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What to Expect

• Brief description of CICO
  – Not a detailed implementation guide

• Overview of systems-level supports needed to ensure effective Tier 2 interventions
  – RtI Framework

• Tim & Nathan: One school’s story

• Q&A
Tier 2 for Behavior

- For students who need support beyond what is provided by the universal system
  - Can expect ~10-15% (Gresham, 2004; Walker et. al., 1996)

- Most schools already implement Tier 2 interventions
  - Lack a systematic approach
  - What constitutes a “Tier 2” intervention?

- Most Tier 2 interventions aren’t well-researched (McIntosh et. al, 2009)
Tier 2 Supports are Most Effective When:

- Similar implementation across students
- All staff are trained on the interventions
- Continuously available
- Quick access
- Consistent with school-wide expectations
- Based on function
- Data used continuously for progress monitoring

(OSEP, 2005)
Why CICO?

• Meets all OSEP guidelines

• Growing evidence base
  – Filter et. al., 2007
  – Hawken & Horner, 2003
  – March & Horner, 2002
  – McCurdy, Kunsch, & Reibstein, 2007
  – Todd et. al., 2008
  – And more!

• Effective, easy, cost-efficient
  • “Standard Protocol” approach?
Continuum of Services

Monitoring the Progress & Outcomes of Students

Monitoring the Progress & Outcomes of the System
What Does CICO Look Like?

• Daily positive adult contact
  – First thing in the morning, last thing in the afternoon
  – ALWAYS positive!
    • Bernard, 1995; Biglan, 1995; Furlong & Morrison, 2000; Masten, Best, & Garmezy, 1990; Metzler et al., 1998

• Builds on the school-wide expectations
  – Teacher feedback throughout the day
    • Pre-corrections, earned praise

• Home/School partnership
Responding to Problem Behavior in Schools, 2nd Edition:
The Behavior Education Program

Deanne A. Crone
Leanne S. Hawken
Robert H. Horner
## Example Check-in Record

From Crone et. al, 2004

Date: ____________  
Check-in Leader: ____________________

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Student Name</th>
<th>Paper</th>
<th>Pencil</th>
<th>Notebook</th>
<th>DPR Parent Copy</th>
<th>DPR School Copy</th>
<th>% Daily Points</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>John A.</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Richard C.</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Donald R.</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Adapted from Crone, Horner & Hawken (2004)

Daily Progress Report

Name: ___________________________  Date: ____________

Rating Scale: 3=Good day  2= Mixed day  1=Will try harder tomorrow

GOALS:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>HR</th>
<th>1st</th>
<th>2nd</th>
<th>3rd</th>
<th>4th</th>
<th>L</th>
<th>5th</th>
<th>6th</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>BE RESPECTFUL</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BE RESPONSIBLE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BE ON TIME</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Teacher Comments: I really like how…

_______________________________________________________________________________
_______________________________________________________________________________
_______________________________________________________________________________

Parent Signature(s) and Comments: _______________________________________________
First Step: Laying the Foundation

• **Tier 1 System in place**
  – Fidelity: BoQ 70+; SET 80/80
  – Most students receive 0-1 office discipline referrals (ODRs)
  – Consistent teaching, rewarding, discipline

• **Disaggregated data**
  – By ethnicity, disability
  – Identify classroom-level needs

• **Tier 2 data system in place/identified**

  Hawken & Homer, 2003; Walker, et. al., 1996
Team Structure: Necessary Roles

- Communication with Tier 1, Tier 3, and academics
- Behavioral expertise
- Knowledge of interventions, legal guidelines
- Resource allocation
- Data systems: screening, progress monitoring, evaluation
Identifying Students

• ODRs are not enough

• Combination of screening measures, ODRs
  – Who collects, analyses data?

• Staff may be reluctant to refer at first
  – Label/Stigma
  – Lack of resources (programs, money, time)
  – Implications for training/roll-out

Walker, Cheney, Stage, Blum & Horner, 2005
Screening Measures

• ODRs, Attendance, other data....
• Participation in Tier 1 systems
  – Token tracking, attendance at events
• Teacher Nomination Process
• Grade-Level Team Nomination process
• Normed Measures
Prioritizing Students

- Contact with Tier 1 system
- Multiple referrals, settings
- Number of teachers nominating for support
- Academics, attendance
- Function of behavior/Identified Needs
- Turbulence factor
- Other risk factors
  - Poor peer relations
  - Low self-esteem
  - Few resources/little support
Intervention Selection – “EBPs?”

- Based on function of behavior, identified needs
- Comprehensive data based decision making vs. “I think it might work”/opinion
- Research and theory to support intervention use (i.e., similar population, demographics, setting, etc.)
- Ongoing evaluation of fidelity, use of intervention, and outcomes
Intervention Integrity

• **Permanent products**
  – CICO: Sample check-in records, Behavior Report Cards (Hawken & Horner, 2003)
  – Worksheets, posters, etc…

• **Intervention-Specific (BEP, Steps to Respect)**

• **Checklists** (Iovannone, 2009)
  – Self-Assessments
  – Outside Observer Assessments
    • Student outcomes guide use
Using DBRCs to Progress Monitor

• Chafouleas et. al. (2007):
  – External observers vs. teachers
    • DBRC completed by external observers similar to direct observation by external observers
    • Degree of effectiveness (strength of response) may be dependent on rater
  – Appropriate for initial levels of progress monitoring
Progress Monitoring: Students

• Gresham (2005);
• Cheney, Flower, & Templeton (2008):
  – *Percentage of change* (percentage difference from successful days in baseline to successful days in treatment)
  – Absolute change (D baseline mean to treatment mean)
  – Effect size (considers standard deviation of baseline)
  – Percent non-overlapping data points-PND (percent of intervention points over highest baseline point)
  – Reliable Change Index-RCI (considers variability in distribution of change scores)

• Decision points for behavior: there are none
• **Tier 2 is unique** (McIntosh, Campbell, Carter, & Dickey 2009):
  – Is lack of response due to:
    • Intensity of intervention – does s/he need more?
    • Match of intervention – was it the right treatment?

• Implementation of the intervention
• Overall effectiveness of the intervention – is it working for **anyone**?
CICO Average Daily Points By Student Report
August 26 - September 20, 2009

Max Number of Days where Score Possible: 18

Days with Score | Student

- Bob Bo
- Snoopy Brown
- John Candy
- Darren Kincaid
- Janice Zimmerman

Avg Daily % of Total CICO Points

www.swis.org
Student: Snoopy Brown

CICO Individual Student Count Report
August 26 - October 6, 2009

- Green: >= 75%
- Red: < 75%
- Grey Circle: Complete
- Grey Triangle: Incomplete
- A: Absent
- ND: No Data
- NS: No School
- ?: No Entry
- Purple Line: Support Plan Change
- ODR Count: 0 to 5

Daily % of Total CICO Points

School Days

08/31 09/07 09/14 09/21 09/28 10/05
Student: Snoopy Brown

CICO Individual Student Period Report
August 26 - September 20, 2009

Max Number of Days where Score Possible: 18

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Period</th>
<th>Number of Periods with Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Avg Daily % of Total CICO Points

www.swis.org
Student: Snoopy Brown
Period (2): Period 2

CICO Individual Student Single Period Report
August 26 - October 6, 2009

% of CICO Points for Period

School Days

ODR Count

- >= 75%
- < 75%
- A Absent
- ND No Data
- NS No School
- ? No Entry
- Support Plan Change
- ODR Count

www.swis.org
Effective Tier 2 Systems

• **Ensure critical systems-level features are in place**
  – Benchmarks for Advanced Tiers (BAT)
  – PBS Implementation Checklist (PIC)
  – Checklist for Individual Student Systems (CISS)
  – Individual Student Systems Evaluation Tool (ISSET)

• **Make data-based decisions for choice of interventions**
  – Function
  – Evidence Base

• **Watch your data**
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Thank You for Attending!

http://flpbs.fmhi.usf.edu

tsandomierski@fmhi.usf.edu
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