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Objectives

- Identify three challenges encountered by an urban school integrating universal screening with an existing SWPBIS framework
- Describe important components of teacher training for behavioral and mental health screening, and effective classroom management strategies
- Identify specific activities necessary to sustain and scale a Tier I and Tier II mental and behavioral health assessment to intervention program
Current State of Child & Adolescent Mental Health: A “Public Health Crisis”

• Approximately **20% of children** are experiencing significant mental, emotional, or behavioral symptoms that would qualify them for a psychiatric diagnosis.
  • (Bums et al., 1995; Costello, Mustillo, Erkanli, Keeler, & Angold, 2003)

• “Most people with mental disorders in the U.S. remain either **untreated or poorly treated**”
  • (Kessler et al., 2005)
Social-Emotional & Behavioral (SEB) Functioning

- Academic success ≠ School success
  - (Taylor & Kilgus, 2014)
- SEB Competence
  - (Denham, 2006; Kwon et al., 2012)
  - Display of appropriate behaviors and skills (e.g., interpersonal skills, study skills, self-regulation, self-awareness)
  - Limited display of inappropriate behaviors and skills (e.g., internalizing, externalizing)
- SEB Competence = protective factor
  - Among ethnic minority students living in low-income, urban communities
  - (Elias & Haynes, 2008)
In academics, universal screening instruments are widely recognized as adequate measures to identify students at-risk for developing further problems (Ardoin et al., 2004; Elliott, Huai, & Roach, 2007).

However, PBIS frameworks continue to rely on psychometrically poor and problematic methods for identifying students at risk behaviorally and emotionally.
Addressing SEB Difficulties

- Most common approach is Positive Behavioral Interventions and Support (PBIS)
- Consistency found in recommendations for Tier 3 assessment
  - Targeted screening → Rating scales
  - Problem identification → FBA
  - Progress monitoring → Direct observation
- Recommendations for assessment are less clear at Tiers 1 & 2
- Problem!

**Tier 1 (80%)**
- Teach & reinforce school-wide expectations

**Tier 2 (15%)**
- Efficient, systematic, & continuously available targeted interventions

**Tier 3 (5%)**
- Intensive & individualized behavior support plans
Universal Screening
Teacher Referral and School Identification

- Refer-Test-Place models
  - teachers differ in their ability to work with students
  - perceptions of “teachability”
  - teachers not trained to know how problematic behavior must be prior to referral
- Children’s behavioral/emotional problems may be under-referred and/or referral (and service!) is delayed
  - (Lloyd, Kauffman, Landrum, & Roe, 1991; Severson et al., 2007; Tilly, 2008; Walker et al., 2000)
Screening for “At-risk” Students
Screening for “At-risk” Students

Instructions:
Checking Baby’s Diaper
CORRECT

INCORRECT
Universal Screening: Outcomes

1) **Short term goal**: provide early intervention

2) **Long term goals**: Decrease academic failure, improve student well-being, improve educators ability to effectively respond to concerns
Social, Academic, & Emotional Behavior Risk Screener (SAEBRS)

- Brief behavior rating scale
  - 19-20 items
  - Teacher, Parent, and Student Self-Report
- Criterion-referenced
  - Research-based cut scores
  - Not At Risk and At Risk
- One broad scale and three subscales
  - Total Behavior
  - Social Behavior
  - Academic Behavior
  - Emotional Behavior
- Available via FastBridge Learning
  - fastbridge.org
Social, Academic, & Emotional Behavior Risk Screener (SAEBRS)

• **Pros**
  - Brief and efficient
  - Assesses multiple domains, based on SEB theory
  - Extent of diagnostic accuracy research
  - Multi-informant, Spanish versions
  - *Only screener that met psychometric criteria established by NCII*

• **Cons**
  - Need for more research at high school levels
  - Also need for more research regarding parent version
  - Cost: $1-2 per student
SAEBRS Conceptual Model

Total Behavior

- Social Behavior
  - Externalizing Problems
  - Social Skills

- Academic Behavior
  - Attention Problems
  - Academic Enablers

- Emotional Behavior
  - Internalizing Problems
  - Emotional Wellness
Universal Screening: Interpretation & Use

- Reactive vs. Prevention-oriented screening
- Already collecting data on
  - Attendance
    - Days absent, tardies, # of moves
  - Academic outcomes
    - Growth on CBM’s
  - Benchmark assessment data
    - Standardized test scores (AIMS)
  - Grades
  - Office Discipline Referrals

Student Identification

- Extant Academic Data
- Extant Behavioral Data
- Universal Screening
Universal Screening: Interpretation & Use

- **School-wide Base Rate ≥ 20%**
  - System Support (Tier 1)

- **School-wide Base Rate < 20%, but Classroom Base Rate ≥ 20%**
  - Classroom Support (Tier 1)

- **School-wide Base Rate < 20% & Classroom Base Rate ≤ 20%**
  - Individual/Small Group Support (Tier 2)
System Support (Tier 1)

- Start with universal strategies
  - Determine type of risk most prevalent
- SRSS or SSBD Example:
  - Externalizing Behavior
    - Revise school-wide expectations or reinforcement plan
    - Or rather, ensure integrity of existing plan
  - Internalizing Behavior
    - Implement social emotional learning curriculum:
      - Promoting Alternative Thinking Strategies (PATHS)
      - Second Step
      - Why Try?
      - Incredible Years

School-wide Base Rate $\geq 20\%$

System Support (Tier 1)
Classroom Support (Tier 1)

• Determine the **type of risk most prevalent** within the classroom

• Example: SAEBRS
  • Social Behavior
    • Classroom Checkup (Reinke, Herman, & Sprick, 2011)
    • Good Behavior Game
  • Academic Behavior
    • Classroom instruction of various academic enablers (e.g., organization, preparedness for instruction)
    • Promote instructional practices (e.g., opportunities to learn, pace of instruction)

School-wide Base Rate < 20%, but Classroom Base Rate ≥ 20%

Classroom Support (Tier 1)
Individual or Group Level Support (Tier 2)

- Individual or small-group interventions
- Example: SAEBRS
  - Teaching Strategies
    - Instruction of key skills
    - Social skills, academic enablers, emotional competencies
  - Antecedent/Consequence Strategies
    - Check In/Check Out (CICO) to prompt and reinforce appropriate behaviors
    - Research supporting use with social, academic, or emotional behavior

School-wide Base Rate < 20% & Classroom Base Rate ≤ 20%

Individual/Small Group Support (Tier 2)
School District of Philadelphia Model
Urban Schools are hard...

1. Staff Turnover
   • FREQUENT changes in administration and staff from year to year

2. Lack of Resources
   • High numbers in classrooms; few teachers/open vacancies
   • Basic supplies missing or diminished

3. Difficulty Communicating
   • HUGE districts with many schools

4. Community Challenges
Predicting Abandonment of SWPBIS

- Investigation of 1861 schools across three states
  - Of these, 70 schools stopped implementation
  - Most schools abandoned within first three years
- The only predictor of abandonment was urban settings
- 44 schools provided reason for abandonment
  - 82% School Administrator Support
  - 11% Insufficient Data Submission
  - 5% Competing Initiatives

State of Affairs

• Due to budget cuts in recent years in the School District of Philadelphia (SDP), mental health services have been severely cut or eliminated, significantly reducing the number of school-based mental health professionals necessary to provide comprehensive services.

• An estimated 100,000 youth in Philadelphia schools may not be able to access mental health services.

• Moreover, 1 in 3 children in Philadelphia live below the poverty line and do not have access to outside mental health services.
Pilot School Model

- Middle school (grades 5-8) in a K-8 building
- Eight teachers of ~200 students
- Implementing PBIS with fidelity across all three tiers (as of May 2018)
- High suspension/ODR rates
Multi-tiered Decision Making Framework

- Decision-making framework was developed via an iterative process that includes
  - feedback from school-based partners,
  - periodic and planned review of program effectiveness that will allow for necessary changes, and
  - data to inform key decisional cut points.

- The framework is based upon and augment a Multi-tiered Systems of Support (MTSS) implementation that is currently being initiated in several schools within the SDP and more broadly across the state, as well as best practices specified within a trauma-informed approach.
**Decision Cut-Points:** Identify base rates, determine type of student risk
**Assessment Tool:** SAEBRS
**Training:** Universal screening, classroom management, base rate

**Decision Cut-Points:** Evaluate responsiveness to Tier II intervention, determine intervention intensity
**Assessment Tool:** Direct Behavior Ratings
**Training:** Tier II intervention implementation and evaluation

**Decision Cut-Points:** Evaluate responsiveness to STS services, develop data-based referral for services
**Assessment Tool:** To be determined
**Training:** Using Tier II data to inform Tier III referrals
Teacher Training on the SAEBRS

- 90 minute in-service training for teachers
- Benefits and purpose of universal screening
- School and teacher’s role in student mental health screening
- Defining and recognizing behaviors on the screener
  - Videos of the behaviors
  - Practice identifying and distinguishing between behaviors
Fall and Winter Screening Data
Students At Risk from Fall 2016 to Spring 2018

Percent of at-risk students on the total SAEBRS scale

Total Risk

- Fall 2016: 63.6%
- Winter 2017: 68.5%
- Spring 2017: 54.9%
- Fall 2017: 52.8%
- Winter 2018: 61.5%
- Spring 2018: 56.9%
Comparison of School-Wide Risk by Subscale and Grade in Spring 2018

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Grade</th>
<th>Social</th>
<th>Academic</th>
<th>Emotional</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fifth</td>
<td>67.9</td>
<td>66.1</td>
<td>83.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sixth</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>57.5</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seventh</td>
<td>58.3</td>
<td>47.9</td>
<td>60.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eighth</td>
<td>68.2</td>
<td>40.9</td>
<td>86.4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Teacher Training in Classroom Management
Teacher Training In Classroom Management

- Many teachers enter the field with limited, if any, classroom management training from pre-service programs (Begeny & Martens, 2006; Freeman, Simonsen, Briere, & MacSuga-Gage, in press)

- Most teachers report receiving little professional development in classroom management (Wei, Darling-Hammon, & Adamson, 2010)

- Student behavioral concerns are one of the leading causes for teachers leaving the field (Ingersoll & Smith, 2003; Smith & Ingersoll, 2004)
Increasing rates of effective instruction provided to students with behavior problems has been associated with a decrease in problem behavior.

Sutherland, Alder, & Gunter, 2003; Simonsen & Myers, 2015
Explain the theory

Have a workshop discussion

Show example of good practice

Staff practice new approach

Joyce & Showers (1980, 2002)

There is no measurable impact on classroom practice up to this point

Petty (2004)
Plan: Classroom Management Training and Coaching

- Train teachers in skills to improve classroom environments and student behavior
- Completed the Devereux Classroom Observation Tool (DCOT) for baseline data
- Review individual data with staff and select skills to address
- Teachers receive performance feedback in target skills
  - Observations in classroom followed by feedback
- Once a skill is mastered, new skills will be addressed
### Devereux Classroom Observation Tool

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Skill</th>
<th>Observed?</th>
<th>Today's Observation Score</th>
<th>Mastery Level</th>
<th>At Mastery Level?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Using a Lesson Agenda</td>
<td>YES or NO</td>
<td>≥ 80% of Steps (up to 5 steps)</td>
<td>YES or NO</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Using Effective Prompts</td>
<td>YES or NO</td>
<td>100% of Steps (up to 4 steps)</td>
<td>YES or NO</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Actively Supervising Students</td>
<td>YES or NO</td>
<td>100% of Steps (up to 5 steps)</td>
<td>YES or NO</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Praise to Correction Ratio (in Lowest Form)</td>
<td>YES or NO</td>
<td>4 Praise : 1 Correction</td>
<td>YES or NO</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Percentage of Behavior-Specific Praise (BSP)</td>
<td>YES or NO</td>
<td>≥ 80% BSP</td>
<td>YES or NO</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Opportunities to Respond (OTR) per Minute</td>
<td>YES or NO</td>
<td>≥ 1 OTR per Minute</td>
<td>YES or NO</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Percentage of Correct Academic Responses (CAR)</td>
<td>YES or NO</td>
<td>≥ 80% CAR</td>
<td>YES or NO</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Student Task Engagement</td>
<td>YES or NO</td>
<td>≥ 80% Student Task Engagement</td>
<td>YES or NO</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Conducting an Effective Transition</td>
<td>YES or NO</td>
<td>≥ 80% of Steps (up to 6 steps)</td>
<td>YES or NO</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Processing Students’ Point Cards</td>
<td>YES or NO</td>
<td>100% of Steps (3 steps)</td>
<td>YES or NO</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Total Number of Skills at Mastery:** __ of 10
Coach Role

Assignments

• Each coach assigned two classrooms
• Logistical considerations

Observations and Feedback

• Observe one skill per week
• Complete feedback form with score and graph
• Leave hard copy with teacher immediately after observation
Recommendations for Successfully Using Praise

Examples of Praise

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Give a Praise Statement or Gesture</th>
<th>Describe the Behavior Observed</th>
<th>Identify the Student</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>&quot;Excellent!&quot;</td>
<td>You are prepared for class today</td>
<td>Michael</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;Nice work&quot;</td>
<td>following directions</td>
<td>group 31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;Great job&quot;</td>
<td>staying seated</td>
<td>Jabari</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;Wonderful!&quot;</td>
<td>You have your hand raised so please read the next paragraph</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;Good job&quot;</td>
<td>using kind language</td>
<td>Imani</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High five</td>
<td>&quot;I know you’re listening because I see your eyes on me&quot;</td>
<td>Everyone</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thumbs up</td>
<td>&quot;I like how you’re waiting patiently&quot;</td>
<td>Desean</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fist bump</td>
<td>&quot;It was really nice of you to help Tia with her homework&quot;</td>
<td>Angela</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Tips to Increase Praise Statements

- When a student is acquiring a new skill
- When you see a small improvement in behavior

Use a Cue Strategy for Praise

- Use cueing device to remind you to praise (e.g., Motivator or Timer) OR Self-Monitor (e.g., put 4 paper clips in your right pocket, when you give a praise statement move 1 paper clip to your left pocket)

Use Both Verbal and Non-verbal Praise

Set a Goal

- e.g., Try to praise 4 students for raising their hand during Social Studies class
- e.g., Put 10 Cat Cash tickets in your pocket and try to give them all away by the end of the day. Be sure to give behavior-specific praise with the Cat Cash.

Tips to Increase Behavior-Specific Praise

- Pick a problem behavior to focus on (e.g., calling out) and praise student(s) who are demonstrating the opposite, expected behavior (e.g., raising your hand)

Reference the School-wide Behavioral Expectations (ROAR)

Tips to Reduce Corrections

- When a student is engaged in an inappropriate behavior (e.g., out of seat), instead of correcting the student, praise another student who is demonstrating the opposite, desired behavior (e.g., sitting appropriately in seat).
- Give students 30 seconds to comply with a direction before giving a correction.
2017-2018 Outcome Data
May 2018 Group Results

Current Skill Averages

- **Lesson Agenda**: 15% (Baseline Average), 95% (Current Average)
- **Behavior-Specific Praise**: 9% (Baseline Average), 54% (Current Average)
- **Praise Ratio**: 0.28 (Baseline Average)
- **OTR**: 1.37 (Baseline Average), 1.48 (Current Average)
Outcome Data

Task Engagement

- Baseline Average
- May 2018 Average
# Classroom Outcomes: Successes and Challenges

## Successes
- Very concrete skills and targets
- Feedback provides details about what the skill looks like
- Lesson agenda was a good place to start – not dependent on student behaviors/outcomes
- Students don’t seem to notice additional staff – used to others coming in and out of classrooms
- Individualized use of specific skills

## Challenges
- **LOGISTICS**
  - More feedback at a time wanted (e.g. more than one skill at a time)
  - Repetitive for second-year participants
  - Specific suggestions for improvement wanted by participants
Secondary Prevention: Targeted Supports for At-Risk Students

Tier 2 Supports: Individual and Small Groups
Student Identification for Tier 2 Intervention

138 students at risk on SAEBRS-ES

Principal and school counselor identify students

Consent forms to parent or guardians of students

17 students in relaxation groups and CATS program

6 Students participate in a trauma-focused group
Relaxation Group Format

1) ROAR Expectations
2) Review Previous Week’s Strategy
3) Learn New Relaxation Strategy
4) Discussion
5) Homework
Relaxation Strategies

1) Breathing
   • General, 4-7-8, changing postures

2) Identifying and Changing Automatic Thoughts
   • CBT triangle, changing unhelpful thoughts to helpful thoughts

3) Progressive Muscle Relaxation
   • Tense and relax all major muscle groups

4) Review
   • Discussion and practice
# CATS Program

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time</th>
<th>8:30</th>
<th>9:15</th>
<th>9:15</th>
<th>10:00</th>
<th>10:45</th>
<th>11:30</th>
<th>12:15</th>
<th>1:00</th>
<th>1:45</th>
<th>2:30</th>
<th>3:09</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>9:15</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10:00</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10:45</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11:30</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12:15</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1:00</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1:45</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2:30</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3:09</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- **CONFIDENT**
- **ADAPTABLE**
- **TASK ENGAGEMENT**
- **SHOWS POSITIVE ATTITUDE**

### Total Points

### Teacher Initials

---

**Class 1 % of Total Time**

Please mark along the line the percentage of total time that the student is withdrawn.

0% Never  | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 100% Always

50% Sometimes
Progress Monitoring

Student Direct Behavior Ratings (DBR):

- A research supported assessment that consists of the quantification of a behavior at a given point in time
- Commonly used to capture small increments of behavioral change in response to an intervention

(Christ, Riley-Tillman, & Chafouleas, 2009; Chafouleas, Sanetti, Kilgus, & Magin, 2012)
Student Comments about Relaxation Groups

“My mom says I have become nicer since I learned how to use these strategies instead of fighting.”

“I did 4-7-8 breathing when I failed a test and it helped me stay calm and in the classroom.”

“I practiced my breathing when my sister was yelling at me so that I didn’t yell back.”

“I taught my mom how to change her automatic thoughts and we practiced together.”
Tier 2: Trauma Screening

- Trauma Exposure Checklist

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Event</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Have you been in a serious accident, where you could have been badly</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>hurt or could have been killed?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Have you seen a serious accident, where someone could have been (or</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>was) badly hurt or died?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- Child PTSD Screener

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Not at all</th>
<th>Once in a while</th>
<th>Half the time</th>
<th>Almost always</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Have you had upsetting thoughts or images about the event that came</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>into your head when you didn’t want them to?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- Student assent and parent consent
Trauma Screening Data

**Screening Guidelines**

- Eligible students must have at least one exposure to trauma AND
- Related PTSD symptoms in the clinical range
  - Indicated by scores >14 on PTSD screener

**Students at our school**

- Students experienced range of 4-14 traumatic events
  - Average number = 9.3
- 10/13 students exhibit moderate to severe symptoms of PTSD
  - Average score = 19.1
CBITS: Cognitive Behavioral Intervention for Trauma in Schools

- Developed by a team of researchers in collaboration with the Los Angeles Unified School District
- Designed specifically for children of diverse ethnic and cultural backgrounds
- Intended to be implemented by people with some training in cognitive-behavioral therapy
- For students in grades 5-12
Goals of CBITS

1) Reduce symptoms of post-traumatic stress disorder (PTSD)

2) Reduce symptoms of depression and anxiety

3) Improve grades, attendance, behavior, and coping skills
Tier 2 Outcomes: Successes and Challenges

**Successes**
- Students reported positive changes in behavior after the groups
- Data sheets similar to currently existing CICO forms and simple to complete

**Challenges**
- Progress monitoring
- Timing of intervention
- Consents
- Implementers and Sustainability
Implementation Processes and Challenges
Implementation Challenges

1. Quick Fix
2. Upside Down Triangle
3. Data Literacy
4. Staffing and Workload issues
Challenge 1: Quick Fix WANTED!

• The Problem:
  • Districts/Staff want to buy a program that will be the “fix”
  • They don’t understand that MTSS is a framework where THEY do the work
  • The “fix” happens over time

• Addressing It:
  • Clearly state expectations for implementation in the overview
  • Show data frequently to teams and staff
  • Celebrate small successes to keep buy in
Challenge 2: Upside Down Triangle

• The Problem:
  • Too many students "at-risk"
  • Tier 2 and Tier 3 supports are stretched too thin and becomes reactive rather than preventative.

• Addressing It:
  • Classroom Management
  • Fidelity at Tier 1
Challenge 3: Data Based Decision Making

The Problem:
- Difficult for staff to:
  - Understand data
  - Value collecting data
  - Use it to make decisions

Addressing It:
- Using data to make "feelings" real and show the team success
- Sharing data with staff so they understand the importance of documentation

SHOW ME THE DATA!!!!
Challenge 4: Staffing/Workload Issues

• The Problem
  • Understaffed
    • Hard to implement interventions
    • Limited availability for trainings
    • Difficulty scheduling regular meetings
  • Staff Turnover
    • Difficulty maintaining fidelity and buy in
    • “Identity crisis”

• Addressing It:
  • Continuous retraining
  • Coaching to support the maintenance of buy in and fidelity
Making the Sale

- District/Building administration needs to buy in first
- Have to provide the "Why" behind "Why Screen"
- Need to have the next steps thought out
- System Change in hard – Go Slow to Go Fast!!
- Sustainability
Questions?
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