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Tier II/III Identification Process

- Teacher nomination
- Existing school data
- Universal screening
Screening

• Simply indicates there might be an issue
• Not intended to be:
  – Prescriptive
  – Evaluative
• Will require additional data triangulation to provide appropriate supports
Systematic Screening

• Advantages
  – Fast, efficient, and respectful
  – Include all children and youth of interest
  – If we make an error, the error tends to identify students who are not at-risk
  – Informs schools about the student population
  – Find groups of students with common needs
  – Facilitates resource mapping of services

(University of Oregon Institute on Violence and Destructive Behavior)
Systematic Screening

• Screening Instruments at a Glance
  – Name of Instrument
  – Description / Use
  – Age of Students
  – Method
  – Time to Administer
  – Cost
  – Ordering Information
# Screening Instruments at a Glance

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name of Instrument</th>
<th>Description/Purpose /Use</th>
<th>Ages</th>
<th>Method(s)</th>
<th>Administration</th>
<th>Cost</th>
<th>Ordering Information</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| SDQ = Strengths & Difficulties Questionnaire (Goodman, 2001) | Brief behavioral screening questionnaire that asks about 25 attributes, some positive and others negative. Scores for conduct problems, hyperactivity, emotional symptoms, peer problems, and pro-social behavior Reports Score As = Low, Medium or High Risk *Internalizing & Externalizing Concerns | K-12   | Teacher or Parent Report (ages 4-10) Teacher or Parent Report (ages 11-17) | 45 min-1hr/class 25 items On-line administration and scoring available Manual scoring = 10 min/student | No cost if administered and scored online. 1 page per student if administered and scored by hand. | www.youthinmind.net  
www.sdqinfo.com |
Working within Three-Tiered, Comprehensive, Integrated (CI3T) Models of Prevention: Where do we begin?
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Essential Questions...

- How do you prepare to install universal screening in your district/school?
- Why implement universal screening as part of a multi-tiered system? (PBIS, MTSS, CI3T)
- How do you access resources to support getting started or expanding universal screening?
- What have other districts, teams, and schools learned from installing universal screening?

What would you like to walk away with from this session? [https://todaysmeet.com/ilconfscreening](https://todaysmeet.com/ilconfscreening)
The Importance of Accurate Decision Making

- It is important reliable, valid tools be used within multi-tired systems
- Information from behavior and academic screening tools can be used to
  - Examine overall level of risk in schools
  - Look for students for who primary prevention efforts are insufficient and then place them in Tier 2 and Tier 3 supports
Comprehensive, Integrated, Three-Tier Model of Prevention
(Lane, Kalberg, & Menzies, 2009)

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

Primary Prevention (Tier 1)
≈ 80%

Secondary Prevention (Tier 2)
≈ 10%

Tertiary Prevention (Tier 3)
≈ 5%

PBIS Framework
Validated Curricula

Academic
Behavioral
Social
Logistical questions

As you think about conducting behavior screenings, there are a number of...
Questions to Consider Before Instituting Behavior Screenings as Part of Regular School Practices?

- What are our district policies regarding systematic screenings?
- When to do them?
- Who should prepare them?
- Who should administer them?
- Who completes them?
- Who should score them?
- When and how should the results be shared?
What screening tools are available? What tools are you using?

See Lane, Menzies, Oakes, and Kalberg (2012)
2012-13 Number of Schools that Utilize Screening Tools

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>None</th>
<th>Unknown</th>
<th>N/A</th>
<th>AimsWeb</th>
<th>SRSS</th>
<th>BASC-2</th>
<th>BESS</th>
<th>ESP</th>
<th>SSIS-PSG</th>
<th>Other</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>79</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Student Risk Screening Scale

(Student Risk Screening Scale; Drummond, 1994)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TEACHER NAME</th>
<th>Student Risk Screening Scale (SRSS)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Use the above scale to rate each student.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Student ID</th>
<th>Student Name</th>
<th>Gold</th>
<th>Silver</th>
<th>Bronze</th>
<th>Peer</th>
<th>Low Academic</th>
<th>Discipline</th>
<th>Attitude</th>
<th>Behavior</th>
<th>Aggressive</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<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></td>
<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></td>
<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></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Student Risk Screening Scale  
( Drummond, 1994 )

The SRSS is 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  

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TEACHER NAME</th>
<th>Student Risk Screening Scale (SRSS)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0 = Never</td>
<td>1 = Occasionally</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 = Sometimes</td>
<td>3 = Frequently</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Student ID</th>
<th>Student Name</th>
<th>Steal</th>
<th>Lie, Cheat</th>
<th>Behavior</th>
<th>Peer</th>
<th>Low Academic</th>
<th>Negative</th>
<th>Aggressive</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1111</td>
<td>Smith, Sally</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Comprehensive, Integrated, Three-Tier Model of Prevention

(Lane, Kalberg, & Menzies, 2009)

**Primary Prevention (Tier 1)**
- Goal: Prevent Harm
- School/Classroom-Wide Systems for All Students, Staff, & Settings
- ≈ 80%

**Secondary Prevention (Tier 2)**
- Goal: Reverse Harm
- Specialized Group Systems for Students At-Risk
- ≈ 15%

**Tertiary Prevention (Tier 3)**
- Goal: Reduce Harm
- Specialized Individual Systems for Students with High-Risk
- ≈ 5%

Academic | Behavioral | Social

PBIS Framework

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

Schoolwide Positive Behavior Support

Basic Classroom Management Effective Instruction Low Intensity Strategies

Low Intensity Strategies

Behavior Contracts Self-Monitoring
Functional Assessment-Based Interventions

Higher Intensity Strategies

Assess, Design, Implement, and Evaluate

Assessment
3-Tiered System of Support

Necessary Conversations (Teams)

Universal Team
- Plans SW & Class-wide supports

Secondary Systems Team
- Uses Process data; determines overall intervention effectiveness

Problem Solving Team
- Standing team; uses FBA/BIP process for one youth at a time

Tertiary Systems Team
- Uses Process data; determines overall intervention effectiveness

CICO
- Social Skills
- Behavior Contracts
- Self-Management
- Newcomers Club/Mentors
- Study/Organizational Skills
- Academic
- Problem-solving

Problem Solving with function in mind

Complex FABI

WRAP RENEW

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
# Procedures for Monitoring: Assessment Schedule

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Aug</th>
<th>Sept</th>
<th>Oct</th>
<th>Nov</th>
<th>Dec</th>
<th>Jan</th>
<th>Feb</th>
<th>Mar</th>
<th>Apr</th>
<th>May</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>School Demographics</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Student Demographics</strong></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Student Outcome Academic Measures</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Benchmarking - AIMSweb</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Report Card Course Failures</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Student Outcome Behavior Measures</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Screener - SRSS</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Discipline: ODR</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attendance (Tardies/Unexcused Absences)</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Referrals</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SPED and Support-TEAM</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Program Measures</strong></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 (PIRS)</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</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>X</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>X</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Student Risk Screening Scale with academic and behavioral data

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TEACHER NAME</th>
<th>P. Rice</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Date: Jan 2013</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0 = Never</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 = Occasionally</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 = Sometimes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 = Frequently</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Use the above scale to rate each item for each student.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Student Name</th>
<th>Student ID</th>
<th>Lie, Cheat, Sneak</th>
<th>Behavior Problem</th>
<th>Peer Rejection</th>
<th>Low Academic Achievement</th>
<th>Negative Attitude</th>
<th>Aggressive Behavior</th>
<th>Total SRSS</th>
<th>GPA</th>
<th>ODRs</th>
<th>Course Failures</th>
<th>Total Days Absent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Angel, Julio</td>
<td>2310</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Akins, J. Monte</td>
<td>2013</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Backer, Brent</td>
<td>2031</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boxwell, Kylie</td>
<td>2001</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cartright, Ashley</td>
<td>2152</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cox, Lucille</td>
<td>2002</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3.9</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hankins, Erin</td>
<td>2017</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Illio, Helen</td>
<td>2132</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jackson, Ronald</td>
<td>2003</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kemp, Patrice</td>
<td>2009</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parker, Stephanie</td>
<td>2004</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reed, Kent</td>
<td>2010</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sterling, Michael</td>
<td>2022</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thomas, James</td>
<td>2018</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Walsh, Carter</td>
<td>2215</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Student Risk Screening Scale with academic and behavioral data

**TEACHER NAME:** R. Collins  
**Date:** Jan 2013

*0 = Never  
1 = Occasionally  
2 = Sometimes  
3 = Frequently*

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Student Name</th>
<th>Student ID</th>
<th>Lie, Cheat, Sneak</th>
<th>Behavior Problem</th>
<th>Peer Rejection</th>
<th>Low Academic Achievement</th>
<th>Negative Attitude</th>
<th>Aggressive Behavior</th>
<th>Total SRSS</th>
<th>DIBELS</th>
<th>Total Days Absent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Alley, Allison</td>
<td>2310</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Atwell, J'Monte</td>
<td>2013</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bonds, Peter</td>
<td>2031</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Booker, Abbie</td>
<td>2001</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cartwright, Ashley</td>
<td>2152</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cox, Lucille</td>
<td>2002</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hankins, Erin</td>
<td>2017</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Julius, OTam</td>
<td>2132</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Justice, Jesse</td>
<td>2003</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ochoa, Kelly</td>
<td>2009</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parker, Stephanie</td>
<td>2004</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paul, Timothy</td>
<td>2010</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reed, Kandra</td>
<td>2022</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Toms, Blake</td>
<td>2018</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wellington, Jasper</td>
<td>2215</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
After reviewing your assessment schedule

- Make a master list of all “extra” supports
- Create an intervention grid
- Selected additional supports with sufficient evidence to support their use
- Enlist needed professional development to assist with implementation
A Step-By-Step Process

1. Construct your assessment schedule
2. Identify your secondary supports
   - Existing and new interventions
3. Determine entry criteria
   - Nomination, academic failure, behavior screening scores, attendance data etc.
4. Identify outcome measures
   - Pre and post tests, CBM, office discipline data, GPA etc.
5. Identify exit criteria
   - Reduction of discipline contacts, academic success, reduction of truancies and absences etc.
6. Consider additional needs
<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>Behavior Contract</td>
<td>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.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self Monitoring</td>
<td>Students will monitor and record their academic production (completion/accuracy) and on-task behavior each day.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></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
<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>
</table>
| 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:** SRSS - mod to high risk  
**Academic:** 2 or more missing assignments with in a grading period                         |                            |               |
| Self-monitoring  | Students will monitor and record their academic production (completion/ accuracy) 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 |                            |               |
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
<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>Behavior Contract</td>
<td>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.</td>
<td><strong>Behavior:</strong> SRSS -mod to high risk AND <strong>Academic:</strong> 2 or more missing assignments within a grading period</td>
<td>Work completion, or other behavior addressed in contract</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-monitoring</td>
<td>Students will monitor and record their academic production (completion/ accuracy) and on-task behavior each day.</td>
<td>Students who score in the abnormal range for H and CP on the SDQ; course failure or at risk on CBM</td>
<td>Work completion and accuracy in the academic area of concern; passing grades</td>
<td></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
<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>
</table>
| 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**: SRSS - mod to high risk  
**Academic**: 2 or more missing assignments within a grading period | Work completion, or other behavior addressed in contract                                  | 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 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              | Passing grade on the report card in the academic area of concern |
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
<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 lesson components each day to complete and compare to teachers’ rating. K – 1.</td>
<td>Students who: <strong>Behavior:</strong> Fall SRSS at moderate (4 -8) or high (9 – 21) risk <strong>Academic:</strong> Fall AIMSweb LNF at the strategic or intensive level</td>
<td>AIMSweb reading PSF 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

Student Name: ______________________  Date: ____________

Reading Checklist

1. Did I come to the reading table when my teacher called me?

2. Did I read my book?

3. Did I build words or practice sounds with the tiles?

4. Did I tap the letter sounds to read or spell words?

5. Did I practice trick words?

6. Did I follow my teacher’s directions?

5 out of 6 = 1 PBIS ticket.

Match my teacher = 1 PBIS ticket

Treatment integrity
Social validity
Monitor student progress

BASC-2 Behavioral and Emotional Screening System (BESS)

Winfield Primary School
Winfield, Missouri
Winfield Primary School

• Preschool – Grade 2 Setting

• Approximately 370 students

• Poverty is most prevalent risk factor
  – 62% Free and Reduced Lunch
SWPBS History

• SWPBS Tier 1 implemented with fidelity
  – SET & BoQ Scores

• Tier 2 team established & interventions available
  – Check-in Check-out, full scale
  – Social Skill Groups, pilot
  – Check & Connect, pilot
Need for Screening

• Efficient way to find students *sooner* rather than later

• Method for sorting children according to intensity of need (Tier 1, 2 or 3)

• Process that accounted for externalizing & *internalizing* attributes
  – ODR & Teacher nominations lack precision
Behavioral & Emotional Screening System (BASC-2 BESS)

• Informant rates each student on 27 items
  – Teacher, parent & student rating forms available

• Score Classification
  – Normal, Elevated or Extremely Elevated

• Includes items for Externalizing & Internalizing characteristics
Screening Procedures

• First Screen - January 17, 2012
  – 15 classroom teachers completed screener for 319 students (K-2)
  – Took place during faculty meeting time
  – Protocols completed with student information prior to teacher ratings
Screening Procedures

• January 27, 2012 team reviewed results with individual teachers
  – 256 students with “Normal” scores
  – 42 students with “Elevated” scores
  – 21 students with “Extremely Elevated” scores
Initial Screening Results

Universal Screening Data - January 17th, 2012

- 6.69% Extremely Elevated
- 13.04% Elevated
- 80.27% Normal

Total*
Use of Results for Students

- Students with *Elevated* scores placed in Tier II interventions
- Conducted classroom observations for students *w/ extremely elevated* scores
  - Feedback to classroom teachers
  - Results used to complete an AIM plan (Assess-Intervene-Monitor)
Use of Results for Staff

• Spring 2012 – Fall 2012 revisited Tier 1 SWPBS implementation
  – Booster trainings for 4:1, school-wide and classroom settings
  – Clarified procedures for responding to and documenting classroom minors
Teacher Perceptions of Process

• Didn’t think any Extremely Elevated

• Would be nice to have for students from year to year to know what to watch but don’t want teachers to see and automatically think bad student

• For children without problems – easy, but harder for students with problems – wanted to get it right but didn’t want to exaggerate.
Second Screening

October 2012 BASC-2 BESS

- 17 classroom teachers completed screener for 370 students (PreK – 2\textsuperscript{nd})
  - 330 students with “Normal” scores
  - 32 students with “Elevated” scores
  - 8 students with “Extremely Elevated” scores
2nd Screening Results

Universal Screening Data – October, 2012

- 89.19% Normal
- 8.65% Elevated
- 2.16% Extremely Elevated

MO SW-PBS
Change in Risk Levels

• Larger % of students with normal range scores
  – increased from 80% to 89%

• Smaller % of students w/ elevated scores
  – decreased from 13% to less than 9%

• Smaller % of students with extremely elevated scores
  – decreased from almost 7% to 2%
Third Screening

• Switched to a different instrument
  – Student Risk Screening Scale (SRSS)

• Added internalizing items
  – Emotionally flat
  – Shy; withdrawn
  – Sad, depressed
  – Anxious
  – Lonely
Advantages of Screening Process

• Identifies students who would not be identified using data decision rules or teacher nominations
• Help with class list formation
• Reassurance for those who had already been identified for Tier II or Tier III
• The breakdown of the reports & easiness to read