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Current Challenges

School-wide screening (e.g., SSBD) alone does little to solve behavior problems.

School-wide Screening + Positive Behavior Support = Comprehensive Systems Approach

Safe, supportive school environment

All students can learn and develop appropriate social behavior

(Lewis, 2001; Sugai & Horner, 1999; Young et al., 2003)
Current Challenges

In 1999-2000
29% of public schools reported daily or weekly student bullying.
19% reported student acts of disrespect for teachers
13% reported student verbal abuse of teachers

(Indicators of School Crime and Safety: 2003, NCES 2004)
Current Challenges

20-40% at-risk for school failure & drop out.
(Walker, et al., 2004)

These trends are reflected by teachers and administrators identifying disruptive and aggressive behavior as their foremost challenge and concern.
(Kauffman, Mostert, Trent, & Hallahan, 1998; Walker & Sylvester, 1998)
Current Challenges

Educators also report that they often feel insufficiently trained to deal with the disruptions, defiance, threats, bullying and aggression with which they are confronted each day.  

(Artresani & Mallar, 1998)
What’s effective?

Screening and assessment provides the basis for effective intervention. Without reliable and valid screening procedures it is not possible to accurately identify the specific children and youth who should be targeted for prevention and intervention efforts, nor is it possible to identify the specific clusters of social-behavioral deficits or problems that should be the focus of prevention and intervention efforts.

( Merrell, 2002)
What’s effective?

The availability and use of practical, easy-to-use, low cost, reliable, and valid measurement tools for social-behavioral concerns is a prerequisite to making positive change.

(Merrell, 2002)
What’s effective

Effective screening tools and procedures typically share specific core characteristics:

1. Proactive
2. Multiple operationalism
3. Incorporated early
4. Supplemented with precise measures
5. Produce specific information

(Lane, 2003)
What’s effective?

Systematic Screening for Behavior Disorders (SSBD)

Six separate studies=

SSBD provided a reliable procedure for systematically screening and identifying elementary school students who demonstrate potential behavior disorders.

What’s effective?

In six additional studies, SSBD proved to be an accurate procedure that discriminates potential behavior disorder students from non disordered or non at-risk students within regular classrooms.

Key components

1. Screening/Referral

2. Assessment

3. Intervention
Evolution of system

Past system:

Systematic Screening for Behavior Disorders (SSBD) stages 1-3 (1992, Walker & Severson)
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Rank Ordering on Externalizing Dimension

**Externalizing** refers to all behavior problems that are directed outwardly, by the child, toward the external social environment. Externalizing behavior problems usually involve behavioral excesses, (i.e., too much behavior) and are considered inappropriate by teachers and other school personnel. **Non-examples** of externalizing behavior problems would include all forms of adaptive child behavior that are considered appropriate to the school setting.

**Examples include:**
- displaying aggression toward objects or persons,
- arguing,
- forcing the submission of others,
- defying the teacher,
- being out of seat,
- not complying with teacher instructions or directives,
- having tantrums,
- being hyperactive,
- disturbing others,
- stealing, and
- not following teacher or school imposed rules.

**Non-Examples include:**
- cooperating, sharing,
- working on assigned tasks,
- making assistance needs known in an appropriate manner,
- listening to the teacher,
- interacting in an appropriate manner with peers,
- following directions,
- attending to task, and
- complying with teacher requests.

### COLUMN ONE
**List Externalizers**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Student Name</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Eric</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robert</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Johnny</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Travis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Julie</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### COLUMN TWO
**Rank Order Externalizers**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Student Name</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Most</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 Eric</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Travis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Johnny</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 Julie</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Instructions:
1. Review the definition of externalizing behavior and then review a list of all students in your class.
2. In Column One, enter the names of the ten students who characteristic behavior patterns most closely match the externalizing behavioral definition.
3. In Column Two, rank order the students listed in Column One according to the degree or extent to which each exhibits externalizing behavior to the greatest degree is ranked first and so on until all 10 students are ranked ordered.
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Critical Events: 3

Adaptive Score: 34

Maladaptive Score: 29

Rank: Secondary

SYSTEMATIC SCREENING FOR BEHAVIOR DISORDERS (SSBD)

SSBD Stage Two Rating for Externalizing Students

Critical Events Index

Date ____________________  Teacher ____________________  School ____________________

Student: Eric  Sex: m  Grade: 2nd

Check one: Stage One SSBD Rank: 1  2  or  3

INSTRUCTIONS: Check each behavior from the list below that you are aware the student has exhibited during this school year.

1. Steals.
2. Sets fires.
3. Vomits after eating.
4. Has tantrums.
5. Physically assaults an adult.
6. Exhibits painful shyness.
7. Exhibits large weight loss or gain over past three months. (Significant weight fluctuation would be in excess of 20% change in body weight.)
8. Exhibits sad affect, depression and feelings of worthlessness to such an extent as to interfere with normal peer and classroom activities.
9. Is physically aggressive with other students or adults (hits, bites, chokes, or throws things).
10. Damages others' property (academic materials, damages personal possessions).
11. Demonstrates obsessive-compulsive behaviors. (Student can't get his/her mind off certain thoughts or obsessions.)
12. Reports having nightmares or significant sleep disturbances.
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Functional behavioral assessment

The FBA showed that Eric engaged in aggressive behavior such as pushing, hitting and shoving other students.

It was determined that the function of the aggressive behavior was to receive attention.
Social competence total:  
At-risk

Antisocial behavior total:  
At-risk
Positive behavioral support plan

Increase teacher praise to decrease off-task behavior, talk-outs and aggression.

Included in special playground program to help reduce verbal and physical aggression.
Results

Eric’s off-task behavior, aggression and talk-outs decreased.

Appropriate play on the playground increased and aggression decreased.
Referral

Teacher was worried about Robert following directions, doing school work, and his relationship with his peers. He was referred to the peaceable schools program for assessment.
Critical Events: 5

Adaptive Score: 30

Maladaptive Score: 31

Rank: Tertiary

SYSTEMATIC SCREENING FOR BEHAVIOR DISORDERS (SSBD)
Stage Two Rating for Internalizing Students

Critical Events Index

Date ___________________________ Teacher ___________________________ School ___________________________
Student ___________________________ Sex M Grade 4th

Check one: Stage One SSBD Rank: □ 1 □ 2 or □ 3

INSTRUCTIONS: Check each behavior from the list below that you are aware the student has exhibited during this school year.

1. Steals.
2. Sets fires.
3. Vomits after eating.
4. Has tantrums.
5. Physically assaults an adult.
6. Exhibits painful shyness.
7. Exhibits large weight loss or gain over past three months. (Significant weight fluctuation would be in excess of 20% change in body weight.)
8. Exhibits sad affect, depression and feelings of worthlessness to such an extent as to interfere with normal peer and classroom activities.
9. Is physically aggressive with other students or adults (hits, bites, chokes, or throws things).
10. Damages others’ property (academic materials, damages personal possessions).
11. Demonstrates obsessive-compulsive behaviors. (Student can’t get his/her mind off certain thoughts or obsessions.)
12. Reports having nightmares or significant sleep disturbances.
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FBA

The FBA showed that Robert exhibited off-task behavior, and didn’t follow directions.

It was determined that the function of his behaviors were to escape.
Negative Affect/ General Distress: Normal

Positive Affect: At-risk
Positive behavioral support plan

Implementation of a self-management program and peer mediation that was reinforced by a token economy.

Involved in a friendshipping group with the school psychologist.
Results

Robert became more social with his peers and the peer involved in his peer mediation became a good friend.

He started following directions and completed his academic assignments.
Refinement

To be effective you have to constantly evaluate and refine your process to stay current with best practice.

By continual refinement the gap between research and practice is narrowed.
The future

• What needs to be done to better our referral process?
• What needs to be done to better our screening process?
• What needs to be done to better our assessment process?
• What needs to be done to better our intervention process?