Three Lane Highway: Aligning Academic, Behavior, and Mental Wellness Drivers to Guide an MTSS Framework

Corinne Wilson, PhD, VTSS Evaluator
Regina Pierce, M.Ed., VTSS Consultant
1. Explain the components of each implementation driver as applied in a multi-tiered system

2. Provide processes, tools, and examples for the alignment of mental wellness

3. Summarize progress using the Virginia Tiered Systems of Supports (VTSS) framework to align the three domains implementation drivers
Wait, What? Drivers?
Implementation Drivers

Reliable Benefits

Consistent Uses of Innovations

Performance Assessment (fidelity)

Competency Drivers

Coaching

Training

Selection

Leadership Drivers

Technical

Adaptive

Organization Drivers

Systems Intervention

Facilitative Administration

Decision Support Data System

Integrated & Compensatory

Fixsen & Blase, 2008
Supporting Improvements in Behavioral Competence, Academic Achievement and Social-Emotional Wellness

Supporting Staff

Supporting Students

Supporting Decision Making

OUTCOMES

SYSTEMS

DATA

PRACTICES
Cascading System of Support

OSEP PBIS TA Center, Project AWARE, USDOE

VDOE

District/Regional Team

Provides leadership, guidance, visibility, political support

Building Leadership Team

Provides guidance and manages implementation

Building Staff

Provides practices to support students and families

Students and Families

Improved student outcomes!

District/Regional Team

Provides leadership, guidance, visibility, training, coaching, funding, and political support

Building Leadership Team

Provides guidance, visibility, political support

Building Staff

Provides practices to support students and families

Students and Families

Improved student outcomes!
“All Means All” isn’t just for students anymore.

Practical: Train statewide coaches across the cascading model on developing and coaching teams.
1. Administrator breakfasts: networking and problem solving around developing a positive school climate for students

2. Systems change process for division and school leaders in the VTSS Systems Coaching institutes

3. Suggestions pertaining to defining roles and responsibilities for the varying leadership teams in a district

4. A virtual Community of Practice for building administrators

5. Inclusion of stakeholders with a Mental Wellness lens on leadership teams across the cascading model and teams of community and school providers

6. Statewide support of District Leadership teams at an Exploration and Installation series to foster implementation skills
VTSS Leadership Roles and Responsibilities Document

Refer to handout

Virginia Tiered System of Supports (VTSS)
Leadership Roles and Responsibilities

 Superintendent
- Organizes division leadership to support the VTSS Vision and Mission
- Communicates the VTSS plan to school board and community
- Includes VTSS as a framework that supports the division Comprehensive Plan and School Improvement Plan
- Allocates resources for VTSS professional learning (both personnel and funding)
- Monitors and communicates expectations for division VTSS implementation
- Establishes a culture that promotes and supports data informed decision making system

 Central Office Leadership Team
- Supports the VTSS Vision and Mission utilizing VTSS documents/action steps
- Integrates the VTSS framework into division planning (division calendars, agendas, professional learning)
- Determines representation of the leadership team: (i.e. Division Coordinator, Superintendent (or designee), Data Management Specialist, Behavior Specialist, Instructional Director, Psychologist, Social Worker, others as division deems appropriate)
- Learns the systems change process and monitors fidelity for successful academic and social behavioral VTSS implementation
- Develops and manages data systems for informed data decision making and problem solving
- Communicates and builds VTSS commitment with all stakeholders

 School Based Leadership Team
- Supports the VTSS Vision and Mission utilizing VTSS documents/action steps
- Organizes Tier I: Universal/"core" team based on VTSS research/evidence-based practices
- Plans and develops Tier II/Tier III supports and system infrastructure based on VTSS research/evidence-based practices
- Builds VTSS commitment by educating all faculty, staff, students, parents, and community members
- Utilizes effective data meeting structures to monitor student progress

All leadership teams work together to build an integrated framework that promotes shared leadership at the division, school, classroom, and community levels.
### Division Data Summary Sheet

#### Academics, Graduation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School Accreditation</th>
<th>% of schools fully accredited</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><em>consider the number of schools that are warned or reconstituted and impact on division plan; comment on schools with support from OSI</em></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SOL scores Reading</th>
<th>Division:</th>
<th>Division SWD:</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><em>include any comments on other disaggregated data</em></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SOL scores Math</th>
<th>Division:</th>
<th>Division SWD:</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><em>include any comments on other disaggregated data</em></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SOL scores ALG 1</th>
<th>Division:</th>
<th>Division SWD:</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Division average only</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><em>include any comments on disaggregated data</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Division average only</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><em>include if there is consistency among High Schools if more than 1 HS</em></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Federal Graduation Indicator</th>
<th>Division:</th>
<th>Division SWD:</th>
<th>(SWD state is 53)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Other</th>
<th>Division:</th>
<th>Division SWD:</th>
<th><em>Any other data relative to this division (working with OCR, etc.)</em></th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

#### Behavior (*TFI and ODR data based on participating schools that report BOY data*)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PBIS Participation</th>
<th>YES, PBIS is a division-wide initiative</th>
<th>If no, % of schools with PBIS team:</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><em>note if available any relative information on advanced tiers</em></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TFI results – Tier 1</th>
<th>% of schools below 50:</th>
<th>% of schools between 50 and 60:</th>
<th>% of schools between 60 and 70:</th>
<th>% of schools 70 and above:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ODR data</th>
<th>% of schools where less than 80% of students have 0 – 1 ODR</th>
<th>% of schools where 80 – 99% of students have 0 – 1 ODR</th>
<th>% not submitted:</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Short Term Suspensions/Risk Ratios/AA</th>
<th>% of schools low risk ratio</th>
<th>% of schools moderate risk ratio</th>
<th>% of schools high risk ratio</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><em>note any particular information regarding long term</em></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Short Term Suspensions/Risk Ratios/SWD</th>
<th>% of schools low risk ratio</th>
<th>% of schools moderate risk ratio</th>
<th>% of schools high risk ratio</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><em>note any particular information regarding long term</em></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Attendance

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Attendance (10% or less are not chronically absent)</th>
<th>Division: % of students missing 0 – 10%:</th>
<th>Division: % of SWD missing 0 – 10%:</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><em>note disparities between elementary and high school, as well as any particular schools with high rates of chronic absenteeism</em></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Division Capacity

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DCA results</th>
<th>Overall Division PD estimation from matrix</th>
<th>Exploration</th>
<th>Installation</th>
<th>Implementation</th>
<th>Full Implementation</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Up to 50</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50 to 60</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60 to 70</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>70 to 90</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note qualitative comments relating to leadership changes, etc.*

*Florida has Relative Risks of 1.2 – 1.9 as low disproportionality, 2.0 – 2.9 as moderate disproportionality, and 3+ as significant levels of disproportionality.*

Refer to Handout
Statewide Division Data Summary

Academic: Standardized test scores, school accreditation, Federal Graduation Indicator

Behavior and Climate: Positive Behavior Interventions and Supports (PBIS) participation, Tiered Fidelity Inventory Scores, office disciplinary referrals, disproportionality risk ratios

Attendance: Chronic absenteeism percentages

Division Capacity: District Capacity Assessment, qualitative reflection on VTSS Implementation Matrix
Mental Wellness Indicators: Steer Carefully

Challenge: Currently difficult to find a uniform indicator across divisions other than the overall “wellness” of the schools
One Possibility

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Support items</th>
<th>Region</th>
<th>State</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Most teachers and other adults at this school...Care about all students.</td>
<td>1 79%</td>
<td>81%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Most teachers and other adults at this school...Want all students to do well.</td>
<td>2 74%</td>
<td>92%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Most teachers and other adults at this school...Listen to what students have to say.</td>
<td>3 78%</td>
<td>90%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Most teachers and other adults at this school...Treat students with respect.</td>
<td>4 83%</td>
<td>93%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There are adults at this school I could talk with if I had a personal problem.</td>
<td>5 80%</td>
<td>91%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>If I tell a teacher that someone is bullying me, the teacher will do something to help.</td>
<td>6 83%</td>
<td>90%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I am comfortable asking my teachers for help with my schoolwork.</td>
<td>7 82%</td>
<td>92%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is at least one teacher or other adult at this school who really wants me to do well.</td>
<td>8 83%</td>
<td>94%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Challenge: Currently difficult to find a uniform indicator across divisions other than the overall “wellness” of the schools
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DATA</th>
<th>PRACTICES</th>
<th>SYSTEMS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>NEED</td>
<td>EVIDENCE</td>
<td>RESOURCES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>□ Do we have data that supports the need?</td>
<td>□ Is there research to support its use?</td>
<td>□ Is there time and money for adequate training?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>□ Have we considered parent and community support?</td>
<td>□ Is there research to support its use with a particular population?</td>
<td>□ Is the technology department able to support the EBP if needed?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>□ Will this EBP support a school improvement or continuous improvement goal?</td>
<td>□ Is the effect size sufficient?</td>
<td>□ Is there time and money for adequate coaching?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>□ Is there data specific to the EBP that can serve as a component of progress monitoring?</td>
<td>□ Is it cost-effective or is there something less expensive that yields similar results?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>□ Can the data be communicated to students (feedback) and parents?</td>
<td>□ Is there a fidelity checklist or tool?</td>
<td>□ Does the leadership team support the EBP?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>□ Is there a system in place to evaluate the data to determine outcomes?</td>
<td>□ Are there competing initiatives?</td>
<td>□ Did the leadership team obtain buy-in?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>□ Is there clarity about where the initiative fits in the tiered system?</td>
<td>□ Have committed staff members to been selected to implement?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>□ Is there sufficient time in the schedule for the EBP?</td>
<td>□ Has the coach or expert on the EBP been identified as a primary assistant and communicator?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>□ Is the EBP easily replicated?</td>
<td>□ Does the division support the EBP?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>□ Can families be shown how to support the EBP?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
For all practices:
1. What is the universal screener?
2. What are the decision rules for movement between tiers?
3. How is fidelity monitored?
4. What data is used for progress monitoring?
5. How are families engaged?
6. What coaching and other supports are needed?
# Practices Across the Three Lanes

## Resource Map/Tier Definition

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Universal Screener</th>
<th>Evidence-based Practices</th>
<th>Tier 1</th>
<th>Subject or Strand:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>How is progress monitored? How often?</td>
<td>Data that indicates the need for targeted and/or more intensive interventions (Entry Criteria to tier 2)</td>
<td>Time and setting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Refer to Handout
Very quickly write down one practice that addresses social-emotional learning.

Can you answer the questions from slide 18?
Practices Across the Three Lanes
Example Resource Map/Tier Definition

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Resource Map/Tier Definition</th>
<th>Tier 1</th>
<th>Subject or Strand:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Universal Screener</td>
<td>Evidence-based Practices</td>
<td>How is progress monitored? How often?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

[Table continues with empty cells]
Practices Across the Three Lanes Example

Evidence Based Practice:
Second Step (Tier 1)

Progress Monitoring:
Devereux Student Strengths Assessment (DESSA)*

Decision Rule for Tier 2 Supports:
DESSA indicator, >2 referrals
(one more indicator for triangulated data**)

*DESSA not yet used as universal screener
**Decision rules remain a challenge; they are in process of working on this
Practices Across the Three Lanes
Example Continued

**Time and Setting:**
Across all K-1 classrooms in 3 elementary schools for 20-25 minutes four times weekly during Morning Meeting

**Fidelity:**
Walk-throughs by school counselor

**Parent Engagement:**
Receive packets on skills; overview on back to school night (more informational at this time)

**Systems Support:**
Training by school social work staff, time allotted in schedule, self-care opportunities for teachers prior to school
# Data Driven Decision Making: Division

## DATA/Evidence of Need:


## Outcome (Set a goal):

## Key Practices: What key practices will the schools commit to implementing with fidelity? Name and define them.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Action Plan</th>
<th>Who?</th>
<th>When?</th>
<th>Fidelity Measures</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

## Key Systems: How will the division support the school in the implementation of new practices?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Action Plan</th>
<th>Who?</th>
<th>When?</th>
<th>Fidelity Measures</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

## Data/Progress Monitoring: Did we do what we said we would do? With fidelity? Outcomes? Are we making progress?

<p>| | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
Competency Drivers

Reliable Benefits

Consistent Uses of Innovations

Performance Assessment (fidelity)

Competency Drivers
- Coaching
- Training
- Selection

Organization Drivers
- Systems Intervention
- Facilitative Administration
- Decision Support Data System

Leadership Drivers
- Technical
- Adaptive
Tools

Academic Enhancements in first trial and in process of validation.

Mental Wellness draft currently in process
**Consistent Coaching Plans**

**Tier 1 VTSS/PBIS**
Division to School Coaching Service Delivery Plan

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School/Division: ___________________</th>
<th>Division Coach(s): ___________________</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Data Initiated: ___________________</td>
<td>School Coach(s): ___________________</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Plan for assisting divisions with the who, how, frequency, and schedule of their Service Delivery Plan.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Coaching Concepts or Skills (Each phase of this work is ongoing and layered upon the previous phase.)</th>
<th>Exploration:</th>
<th>Installation:</th>
<th>Implementation:</th>
<th>Sustainability:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
Systems Coaching Institute 101: Session A
September 12 - September 13

Homewood Suites by Hilton Richmond – Airport, 5996 Audubon Drive
Sandston, VA 23150 United States + Google Map
Supporting Social-Emotional Learning With Evidence-Based Programs

THE ANNIE E. CASEY FOUNDATION

Where Do You See the Drivers in Action?

Rather than continuing to lurch from grant to grant, in recent years CCS decided to take a more intentional approach to identifying and implementing evidence-based programs. CCS brought together action teams to take a comprehensive look at four areas: mental wellness, community partnerships, professional learning, and social and emotional learning. The action teams comprised district staff, principals, community providers, teachers, school social workers, school psychologists, and counselors. Each action team identified student needs, the existing supports available and the remaining gaps. Teams then selected evidence-based programs that would address the unmet needs and were a good fit for their school populations, and that they felt could be easily embedded and sustained. Based on this work, the district piloted a series of evidence-based programs to see which were, in fact, a good fit for implementation.
Why We Are Happy

• 54 VTSS Divisions
  – 14 joined Summer 2018

• 439 schools (established VTSS divisions)

• ≈ 98% school submission rates
Impact on Office Discipline Referrals (ODRs)

33% decrease from EOY 2015 to EOY 2017 for general education students.

21% decrease from EOY 2015 to EOY 2017 for special education students.
Impact on In-School Suspensions (ISSs)

There was a 33% decrease in ISSs from EOY 2015 to EOY 2017 for general education students.

There was a 35% decrease in ISSs EOY 2015 to EOY 2017 for special education students.
There was a 21% decrease in OSSs from EOY 2015 to EOY 2017 for general education students.

There was a 14% decrease in OSSs EOY 2015 to EOY 2017 for special education students.
Impact on Short-term Suspensions

There was a 9% decrease in Short-term Suspensions in state-reported VTSS schools from 2015-16 to 2016-17.

There was a 5% decrease in Short-term Suspensions in all Virginia schools from 2015-16 to 2016-17.*

*Only Elementary, Middle, High, and Combined schools were used.
Student Enrollment by Tier

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Standard</th>
<th>2016-17</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>6+ ODRs</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2-5 ODRs</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0-1 ODRs</td>
<td>80%</td>
<td>88%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
As Tier I fidelity increases, Office Discipline Referrals (ODRs) decrease.
## Fidelity and Disciplinary Actions

Correlations between 2016-17 Outcome Summary data totals and Tiered Fidelity Inventory Tier I scores

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Correlation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ODRs</td>
<td>-0.258*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ODRs – SE</td>
<td>-0.196</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ISSs</td>
<td>-0.117</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ISSs – SE</td>
<td>-0.157</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OSSs</td>
<td>-0.211</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OSSs – SE</td>
<td>-0.165</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*statistically significant using a 5% significance level
92% of VTSS Cohort 1-3 divisions had consistent or improved pass rates for all students on both the English and Mathematics SOLs from 2013-14 to 2016-17 academic years.
Impact on Academics
School-level

• 76% of VTSS Cohort 1-3 divisions had consistent or improved pass rates *for students with disabilities* on the *English* SOLs from 2014-15 to 2016-17

• 48% of VTSS Cohort 1-3 divisions had consistent or improved pass rates *for students with disabilities* on the *Math* SOLs from 2014-15 to 2016-17
Impact on Graduation Rates

- **State**: 2014-15: 90.60%, 2015-16: 91.20%, 2016-17: 91.40%
- **VTSS Cohort 1-2**: 2014-15: 90.86%, 2015-16: 91.81%, 2016-17: 90.92%
- **VTSS Cohort 3**: 2014-15: 90.25%, 2015-16: 91.92%, 2016-17: 92.58%
% of respondents who said there was an adult at school they could talk with if they had a personal problem:

2013: 70%
2015: 74%
2017: 76%

*Data is for all Virginia Middle schools not only schools in a VTSS division*
Project AWARE
Impact on Adults’ Capacity to Implement Youth Mental Health First Aid (YMHFA)

Training for school personnel and other adults to detect and respond to mental illness in children, youth, and young adults:

• **7,835 students referred** (since 2015)
• **3,302 adults trained** (in YMHFA)
There was a 53% increase in the number of students served by school-based mental health professionals from 2015-16 to 2016-17.

There was a 4% increase in the percentage of students referred to community mental health services who received such services 2015-16 to 2016-17 (over 72% received services).
Impact on Use of Evidence-based Programs Related to Mental Wellness

There was a 295% increase in the number of evidence-based programs in Project AWARE schools from 2015-16 to 2016-17 (20 to 79).

There was a 41% increase in the number of Student Assistance Program (SAP Team) members from 2015-16 to 2016-17.
School-Based Mental Health Services

• In 2016-2017, 3,184 students received school-based mental health services
  – Represents 53% increase from previous year

• 7,835 school-aged youth were linked to a mental health or related service, resource, or support since the start of the grant (2015).

• 72% of students referred to community-based MH services received such services.
Our division leaders say...
In the first three years of implementing PBIS, [our] school was only partially accredited. We quickly became fully accredited based on state and federal requirements. Additionally, since joining VTSS, we have lowered the overall discipline for the entire school community from 35% of students having at least one office referral to 15%.
Student data is the focus. The VTSS tiered-support framework helps us identify those students who really need additional academic and/or behavioral supports.
If kids aren’t doing well, either academically or behaviorally, staff bring data to the school data team meeting where we problem-solve, trying to figure out if this is an instruction issue, a mismatch, a fidelity issue, time, ...

...at our elementary schools last year we saw significant gains in reading and math for students with disabilities...
Thank You for Joining Us
Contacts

Regina Pierce:  rhpierce@vcu.edu

Corinne Wilson:  pbisva@odu.edu

Website:  http://vtss-ric.org