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• Systematic Screening Tools & Logistics
• Using Screening Data to Inform Instruction
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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 Rehabilitation of the United States Department of Education

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

Comprehensive, Integrated, Three-Tiered Model of Prevention
(Lane, Kalberg, & Meneres, 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
Implementing C3T Models: A Respectful Partnership

Comprehensive, Integrated, Three-Tiered Model of Prevention
(Lane, Kolberg, & Mercier, 2009)

Tier 1
Primary Prevention
(Tier 1: 70-80%)

Tier 2
Secondary Prevention
(Tier 2: 15-20%)

Tier 3
Tertiary Prevention
(Tier 3: 5%)

Academic ◇ Behavioral ◇ Social

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

Comprehensive, Integrated, Three-Tiered Model of Prevention
(Lane, Kolberg, & Mercier, 2009)
**Behavioral Component:**
Positive Behavioral Interventions and Supports (PBIS)

- 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


---

**A Framework, Not a Curriculum**

### Elementary Settings

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Setting</th>
<th>Classroom</th>
<th>Hallway</th>
<th>Cafeteria</th>
<th>Playground</th>
<th>Bathroom</th>
<th>Bus</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Respect</strong></td>
<td>Use self-control.</td>
<td>Control your volume.</td>
<td>Keep to your own side.</td>
<td>Stay a safe distance from other kids.</td>
<td>Listen to and follow adult requests.</td>
<td>Use the restroom and wash your hands before sitting down.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Responsibility</strong></td>
<td>Arrive to class on time.</td>
<td>Remain in school all day.</td>
<td>Fill your required materials.</td>
<td>Turn in your work on time.</td>
<td>Follow the rules of the game.</td>
<td>Use your own bathroom stall.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Best Effort</strong></td>
<td>Participate in class activities.</td>
<td>Complete with your best effort.</td>
<td>Ask for help politely.</td>
<td>Use your table manners.</td>
<td>Use an inside voice.</td>
<td>Respect other people's personal space.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The Five Social and Emotional Learning Core Competencies

- Self-awareness
- Self-management
- Social & Emotional Learning
- Responsible Decision making
- Relationship Skills

(CASEL, 2013)

Outcomes Associated with Social Skills Training

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

Primary Prevention (Tier 1)
- Academic
- Behavioral
- Social

Secondary Prevention (Tier 2)
- Pre-training activities
- Building the primary prevention plan
- Building Tier 2 supports

Tertiary Prevention (Tier 3)
- Preparing to implement

CI3T Professional Learning Series
## Ci3T Primary Plan: Roles and Responsibilities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Stakeholder Group</th>
<th>Communication</th>
<th>Systematic Screening</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Teachers (all)</td>
<td>Soliciting Feedback, Sharing Progress, Providing Professional Learning</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parents</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Communication:

- Soliciting Feedback, Sharing Progress, Providing Professional Learning
- Social Validity
- Treatment Integrity
- Systematic Screening

### Systematic Screening:

- Academic
- Behavioral
- Treatment Integrity
- Social Validity

### Ci3T Primary Plan: Procedures for Teaching

- Implement Evidence-Based Practices
- Provide behavioral specific group instruction and one-on-one coaching to support academic and social skills of students

### Ci3T Primary Plan: Procedures for Reinforcing

- Implement a multi-tiered behavior intervention plan
- Use multiple positive reinforcement procedures

### Ci3T Primary Plan: Procedures for Monitoring

- Monitor student progress using data collection procedures
- Communicate with parents and stakeholders about student progress
Comprehensive, Integrated, Three-Tiered Model of Prevention
(Lane, Kalberg, & Muenks, 2009)

Tertiary (Tier 3) Intervention Grids

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

Secondary (Tier 2) Intervention Grids

Implementation Science
(Adapted from Maas & Blase, 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

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 Screener for Behavior Disorders

Available from Pacific Northwest Publishing

(33rd ed.; Walker, Soverson, & Feil, 2014)
SSBD Results – Winter 2007 through Winter 2009
Risk Status of Nominated Students

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Screening Time Point</th>
<th>Nominated But Did Not Exceed Criteria</th>
<th>Exceeded Normative Criteria</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Winter 2007 (N=60)</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Winter 2008 (N=69)</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Winter 2009 (N=66)</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>57</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

Source: Lane, Menzies, Oakes, & Kalberg, 2012. Figure 2.2 WES Elementary Systematic Screening for Behavior Disorders (SSBD; Walker & Severson, 1992) results comparing the percentage of students nominated and exceeding normative criteria for both externalizing and internalizing behavior disorder over a three year period.
### 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>*5</td>
<td></td>
<td>(5.56%)</td>
<td>(1.39%)</td>
<td>(4.17%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1&lt;sup&gt;st&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>*9E/ 8I</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>1</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>2&lt;sup&gt;nd&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>*10</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>3</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

---

Student Risk Screening Scale

Available from ci3t.org and mibisi.org

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

The SRSS is a 7-item mass screener used to identify students who are at risk for antisocial behavior.

Uses 4-point Likert-type scale:
- never = 0
- occasionally = 1
- sometimes = 2
- frequently = 3

Teachers evaluate each student on the following items:
- Steal - Low Academic Achievement
- 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

### 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.

### Variable Risk

**Low**
- ODR: $1.50 (2.85)$
- In-School Suspensions: $0.08 (0.38)$
- GPA: $3.35 (0.52)$
- Course Failures: $0.68 (1.50)$

**Moderate**
- ODR: $5.02 (5.32)$
- In-School Suspensions: $0.35 (1.04)$
- GPA: $2.63 (0.65)$
- Course Failures: $2.78 (3.46)$

**High**
- ODR: $8.42 (7.01)$
- In-School Suspensions: $1.71 (2.26)$
- GPA: $2.32 (0.59)$
- Course Failures: $4.17 (3.49)$

### Significance Testing
- ODR: $L < M - H$
- In-School Suspensions: $L < M - H$
- GPA: $L > M - H$
- Course Failures: $L > M - H$

*Lane, Parks, Kolberg, & Carter, 2007*

### 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.

*Lane, Kolberg, Parks, & Carter, 2008*
### Student Risk Screening Scale for Internalizing and Externalizing

Available on ci3t.org

(SRSS-IE; Drummond, 1994 and Lane & Menzies, 2009)

#### STUDENT RISK SCREENING SCALE-IE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th><strong>TEACHER rating</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Rarely</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Sometimes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Frequently</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Use the above code to rate each item for each student.

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>0-3 = 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:
Fall 2017
SRSS-Externalizing Results: Grade level

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Grade Level</th>
<th>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>

Procedures

RESULTS:
SRSS-IE: Externalizing Subscale Elementary
**RESULTS:**

**SRSS-IE: INTERNALIZING SUBSCALE ELEMENTARY**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Risk</th>
<th>M (SD)</th>
<th>n</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Moderate</td>
<td>High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fall Internalizing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oral Reading</td>
<td>159.04 (41.45)</td>
<td>459</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nurse Visits</td>
<td>234.44 (7.37)</td>
<td>3,387</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In-School</td>
<td>0.0142 (0.15)</td>
<td>3,387</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>150.59 (45.76)</td>
<td>88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>9.33 (10.81)</td>
<td>450</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.0510 (0.36)</td>
<td>628</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.0311 (0.20)</td>
<td>450</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).

**Elementary School**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Low Risk</th>
<th>Moderate Risk</th>
<th>High Risk</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1-7</td>
<td>0-3</td>
<td>4-8</td>
<td>9-21</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Middle and High School**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Low Risk</th>
<th>Moderate Risk</th>
<th>High Risk</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1-7</td>
<td>0-3</td>
<td>4-8</td>
<td>9-21</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Lane, Oakes et al. (2018).


Lane, Oakes, Cantwell, Schatschneider, Crittenden, Messenger, & Sanchez. (in press). Student risk screening scale for internalizing and externalizing behaviors: Preliminary cut scores to support data-informed decision making in middle and high schools. Behavioral Disorders.
Sample High 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>F15</td>
<td>2.42%</td>
<td>8.06%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F16</td>
<td>3.64%</td>
<td>2.8%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F17</td>
<td>8.2%</td>
<td>9.1%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F18</td>
<td>28.0%</td>
<td>91.2%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<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>F19</td>
<td>90.0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Screening Time Point</th>
<th>Low Risk (0-3)</th>
<th>Moderate (4-5)</th>
<th>High (6-18)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>F16</td>
<td>90.18%</td>
<td>4.16%</td>
<td>5.66%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F17</td>
<td>N = 87</td>
<td>N = 64</td>
<td>N = 1307</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F18</td>
<td>N = 32</td>
<td>N = 44</td>
<td>N = 106</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F19</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### 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>

**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...

<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>N</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>554</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>550</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Sample Middle School: Fall
SRSS-E7 Results – All Students
Screening Data: High School Yrs1-3

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Fall</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>Fall</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Mod</td>
<td>High</td>
<td></td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Mod</td>
<td>High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016</td>
<td>80.28%</td>
<td>10.36%</td>
<td>9.36%</td>
<td>2016</td>
<td>89.56%</td>
<td>8.02%</td>
<td>2.42%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2017</td>
<td>90.38%</td>
<td>6.16%</td>
<td>3.66%</td>
<td>2017</td>
<td>91.29%</td>
<td>6.18%</td>
<td>2.54%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2018</td>
<td>90.91%</td>
<td>3.86%</td>
<td>5.23%</td>
<td>2018</td>
<td>92.22%</td>
<td>6.20%</td>
<td>1.58%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>WTR-SRSSIE-I</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>WTR-SRSSIE-E</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Mod</td>
<td>High</td>
<td></td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Mod</td>
<td>High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016</td>
<td>87.25%</td>
<td>9.49%</td>
<td>3.26%</td>
<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>
<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>
<td>2018</td>
<td>88.79%</td>
<td>8.52%</td>
<td>2.69%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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 District Leadership Team

Ci3T School Leadership Team

Elementary

Middle

High

College & Career

Effective Teams
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, Menzies, Bruhn, and Crnobori (2011)
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)


Examining Academic and Behavioral Data: Elementary School Level
## Low-Intensity Strategies

### Opportunities to Respond
- **Behavior Specific Praise**: Providing feedback for a student on his or her behavior or work. Examples:
  - "Nicole, great job using your graphic organizer to draft your essay."
  - "Justice, thank you for cleaning up the classroom."

### Behavior Specific Praise: Identifying the specific expectation the student met.
- "Nicole, great job using your graphic organizer to draft your essay."
- "Justice, thank you for cleaning up the classroom."

### Active Supervision
- Monitoring a student’s progress and providing feedback to ensure the student is on task.

### Instructional Feedback
- Providing feedback and support to help a student improve.

### High P Requests
- Asking a student to respond immediately to a request.

### Precorrection
- Providing feedback before a task to help a student anticipate what is expected.

### Incorporating Choice
- Offering students the opportunity to choose which instructional activity they would like to complete.

### Self-monitoring
- Encouraging students to monitor their own behavior and progress.

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

### Low-Intensity Strategy

<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, chorally, verbally, written, gestural, or symbolically. | • David Rofer, Administration  
• Emily Cantwell, 5th Grade  
• Scarlett Lane, 1st 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, 1st Grade  
• Bryan Simmons, PE  
• Liane Joffe, Kindergarten |
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)

Tier 3
Tertiary Prevention (≤5%)

Tier 2
Secondary Prevention (≤15%)

Secondary (Tier 2) Intervention Grids

Academic ◇ Behavioral ◇ Social

Validated Curricula PBIS Framework Validated Curricula

Comprehensive, Integrated, Three-Tiered Model of Prevention
(Lane, Kalberg, & Menzies, 2009)
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></td>
<td>N = 624</td>
<td>n = 219</td>
<td>n = 202</td>
<td>n = 203</td>
</tr>
<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>

Percent of Students

Subgroup

- Normal
- Elevated
- Extremely Elevated

Comprehensive, Integrative, Three-tiered (CI3T) Models of Support

Assess, Design, Implement, and Evaluate

Behavior Contracts, Self-Monitoring - Functional Assessment-Based Interventions

Sample Secondary Intervention Grid

- Behavior: SRSS - mod to high risk
  - Academic: 2 or more missing assignments with in a grading period

- Academic: course failure or at risk on CBM
  - Work completion, or other behavior addressed in contract

- Social Validity
  - Successful Completion of behavior contract
  - Passing grade on the report card in the academic area of concern

Lane, Solberg, & Mervain (2009). pp. 131 - 137, Boxes 6.1 - 6.4
An illustration

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

Small group reading instruction with self-monitoring

- Behavior: Fall SRSS at moderate (4-8) or high (9-21) risk
- Academic: Fall AIMSweb LNF at the strategic or intensive level
- Students who: AIMSweb reading PSF and NWF progress monitoring probes (weekly).
- Social Validity: Treatment Integrity: Daily self-monitoring checklists
- Low Risk on SRSS at next screening risk.

Students who: Meet AIMSweb reading benchmark at next screening time point.

K-1.

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.

### First Grade Students’ Self Monitoring Form

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Support</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>School-wide Data Entry Criteria</th>
<th>Data to Monitor Progress</th>
<th>End criteria</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Positive Action (PA) – counselor-led small group</td>
<td>Students and/or social workers will lead small group Positive Action sessions for approximately 30-40 min 2-3 days per week. Students will acquire new skills, learn how to engage more fully in instructional experiences, and learn how to meet more school-wide expectations. Small groups will run for up to 24 sessions (8 to 12 weeks depending on the number of sessions conducted per week) using a subset of Positive Action lessons appropriate for student skillsets as identified using Skills For Greatness (teacher, counselor, parent versions) and SSS-Rating Scale (teacher and parent versions).</td>
<td>Student self-monitoring form and checklist (Parent)</td>
<td>Monitor student progress</td>
<td>Student measures: a) SSiS-Rating Scale (Pre/Post) b) Skills for Greatness (Pre/Post) c) Social validity (Parent) d) Treatment integrity: direct observation</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Support Description School-wide Data: Entry Criteria Data to Monitor Progress Exit Criteria

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

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

Entry Criteria:
- SSIS-E7 score: Moderate (4-8) AND SRSS-I5 score: Moderate (2-3) AND 2 or fewer absences in first 3 months of school AND Evidence of teacher implementation of Ci3T primary (Tier I) plan (treatment integrity: direct observation) AND Parent permission

Data to Monitor:
- Student measures:
  - SSIS Rating Scale (Pre/Post)
  - Skills for Greatness (Pre/Post)
  - Daily behavior report (DBR; daily)
  - Attendance and tardies

Social validity:
- Teacher: RBP-15
- Student: TBP

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

Review student progress at end of 24 sessions.

Team agrees goals have been met or no further SSIS small group sessions are warranted.

SRSS-E7 and I5 scores in the low risk category.

Sample Elementary Intervention Grid: SSIS

Active Supervision

https://eclkc.ohs.acf.hhs.gov/safety-practices

READ 180 (Stage C) Reading Intervention

Students participate in a 50 min reading instructional block during their study hall period. Instruction is relevant to high school students. 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 to below basic on state assessment (but above 4th grade reading level).
3) SSIS-risk score in the moderate range (4 – 8).

Students must instructional reading goals.

SRSS score in the low risk category (0 – 3) on the next screening time point.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Support</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Scholastic Data: Entry Criteria</th>
<th>Data to Monitor Progress:</th>
<th>Exit Criteria</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mentoring Program</td>
<td>Focus is on academic achievement, character development, problem-solving skills, improving self-esteem, relationships with adults and peers, and school attendance. Volunteer teachers serve as mentors, meeting weekly (30 – 60 min) with students during the school day.</td>
<td>(1) 10th/11th/12th grades (2) Behavior: SRSR 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 monitored weekly. (3) Reduced absences (fewer 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.</td>
<td>Varied support Students who no longer meet criteria next fall Seniors: graduation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sophomores/Juniors</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Juniors/Seniors</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mentoring Program</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mentoring Program</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mentoring Program</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></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 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</td>
<td>Student Measures: Algebra II classroom grades 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</td>
<td>Algebra II Grade increase to satisfactory level (above 75%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mentoring Program</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mentoring Program</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mentoring Program</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Comprehensive, Integrated, Three-Tiered Model of Prevention
(Lane, Kalberg, & Mentes, 2009)

Tertiary (Tier 3) Intervention Grids
Secondary Prevention (Tier 2)

Primary Prevention (Tier 1)

Tertiary (Tier 3) Intervention Grids

SAMPLE TERTIARY (Tier 3) INTERVENTION GRID

Support | Description | Schoolwide Data: Entry Criteria | Data to Monitor Progress | Exit Criteria
--- | --- | --- | --- | ---
Behavior | Functional Assessment Intervention developed by the behavior specialist and PBS team | Students who scored in the high-risk category on the Student Risk Screening Scale (SRSS), or scored in the clinical range on Strengths and Difficulties (SDQ) subscales: Emotional Symptoms, Conduct Problems, Hyperactivity, or Peer-related 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. | Data will be collected on both the (a) target (problem) behavior and (b) replacement (desirable) behavior identified by the team on an ongoing basis. | Treatment Integrity Social Validity


Changes in Harry’s Behavior

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 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

Session 1:
- 2 hours
- Ci3T model overview

Session 2:
- Full day
- Building the primary prevention plan

Session 3:
- 2 hours
- How to monitor the plan
- Student team members attend

Session 4:
- Full day
- Building Tier 2 supports

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

Session 6:
- Full day
- Preparing to implement Ci3T Professional Learning Series

Homework
- Share overview with faculty and staff; Build reactive plan
- Finalize and share expectation matrix and teaching & reinforcing components
- Share screeners; Complete assessment schedule
- Share Ci3T plan; Complete PIRS; Complete secondary grid
- Share revised Ci3T plan; Complete Ci3T Feedback Forms

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

Additional Professional Development on Specific Topics

Upcoming Professional Development

Ci3T IMPLEMENTATION
Professional Learning Series
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?

Thank you
Kathleen.Lane@KU.edu
WendyOakes@ASU.edu
www.ci3t.org