment Integrity Social Validity</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Meet AIMSweb reading benchmark at next screening time point. Low Risk on SRSS at next screening time point.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


First Grade Students’ Self Monitoring Form
Treatment Integrity
Social Validity
Monitor student progress

Sample Elementary Intervention Grid: PA

Sample Elementary Intervention Grid: SSIS
Active Supervision

READ 180 (Stage C)

**Reading Intervention**

Students participate in a 60 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.

**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 scores in the moderate range (4 – 8).

**Data to Monitor Progress:**

1. Students meeting individual READ 180 reading goals:
   (1) Progress Monitoring with Scholastic Reading Inventory
   (2) Writing Assessments
   (3) curricular-based assessments (vocabulary, comprehension, and spelling)
   (4) Curriculum-based Assessments
   (5) Attendance in class

**Exit Criteria**

Students meet instructional reading goals. SRSS score in the low risk category (0 – 3) on the next screening time point.


**Mentoring Program (Sophomores/Juniors/Seniors)**

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.

**Entry Criteria**

1. 10th/11th/12th graders
2. Behavior: SRSS: High (9-21) or Moderate (4-8) by either 2nd or 7th period teacher
3. Absences 5 days in a grading period
4. Academic: GPA ≤ 2.75

**Data to Monitor Progress:**

1. Student Measures:
   (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**

Students no longer meet criteria next fall.

**Social Validity:** Mentors complete weekly monitoring checklists to report meeting time and activities.

Support Description Schoolwide Data: Entry Criteria Data to Monitor Progress Exit Criteria

**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.
50 min per day until exit criteria is met.

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

**Student Measures:**
Algebra II classroom grade
Daily class average if grade is ≤ 75

**Treatment Integrity:**
Daily monitoring of the lessons covered and student attendance

**Social Validity:**
Pre and Post Student Surveys

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

---

_References_


---

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

**Tertiary Prevention (Tier 3)**

**Tertiary (Tier 3) Intervention Grids**

---

_Images_
### 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 the behavior specialist and PBIS team</td>
<td>Students who: <strong>Behavior</strong> 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 (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. <strong>Academic</strong> 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. 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>
</tbody>
</table>

### Changes in Harry’s Behavior

![Graph showing changes in Harry’s Behavior](image)

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

Recommendations to Consider

- Recommendation #1: Build Stakeholders’ Expertise
- Recommendation #2: Develop the Structures to Sustain and Improve Practices
- Recommendation #3: Conduct Screenings in a Responsible Fashion
- Recommendation #4: Consider Legal Implications- know your state laws

(Lane & Oakes, 2012)
District Decision Makers

Pre-Training Activities
- Introduction to CI3T

Session 1: Overview of CI3T
- Establish team meetings and roles

Session 2: Mission and Purpose
- Establish Roles and Responsibilities
- Procedures for Teaching and Reinforcing

Session 3: Procedures for Monitoring
- Revision of essential strategies

Session 4: 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

Additional Professional Development on Specific Topics
- Core Curriculum
- Functional Interventional Interventions
- Additional Tier 3 Supports
- Teacher Drive Supports: Instructional Techniques to Improve Student Motivation; General Classroom Management Practices; Low Intensity; Behavioral Supports

MTSS: CI3T Training Series
- Core Curriculum
- Functional Interventional Interventions
- Additional Tier 3 Supports
Upcoming Professional Development

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Month</th>
<th>Day 1</th>
<th>Day 2</th>
<th>Day 3</th>
<th>Day 4</th>
<th>Day 5</th>
<th>Day 6</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sep</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>KU Ci3T</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oct</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>IMPLEMENTATION</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nov</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Technology Training</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dec</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jan</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feb</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mar</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Apr</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

KU Ci3T

IMP

Day 1

11/13/18
5:00-
7:00PM

Day 2

12/05/18
8:00AM-
4:00PM

Day 3

01/15/19
5:00-
7:00PM

Day 4

02/12/19
8:00AM-
4:00PM

Day 5

04/03/19
5:00-
7:00PM

Day 6

05/09/19
8:00AM-
4:00PM

KU Ci3T

EMPOWER

Session  1

10/03/18
5:00-7:00 PM

Session  2

11/15/18
5:00-7:00 PM

Session  3

01/24/19
5:00-7:00 PM

Session  4

03/20/19
5:00-7:00 PM

Session  5

04/17/19
5:00-7:00 PM

Session  6

05/21/19
5:00-7:00 PM

Session  7

06/04/19
5:00-7:00 PM

Session  8

07/02/19
5:00-7:00 PM

KU Ci3T

TRAINING

KU Ci3T

IMPLEMENTATION

KU Ci3T

TRAINER OF TRAINEES

KU Ci3T

EMPOWER

Day 1

09/19/18
9:00AM-12:00PM

Day 2

11/14/18
5:00-
7:00PM

Day 3

01/16/19
5:00-
7:00PM

Day 4

03/19/19
5:00-
7:00PM

Day 5

04/02/19
5:00-
7:00PM

KU Ci3T

ToT

Coaching Call

Session 1

09/20/18
9:00AM-12:00PM

Session 2

11/16/18
5:00-
7:00PM

Session 3

12/07/18
5:00-
7:00PM

Session 4

01/17/19
5:00-
7:00PM

Session 5

02/13/19
5:00-
7:00PM

Session 6

03/21/19
5:00-
7:00PM

Session 7

04/04/19
5:00-
7:00PM

Session 8

05/03/19
5:00-
7:00PM

KU Ci3T

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
Wendy.Oakes@ASU.edu
www.ci3t.org