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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

Thank you… Commitment to Students with and at risk for EBD

• 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 (Hornor & Sugai, 2015)

Thank you… Commitment to Students with and at risk for EBD

• 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 (Hornor & Sugai, 2015)
Michael Yudin urged educators and educational system leaders to “pay as much attention to students’ social and behavioral needs as we do academics” ...

2014 National PBIS Leadership Conference, Michael Yudin, Assistant Secretary for the Office of Special Education and Rehabilitation of the United States Department of Education

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

- **Primary Prevention (Tier 1)**: School/classroom-wide systems for all students, staff, & settings
  - Goal: Prevent Harm
  - Academic = 80%
  - Behavioral = 15%
  - Social = 5%

- **Secondary Prevention (Tier 2)**: School/classroom-wide systems for all students, staff, & settings
  - Goal: Reverse Harm
  - PBIS Framework
  - Validated Curricula

- **Tertiary Prevention (Tier 3)**: Specialized individual systems for students with high-risk
  - Goal: Reduce Harm
  - Specialized group systems for students at-risk
  - ≈10%
Comprehensive, Integrated, Three-Tiered Model of Prevention
(Lane, Kalberg, & Menzies, 2009)
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### 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>
<th>School Wide Expectations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Area I: Academics</strong></td>
<td>Responsibilities</td>
<td>Students will:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty and Staff will:</td>
<td>Faculty and Staff will:</td>
<td>Students will:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parents will:</td>
<td>Parents will:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administrators will:</td>
<td>Administrators will:</td>
<td></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
- Facilitate communication with parents
- Support Positive Behavioral Interventions and Support (PBIS) framework
- Implement proactive and reactive plan with fidelity: use behavior specific praise with BOW WOWS, reminder behavioral expectations, assess expectations and follow rest of the plan
- Conduct, report, and use screening and assessments (see Assessment Schedule)

Area II: Behavior 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
- Facilitate communication with parents
- Support Positive Behavioral Interventions and Support (PBIS) framework
- Implement proactive and reactive plan with fidelity: use behavior specific praise with BOW WOWS, reminder behavioral expectations, assess expectations and follow rest of the plan
- Conduct, report, and use screening and assessments (see Assessment Schedule)

Area III: Social Skills Responsibilities

Faculty and Staff:
- Support the school’s Connect With Kids Social Skills Program
- Support positive social interaction
- Model positive social interaction
Faculty and Staff:

Students:

Parents/Community:

https://youtu.be/b4swsa_knYE
Procedures for Reinforcing

Faculty and Staff:

Students:

Parents/Community:

Ticket Examples

Reactive Plan

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

---

#### Measure Program

<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>Student Demographic</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Information</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>SBAS-II</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></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 Measure</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></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 Measure</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></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 - PARR</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</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Tool (GET)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- CI3T 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>
What screening tools are available?


SSBD Screening Process
- **Stage 1: Teacher Screening** on Externalizing and Internalizing Behavioral Disorders
- **Stage 2: Teacher Rating** on Critical Events Index and Combined Frequency Index
- **Stage 3: Direct Observation and/or SARS** of Pupil Selected Pupil in Classroom and/or Playground

**Pass Gate 1**

**Pass Gate 2**

**Pass Gate 3**

Pre-referral Intervention(s)

Child may be referred to Child Study Team
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>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Winter 2008 (N=69)</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Winter 2009 (N=66)</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Number of Students

Source. Lane, M., Menzies, C., & Kalberg, W. (2012). Figure 2.2: WES Elementary Systematic Screening for Behavior Disorders (SSBD): Results comparing the percentage of students nominated and exceeding normative criteria for both externalizing and internalizing behavior disorders over a three year period.

Student Risk Screening Scale (SRSS)


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
- Lie, Cheat, Sneak
- Low Academic Achievement
- Negative Attitude
- Behavior Problems
- Aggressive Behavior
- Peer Rejection

Student Risk is divided into 3 categories:

- Low: 0 – 3
- Moderate: 4 – 8
- High: 9 – 21

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Items</th>
<th>Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Steal</td>
<td>0 = Never</td>
<td>1 = Occasionally</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lie, Cheat, Sneak</td>
<td>0 = Never</td>
<td>1 = Occasionally</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low Academic Achievement</td>
<td>0 = Never</td>
<td>1 = Occasionally</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Negative Attitude</td>
<td>0 = Never</td>
<td>1 = Occasionally</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peer Rejection</td>
<td>0 = Never</td>
<td>1 = Occasionally</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

---

**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=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 M=H</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Course Failures</td>
<td>0.68 (1.50)</td>
<td>2.78 (3.46)</td>
<td>4.17 (3.49)</td>
<td>L=M, H M=H</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Lane, Parks, Kolberg, & 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, 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, M = H)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Lane, Kolberg, Parks, & Carter, 2008)

### Externalizing AUC 0.952

**Elementary Level**

Results: ROC Curves

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1 - Specificity</th>
<th>Sensitivity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>0.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>0.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>0.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>0.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\[ AUC = 0.952 \]


### Internalizing AUC .802

**Elementary Level**

Results: ROC Curves

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1 - Specificity</th>
<th>Sensitivity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>0.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>0.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>0.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>0.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\[ AUC = 0.802 \]
STUDENT RISK SCREENING SCALE-IE

Student Name  Validation Study
- Original SRSS-IE 14
- 12 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>With Condition N</td>
<td>Without the Condition N</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Internalizing</td>
<td></td>
<td>SRSS-I5</td>
<td>.849</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>SRSS-IE12</td>
<td>.818</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Externalizing</td>
<td></td>
<td>SRSS-E7</td>
<td>.952</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>SRSS-IE12</td>
<td>.921</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: SSBD refers to the Systematic Screening for Behavior Disorders (Walker & Severson, 1992). SRSS-E7 refers to the version with 5 items retained; SRSS-I5 refers to the original 7 items from the SRSS developed by Drummmond (1994) combined with the new five items constituting the SRSS-IE5. The SRSS-II 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
  - 2-3 moderate (yellow)
  - 4-25 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?

• All scores will be automatically calculated.
• SRSS scores are the sum of items 1–7 (range 0–21)
• Internalizing scores are the sum of items 8–12 (range 0–15)

Sample Elementary School ... Fall SRSS-E7 Results – All Students

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School F14</th>
<th>School F15</th>
<th>School F16</th>
<th>School F17</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>69.25%</td>
<td>85.47%</td>
<td>23.82%</td>
<td>9.97%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.93%</td>
<td>4.56%</td>
<td>4.56%</td>
<td>4.56%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Sample Elementary School ... Fall 2015 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>65</td>
<td>54 (83.08%)</td>
<td>7 (10.77%)</td>
<td>4 (6.15%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1st</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>45 (84.91%)</td>
<td>3 (5.66%)</td>
<td>5 (9.43%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>31 (67.39%)</td>
<td>8 (17.39%)</td>
<td>7 (15.22%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Sample Elementary School ... Fall 2015

**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>68</td>
<td>64 (94.12%)</td>
<td>4 (5.88%)</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4th</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>52 (91.23%)</td>
<td>5 (8.77%)</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5th</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>54 (87.10%)</td>
<td>8 (12.90%)</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

### Sample Elementary School ... Fall 2015

**SRSS-I5 Results – All Students**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Screening Time Point</th>
<th>N = 19</th>
<th>N = 72</th>
<th>N = 85</th>
<th>N = 204</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Low Risk (0-1)</td>
<td>56.51%</td>
<td>19.46%</td>
<td>12.26%</td>
<td>5.41%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moderate (2-3)</td>
<td>4.48%</td>
<td>4.48%</td>
<td>19.94%</td>
<td>12.25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High (4-15)</td>
<td>49.01%</td>
<td>69.66%</td>
<td>33.79%</td>
<td>19.94%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

### Sample Elementary School ... Fall 2015

**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>65</td>
<td>49 (75.38%)</td>
<td>9 (13.85%)</td>
<td>7 (10.77%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1st</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>40 (75.47%)</td>
<td>9 (16.98%)</td>
<td>4 (7.55%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>36 (78.26%)</td>
<td>6 (13.04%)</td>
<td>4 (8.70%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Sample Elementary School ... Fall 2015
SRSS-I5 Comparison by Grade Level

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Grade Level</th>
<th>N Screened</th>
<th>Low (0-1)</th>
<th>Moderate (2-3)</th>
<th>High (4-15)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3rd</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>60 (88.24%)</td>
<td>6 (8.82%)</td>
<td>2 (2.94%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4th</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>51 (89.47%)</td>
<td>5 (8.77%)</td>
<td>1 (1.75%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5th</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>53 (85.48%)</td>
<td>8 (12.90%)</td>
<td>1 (1.61%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Sample High School ... Fall 2015
SRSS Results – All Students

<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>327</td>
<td>287 (87.77%)</td>
<td>32 (9.79%)</td>
<td>8 (2.45%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10th</td>
<td>318</td>
<td>271 (85.22%)</td>
<td>34 (10.69%)</td>
<td>13 (4.09%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11th</td>
<td>289</td>
<td>264 (91.35%)</td>
<td>19 (6.57%)</td>
<td>6 (2.08%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12th</td>
<td>263</td>
<td>250 (95.06%)</td>
<td>11 (4.18%)</td>
<td>2 (0.76%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The Student Risk Screening Scale for Early Childhood: An Initial Validation Study

Lane, Oakes, Menzies, Major, Allegra, Powers and Schatschneider (2015)

Screening ... Considering the Logistics
Examining your screening data ...

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

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

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

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

Teacher-Level Considerations

1. Instructional Considerations
2. General Classroom Management
3. Low-intensity Strategies
Examining Academic and Behavioral Data: Elementary School Level

Examining Academic and Behavioral Data: Middle and High School Level
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

Assessment

Low‐Intensity Strategies

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

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

Goal: Reverse Harm Specialized group systems for students at-risk

Goal: Prevent Harm School/classroom-wide systems for all students, staff, & settings

Primary Prevention (Tier 1) ≈80%

Secondary Prevention (Tier 2) ≈15%

Tertiary Prevention (Tier 3) ≈5%

PBIS Framework

Validated Curricula
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

Schoolwide Positive Behavior Support

Behavior and Emotional Screening Scale (BASC)-2

Spring 2012

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
- 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: Elementary School Level

Support Description

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.

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

Work completion, or other behavior addressed in contract
Treatment Integrity
Social Validity

Successful Completion of behavior contract

Self-monitoring
Students will monitor and record their academic production (completes/accuracies) and on-task behavior each day.

Students who score 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 Treatment Integrity

Passing grade on the report card in the academic area of concern

Examining Academic and Behavioral Data: Middle and High School Level

Support Description

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.

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

Work completion, or other behavior addressed in contract
Treatment Integrity
Social Validity

Successful Completion of behavior contract

Self-monitoring
Students will monitor and record their academic production (completes/accuracies) and on-task behavior each day.

Students who score 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 Treatment Integrity

Passing grade on the report card in the academic area of concern

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Support</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Schoolwide Data: Entry Criteria</th>
<th>Data to Monitor Progress:</th>
<th>Exit Criteria</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Small group reading instruction with self-monitoring</td>
<td>Small group reading instruction (30 min, 3 days per week). Students monitored their participation in the reading instructional tasks. Students used checklists of reading lexon components each day to complete and compare to teachers' rating. K – 1.</td>
<td>Students who: Behavior: Fall SRSS at moderate (4 - 8) or high (9 – 21) risk Academic: Fall AIMSweb LNF at the strategic or intensive level</td>
<td>AIMSweb reading P5F and NWF progress monitoring probes (weekly). Daily self-monitoring checklists</td>
<td>Meet AIMSweb reading benchmark at next screening time point. Low Risk on SRSS at next screening time point.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Small group Reading Instruction with Self-Monitoring**


**First Grade Students’ Self Monitoring Form**

### Treatment Integrity

#### Social Validity

**Monitor student progress**


#### Support Description Schoolwide Data:

**Entry Criteria**

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

**Data to Monitor Progress:**

1. Progress Monitoring with Scholastic Reading Inventory
2. Writing Assessments (vocabulary, comprehension, and spelling)
3. Curriculum-based Assessments
4. Attendance in class

**Exit Criteria**

Students maintain instructional reading goals.

SSRS score in the low risk category (0 – 3) on the next screening time point.

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

Changes in Harry’s Behavior

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date of Session</th>
<th>Percentage of AET</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4/27</td>
<td>90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4/28</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4/29</td>
<td>70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4/30</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5/5</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5/10</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5/13</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5/14</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5/17</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5/18</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5/19</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5/20</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5/21</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5/24</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5/25</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5/26</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5/27</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5/28</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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
Getting Started with Systematic Screening ...

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 and Oakes 2013
Monthly Faculty Presentations

JANUARY 2015

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