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Agenda

• Comprehensive, Integrated, Three-tiered (CI3T) Models of Prevention
• The Importance of Systematic Screening
• Using Screening Data ... • implications for primary prevention efforts • implications for teachers • implications for student-based interventions at Tier 2 and Tier 3

Goal: Reverse Harm
Specialized Group Systems for Students At-Risk

Goal: Prevent Harm
School/Classroom-Wide Systems for All Students, Staff, & Settings

Goal: Reduce Harm
Specialized Individual Systems for Students with High-Risk

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

Primary Prevention (Tier 1) ≈ 80%
Secondary Prevention (Tier 2) ≈ 10%
Tertiary Prevention (Tier 3)

PBIS Framework
Validated Curricula
### Comprehensive, Integrated, Three-Tiered Model of Prevention

**Lane, Kalberg, & Menzies, 2009**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tier</th>
<th>Prevention</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Primary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Secondary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Tertiary</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- **Primary Prevention (Tier 1):**
  - Academic: ≈80%
  - Behavioral: ≈15%
  - Social: ≈5%

- **Secondary Prevention (Tier 2):**
  - Positive Behavior Interventions and Supports (PBIS)

- **Tertiary Prevention (Tier 3):**
  - District & State Standards, High Quality Instruction
  - Reading Street

---

**Diagram:**

- Tertiary Prevention (Tier 3) at the apex.
- Secondary Prevention (Tier 2) in the middle.
- Primary Prevention (Tier 1) at the base.

- Academic, Behavioral, and Social categories.

---

**CL3F**

- CL3F logo on the top right corner.
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 Intervention Plan

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>Purpose Statement</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>School Wide Expectations</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Area I: Academic Responsibilities Students will:</td>
<td>Area II: Behavioral Responsibilities Students will:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty and Staff will:</td>
<td>Faculty and Staff will:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parents will:</td>
<td>Parents will:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administrators will:</td>
<td>Administrators will:</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Lane & Oakes 2012
Positive Behavior Interventions and Supports (PBIS)

What do I need to know?

Area I: Academic Responsibilities

Faculty and Staff:
- Display posters with school-wide expectations
- Foster a safe environment for all students
- Model, teach, and revisit school-wide expectations
- Provide behavior specific praise and reinforcement to students who display expectations
- Establish a continuous communication with parents
- Support Positive Behavioral Interventions and Supports (PBIS) Framework
- Implement proactive and reactive plans with fidelity: use behavior specific praise with BOW WOWS, reminder behavioral expectations, retest expectations and follow rest of the plan
- Conduct, report, and use screening and assessments (see Assessment Schedule)

Area II: Social Skills Responsibilities

Faculty and Staff:
- Support the school’s Character With Kids’ social skills programs
- Support positive behavior expectations
- Support positive social interactions

Area III: Social Skills Responsibilities

Faculty and Staff:
- Support the school’s Character With Kids’ social skills programs
- Support positive behavior expectations
- Support positive social interactions
Procedures for Reinforcing

Faculty and Staff:

Students:

Parents/Community:

---

Ci3T Ticket Examples

---

Reactive Plan

All Faculty Will First:
1. Teach, Remind, and Reteach Appropriate Behaviors “Teachable Moments” to students
2. Reinforce positive behaviors
3. Problem solve with students “More Teachable Moments”
4. Continue building relationships
5. Communicate with parents and elicit their support
Essential Components of Primary Prevention Efforts

- Social Validity
- Treatment Integrity
- Systematic Screening
- Academic
- Behavior

Critical Information for school and district teams

---

What screening tools are available?

See Lane, Meneses, Oakes, and Kalberg (2012)

---

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measure</th>
<th>Aug</th>
<th>Sep</th>
<th>Oct</th>
<th>Nov</th>
<th>Dec</th>
<th>Jan</th>
<th>Feb</th>
<th>March</th>
<th>April</th>
<th>May</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>School Demographics</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Screening Measures</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- SRSS-IE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Outcome Measures</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Academic</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Behavior</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Program Measures</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Social Validity - iPad</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Schoolwide Evaluation Tool</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- VIPS (treatment) Integrity</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Systematic Screener for Behavior Disorders

SSBD 2nd ed.; Walker, Severson, & Feil, 2014

SSBD Screening Process

1. STAGE 1: TEACHER SCREENING on Externalizing and Internalizing Behavioral Disorders
   - 3 Highest Ranked Pupils on Externalizing and Internalizing Behavior Criteria

2. STAGE 2: TEACHER RATING on Critical Events Index and Combined Frequency Index
   - Exceeded Normative Criteria on CEI of CFI

3. STAGE 3: DIRECT OBSERVATION AND/or SARS of Process Selected Pupils in Classroom and on Playground
   - Exceeded Normative Criteria on AET and PSB

Pre-referral Intervention(s)

Child may be referred to Child Study Team

SSBD Results – Winter 2007 through Winter 2009

Risk Status of Nominated Students

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 behavioral disorders over a three year period.
### Student Risk Screening Scale (SRSS)

**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. 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
- 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

**SRSS Score:** Sum Items 1-7
(Range 0 - 21)

Teachers evaluate each student on the following items:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Score</th>
<th>Category</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Steal</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Low</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lie, Cheat, Sneak</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Low</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Behavior Problems</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Low</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peer Rejection</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Low</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low Academic Achievement</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Low</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Negative Attitude</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Low</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aggressive Behavior</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Low</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Student Name:** Smith, Sally

**Student ID:** 11111

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Steal</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lie, Cheat, Sneak</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Behavior Problems</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peer Rejection</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low Academic Achievement</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Negative Attitude</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aggressive Behavior</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**SRSS Score:** 9

**Student Risk:** High
**Student Risk Screening Scale**

Middle School Fall 2004 – Fall 2011

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Percentage of Students</th>
<th>Fall 2004</th>
<th>Fall 2005</th>
<th>Fall 2006</th>
<th>Fall 2007</th>
<th>Fall 2008</th>
<th>Fall 2009</th>
<th>Fall 2010</th>
<th>Fall 2011</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>High</td>
<td>86.00%</td>
<td>86.00%</td>
<td>89.79%</td>
<td>93.08%</td>
<td>90.55%</td>
<td>92.56%</td>
<td>94.06%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moderate</td>
<td>17.00%</td>
<td>11.00%</td>
<td>7.87%</td>
<td>6.29%</td>
<td>7.77%</td>
<td>6.11%</td>
<td>3.71%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low</td>
<td>77.00%</td>
<td>86.00%</td>
<td>86.00%</td>
<td>89.79%</td>
<td>93.08%</td>
<td>90.55%</td>
<td>92.56%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


**SAMPLE DATA: SRSS**

Middle School Study 1: Behavioral & Academic Characteristics of SRSS Risk Groups

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Low (n = 422)</th>
<th>Moderate (n = 51)</th>
<th>High (n = 12)</th>
<th>Significance Testing</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ODR</td>
<td>1.50 (2.85)</td>
<td>5.02 (5.32)</td>
<td>8.42 (7.01)</td>
<td>L &lt; M &lt; 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 &lt; M &lt; 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</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Course Failures</td>
<td>0.68 (1.20)</td>
<td>2.78 (3.46)</td>
<td>4.17 (3.49)</td>
<td>L = M, H</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Lane, Parks, Kalberg, & Carter, 2007)

**STUDENT RISK SCREENING SCALE**

High School: Behavioral & Academic Characteristics of SRSS Risk Groups

Non-Instructional Raters

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Low (n = 328)</th>
<th>Moderate (n = 52)</th>
<th>High (n = 35)</th>
<th>Significance Testing</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ODR</td>
<td>3.53 (5.53)</td>
<td>8.27 (7.72)</td>
<td>8.97 (9.39)</td>
<td>L &lt; M &lt; 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>

(Lane, Kalberg, Parks, & Carter, 2008)
Elementary Level Results: ROC Curves

Externalizing AUC 0.952


Internalizing AUC .802


STUDENT RISK SCREENING SCALE-IE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>BEHAVIOR</th>
<th>0 = Never</th>
<th>1 = Occasionally</th>
<th>2 = Sometimes</th>
<th>3 = Frequently</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Steal</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lie</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cheat</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sneak</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Behavior Problem</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peer Rejection</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low Academic Achievement</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Negative Attitude</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aggressive Behavior</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emotionally Flat</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shy; Withdrawn</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sad; Depressed</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anxious</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Obsessive-Compulsive Behavior</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lonely</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-Inflicts Pain</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

Original SRSS-IE 14 items retained for use at the elementary level 14 items under development in middle and high schools
Convergent Validity: SRSS-E7, SRSS-I5, & SRSS-IE12 with the SSBD

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target as Measured by the SSBD</th>
<th>Student Condition According to the SSBD</th>
<th>SRSS-IE Comparison</th>
<th>ROC</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>With Condition N</td>
<td>Without Condition N</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Internalizing</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>1026</td>
<td>SRSS-I5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>SRSS-IE12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Externalizing</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>1026</td>
<td>SRSS-E7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>SRSS-IE12</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: SSBD refers to the Systematic Screening for Behavior Disorders (Walker & Severson, 1992). SRSS-IE12 refers to the original 7 items from the SRSS developed by Drummond (1994) combined with the new five items constituting the SRSS-IE5. The SRSS-E7 refers to the original 7 items constituting the SRSS.


SRSS-IE: SRSS-E7, SRSS-I5 Cut Scores

- Enter 'practice' data into that one sheet so that the total scores and conditional formatting are tested.
- Items 1-7 (The SRSS externalizing scale)
  0 – 3 low risk
  4 – 8 moderate risk (yellow)
- Items 8-12 (The SRSS-IE internalizing items)*preliminary cut scores for elementary only
  0 – 1 low risk
  2 – 5 moderate (yellow)
  6 – 15 high (red)

- 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.

How do we score and interpret the SRSS-IE at the Elementary Level?
Sample ... Winter
SRSS-E7 Results – All Students

Sample ... Winter 2014
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>K</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>45 (77.59%)</td>
<td>10 (17.24%)</td>
<td>3 (5.17%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1st</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>38 (73.08%)</td>
<td>11 (21.15%)</td>
<td>3 (5.77%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>45 (76.27%)</td>
<td>11 (18.64%)</td>
<td>3 (5.08%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Sample ... Winter 2014
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>3rd</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>51 (82.26%)</td>
<td>11 (17.74%)</td>
<td>0 (0.00%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4th</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>55 (82.09%)</td>
<td>8 (11.94%)</td>
<td>4 (5.97%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5th</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>42 (71.19%)</td>
<td>15 (25.42%)</td>
<td>2 (3.39%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### SRSS-I5 Results – All Students

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Screening Time Point</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Low (0-1)</th>
<th>Moderate (2-3)</th>
<th>High (4-15)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>School W14</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>78.99%</td>
<td>13.45%</td>
<td>7.56%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School W15</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>76.99%</td>
<td>11.43%</td>
<td>11.58%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School W16</td>
<td>210</td>
<td>75.55%</td>
<td>12.71%</td>
<td>11.74%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School W17</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>70.40%</td>
<td>13.79%</td>
<td>15.81%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Sample … Winter 2014 SRSS-I5 Comparison by Grade Level

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Grade Level</th>
<th>N Screened</th>
<th>Low (0-1)</th>
<th>Moderate (2-3)</th>
<th>High (4-15)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>K</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>48 (82.76%)</td>
<td>7 (12.07%)</td>
<td>3 (5.17%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1st</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>37 (71.15%)</td>
<td>9 (17.31%)</td>
<td>6 (11.54%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>43 (72.88%)</td>
<td>12 (20.34%)</td>
<td>4 (6.78%)</td>
</tr>
<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>
A Look at Screening in High Schools

Principal Interview: HS Screening

Lane, Oakes, Menzies, Major, Allegra, Powers and Schatschneider (2015)
Examining your screening data ...

... implications for primary prevention efforts
... implications for teachers
... implications for student-based interventions

See Lane, Menes, Brune, and Cricoboni (2011)

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

Student Risk Screening Scale
Middle School Fall 2004 – Fall 2011

Examining your screening data ...

... implications for primary prevention efforts

... implications for teachers

... implications for student-based interventions

See Lane, Menias, Bruhn, and Crnobori (2011)

Teacher-Level Considerations

1. Instructional Considerations
2. General Classroom Management
3. Low-intensity Strategies

Student Risk Screening Scale (SRSS; Drummond, 1994)
Consideration #3
Low-Intensity Strategies

Opportunities to Respond
Behavior Specific Praise
Active Supervision
Instructional Feedback
High-Response Prevention
Precorrection
Incorporating Choice
Self-monitoring
Behavior Contracts

Consider a book study ...
Build school site capacity

Examining your screening data …

… implications for primary prevention efforts
… implications for teachers
… implications for student-based interventions

See Lane, Menzies, Bruhn, and Crnobori (2011)

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

Tertiary Prevention (Tier 3)
Goal: Reduce Harm
Specialized Individual Systems for Students with High-Risk

Secondary Prevention (Tier 2)
Goal: Reverse Harm
Specialized Group Systems for Students at-Risk

Primary Prevention (Tier 1)
Goal: Prevent Harm
School/Classroom-Wide Systems for All Students, Staff, & Settings

PBIS Framework
Valued Curricula

Academic
Behavioral
Social

Schoolwide Positive Behavior Support
Comprehensive, Integrated, Three-tiered (CI3T) Model of Support
Low Intensity Strategies
Basic Classroom Management
Effective Instruction
Low Intensity Strategies

Higher Intensity Strategies
Behavior Contracts
Self-Monitoring
Functional Assessment-Based Interventions

Assessment
Assess, Design, Implement, and Evaluate
Step 1: Construct your assessment schedule
Step 2: Identify your secondary supports
  - Existing and new interventions
Step 3: Determine entry criteria
  - Academic screening scores, progress data, behavior screening scores, attendance data, etc.
Step 4: Identify outcome measures
  - Pre and post tests, CBM, office discipline data, GPA, etc.
Step 5: Identify exit criteria
  - Reduction of discipline contacts, academic success, reduction of truancies and absences, etc.
Step 6: Consider additional needs
Examining Academic and Behavioral Data: Middle and High School Level

Support | Description | Schoolwide Data: Entry Criteria | Data to Monitor Progress | Exit Criteria
--- | --- | --- | --- | ---
Behavior Contract | 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. | | | Successful completion of behavior contract
Self-monitoring | Students will monitor and record their academic production (completion/accuracy) and on-task behavior each day. Students who scored in the abnormal range for H and CP on the SDQ; course failure or at-risk on CBM | Work completion and accuracy in the academic area of concern; passing grades | | 

An illustration

Support | Description | Schoolwide Data: Entry Criteria | Data to Monitor Progress | Exit Criteria
--- | --- | --- | --- | ---
Small group reading instruction with self-monitoring | Small group reading instruction (30 min. 3 days per week) Students monitored their participation in the reading instructional tasks. Students used checklists of reading lesson components each day to complete and compare to teachers’ rating. K-1. | Students who: Behavior: Fall SRSS at moderate (4-8) or high (9-21) risk Academic: Fall AIMSweb LNF at the strategic or intensive level | AIMSweb reading PSF and NWF progress monitoring probes (weekly) Daily self-monitoring checklists | Men AIMSweb reading benchmark at next screening time point. Low Risk on SRSS at next screening time point.
Small group Reading Instruction with Self-Monitoring


First Grade Students' Self Monitoring Form


Treatment Integrity
Social Validity
Monitor student progress

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Support Description</th>
<th>Data to Monitor</th>
<th>Exit Criteria</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>READ 180 (Stage C)</strong> Reading Intervention</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>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.</td>
<td>(1) Students in grades 9 - 12. (2) Reading performance basic or below basic on state assessment (but above 4th grade reading level). (3) SRRS: moderate to high risk scores (5 - 9).</td>
<td>Students meet instructional reading goals. SSRS score in the low risk category (0 – 3) on the next screening time point.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


| **Mentoring Program (Sophomores/Juniors)** | | |
| 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. | (1) 10th/11th/12th graders (2) Behavior: SRSS: High (9-21) or Moderate (4-8) by either 2nd or 7th period teacher. ODR ≥ 2. Absences ≥ 3 days in one grading period. (3) Academic: GPA ≤ 2.75. | Students who no longer meet criteria next fall. |


| **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) 33A grades. (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. | Algebra II Grade increases to satisfactory level (above 75%). |

A Step-by-Step Process

Step 1: Construct your assessment schedule
Step 2: Identify your secondary supports
  • Existing and new interventions
Step 3: Determine entry criteria
  • Nomination, academic failure, behavior screening scores, attendance data etc.
Step 4: Identify outcome measures
  • Pre and post tests, CBM, office discipline data, GPA etc.
Step 5: Identify exit criteria
  • Reduction of discipline contacts, academic success, reduction of truancies and absences etc.
Step 6: Consider additional needs

---

A Comprehensive, Integrative, Three-tiered (CIT3) Model of Support

Assess, Design, Implement, and Evaluate

Behavior Contract
Self-Monitoring
Functional Assessment-Based Interventions

Schoolwide Positive Behavior Support

Low Intensity Strategies

Higher Intensity Strategies

---

Changes in Harry’s Behavior

---

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

Data-Informed Decision Making

**Questions to consider**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>3rd</th>
<th>4th</th>
<th>5th</th>
<th>6th</th>
<th>7th</th>
<th>8th</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>What are the grade levels for the measure?</td>
<td>3rd</td>
<td>4th</td>
<td>5th</td>
<td>6th</td>
<td>7th</td>
<td>8th</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What types of concerns does the measure detect?</td>
<td>Internalizing/Externalizing</td>
<td>Internalizing/Externalizing</td>
<td>Total Difficulties</td>
<td>Internalizing/Externalizing</td>
<td>Total Difficulties</td>
<td>Total Difficulties</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Who may complete it?</td>
<td>Teacher</td>
<td>Teacher</td>
<td>Teacher</td>
<td>Teacher</td>
<td>Teacher</td>
<td>Teacher</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is the measure free-access?</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How much time does the measure take?</td>
<td>30 - 60 mins</td>
<td>30 - 60 mins</td>
<td>30 - 60 mins</td>
<td>30 - 60 mins</td>
<td>30 - 60 mins</td>
<td>30 - 60 mins</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is there an online or electronic scoring option?</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is there an intervention component?</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The Professional Development Training Series

- **November**: CI3T: Tertiary Prevention
- **December**: CI3T: Secondary Prevention
- **January**: CI3T: Primary Prevention
- **February**: Core Content Curriculum
- **March**: Additional Tier 3 Supports

Additionally, there are sessions on specific topics such as:
- **Check In - Check Out**
- **Additional Tier 3 Supports**
- **Student Driven Interventions, Strategies, & Practices**
- **Functional Assessment-based Interventions**
- **Reading, Math, Writing Benchmarking and Progress Monitoring Tools**
- **Student Driven Interventions, Strategies, & Practices**
- **Check In - Check Out**

The Professional Development Training Series provides comprehensive, integrated, three-tiered (CI3T) models of prevention training. Figure 5 illustrates the CI3T training sequence. Lane, K. L., Oakes, W. P., Jenkins, A., Menzies, H. M., & Kalberg, J. R. (2014). A team-based process for designing Comprehensive, Integrated, Three-Tiered (CI3T) Models of Prevention: How does my school-site leadership team design a CI3T model? Preventing School Failure, 58, 129-142. DOI: 10.1080/1045988X.2014.893976
Professional Development: A Collaborative Effort to Empower Public School Systems

Project Empower

- September 30
- October 7
- November 21
- January 5
- March 5

Five 2-hour sessions held after school: 5-7pm

2015-2016 Professional Learning Offerings

January 30
February 6
February 20
March 5
March 23
April 6
May 2
May 20
May 27

Monthly Faculty Presentations

JANUARY 2015

For Faculty & Staff During the Work Day

6 - 10
11 - 15
16 - 20
21 - 25
26 - 30
PBIS.org
• Very useful to find research on specific interventions
• PowerPoint presentations are available for some interventions
• Training modules are available on PBIS aspects and interventions
• Some tools and measures are available to be viewed
• Quick FAQs on secondary and tertiary interventions

Ci3T.org

Moving Forward ... Resources
Questions: Kathleen.Lane@ku.edu