

# USING DATA TO MAKE DECISIONS

## SCREENING



## Quick Activity

What kind of  
screening does  
your school do  
now?



# Questions to Ponder

- How do we determine which students need Tier 2 & 3 Services (Individual student analysis)?
- How do we determine the effectiveness our Tier 1 Schoolwide Discipline Plan (School unit analysis)?





# Proactive Data Collection: **Screening**



**REACTIVE DATA COLLECTION:  
BEHAVIOR INCIDENT  
REPORTS**

# Why Screen?

- Academic success linked to social/behavioral skills
- Five predictor variables concerning student skills or behaviors related to **success in school**:
  - (a) prior achievement,
  - (b) interpersonal skills,
  - (c) study skills,
  - (d) motivation, and
  - (e) engagement (DiPerna and Elliott, 1999, 2000)



# Why Screen?

Move beyond traditional “wait to fail” model  
common in schools towards a more  
proactive approach

(Glover & Albers, 2007)

# Why Screen

- Identify students with socio-emotional needs in a proactive manner
  - 2-20% of students at-risk for further development of antisocial behavior (Walker, Ramsey, & Gresham, 2004).
  - Among approximately 20% of school-aged children who experience mental health difficulties, only 30% receive services (United States Public Health Service, 2000).
  - Assists in decision-making related to limited school **RESOURCES** (Walker, Cheney, Stage, & Blum, 2005).

# Why Screen

Preventative PBIS reduces the need for more intensive, less efficient, more expensive supports later.

(Cheney & Stage, in press; Walker, Cheney, Stage, & Blum, 2005)

# Why Screen

- Teachers are reliable evaluators/judges of student academic & behavioral performance when given a clear, overt structure to facilitate the decision making (Elliott , Huai , Roach, 2007).
- But seldom have a mechanism for sharing their knowledge.

# Why Screen?

- Schools need to be ready to move away from reactive systems of responding only to established need.  
(Severson, Walker, Hope-Doolittle, Kratchowill & Gresham, 2007)
- Most effective when in the context of a three tiered comprehensive model, such as RTI/PBIS.

# Quiz

- Limitation of ODRs: Insufficient for identifying students with internalizing behaviors. True or False
- Teacher nominations, parent and student reports can be used as part of the screening process, but they do not constitute a universal screening system. True or False Why?
- Screening leads to labeling Yes or No Why

What is more concerning to you?

- False positives: Identifying students who are not at risk.
- False negatives: Not identifying kids who are at risk.

# BASC- Behavior and Emotional

## Screening Scale (Pearson Publications)

- Based on BASC by Reynolds & Kamphaus, 2002
- Universal screener with norms for preschool & K-12,
- Includes teacher, parent, and self-rating forms grades 3-12. 3-5 minutes per form. Completed on all students in class
- Hand scored and scannable forms, ASSIST software available
- Provides comprehensive summary of student scores and teacher ratings across the school

DO: Review BESS Questions  
Reflect: Pros and cons?



**5 Minutes**  
New Spokesperson

# Strengths and Differences Questionnaire

- <http://www.sdqinfo.com/>
- Click on “questionnaires etc.”
- Click on preferred language
- Click on desired questionnaire (T)

DO: SDQ on a couple of students.  
Reflect: Pros and cons?  
Large group discussion.



# Office Discipline Referrals

- Implemented widely in SWPBS where 2-5 ODR considered threshold for at-risk (Horner et al., 2005)
- Often measured using Schoolwide Information System (SWIS; May et al., 2002)
  - [www.swis.org](http://www.swis.org)
- May miss a number of students
  - One study found that 35% of students who qualified as at risk on SSBD did not have multiple ODRs (Walker, Cheney, Stage, & Blum, 2005)

# Tier I Problem Solving Approach

- *Question: How effective is school-wide program?*
- *Assessment:*
  - *Office discipline referrals (ODR)*
  - *School climate surveys*
  - *Screening*
- *Hypotheses:*
  - *Lack of instruction*
  - *Lack of positive behavior supports*
  - *Inconsistent discipline policy or implementation*
- *Interventions*
  - *Identify common behavioral issues & develop school-wide (or whole class) interventions*
  - *Introduce positive behavior supports*
  - *Teach prosocial behaviors*

# Tier II Problem Solving Approach

- *Question: How is student functioning compared to expectations? peers?*
- *Progress Monitoring Assessment:*
  - *Baseline data (intensity of behavior - frequency, duration)*
  - *Peer group comparison*
  - *Gap analysis*
- *Hypotheses:*
  - *Student has not been taught the skill*
  - *Expected behavior is not reinforced in the learning environment*
- *Interventions*
  - *Classroom-based behavioral interventions*
  - *Small-group, targeted interventions*

# Tier III Problem Solving Approach

- *Question: What is the student's response to evidence-based interventions (progress monitoring)?*
- *Assessment:*
  - *Functional Behavior Assessment - prior to interventions*
  - *Response to Intervention data with graphs*
- *Hypotheses:*
  - *Focus on child-specific issues in problem-solving*
- *Interventions*
  - *Behavior intervention plan - based on FBA*
  - *Assessing quality/intensity of interventions*

# Limitations of Screening

Screening indicates  
increased risk

Screening and Assessment are not  
interchangeable terms

Screening triggers assessment

Screening does not provide  
confirmation or diagnosis

Screening may miss some students at risk

# Issues with Implementation 1: Staff Training and Implementation

- For effective screening to occur leadership teams must consider:
  - Procedural considerations in implementation of the process of screening (implemented consistently and with fidelity to the instructions and process)
  - General training in behavioral and mental health issues that improves teachers' understanding of the purpose and content of the screening process, provided prior to implementation (e.g. internalizing vs. externalizing behaviors) as well as potential concerns and misconceptions (Severson, Walker, Hope-Doolittle, Kratchowill & Gresham, 2007)

## Issues with Implementation 2: Informed Consent, Student Privacy

- Determine threshold for specific informed consent in your district/community
  - Minimum includes; parents clearly informed as part of schoolwide academic/social screening, use of passive consent process for screening, outline confidentiality policy and follow up procedures for students who are identified as at-risk, no interventions at that level without informed parental consent
- Establish procedure to protect student privacy throughout the process
- Review confidentiality guidelines and follow up procedures with staff

# Key References

- Hawken, L., Vincent, C., & Schumann (2008). Response to intervention for social behavior: Challenges and opportunities. *Journal of Emotional and Behavioral Disorders*.16, p. 213.
- Severson, H., Walker, H., Hope-Doolittle, J., Kratchowill, T., & Gresham, F. (2007). Proactive early screening to detect behaviorally at-risk students: Issues, approaches, emerging innovations, and professional practices. *Journal of School Psychology*, 45, 193-223.
- Walker, B., Cheney, D., Stage, S. & Blum, C. (2005). Schoolwide screening and positive behavior supports: Identifying and supporting students at risk for school failure. *Journal of Positive Behavior Intervention*, 7, p. 194.



Significant content for these slides were gathered from presentation slides prepared by:

## **Effective Schoolwide Screening: Identifying Students At-Risk for Emotional and Behavioral Disabilities**

Bridget Walker, Ph.D.

Seattle University

Seattle WA

[walkerb@seattleu.edu](mailto:walkerb@seattleu.edu)

[www.uwbrc.org](http://www.uwbrc.org)

[www.wapbis.org](http://www.wapbis.org)

# Tasks

Review screening options.

Choose screening protocol.

Conduct screening with one grade level or pilot group.

