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Schools today must deal with increasingly challenging and maladaptive behaviors. Many schools still utilize punitive systems to deal with difficult behavior. Given the ineffectiveness of current discipline policies, new strategies must be developed to create more positive school climates. School-wide positive behavior supports (SW-PBS) is a proactive system for encouraging adaptive behaviors and creating safer learning environments based on the needs of schools and individual students.

In the development of this project and presentation, both authors worked collaboratively, contributing equally to all parts of this endeavor. To complete the literature review, the authors searched the Academic Search Premier, ERIC, and PsychArticles databases for articles about SW-PBS components, interventions, and effectiveness.

The professional training developed for this project will ideally persuade teachers, school administrators, and school psychologists of the need to develop SW-PBS in their own schools by establishing the need for changing policies and demonstrating the
effectiveness of SW-PBS. The in-service also provides participants basic background information, ideas for possible interventions at the different tier levels, and time for discussion to begin the process of building school-wide positive behavior supports at their school sites.
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Chapter 1

INTRODUCTION

In 1996, Walker and his colleagues from the University of Oregon detailed a system of behavior supports for schools that was based on a public health framework. This initial three-tiered conceptualization has since grown into an international school reform process that has officially been adopted by several states including Illinois, Maryland, Colorado, New Jersey, Oregon, and Pennsylvania (Education Law Center of Pennsylvania & Disability Rights Network of Pennsylvania, 2008). This multi-tiered behavioral approach, called school-wide positive behavior supports (SW-PBS), represents an evidence-based practice to assist schools in addressing the mounting expectations, dwindling resources, and increasing incivility, violence, and disruption found in contemporary schools.

Statement of Collaboration

The authors collaborated on all aspects in undertaking this project. In the creation of the final product, each author contributed by developing outlines, researching literature, making decisions, and designing the presentation. Initial drafts of individual sections of each chapter were written by both authors. The authors then collaborated to review, edit, and revise the chapters to construct a coherent final project. This project was equally contributed to by both authors.
Background

Educational systems and society are increasingly burdened with disruptive, deviant, and maladaptive behavior. Violent crimes and theft occur more frequently on school grounds than away from school (Dinkes, Kemp, & Baum, 2009). Bullying continues to be an issue in our schools. Students today not only have to deal with physical and relational bullying, but must also face cyber-bullying through text messages and online social networking. An unsafe environment is far from an ideal atmosphere conducive to learning. It is difficult for students to learn and teachers to instruct when educators must continually take time to deal with challenging behavior. A significant amount of resources including time and money is wasted due to disorderly and troublesome behavior in schools (Putnam, Luiselli, Sennett, & Malonson, 2002; Scott & Barrett, 2004). It is difficult for students and educators to maintain a positive morale when schools are environments of disruption and fear.

Statement of the Research Problem

Currently many schools still utilize punitive systems of handling difficult behavior (Evenson, Justinger, Pelischek, & Schulz, 2009), even though zero-tolerance practices like suspension and expulsion have been shown to be ineffective (National Association of School Psychologists, 2008). Educational systems need to develop more effective policies for establishing and developing positive behaviors in students. School-wide positive behavior supports is a systematic way of creating a safer learning environment and developing adaptive skills.
Purpose of the Project

This project, a presentation titled Implementing School-Wide Positive Behavior Supports when No State Initiative Exists, will provide teachers, school administrators, and school psychologists with the initial skills and work time required to begin the process of building school-wide positive behavior supports at their schools. Although there are several states with well-organized and funded SW-PBS initiatives, schools that are not a part of these programs are left with few research-based alternatives for meeting the behavioral and social needs of their students. This project will fill the gap between schools working as part of these large initiatives and those schools looking to create their own school-wide behavior system.

Organization of Project

This presentation and corresponding facilitator’s guide will provide all of the necessary materials to conduct a six-hour in-service outlining the need for and the process of beginning school-wide positive behavior supports. Facilitators utilizing these materials will be provided with a detailed PowerPoint presentation, slide notes, and leaning activities. The in-service is organized in a manner that provides assessment and investment activities, direct instruction, learning activities, and work time to complete initial startup requirements.

Definition of Terms

Adaptive behavior

Adaptive behaviors are practical, social, and conceptual skills that all people learn and need to function in daily life (American Association of Intellectual and
Developmental Disabilities, 2011). Development of adaptive and desirable behaviors needs to be emphasized with positive behavioral interventions, rather than just the elimination of maladaptive behaviors.

Evidence/research/scientific-based interventions

Interventions utilized under a Response to Intervention (RtI) model need to be supported by scientific research. Supports and interventions need to have been shown to improve students’ academic, social, or behavioral functioning. If an intervention is evidence-based, it is likely to result in positive outcomes for students (Cook & Browning-Wright, 2009).

Intervention fidelity

Interventions should be implemented as they were designed and intended. Implementing supports with fidelity facilitates making educationally appropriate decisions (Cook & Browning-Wright, 2009).

Maladaptive behavior

Behaviors that inhibit people from adjusting to particular situations can be considered maladaptive. Maladaptive behavior is not productive and is dysfunctional and can include antisocial behavior. Antisocial behaviors involve covert and overt hostility and intentional aggression towards others. Antisocial behaviors exist along a continuum of severity. It can include lying, defiance, theft, and includes repeated violations of social rules.
Primary/universal intervention

Primary interventions are organization-wide systems for all students and staff across all settings. These interventions are intended to meet the needs of most students (80-90%). Primary intervention is high quality core instruction (National Center on Response to Intervention, 2010). In SW-PBS, primary intervention involves a set of behavioral expectations for all students across classroom and non-classroom settings. The primary or universal tier includes defining, teaching, monitoring, and rewarding the behavioral expectations (Horner et al., 2009).

Response to Intervention (RtI)

RtI integrates assessment and intervention within a multi-level prevention system to maximize student achievement and to reduce behavior problems. With RtI, schools identify students at risk for poor learning outcomes, monitor student progress, provide evidence-based interventions and adjust the intensity and nature of those interventions depending on a student’s responsiveness, and identify students with learning disabilities or other disabilities (National Center on Response to Intervention, 2010).

School-wide positive behavior supports (SW-PBS)

Improving student academic and behavior outcomes is about ensuring all students have access to the most effective and accurately implemented instructional and behavioral practices and interventions possible. SW-PBS provides an operational framework for achieving these outcomes. More importantly, SW-PBS is NOT a curriculum, intervention, or practice, but IS a decision making framework that guides selection, integration, and implementation of the best evidence-based academic and
behavioral practices for improving important academic and behavior outcomes for all students (Office of Special Education Programs Technical Assistance Center on Positive Behavioral Interventions and Supports, 2011).

Secondary/selected intervention

Secondary intervention supplements primary intervention (i.e., the universal core program) such that students receive additional research-based preventative treatment. Secondary level interventions are often short-term, implemented in small group settings, and may be individualized (National Center on Response to intervention, 2010).

Tertiary/targeted/intensive intervention

Tertiary level of intervention often occurs under the auspices of special education. Individualized education program (IEP) goals are established; individualized student programs are developed formatively using systematic progress monitoring; and student progress data are also used to determine when a student may return to secondary or primary prevention. Tertiary level of intervention is usually implemented individually or in very small groups.

Zero tolerance policies

"Zero tolerance" initially was defined as consistently enforced suspension and expulsion policies in response to weapons, drugs and violent acts in the school setting. Over time, however, zero tolerance has come to refer to school or district-wide policies that mandate predetermined, typically harsh consequences or punishments (such as suspension and expulsion) for a wide degree of rule violation (National Association of School Psychologists, 2008).
Assumptions

School teams need to increase their knowledge of school-wide positive behavior supports. In recent years educators have become increasingly frustrated and overwhelmed by challenging behavior. In order to initiate change in their school systems, they must have a basic understanding of the problems that exist, the ineffectiveness of current policies, and the effectiveness of evidence-based behavioral support strategies such as school-wide positive behavior supports. Through participating in this training, attendees will comprehend the basic structure of SW-PBS, have ideas regarding effective interventions, and gain insight into sustainability. Participants can develop an action plan for how to begin the process of building a school-wide PBS team. They will start making progress toward a safer school environment more conducive to learning.

Justification

School-wide positive behavior supports are associated with a variety of positive outcomes. SW-PBS is associated with improved staff perceptions (Bradshaw, Koth, Bevans, Ialongo, & Leaf, 2008; Horner et al., 2009) and fewer discipline problems resulting in decreased office discipline referrals and suspensions (Luiselli, Putnam, Handler, & Feinberg, 2005; McCurdy, Mannella, & Eldridge, 2003; Scott, 2001). Resources like time and money are utilized more effectively with SW-PBS (Putnam et al., 2002; Scott & Barrett, 2004). Academic gains (Horner et al., 2009; Luiselli, et al., 2005) are also associated with implementation of SW-PBS.
It is worth investing time in participating in the proposed training. This in-service is intended to motivate educators to establish school-wide PBS in their own schools and provide basic tools for how to begin. Administrators, school psychologists, special education, and general education teachers will ideally all come together to build a team committed to making changes. Participants will begin the process toward safer, more effective learning environments for themselves and their students.

Limitations

Although this project will assist schools, that are not a part of externally funded SW-PBS initiative, implement best practice interventions, it is worth noting that the research that supports SW-PBS has been conducted with schools that have generally received a significant amount of support and this support has often included very intensive staff development. For example, schools participating in the Building Effective School Teams (BEST) program participate in eighteen hours of initial staff development (Sprague & Golly, 2005). In the BEST program, the initial training is three times the length of the in-service detailed in this project. This difference will undoubtedly have an effect on the fidelity of the interventions and systems developed in a six hour in-service. However, even with this difference in intensity, the components contained in this project still represent an effective and research proven set of reforms.
Chapter 2

REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE

Establishing the Need for School-Wide Positive Behavior Supports

Behavior issues in school are becoming increasingly prevalent and intense. This is a major area of concern for educational systems and society. Today, students come to school from increasingly difficult situations. Defiant and disruptive behavior cause major discipline issues at school. Behaviors like violence, vandalism, weapons possession, bullying, and harassment create an unsafe learning environment (Luiselli et al., 2005; Mayer, 1999). Schools need both systematic and individual strategies for creating safer learning environments.

School Safety

When examining recent statistics compiled from a number of sources supported by the Federal government for the 12th edition of Indicators of School Crime and Safety, (Dinkes et al., 2009), it can be concluded that schools are not as safe a place as some might think. While fewer fatal incidents occur at school than away from school for students five to eighteen years old (with less than 2% of homicides and less than 1% of suicides happening at schools), this is not the case when considering the rate of nonfatal crimes against students. More theft and violent crimes including rape, aggravated assault, robbery, and sexual assault, occurred at schools (59%) than away from schools (41%) in 2007 (Dinkes et al.).

Twelve to eighteen year olds were victims of approximately 1.5 million violent crimes or thefts at school in 2007 (Dinkes et al., 2009). One or more crimes were
reported during the 2007-2008 school year at 85% of public schools and 75% of schools reported one or more violent incidents. The respondents reported that within the past 30 days, 6% of students reported carrying a weapon onto school property. Seven percent of elementary teachers and 8% of secondary teachers reported being threatened with injury by a student. Six percent of elementary teachers and 2% of secondary teachers reported actually being physically attacked (Dinkes et al.).

**Bullying**

Bullying is another serious issue at schools. It is a problem that is currently being highlighted by the media and the President’s administration. Estimates of bullying vary with 10% of children reporting they were victims of severe bullying while 75% of students report being victims of bullying at least once in an academic year (Sassu, Elinoff, Bray, & Kehle, 2004). Dinkes and colleagues (2009) found that 32% of 12 to 18-year-old students reported being bullied at school. Seven percent reported avoiding school activities or certain places at school due to fear of attack or harm.

Bullying comes in many forms, including cyber bullying, physical bullying, and relational bullying. In today’s technology driven world, with social networking, texting, and email, bullying no longer ends when the school bell rings, but can continue 24 hours a day. While incidents of targeted school violence are rare events, it is “only the tip of the iceberg of pain, loneliness, desperation, and despair that many students in this nation’s schools deal with on a daily basis” (Fein et al., 2002, p. 11).
Time and Money Wasted

Discipline problems require a significant amount of time, attention, and resources from educators. Challenging behavior can waste up to 80% of a teacher’s instructional time (Sugai & Horner as cited in Scott, 2001, p. 88). Thirty-four percent of teachers in 2007-08 agreed or strongly agreed that student misbehavior interfered with teaching (Dinkes et al., 2009). It is known that student achievement is highly correlated with time spent actively engaged in academics (DiPerna & Volpe, 2002; DiPerna, Volpe, & Elliott, 2005; Shapiro, 2004). Yet students spend an average of twenty minutes out of class for each referral and six hours per day for each suspension (Scott & Barrett, 2004). These students are missing the opportunity to be actively engaged in their education while not in the classroom. Dealing with behavioral issues also occupies a significant amount of administrators’ time. Administrators identified lost time dealing with behavior issues as a crucial obstacle in providing a level of positive interaction needed to promote positive systemic results. A typical office discipline referral uses ten minutes of an administrator’s time while processing a suspension takes 45 minutes (Scott & Barrett, 2004). This is time that administrators could be using to support and train teachers and engage in further prevention efforts.

When school districts lack appropriate resources to handle extremely challenging behaviors, they sometimes respond by sending students out of their districts to settings such as private day schools or residential care facilities (Putnam et al., 2002). Such placements are very costly. The average cost for a public education is $6,684 per student per year compared to an out-of-district placement of $30,000-$120,000. The majority of
students who are placed out-of-district do not return and continue to receive services in costly private programs (Putnam et al.). Overall, school districts expend a tremendous amount of resources by not establishing positive behavioral interventions.

**Reactionary Discipline is Ineffective**

Many schools utilize a reactive and punitive model for discipline in response to fears that school violence has increased (Evenson et al., 2009). Zero tolerance policies that involve predetermined, usually severe consequences like suspension and expulsion for rule violations are ultimately ineffective (National Association of School Psychologists [NASP], 2008). Zero tolerance is associated with many negative outcomes such as higher rates of school drop out, low academic achievement, a negative school climate, and discriminatory discipline practices (Evenson et al., 2009; Sundius & Farneth, 2008).

Students with disabilities and minority students are disproportionately represented in suspension and expulsion rates. One study showed that African Americans were four times more likely to be suspended than White students for the same rule violation while Hispanic students were twice as likely to be suspended than were White students (Rausch & Skiba, 2004). Typically 30% to 50% of students who are suspended are repeat offenders, indicating that this is not an effective deterrent for disruptive behavior (Skiba, 2004). Suspension may serve as reinforcement as students may find school aversive and being suspended allows them to escape this environment. Students in special education are disproportionately represented in suspension rates. They make up about 11% of
school populations, but account for almost 20% of suspensions (Leone, Mayer, Malmgren, & Meisel, 2000).

Suspension and expulsion have negative effects for the mental and physical health of students. Suspensions are associated with high rates of depression, drug use, and stressful home lives (American Academy of Pediatrics, 2003). These punishments may accelerate a delinquent course for students who already display antisocial behavior by denying them educational services, placing them in situations with a lack of parental supervision, and providing more chances to socialize with deviant peers (NASP, 2008). Students out of school are more likely to have suicidal ideation during these times of isolation (Evenson et al., 2009). Unfortunately suspension and expulsion may be favored by some teachers and administrators as they are negatively reinforcing: the problem behaviors and challenging students are removed (NASP, 2008).

**Summary**

Given the presence of increasingly maladaptive and challenging behaviors at schools and the ineffectiveness of reactive, punitive discipline policies, alternative strategies must be created. In order to improve school climates, proactive early intervention and prevention are recommended. Developing school-wide positive behavior supports (SW-PBS) provides a system for teaching and reinforcing adaptive behaviors based on the different needs of the students.

**Defining School-Wide Positive Behavior Supports**

Within the school-wide PBS approach, there are seven major features (Horner et al., 2004). Schools define three to five positively stated school-wide expectations. These
expectations are directly taught to all students and a system for acknowledging this behavior is developed. Additionally, fair and consistent corrective consequences are defined for rule infractions. To establish these strategies, district level support is established as well as a site PBS team who receives staff development and who is responsible for implementation. Finally, a system of data collection is created, used to evaluate outcomes, and used to identify appropriate interventions and students in need of more intensive supports. Along with these seven key features, social emotional learning and social skill curricula represent another frequently included set of interventions used within school-wide positive behavior support (Horner et al.).

**Tier 1 Components**

Tier 1 components of school-wide positive behavior supports include a number of supports directed at all students and encompass the entire school (Sprague & Golly, 2005). Often Tier 1 supports center around staff development and the creation of school wide systems by a representative team at the school. Frequently, the team undergoes training and then is responsible for developing school wide expectations, a school-wide system of reinforcement, and a continuum of corrective consequences along with implementing some form of social emotional learning.

**Team developed school-wide systems.** School-wide staff development initiatives aimed at improving the effectiveness of Tier 1 supports often include procedures for creating and defining school-wide expectations, systems of reinforcement, and a continuum of fair and consistently applied corrective consequences. These systems are
developed and put into place by representative teams that undergo many hours of staff development (Sprague & Golly, 2005).

In an examination of such a model, Sprague et al. (2001) conducted a quasi-experimental study to evaluate the effects of a school-wide behavior intervention on office discipline referrals. A total of fifteen schools were included in the study with nine representing the treatment condition and six being controls. The intervention entailed four major strategies. First, the researchers met with the staff to establish school-wide conduct rules encompassing student compliance, student interaction, academic achievement, and study skills. These rules were developed around the framework of “safety,” “respect,” and “responsibility” and were taught to the student body. Second, schools developed a systematic means of reinforcing the rules, monitoring the students, and enforcing the rules. Third, the schools were provided feedback regarding their implementation of the interventions and graphic representations of office referral data. Finally, the Second Step Violence Prevention Curriculum (Committee for Children, 1997a, b) was utilized by most of the teachers in the treatment schools. Results of the study show that all nine treatment schools demonstrated a reduction of office discipline referrals when compared to the previous year’s data. Comparatively, middle schools in the control group demonstrated an increase in office discipline referrals of more than 75% during this same time. Measures of behavior supports were also reported as being higher for treatment schools (Sprague et al., 2001).

Metzler, Biglan, Rusby, & Sprague (2001) evaluated the implementation of a similar intervention at the middle school level. A representative team of school staff was
trained and provided with work time to implement several strategies. These strategies included defining school wide expectations, “be respectful; put ups, not put downs; cooperate with others; and solve problems peacefully.” These expectations were then taught at the beginning of the school year and in the spring, as needed. Several systems were implemented to reinforce students’ following the stated expectations. Finally, the *Second Step* curriculum was utilized along with progress monitoring of key components and outcomes. Results indicated improved student perception of school safety, rates of reinforcement increased, and office discipline referrals decreased at the target schools (Metzler et al.).

**Specific universal strategies.** In addition to working with school teams to develop sustainable systems of support, the effects of specific interventions on student behavior have also been examined. These interventions include active supervision, pre-correction, and social emotional learning curricula. Active supervision included staff moving within the environment frequently, scanning the target area, and providing frequent interaction with students including non-contingent interactions, reinforcement for appropriate behavior, and immediate and brief corrective feedback (Colvin, Sugai, Good, & Lee, 1997). The pre-correction intervention included staff reminding students of behavior expectations just before students entered a new environment. Finally, social emotional learning curricula target a number of important skills including interpersonal and intrapersonal skills (Merrell, 2010).

In an examination of the effectiveness of two universal strategies, Colvin and colleagues (1997) utilized a multiple baseline design across settings to measure the
impact of pre-correction and active supervision on student behavior during transitions. In this study, school staff received training in active supervision of recess and pre-correction during problematic transitions. Results showed a significant increase in staff’s use of active supervision and pre-correction and a significant decrease in student problem behavior during the targeted transitions (Colvin et al.).

Lewis, Colvin, and Sugai (2000) studied the effects of pre-correction and active supervision on the behavior of elementary students at recess. A multiple baseline across period design was utilized in their study. Pre-correction took place in the classroom and was provided by the students’ classroom teachers. During this time, teachers reviewed playground rules just before excusing students to recess. Supervision staff was trained in the principles of active supervision including frequent movement, positive contact for rule following, and brief but frequent correction for rule violation. Lewis et al. (2000) found a decrease in problem behavior at recess but also noted that supervisory staff did not increase their use of active supervision.

Social emotional learning and social skill programs are an effective school-wide component. The Second Step program (Committee for Children, 1997a, b) represents one such program that is widely used in schools. Frey, Nolen, Van Schoiack Edstrom, & Hirschstein (2005) examined the effectiveness of this program as a stand-alone component. This study utilized a large number of students (n=1253) and a control group design. Children in the intervention group demonstrated a lower rate of aggressive behavior than did the students in the control group. On the direct observation measure, the groups did not differ on the display of pro-social behavior. However, teachers of
students in the intervention group reported increases in pro-social behavior and decreases in aggressive behavior (Frey et al.).

In addition to the Second Step program, other social emotional learning curricula have been shown to positively impact a host of desirable social outcomes in students. The Strong Kids collection of curriculum is another research-based and validated program (Merrell, 2010). The Strong Kids collection has been shown to increase students’ understanding of healthy social emotional behaviors; increase the rate at which students demonstrate these behaviors; and reduce self, parent, and teacher reported concerns including internalizing and externalizing issues.

**Tier 2 Components**

While primary, well-implemented interventions are generally effective with about 80% of students (Crone, Horner, & Hawken, 2004; Reid as cited in Walker et al., 1996 p. 202), secondary and tertiary interventions need to be developed for students who have not responded to the first level interventions. There are numerous Tier 2 interventions that have been shown to be effective such as Check in-Check out (Crone et al., 2004), small group social skills instruction, First Step to Success (Walker et al., 1997), and growth mindset instruction (Dweck, 2006). Establishing positive relationships among school staff and students is one way to mediate risk factors and facilitate interventions for prosocial development (Luiselli et al., 2005).

**Check in-Check out and the Behavior Education Program.** One secondary intervention that encourages positive relationships is the Check in-Check out (CICO) program. The CICO program, also known as the Behavior Education Program
(BEP) involves increasing antecedents for appropriate behavior, increasing contingent adult feedback, improving daily structure throughout the day for students, and increasing feedback to families (Crone et al., 2004; Filter et al., 2007). This intervention involves a student checking in with a specific adult in the morning to develop behavior goals and using a point card to collect adult feedback throughout the day. The student then checks back in with the designated adult at the end of the school day to review behavior, shows the point card to a parent who signs it, and then returns the card to their adult mentor at school the following day. Point cards used to monitor students’ behavior have been referred to with various names such as a daily behavior report card (DBRC; Chafouleas, Riley-Tillman, Sassu, LaFrance, & Patwa, 2008) or daily progress report (DPR; Crone et al., 2004).

Filter and colleagues (2007) studied the effects of the Check in-Check out program with nineteen students at three elementary schools in the Pacific Northwest using a quasi-experimental design. In addition to the daily routine described above, there was also: a weekly review of student data by the behavior support team; monthly review of the percentage of points earned by each student to make adjustments to support options or points required to earn tangible reinforcements; and quarterly feedback to all school personnel, families, and students about the impact of the program. Each of the schools implemented the program with fidelity; however, they found that only 41% of participants had family feedback. Overall, students participating in the intervention reduced their average number of office discipline referrals from one every 5.59 days to one every 8.47 days. The intervention was effective for 68% of the students involved.
Filter et al. (2007) also found that teachers, administrators, and staff perceived the intervention as being effective and efficient.

In a study at a rural elementary school, Todd, Campbell, Meyer, and Horner (2008), found that office discipline referrals for students involved in the CICO intervention were reduced from 0.14 per day prior to implementation to 0.04 per day during the intervention. A majority of teachers rated CICO as being easy to implement and worth the effort as well being an intervention they would recommend to other schools.

In a study by Hawken and Horner (2003), the Behavior Education Program was found to reduce the mean level of problem behaviors and increase the mean level of academic engagement for students participating in the intervention at a rural middle school. A different study, using a multiple baseline design, evaluated the effectiveness of BEP with twelve students at an urban elementary school who participated in the intervention. Seventy-five percent of the students had reductions in the number of office discipline referrals (ODRs) they received when comparing data pre-BEP to post-BEP (Hawken, MacLeod, & Rawlings, 2007). The students had been divided into four groups of three students. The groups ranged from a 51% reduction from baseline for the number of ODRs to a 25% reduction. Hawken and colleagues hypothesized that the BEP may not be effective with students who do not find adult attention reinforcing or the intervention may not have been individualized or intense enough for some students.

At an elementary school in an urban area in the northeastern United States, McCurdy, Kunsch, and Reibstein (2007) found that 75% of the students participating in
Small group social skills instruction. Small group social skill instruction is another secondary intervention. There are a variety of social skills curricula available. Modeling, coaching, instruction, and reinforcement of desired social behaviors have been shown to be effective strategies (Gresham, Sugai, & Horner, 2001; Miller, Lane, & Wehby, 2005). Seven students with high-incidence disabilities in self-contained special education classrooms received twelve hours of social skills training over a six week period in a study conducted by Miller and colleagues (2005). They utilized a multiple baseline design. The intervention was integrated into the classroom environment and involved social skills instruction based on acquisition deficits of each student, coaching and modeling of desired behavior, and a generalization component. Inappropriate classroom behavior declined and academic engaged time increased between baseline and intervention phases. Only one student continued to improve classroom behavior in the post-intervention phase. However, half of the students maintained their increased academic engaged time (Miller et al.).

Gresham and colleagues (2001) investigated the impact of social skills training (SST). In reviewing the literature, they found that SST can produce both small effects, such as improving students’ social competence by eight percentile ranks, and large effects, improving social competence by 31 percentile ranks. They found that effectiveness of social skills training may depend on the population of students such as
whether they have specific learning disabilities or emotional disturbance. Effectiveness may also depend on matching the training specifically to the type of social skill deficit of a student. Treatment integrity, assessment issues, and generalization issues were also found to impact effectiveness (Gresham et al.).

Gresham and colleagues (2001) found social skills training was more effective with students who were grouped based on being aggressive, internalizers, at-risk, or unpopular, than with students who were receiving services through special education under categories such as emotional or behavioral disorders or learning disabilities. They hypothesized that different levels of intensity of SST should be investigated with high incidence disability groups. Gresham and colleagues advised that functional assessment of behaviors should be taken into account when matching social skills interventions. Additionally, Moote, Smyth, and Wodarski (1999) reviewed 25 SST intervention studies with preadolescents and adolescents. They found that fourteen of the studies reported beneficial effects for participants, nine reported limited or mixed results, and two concluded that SST was no more effective than the control or comparison condition.

**First Step to Success.** *First Step to Success* (Walker et al., 1997) is another secondary intervention program for children. It is for students in a kindergarten through third grade range who are at-risk behaviorally (Walker, Golly, McLane, & Kimmich, 2005; Walker et al., 2009). The program involves collaboration between home and school to address prevention goals and outcomes. *First Step to Success* is typically implemented for three months and involves a screening procedure, a school intervention teaching adaptive behavior, and parent training. Walker and colleagues (2005) evaluated
the use of *First Step to Success* in Oregon. An experimental group of 181 students participated in the program with thirty students making up the control group. Pre-post score changes for the experimental group were substantial and in the anticipated direction across the measures of adaptive, aggressive, and maladaptive behavior as well as academic engaged time. Results in this less-controlled intervention across multiple school districts were similar to the study by Walker et al. (1998) when 46 students were exposed to an experimenter-controlled, higher quality, and closely monitored *First Step to Success* intervention.

In another study, Walker and colleagues (2009) evaluated the *First Step to Success* intervention in a diverse, urban school district. During year two and three of the study, *First Step* was implemented with 101 behaviorally at-risk students while 99 students received usual care. During year four, long-term follow up assessments were conducted and sustainability procedures were implemented. Pre and post teacher and parent ratings of student social skills and behavior showed moderately robust effects. Academic engaged time improved for the students in the intervention; however, direct measures of academic performance did not show improvement for the intervention students (Walker et al.).

**Growth mindset.** An additional secondary intervention that can be used for at-risk students is instruction in having a growth mindset. Motivation is an important factor in education (Maehr& Meyer, 1997) and having a growth mindset can be vital to increasing students’ motivation and instilling a love of learning (Dweck, 2006). Blackwell, Trzesniewski, and Dweck (2007) conducted a study of small group
interventions for 91 seventh graders. Over the course of eight weeks, groups of 12-14 students participated in 25 minute weekly sessions in which they learned about the brain and study skills. In the experimental group, 48 students received an explicit message that learning changed the brain by forming new connections and that the students controlled this process. Students who received the ‘growth mindset’ message stopped their declining math grades while students who received a message focusing on memory continued in the downward trajectory for math achievement. Teachers, who were blind as to group participation, reported positive motivational changes (learning goals, positive effort beliefs, positive strategies, and low helpless attributions) in students who received the intervention that intelligence is malleable (Blackwell et al.). In a study by Aronson, Fried, and Good (2002), African American college students who were encouraged to view intelligence as malleable in an effort to overcome stereotype threats, obtained higher grade point averages and reported greater academic enjoyment and engagement than students in control groups.

**Tier 3 Components**

Students who present dangerous behaviors and/or who have been unresponsive to Tier 1 and Tier 2 behavior strategies, are likely candidates for Tier 3 interventions (Crone & Horner, 2003). Tier 3 interventions differ from those interventions in Tier 1 and Tier 2 in that they are individualized and more intensive. Tier 3 interventions include function based behavior support plans and may also include cognitive behavioral therapy, family based supports, and multi-agency wrap services.
**Function-based behavior support plans.** A number of variables have been studied related to individualized behavior supports in schools. For example, the effects of basing behavior supports on data gathered from functional behavior assessment information have been studied. Function-based behavior support plans are specific interventions that are guided by assessment that identifies the relevant antecedent and consequence stimuli associated with target behavior. These support plans serve to make the target behavior irrelevant, inefficient, and ineffective (Crone & Horner, 2003).

Ingram, Lewis-Palmer, and Sugai (2005) evaluated the effectiveness of function based versus non-function based interventions on two middle school students utilizing an ABCBC single subject design. Both students demonstrated lower rates of target problem behavior under the function based intervention condition. This suggests that basing individual behavior supports on functional assessment information increases the effectiveness of the intervention. Specifically, Ingram et al. demonstrated that functional assessment is a valuable procedure in schools even when working with typically developing children.

For behavior support plans to be effective, they must be technically sound and must also work in the environment where they are intended to be executed (i.e., contextual fit). In a study of these two variables, Benazzi, Horner, and Good (2006) examined the effects of utilizing school-based teams and behavior specialists on the technical adequacy and contextual fit of behavior support plans. Specifically, they introduced three conditions: one in which a plan was developed by the behavior specialist alone; one in which the school team developed the intervention; and one in
which the school team worked with a behavior specialist to develop the intervention plan. Results indicated that contextual fit was higher in conditions in which the team participated in developing the plan and that technical adequacy was higher when the behavior specialist was involved in the design of the behavior support plan. The condition that included the behavior specialist and the school-based team provided for a high level of technical adequacy and contextual fit. Benazzi et al. recommend that school based behavior support teams include individuals who know the student well, know the environment well, and have a high level of skill and knowledge in behavior theory and behavior supports.

**Parent training and cognitive behavioral therapy.** In addition to interventions based on behavioral theory, Tier 3 supports often also include family oriented and cognitive behavioral strategies. In a meta-analysis of the effectiveness of parent training and cognitive behavioral therapy, McCart, Priester, Davies, and Azen (2006) examined the research base of these two interventions. The authors reported that both parent training and cognitive behavioral techniques can be effective in the treatment of anti-social behavior. They further noted that the two interventions are not equally powerful across all age ranges. The research they included in their study indicated that young children benefited more from parent training and adolescent aged participants benefited more from cognitive behavioral therapy. McCart and colleagues hypothesized that this was because of the greater impact parents have on young children and that older children may be more able to perform the cognitive tasks associated with cognitive behavioral therapy.
**Wraparound services.** Wraparound services have also been advocated for as an intensive intervention within school-wide positive behavior supports (Eber, Sugai, Smith, & Scott, 2002). Wraparound services represent a planning process whereby agencies work with students and their families to develop a service plan that takes into account goals, needs, preferences, and strengths.

In an examination of the effectiveness of wraparound services compared to traditional social work, Mears, Yafee, & Harris (2009) conducted a quasi-experimental study involving 126 youth with emotional disturbance. Three treatment groups were utilized: wraparound, traditional, and parent custody. Participants in the wraparound group and the parent custody group each received wraparound supports while the participants in the traditional group received typical social work services. Participants in the wraparound group were being served in state foster care and the parental group lived with their parents. Results indicated that those students who received wraparound services demonstrated “exceptional” improvement on the study’s outcome measure, the *Child and Adolescent Functional Assessment Scale* (CAFAS; Hodges as cited in Hodges, Xue & Jim, 2004, p. 111). Participants in the traditional group demonstrated less improvement on the CAFAS and experienced fewer placements (Mears et al., 2009).

To evaluate the effectiveness of wraparound services, Suter and Burns (2009) conducted a meta-analysis of the research on wraparound. This study indicated that the largest effect sizes were seen in addressing where students lived (i.e., keeping students in their home or another less restrictive environment). The authors also noted medium to
small effect sizes across several outcomes including mental health status, overall youth functioning, school functioning, and juvenile justice related outcomes.

**Data-Based Decision Making**

A core feature of school-wide positive behavior supports is data-based decision making (Horner et al., 2004). Since school-wide positive behavior supports exist across a continuum of needs, the requirement for multiple forms of data exists. This need is due to differing requirements of the three-tiered structure of school-wide PBS. Additionally, data are needed to assess a host of important system-level outcomes, to identify students in need of greater support, and to monitor school-wide and individual outcomes (Sprague, Cook, Browning-Wright, & Sadler, 2008). Tier 1 data must address school-wide trends and information because all students are affected by Tier 1 supports. As students move to the more intensive tiers of support, the shift moves from school-wide decisions and data to more individual, student focused information. Additionally, in Tier 3, data are frequently used to not only identify and track student progress but also to develop individualized interventions.

**Office Discipline Referrals**

Office discipline referrals represent a viable source of data for decision making because they are significant indicators of a host of detrimental life outcomes and have been shown to be a valid and reliable measure of overall school behavioral functioning (Horner et al., 2006; Irvin, Tobin, Sprague, Sugai, & Vincent 2004).

Sugai, Sprague, Horner, and Walker (2000) examined the use of office discipline referrals as a guide to the implementation and reform of the three levels of behavioral
supports (universal, selected, and targeted). The researchers analyzed data from 11 elementary schools and 9 middle schools. The data were compiled and used to calculate the average number of referrals per student, the average number of referrals per student who received at least one referral, and the average number of referrals per day. In addition to the previously mentioned data, the percentage of students who generated one or more referrals, the percentage of students who generated ten or more referrals, and the percentage of total referrals the 5% of students with the most referrals accounted for were obtained. Using this information, the authors contended that in elementary schools, reform of the universal behavior support system is needed when the referral per student ratio exceeds 0.5. The authors further specified that the selected behavioral supports should be reformed when over 20% of students receive at least one referral. Finally, the targeted system should be reformed when 0.5% of the students receive 10 or more referrals, or when 60% of referrals are accounted for by 5% of the students. Sugai and colleagues (2000) did not attempt to make response decisions or select students for more intensive interventions based on the office referral data.

Using a longitudinal analysis to further examine office discipline referrals, McIntosh, Horner, Chard, Boland, and Good (2006) studied the predictive power of early literacy measures, reading fluency, and past office discipline referrals (ODRs) on the number of ODRs in the fifth grade. Specifically, the predictor variables included ODRs received in one academic year from kindergarten, second grade, and fourth grade, early literacy measures (i.e., Dynamic Indicators of Basic Early Literacy Skills; DIBELS) from kindergarten, and reading fluency scores from second to fourth grade. The dependent
variable was dichotomous, and consisted of students receiving 0-1 ODRs in fifth grade or 2 or more during that same time. All data were drawn from a small school district in the Pacific Northwest which had implemented multi-tiered reading and behavioral interventions. Overall, when all statistically significant predictors were included, the model explained 49% of the variance of whether students received 0-1 ODRs or 2 or more. Furthermore, McIntosh et al. (2006) reported that ODRs in fourth grade, reading fluency in winter of fourth grade, ODRs in second grade, reading fluency in spring of second grade, and phoneme segmentation fluency in kindergarten were all significant predictors of multiple ODRs in fifth grade. When reading measures were significant, the correlation was negative and when previous ODRs were significant, a positive correlation was observed. McIntosh et al. note that the data suggested that kindergarten early literacy measures may be a better predictor of behavioral difficulties in fifth grade than office referrals in kindergarten.

**Direct Observation and Staff Nomination**

Direct observation involves observing behavior as it occurs. Such observations are conducted by highly trained individuals, are accurate, and involve a significant amount of staff time (Chafouleas, Volpe, Gresham, & Cook, 2010). In contrast, staff nomination is less accurate but requires significantly fewer resources.

In an examination of classroom behavior supports, Sugai, Guardino, and Lathrop (2007) used teacher and counselor nomination and direct observation to analyze response to a multi-tiered approach to behavioral support based on response to intervention (RtI) methodologies. In their study, Sugai et al. utilized two interventions, which differed in
terms of intensity and resource demands, to provide ten second grade students with behavioral supports. Specifically, a Check in-Check out intervention was used as the secondary intervention, while an individualized function based behavior support plan was utilized as the tertiary intervention. All conditions were administered in the general education setting. After baseline data were collected, each of the participants took part in the CICO condition. Of the 10 students included in the study, 4 were deemed responders to the CICO intervention and 4 were selected to participate in the tertiary intervention (parent permission was not obtained for two of the non-responders to participate in the function based intervention). As noted earlier, adequate response decision was based on behavioral data and teacher/counselor nomination. During the function-based phase the authors developed, and later refined, the individualized function based behavior plans for each of the 4 students. The plans’ implementations were staggered to provide for multiple baselines across the students. The 4 students included in the function based intervention all demonstrated a decrease in problem behaviors while receiving the individualized behavior plan. The two control non-responders left in the CICO condition did not demonstrate an improvement. Sugai et al. suggest that a multi-tiered approach based on intervention response is an efficient model of behavioral support.

**Behavior Report Cards**

Daily behavior report cards (DBRCs) have been shown to be a practical and effective behavioral support (Hawken& Horner, 2003; Hawken et al. 2007; Sugai et al., 2007). Additionally, DBRCs have begun to show promise as a data-based decision making tool (Chafouleas et al., 2010).
Based on this premise, research conducted by Chafouleas et al. (2008) examined the viability of using scores from DBRCs to make behavior intervention decisions. Specifically, Chafouleas et al. compared scores across two raters using DBRCs and one rater using direct observation. Additionally, an intervention was conducted to compare scores across two different conditions. Three teacher-student pairs were selected for inclusion in the study along with three doctoral students in school psychology who were used as independent observers. After selection and training, baseline data were collected by the teachers and independent observers. Following the fifth observation, an intervention was implemented and five more teacher ratings and independent observations occurred. A visual analysis of the data was conducted and Chafouleas et al. concluded that the independent observer using the DBRCs reported data that were very similar to the data reported by the observer using direct observation. Furthermore, it was concluded that similar intervention decisions would have been made based on the data from both measures. This conclusion is important given the significant time advantage associated with DBRCs. The data reported by the teachers was not as consistent but was similar to direct observation in three of the four participants (Chafouleas et al.).

**Implementation Checklists**

Another important source of information for schools implementing school-wide positive behavior supports are fidelity and implementation checklists. One such example is the *Benchmark of Quality* (BoQ; Cohen, Kincaid, & Elfner Childs, 2007). The BoQ is a self-report measure that is completed by site PBS teams to assess their level of implementation and to help schools identify relevant goals. Initial research into the
BoQ indicates that it is a reliable and valid measure. Additionally, the BoQ involves little training and is interpretable by the school-wide team (Cohen et al.).

Another example of a frequently used fidelity checklist is the School-Wide Evaluation Tool (SET; Horner et al., 2004). Scores of the SET rate a number of items on a 0-2 likert scale. The SET items are organized around the seven key features of the universal system of SW-PBS. Each of these areas has multiple items associated with it. Validity and reliability are strong for the SET (Horner et al.). One possible drawback of the SET, however, may be the intensive training required to utilize the tool. As it was researched, the SET requires a total of three full days of staff development. Horner and colleagues note that the intensive training requirement may be associated with the original intent of the SET to be utilized as a research instrument.

**Effectiveness of School-Wide Positive Behavior Supports**

School-wide positive behavior supports are an effective intervention. More than 7,000 schools across the United States are in various stages of implementation of SW-PBS (Bradshaw et al., 2008; Horner et al., 2009). “The principle objective of school violence-reduction strategies should be to create cultures and climates of safety, respect, and emotional support within educational institutions” (Fein et al., 2002, p. 11). Establishing a safe school climate is one of the most effective crisis prevention strategies and the best protective factor for schools (Brock et al., 2009). SW-PBS can successfully create a positive and safe learning environment for students and educators.
Improved Staff Perceptions

With school-wide positive behavior supports, educators have improved perceptions about their schools. Bradshaw and colleagues (2008) conducted a longitudinal, randomized control study of Positive Behavioral Interventions and Supports (PBIS) in Maryland. Twenty-one elementary schools participated in the PBIS intervention while sixteen schools refrained from implementing PBIS and were used as comparisons. A measure of staff’s perceptions showed that schools that implemented PBIS had significant improvement in their school’s overall organizational health, resource influence (principal’s ability to positively influence the allocation of district resources), and staff affiliation within the first three years of implementation (Bradshaw et al., 2008).

Staff perception of effectiveness of discipline practices is an important measure to consider. By utilizing SW-PBS at an urban elementary school, about 83% of the personnel thought students’ learning time was protected from disruption, an increase from 52% prior to implementation (Luiselli et al., 2005). Prior to SW-PBS implementation, only 45% of school staff believed the school discipline plan was effective. This percentage increased to 98% with the implementation of school-wide positive behavior supports.

In a randomized controlled trial with elementary schools in Hawaii and Illinois, Horner et al. (2009) assessed the effectiveness of SW-PBS over three years. Both Hawaii and Illinois had invested at least five years in development of state-level implementation of SW-PBS prior to the study and had personnel experienced in training and supporting
SW-PBS. Ultimately 30 schools participated in the treatment (SW-PBS) group and 23 schools made up the control/delay group. Schools implementing SW-PBS were perceived as statistically significant safer environments. These schools also reported lower than average levels of problem behaviors and lower office discipline referrals (Horner et al.).

**Academic Gains**

Utilizing school-wide positive behavior supports has been associated with improved academic outcomes. In Horner and colleagues (2009) study of schools in Hawaii and Illinois, SW-PBS was associated with increased reading performance for third graders meeting the state reading standard. The implementation of SW-PBS at an urban elementary school in the midwest region of the United States was also associated with improved academic achievement (Luiselli et al., 2005). After eight months of implementing whole-school PBS, elementary school students taking a nationally standardized test improved their percentile ranks by 18 points in reading comprehension and 25 points in mathematics (Luiselli et al., 2005). Improvements in academic performance are significantly associated with improvements in problem behaviors (Najaka, Gottfredson & Wilson, 2001).

Lassen, Steele, and Sailor (2006) examined the effectiveness of SW-PBS in urban, inner city middle schools in Kansas. Data from three years of PBS implementation was compared to baseline data. School staff provided more positive reinforcement to students during each year of the study. The number of ODRs and suspensions significantly declined each year of the study. The percentage of essential
PBS components implemented at the school increased from about 25% to 70%.

Standardized math scores for 8th grade students increased significantly over the three years of PBS implementation. Reading scores on a state assessment for 7th graders increased from the first year of implementation to the third year (Lassen et al.).

**Office Discipline Referrals and Suspensions Reduced**

SW-PBS is associated with significant decreases in problem behaviors. In a study by Luiselli and colleagues (2005) in an urban elementary school with SW-PBS implementation, office discipline referrals for behaviors such as fighting with peers, threat or assault toward staff, classroom disruptions, problems during bus transportation, defiance, and property destruction, decreased from 1.3 per 100 students per day during the pre-intervention year to 0.54 during the follow up year three. Suspensions also decreased from a rate of 0.31 per 100 students per day to 0.20 in the follow up (Luiselli et al.).

In another urban elementary school, with two years of SW-PBS, a 46% reduction in ODRs for disruption and a 55% reduction for ODR for fighting were realized when compared to data the year prior to implementation (McCurdy et al., 2003). Fighting can be a marker variable for antisocial behavior. With the decline in this serious offense, SW-PBS may be an effective strategy to prevent the escalation of antisocial behavior. This school saw ODRs decline from 0.27 per student in the classroom prior to SW-PBS implementation to 0.17. ODRs decreased from 0.13 to 0.06 in the schoolyard. The decline in problem behaviors during recess, when students that may exhibit antisocial
behaviors can be most problematic, also indicates that SW-PBS may have preventative potential for antisocial behavior (McCurdy et al.).

At another inner-city elementary school, with implementation of SW-PBS, there was a 61% decrease of total hours spent at in-school suspension compared to the year prior to implementation, resulting in students gaining more than 775 classroom hours (Scott, 2001). There was also a 65% reduction in the number of out of school suspension days with SW-PBS and a 75% decrease in the total number of students suspended.

Luiselli, Putnam, and Sunderland (2002) evaluated the use of a behavior support plan implemented with an entire school in a rural community in Massachusetts over the course of four years. The number of detentions for disruptive-antisocial behavior (including disturbances in the school building, disrespect toward staff, suspension from the classroom, physical abuse of a student, disobedience, dishonesty, verbal or physical threats, obscene language, throwing objects, and cheating) steadily declined over the four academic years from 1,326 in year one to 599 detentions in year four. Detentions for substance abuse significantly declined each year of the study. Vandalism detentions also declined, except for year two. Luiselli et al. also found that the percentage of student attendance and proportion of students earning positive reinforcement increased modestly.

School-wide PBS implementation at an urban high school in Chicago was evaluated by Bohanon and colleagues (2006). Between the baseline year and intervention year three, the number of ODRs declined by an average of 20%. Behaviors that were considered more severe were reduced from an average of 1.64 per 100 students during the baseline year to 0.05 per 100 students in implementation year. At the high
school level, it was found that directly teaching expected behaviors was a difficult component of SW-PBS to consistently implement. Bohanon et al. attributed this in part to the size of high schools, as well a school culture of independent activity by faculty arranged by content area.

**Time and Money Saved with SW-PBS Implementation**

A significant amount of resources are saved by utilizing school-wide PBS. With the reduction of office discipline referrals, over the course of two years of PBS implementation at an urban elementary school, Scott and Barrett (2004) estimated that there was an average net gain of 10,620 minutes (29.5 days) in the classroom (based on a loss of twenty minutes of instructional time per ODR). There was a net gain of fifty days in school attendance over the two years with a decrease in the number of suspensions. As administrators typically spend an average of ten minutes processing each ODR and 45 minutes for suspensions, with SW-PBS administrators have more time for preventative activities such as staff development and student recognition (Scott & Barrett). Teachers have more time to teach and students have more time to learn.

By utilizing SW-PBS, ultimately a significant amount of money is saved through fewer private placements for high-risk students. Putnam and colleagues (2002) evaluated the out-of-district costs for fifteen of the largest urban public school districts in Massachusetts. One school district had implemented a comprehensive system of behavior support for elementary, middle, and high school students. For the fifteen schools, special education accounted for 17% of total expenditures and 4.1% was allocated for out-of-district placements. On the other hand, the target school, with
comprehensive behavior support, spent only 1.6% of total expenditures on out-of-district placements, or an average of $94 per student versus $286 per student for the other fourteen school districts. The criterion school district also had the highest percentage of special education students (almost 70%) receiving services in the regular classroom at least 80% of the school day (Putnam et al.). This showed that having system-wide behavior support may improve a school district’s ability to maintain students with challenging behavior within their own district and more effectively provide the least restrictive learning environment.

The Marchus School’s 599/1261 Project, funded by the State of California also resulted in fewer nonpublic placements for students with serious emotional disturbance (MacMillan et al., 1997). This program, which could be considered a Tier 3 intervention, involved establishing an inclusive education program that utilized a social cognitive approach for teaching academic, social, and conflict resolution skills. Counseling and education programs were integrated for healthy emotional development and academic achievement. Wraparound services from mental health and other agencies supported classroom staff. By avoiding nonpublic placements for students with emotional disturbance, the children had more opportunity to receive services in the least restrictive environment. By serving students in less restrictive and less costly programs, the 599/1261 Project resulted in a total savings and costs avoided of over $700,000 in two years. In this successful intervention, students were able to improve both their social skills and classroom behavior (MacMillan et al.).
**Summary**

SW-PBS has been shown to be an effective intervention. It has been successful in urban and rural settings, at the elementary, middle, and high school levels. Problem behaviors decrease as evidenced from reductions in office discipline referrals, fighting, and suspensions. Improvements in academic achievement in reading and math are also associated with SW-PBS. Overall school staff satisfaction has increased with SW-PBS. Through implementing school-wide PBS, students spend more time in classrooms learning while teachers and administrators have more time to teach and engage in prevention efforts. This intervention has also been shown to save a significant amount of money through fewer private placements for students with severe emotional and behavioral issues and more successfully provide the least restrictive environment for learning.

While SW-PBS represents a growing and effective school reform process, schools across the country continue to implement outdated, reactive, and ineffective behavioral strategies. Although it is possible that some of these schools are aware of the SW-PBS movement and further understand the process well enough to implement the intervention, it is far more likely that as a group these schools lack the fundamental understanding of the structure, process, and research that supports the development of such an initiative. This problem is exacerbated in states such as California, where no well organized and funded state-wide SW-PBS initiative exists. Some states such as Illinois, Maryland, Colorado, New Jersey, Oregon, and Pennsylvania have committed to PBS as a state-wide initiative.
Pennsylvania, 2008). Before undertaking a complex and resource demanding initiative such as SW-PBS, schools must understand the model and the training demands associated with implementation. Based on this assertion, this project will provide a structure for providing an initial staff development presentation on understanding the structure of SW-PBS and a framework for achieving training in such a model.
Chapter 3

METHODS

Research

In the process of researching this project, several techniques were utilized. The Academic Search Premier, ERIC, and PsychArticles databases were searched for journal articles using a variety of search terms. The key words school wide positive behavior supports were used in combination with other terms such as effectiveness, cost, high school, elementary school, and achievement. Behavioral response to intervention was also utilized. In addition, specific interventions were searched for in the databases such as social skills, wrap around services, Second Step, Check in-Check out, behavior report cards, functional behavior assessment, First Step to Success, and social emotional learning. Key words such as data-based decision making, office discipline referrals, and implementation checklists were also included. The National Association of School Psychologist’s website, (nasponline.org) was searched for topics such as zero tolerance policies and bullying. The Indicators of School Crime and Safety (Dinkes et al., 2009) was a resource from a school psychology graduate course that was utilized for current statistics.

Books used in graduate courses and in professional practice were also utilized as resources, such as Best Behavior: Building Positive Behavior Support in Schools (Sprague & Golly, 2005). Prominent authors in the field including R. Horner, J. Sprague, G. Sugai, and H. Walker were additionally used as search determinants. References cited within articles and books were also utilized for additional information. Both qualitative
and quantitative studies were considered. The articles found were categorized by themes according to an initial outline. The outline was then adapted based on information gathered. Each author then focused on specific topics to write sections of the literature review.

**Development of the Presentation**

The in-service training presentation was developed to encourage participants to advocate for the development of school-wide positive behavior supports in their own schools, gain an understanding of the process, and to formulate individual action plans for how to begin implementation. The main points from the literature review were summarized in the presentation in order to create a sense of urgency with the audience and motivate them to become proponents for SW-PBS in their own schools. The in-service includes an overview of school-wide positive behavior supports, possible interventions, and how to begin the process of establishing SW-PBS. The training is designed to be presented in six hours with direct instruction, discussions, and time to develop an action plan. Discussion topics include: the changes participants would like to facilitate in their own schools, considering the population and resources of audience members’ schools, and determining first steps to take toward developing SW-PBS.

The intended audience for the presentation is school teams including general and special education teachers, administrators, and school psychologists. The in-service was adapted from a paper presentation developed and delivered by the authors at the National Association of School Psychologists Annual Convention (Anderson & Wylie, 2010). A brief overview of the current presentation was also delivered to fellow school psychology
graduate students and a faculty member who provided some feedback. As the entire presentation has not been delivered to an audience prior to submission, suggestions were sought from school psychology faculty. The PowerPoint presentation, handouts, and notes for presenters are located in the appendix of this project. Additionally a CD with the same materials is provided to facilitate the presentation of the in-service using a computer and projector.
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RESULTS

*Implementing School-Wide Positive Behavior Supports when No State Initiative Exists* resulted in a PowerPoint presentation intended to convince participants of the need to change educational discipline systems and create a tiered model of behavioral supports in their own schools through showing the inadequacy of current systems and the effectiveness of SW-PBS. Additionally the presentation will provide the initial skills and framework for establishing SW-PBS. The final goal of the in-service is to facilitate teams discussing their own needs and resources available to begin building SW-PBS at their schools.

The training is designed to be six hours and is structured to provide activities and time for brainstorming to ensure maximum benefit for participants to develop resources to take back to their sites. In addition specific interventions are identified to enable the administrators, teachers, and school psychologists participating to consider the possibilities for their own schools. Several handouts to support planning and implementation are provided. Additionally, the presentation includes information and ideas for sustainability and data collection for SW-PBS. Participants will develop their own action plans for establishing school-wide positive behavior supports in their schools.
Chapter 5

DISCUSSION

Six hours is not a sufficient amount of time for SW-PBS training. Research indicates that school teams need intensive training and support to successfully implement school-wide positive behavior supports. Ideally this presentation will motivate participants and provide enough background information and resources for teams to seek further training and support to become SW-PBS schools.

Considering the research consistently shows the ineffectiveness of current reactionary, zero tolerance policies for challenging behaviors, it is difficult to comprehend why more schools have not adopted school-wide positive behavior supports. Given this information, it is understandable that suspension and expulsion may be favored by some teachers and administrators because such consequences may serve a negatively reinforced function: the problem behavior and challenging students are removed from the school environment. However, educators should be able to recognize that these discipline policies are ultimately not effective. The ineffectiveness of these sanctions are further elucidated when we consider that, typically, it is the same small number of students who continue to access the discipline system even after these exclusions are applied. If the same student continues to be suspended, it seems obvious that the punishment is not effective in decreasing problem behaviors (i.e., does not contain punishing properties). It is admirable that some states such as Illinois, Maryland, Colorado, New Jersey, Oregon, and Pennsylvania have committed to PBS as a state-wide initiative, and hopefully more states will follow. While SW-PBS requires resources,
research has shown that schools implementing this system ultimately save money through fewer out of district placements and less time spent by educators handling challenging behavior.

In compiling research for this project, the authors were surprised at the mixed evidence of effectiveness of a popular secondary intervention, small group social skills instruction. From the research, this intervention seems to be most effective while it is occurring, but improvements may not continue after the group ends. Providing more real world practice of the skills students in groups are developing may help ensure that effects continue after the end of the intervention. For example, students could be reinforced for showing specific skills outside of the small group, with teachers, family members, and classmates. This could be accomplished by making sure that stakeholders are aware of the goals of the social skills group, providing a way of documenting skills practice (such as a signed slip of paper) and then providing reinforcement, such as verbal praise or choice of a tangible item for a specified number of practices.

**Recommendations**

It is important to emphasize sustainability when discussing SW-PBS. Change can be a difficult process and schools may give up on implementation. In a presentation at the National Association of School Psychologists Annual Convention, Sawka-Miller (2011) had suggestions for overcoming the challenges schools face in implementing SW-PBS. Sawka-Miller suggested that specific-setting expectations must be explicit, that lesson plans can be standardized for teaching expected behaviors, and that it is essential that all school staff serve as models for the school-wide expectations. It was also advised
that integrity checks and high levels of accountability should be built into the SW-PBS system from the beginning. This can be done with a variety of techniques, such as having goals and measurements for levels of reinforcement, documentation of behavior lesson plan delivery, and self-assessments for teaching the expectations. The recognition system should be easy for staff to utilize and provide frequent recognition. Sawka-Miller also emphasized the need for on-going training for school teams.

Ultimately, school-wide positive behavior supports, especially the tier 3 level of interventions, may provide an alternative means of identifying students with emotional disturbance (ED). Given the challenges school teams face in identifying these students, especially in states where a differentiation between social maladjustment and emotional disturbance must be made, having an alternative method for identifying and providing services to students in need could be very beneficial. In utilizing an RtI approach, those students whose behavior does not change sufficiently in response to evidence-based interventions implemented with fidelity, may be identified as having ED as opposed to using a refer-test-place model. An RtI model would ensure that students had participated in systematic interventions prior to identification (Gresham, 2005). Additionally, Gresham pointed out that having a common set of behavioral expectations that are followed and recognized by whole schools should promote the generalization and maintenance of individual interventions for students with ED. SW-PBS, especially with well-developed tier 3 interventions, provides a means of supporting students with intense behavioral challenges, ensuring they receive interventions throughout school. More research is needed in this area.
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School-Wide Positive Behavior Supports

Lucas Anderson & Rebecca Wylie
Today’s Agenda:
Why we need to be doing things differently.
What is SW-PBS.
Getting Started: This will be the “meat” of the presentation, the format will include the PowerPoint presentation and work time. This work time will be important to begin to develop the systems that are at the core of SW-PBS.
Finally, we will look ahead and schedule follow up trainings and meeting times.
Why SW-PBS?
The 12th edition of *Indicators of School Crime and Safety* includes recent available data, compiled from a number of statistical data sources supported by the federal government.

When looking at homicide and suicide rates among youth age 5-18 in the period from July 2006-June 2007 (with less than 2% of homicides and less than 1% of suicides occurring at school), schools appear safe. However...(data on next slide shows the number of crimes)
This graph shows the rate of student reported nonfatal crimes against students age 12-18 in 2007. More theft and violent crimes (such as rape, aggravated assault, robbery, sexual assault) occurred at schools than away from schools in 2007. N = 58 to 40 total crimes, 32 to 21 theft, and 26 to 19 violent crimes.
Why SW-PBS? ... Dangerous schools?

- 12-18 year olds were victims of approximately 1.5 million violent crimes or thefts at school in 2007
- 85% of public schools reported one or more crimes occurring during the 2007-2008 school year
- 8% of secondary and 7% of elementary teachers reported being threatened with injury by a student

(Deines et al., 2009)

Additionally 75% of schools reported one or more violent incidents. 6% of elementary teachers and 2% of secondary teachers reported actually being physically attacked.
Why SW-PBS? ...Bullying in our schools

- 75% of students report being victims of bullying at least once in the academic year (Sassu et al., 2004)

- 32% of 12-18 year old students reported being bullied at school while 7% reported avoiding school activities or certain places at school due to fear of attack or harm (Dinkes et al., 2009)

Bullying can take many forms: physical, relational, and cyber-bullying. With text messaging and social networks such as Facebook, students can no longer escape bullying when they leave school. They are faced with bullying 24 hours a day.
Why SW-PBS? ... Frustrated teachers

- Challenging behavior can waste up to 80% of a teacher's instructional time  
  (Sugai & Horner as cited in Scott, 2001)
- 34% of teachers in 2007-08 agreed or strongly agreed that student misbehavior interfered with teaching  
  (Dinkes et al., 2009)
Why SW-PBS? ...What we are doing is not working

- Zero tolerance policies that involve predetermined, usually severe consequences like suspension and expulsion for rule violations are ultimately ineffective (NASP, 2008)

- Zero tolerance is associated with many negative outcomes such as higher rates of school drop out, low academic achievement, negative school climate, and discriminatory discipline practices (Evenson et al., 2009)

Students with disabilities and minority students are disproportionately represented in suspension rates. One study showed that African Americans were 4 times as likely to be suspended than White students for the same rule violation. Hispanic students were twice as likely to be suspended than White students (Evenson et al., 2009). Also students in special education make up 11% of school populations, but account for almost 20% of suspensions.
Why SW-PBS? ...What we are doing is not working

- Suspension and expulsion have negative effects for the mental and physical health of students. Suspensions are associated with high rates of depression, drug use, and stressful home lives (American Academy of Pediatrics, 2003)

- Suspension and expulsion may be favored by some teachers and administrators because it is negatively reinforcing: the problem behavior and challenging students are removed (NASP, 2008)

These punishments may accelerate a delinquent course for students who already display antisocial behavior by denying them educational services, placing them in situations with a lack of parental supervision, and allowing more chances to socialize with deviant peers (NASP, 2008). Students out of school are more likely to have suicidal ideation during these times of isolation (Evenson et al., 2009).
Why SW-PBS? ...Our students are suffering

- While incidents of targeted school violence are rare events, it is “only the tip of the iceberg of pain, loneliness, desperation, and despair that many students in this nation’s schools deal with on a daily basis” (Fein et al., 2002)

Students are also trying to establish their own identity, fitting in with others, dealing with bullying, peer pressure, stress, and family struggles.
Why SW-PBS? ...Improving the well-being of our students

- “The principle objective of school violence-reduction strategies should be to create cultures and climates of safety, respect, and emotional support within educational institutions”
  (Fein et al., 2002)

- Establishing a safe school climate is one of the most effective crisis prevention strategies and the best protective factor for schools
  (Brock et al., 2009)
Why SW-PBS? ...Reduction in discipline issues

- In an elementary school, with SW-PBS implementation, office discipline referrals (ODRs) decreased from 1.3 per 100 students per day to .54 (Luiselli et al., 2005)

- A 65% reduction in the number of suspension days was realized with SW-PBS (Scott, 2001)

- With SW-PBS, 46% reduction in ODRs for disruption & 55% reduction for ODRs for fighting (McCurdy et al., 2003)

On average, administrators typically spend 10 minutes processing each ODR and 45 minutes for suspensions (Scott & Barrett, 2004). With SW-PBS administrators have more time for preventative activities such as staff development and student recognition.
Why SW-PBS? …Improved learning

- Students spend an average of 20 minutes out of class for each referral and 6 hours per day for each suspension (Scott & Barrett, 2004)
- Association between implementation of SW-PBS and improved academic achievement (Luiselli et al., 2005)

Student achievement is highly correlated with academic engaged time (Shapiro, 2004). Elementary school students taking a nationally standardized test improved their percentile ranks by 18 percentage points on reading comprehension and 25 points on math. (Luiselli et al., 2005).

About 83% of the personnel also thought student learning time was protected from disruption with SWPBS, an increase from 52% prior to implementation.
Prior to SW-PBS implementation, only 45% of school staff believed the school discipline plan was effective. This percentage increased to 98% with the implementation of school-wide positive behavior supports (Luiselli et al., 2005)
Why SW-PBS? …Money saved

- While SW-PBS involves financial costs, ultimately a significant amount of money is saved
- reduced administrative time needed for discipline (Scott & Barrett, 2004)
- fewer private placements for high-risk students (Putnam et al., 2002)

Funds can be sought through community donations and schools can utilize funds for discipline improvement.

A target school, with comprehensive behavior support, spent only 1.6% of total expenditures on out-of-district placements, or an average of $94 per student versus $286 per student for other fourteen school districts (Putnam et al., 2002). The criterion school district also had the highest percentage of special education students (almost 70%) receiving services in the regular classroom at least 80% of the school day.

The Marchus School's 599/1261 Project resulted in fewer nonpublic placements for students with serious emotional disturbance (MacMillan et al., 1997). This program, which could be considered a Tier 3 intervention, resulting in serving students in less restrictive and less costly programs. Ultimately a total savings and costs avoided of over $700,000 in two years was realized.
What is SW-PBS?
Critical Features
PBS blends four key elements: outcomes, practices, systems, and data use. Student outcomes are at the heart of SW-PBS, including what students need to succeed in life, academics and behavior.

Practices: include those which are research based, reflect what the adults at school do: Fit the context of school systems.

Systems: What is needed to sustain SW-PBS? Polices, training: what affects adult behavior at schools?

Data: the collection and use of data for decision making: How do we use data to help us answer important questions?
PBS is based on a multi-tiered model.
Continuum of supports: Behavior change is difficult and costly. We must prevent the development of social/emotional and behavioral disorders.
Need for assessment increases as we move up the triangle.

Similar to academic RTI
Generally
~80% of students respond to tier 1 supports
~15% will require tier 2 supports
~5% will require tier 3 supports
Note academic support at each tier. This is the primary goal of schools and also helps to support positive behavior in the schools. Note social skills at each tier as well.

Tier 1 supports include interventions that effect all environments and all students.

The goal today is for participants to walk out of this training with a firm grasp of tier 1 supports and the beginnings of a tier 1 system.
Tier 2 interventions should be “up and running” and students should be able to move into the interventions quickly. If an intervention is highly individualized, then it may be more accurate to characterize it as a tier 3 intervention.

Later in this presentation will be reviewing two packaged tier 2 interventions. These interventions will focus on adult mentors, contingency management, and parent training and collaboration.
More intense and individualized; greater need for assessment; often require multiple agencies and supports.
School Wide Positive Behavior Support

Case Example: San Juan USD
About San Juan USD

- Located in Suburban Sacramento, CA
- Over 40,000 Students
- 70 Schools and Centers
  - (Operating Budget ~ $300-400 Million)
- Experiencing Declining Enrollment
- No Explicit District PBS Initiative
  - But funding is provided for staff and trainings!
Incidents of suspension reported on this chart. All of these schools participated in 18 hours of initial training during their startup year and 4-8 hours of tier 2 training in a following year.
45 Elementary and K8 Schools
20 PBS Schools (been trained and received ongoing support)
25 Non PBS Schools
Getting SW-PBS Started at Your School

Your Own Data
Activity 1: Average Number of Office Discipline Referrals at Schools Implementing PBS and at Your School

- Do we have a problem?
- Could SWPBS help us?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Grade Range</th>
<th>Number of Schools</th>
<th>Mean Enrollment per school</th>
<th>Mean ODRs per 100 per school day</th>
<th>Number of ODRs per 100 at your school</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>K-6</td>
<td>2,162</td>
<td>450</td>
<td>.34</td>
<td>&lt;Input the number of ODRs per 100 kids per school day here&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6-9</td>
<td>602</td>
<td>657</td>
<td>.85</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9-12</td>
<td>215</td>
<td>887</td>
<td>1.27</td>
<td>&lt;Input ODRs per 100 at your school&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K-12</td>
<td>431</td>
<td>408</td>
<td>1.06</td>
<td>&lt;Input ODRs per 100 at your school&gt;</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: SWIS.org

Schools will be comparing the number of office discipline referrals generated at their schools vs. schools implementing SW-PBS. If schools are unable to locate this information or if a comparison would be inappropriate (i.e., in the case of a special education center) then this activity should be skipped.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tier 1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Universal Supports</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Again, note academic support at each tier. This is the primary goal of schools and also helps to support positive behavior in the schools. Note social skills at each tier.
This is the training agenda for the BEST Behavior training curriculum. BEST has a training curriculum but the program should be thought of as a system not a curriculum. Schools will develop their own rules and expectations and develop a unique program of reinforcing these rules as part of this system. Additionally, a team will be meeting on a regular schedule to ensure implementation and to continue to develop and modify the system. These changes will be based on data.
Introducing individual supports (schools will need more training on this). It is good for them to hear it multiple times.
Activity

- In your teams: In the next 2 minutes, create a list of all of the behaviors that we would not want our students to engage in while at school.

The purpose of this activity is for schools to “see” how inefficient it is to create lists of “don’ts”. 
Activity Debrief

- Share out.
- Did anyone finish their list in time?
  - What if we had 10 minutes? Or an hour?
- Could we expect our students to remember our list of don'ts?
We should hold ourselves accountable to these same expectations. Because of this, we’ll want to be sure that the expectations we have of our students are fair and reasonable and the adults are willing to follow them as well. For example, is being silent in the halls reasonable? Perhaps using a quiet voice is a more reasonable expectation. Should cell phones be put away and off at all times? Can the staff follow that expectation?
Expectations

- **Umbrella Rules**
  - Consistent rules and expectations are a key universal intervention for effective school environments (Metzler, 2001)

- 3-5 Positively Stated Rules will represent the core values from which we will define our procedures and skills
Some Examples

"reach for five"
Work Time, Activity 2

- Objective: Identify 3-5 positively stated expectations for your school.
- Things to consider:
  - Developmental level of students
  - Values of community and all stakeholders (what you come up with today may need to change as you include all stakeholders)
  - Do you want to create a mnemonic to tie in the rules to your mascot?
- You have 15 minutes to begin this process. Remember, these are the values that you will be teaching to your students.

As you help schools complete this activity, it is important that you ensure that they have identified positively stated expectations and that they have considered the developmental level of their students.
Expectations continued

- Umbrella Rules are broad and cover everything, but we'll need to get clearer if we are really going to teach our expectations.
Developing a Rules Matrix

- A rule matrix identifies the specific expectations for the common areas at your school.
- These will be positively stated and will fall under the categories of your umbrella rules.
### Example Rule Matrix (Dyer Kelly Elementary)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Common Area</th>
<th>Safe</th>
<th>Responsible</th>
<th>Respectful</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Hallways & Common Areas | • walk facing forward  
• stay on sidewalks  
• avoid red circles  
• keep hands, feet & objects to self  
• walk blaza on campus | • take proper care of personal belongings and school property  
• hold play equipment  
• a pass is required when absent/ill | • take quiet voices  
• use kind words  
• allow others to pass  
• touch only your own belongings  
• Follow directions given by adults |
| Restrooms | • wash hands  
• keep water in sink | • flush toilet once after use  
• put paper towels in trash can  
• leave restroom promptly | • use toilets and urinals appropriately  
• give people privacy  
• use quiet voices |
| Cafeteria | • walk  
• sit with your bottom on the bench, facing the table  
• keep all food on your own tray or in front of you  
• eat only your own food | • sit at assigned table  
• keep food & wrappings off the floor  
• stay seated until excused  
• when excused form single file line to empty tray into garbage, then stack tray neatly | • Follow directions given by adults  
• allow everyone to sit next to you  
• use quiet voices  
• use kind words |
| Lines | • face forward  
• keep hands, feet & objects to self | • be courteous | • take quiet voices  
• no talking when working past classrooms  
• no cutting |

This is an example that was developed by the SW-PBS team at Dyer Kelly Elementary School in Sacramento, CA. Point out the use of positive language and language that is appropriate for elementary school students.
Work Time, Activity 3

- Objective: Utilizing the provided materials, begin the process of completing your rule matrix
- Remember: Utilize positive language (i.e., what we expect our students to do)
Teaching School Wide Expectations

- Important features in teaching behavior expectations
  (Sprague & Golly, 2005)
  - Teach through multiple examples
  - Teach where the problems are occurring
  - Give frequent practice opportunities
  - Provide useful corrections
  - Provide positive feedback
  - Monitor for success

These principles from Sprague and Golly are based on social learning theory and are very similar to the critical features of many social skill curricula.
Video

- Teaching Behavior Expectations

This video shows a behavior expectations being taught, modeled, and role-played.
Teaching Expectations

- Step 1: Define the rule/expectation.
- Step 2: Model/demonstrate the rule/expectation.
- Step 3: Set-up role play.
- Step 4: Conduct role play.
- Step 5: Provide monitoring and feedback.

(McGinnis & Goldstein, 1997; Sprague & Goff, 2005)

Do not go into detail on this slide as each of these steps will be detailed in the slides to come.
1) Define the rule/expectation

- Lead a discussion of the rule/expectation to be taught. Describe the activities the students will be engaging in and the expectations for them during the lesson.

- Check for understanding by asking the students to tell you what they will be working on and doing during the lesson.

- State the rules and the rule definition.

(McGinnis & Goldstein, 1997; Sprague & Golly, 2005)

Having standardized lesson plans will make it easier for teachers and may make it more likely that they will teach the lesson. As a way to increase accountability, students may need to have an exit ticket where they write a sentence about what they learned. Exit tickets can then be collected by an administrator or SW-PBS team to ensure the lesson was taught. Another way to ensure accountability is to have lessons taught at a set time and administrators (and other people available such as secretaries, school psychologists, etc.) can go into classrooms and briefly observe.
2) Model / demonstrate the rule / expectation

- Model at least 2 positive examples and 2 negative examples of the rule / expectation.
- Use another adult or student to demonstrate these examples.
- Give students observation tasks such as:
  - List all of the things that "were safe".
  - List all of the things that I did that "were not safe".

(McGinnis & Goldstein, 1997; Sprague & Goff, 2005)

For modeling, it is important to ensure students do not receive a high magnitude of reinforcement for engaging in the negative example via laughing and call out. Because of this, it may be advantageous to have an adult model the negative example. Also, having students cheer for the positive examples is a good idea.
3) Set-up the role play

› Choose 1-3 students to participate.
› In order to make the role-playing as realistic as possible, describe the:
  › physical setting
  › the situations
  › the manner the actors should portray.
› Assign the actors their roles and responsibilities

(McGinnis & Goldstein, 1997; Sprague & Goffy, 2005)

It is helpful to be in the actual setting for the behavioral expectation when conducting the role play (playground, hallway, classroom, cafeteria, etc.).
4) Conduct the role play

- Instruct the role-players to begin.
- Provide the actors with any help or coaching needed in order to keep the role play going.
- If the role play is clearly going astray, the scene can be stopped, needed instruction provided, and the role play resumed.

(McGinnis & Goldstein, 1997; Sprague & Golly, 2005)

If role play does go astray, ask for input from the class about what might be going wrong and how it can be fixed. (If age appropriate) have students clap when the targeted behaviors are displayed.
5) Provide monitoring and feedback

- A brief period of feedback follows each role play.
- Provide specific feedback which points to concrete behaviors and **not** general evaluative comments.
- Positive feedback should always be given first.
- Negative feedback should be constructive in nature, offering suggestions for what might improve the skill enactment.

(McGinnis & Goldein, 1997; Sprague & Golly, 2005)

Seek input from observers and participants about the specific behaviors they saw or performed that were the expectations, and what they saw that was not appropriate.
Work Time, Activity 4

Working with your team, develop 3 lesson plans and create a schedule for when and where the lessons will be taught.

You will also need to identify who will teach the lessons:
- Classroom teachers
- Rotations

For rotations, a specific person, or persons (from SW-PBS team) can be teaching, modeling, and role-playing the behavior expectations in the designated environments (cafeteria, playground, library, etc.) and classes can rotate through the settings at certain times to participate.
Some teachers may be reluctant to use tangible reinforcements with their students.
Systems of Rewards and Behavior Improvement in Schools

- “Discipline referrals were significantly decreased for 7th graders and for harassment among males. Students’ perceptions of school safety improved at the target school but not at comparison schools” (Metzler et al., 2001, p. 448).

- “…alone (reactive and punitive strategies) have been ineffective in creating more sustained positive school climates that prevent the development and occurrence of antisocial behavior in schools. In the long term, reactive and punishment-based responses create a false sense of security” (Sugai & Horner, 2002, p. 26).
Systems of Recognition

- When we define our system of reinforcement, we define how we will acknowledge the behaviors that are important to us.
- It is important that the recognition system be used consistently and be used in all environments where it is important to increase student use of rule following behavior.

(Sprague & Golly, 2005)

Tokens/tickets are really for the adults. They are so the adults remember to reinforce the students.
Example (Dyer Kelly Handbook)

- The recognition program focuses on acknowledging students who demonstrate pro-social skills, as evidenced by following the school rules. This program is comprised of the following components:
  - Specific verbal feedback
  - "Magic Dragon Tickets"
  - Weekly classroom drawings of "Magic Dragon Tickets"
  - Weekly school-wide assembly
  - Social skills certificates
  - Individual classroom goal setting and celebrations (optional)
Example (Dyer Kelly Handbook)

- Specific Verbal Feedback
  - When a student is observed being safe, responsible, or respectful, acknowledge the student by giving specific, positive, verbal feedback.

For example, don’t use general language like “nice job.” Use language such as “thank you for keeping your hands to yourself when Johnny walked by.”
Example (Dyer Kelly Handbook)

- "Magic Dragon Tickets"
  - Acknowledge student who follows school rules, or exhibits exemplary pro-social skills, by giving specific verbal feedback and a "Magic Dragon Ticket" card.
  - Make a point to issue 5 - 10 "Magic Dragon Tickets" per day, school wide.
  - "Magic Dragon Tickets" are never taken away as a result of negative behavior.
  - Students will write their name on the ticket and put it in their classroom's "Magic Dragon Ticket" container for the weekly drawing.

There can be days when students give other students tickets. There can be days when students give teachers tickets as well, and must pair the ticket with specific verbal praise. This is a way of helping to motivate teachers to give out tickets, once they have earned some themselves (or not earned any!)
Example (Dyer Kelly Handbook)

- **Weekly Classroom Drawing**
  - Every Thursday afternoon the classroom teacher will draw 2 "Magic Dragon Tickets". These 2 students will receive a student store gift certificate and/or be entered in the school-wide drawing at the Friday assembly.

- **Weekly School-wide Assembly**
  - Every Friday a school-wide assembly will be held. At the assembly the names of the students selected in the Thursday classroom drawings will be recognized and given student store certificates.
  - The principal will draw 7 names. Those 7 students will be given the opportunity to spin the wheel and win a prize.

At schools with many teachers who are against giving tangible reinforcements or prizes, students may just receive the verbal recognition, their name said over the loud speaker, a handshake from the principal, and/or a postcard sent home noting the student’s accomplishment.
Example (Dyer Kelly Handbook)

- **Social Skills Certificates**
  - Each month, at a school-wide assembly, students will be awarded a certificate in recognition of:
    - consistently demonstrating pro-social skills; or
    - improvement in pro-social skills
  - Classroom teachers will determine which students in their class will receive a certificate. Students can receive multiple certificates (or no certificates) in a school year.
Example (Dyer Kelly Handbook)

- Individual Classroom Goal Setting and Celebrations
  (optional)
  Each classroom teacher is encouraged to, but has the option of, organizing additional classroom activities to support pro-social skills building. Suggested activities could include:
    - classroom goal setting for number of "Magic Dragon Tickets" earned, and a celebration when goal is met
    - additional classroom drawings of "Magic Dragon Tickets" for prizes (some examples of inexpensive prizes include no homework passes, break passes, ability to eat a snack in class, place desk anywhere in classroom for a period, time on the computer.)
Work Time, Activity 5

- In your teams, begin to define your school-wide recognition system.
- Remember, to include all of the important environments
- Also, begin to develop a timeline for when drawing will be conducted or for when tickets will be cashed in.

This will of course need to be refined with the SW-PBS at your school.
School Wide Information System

- SWIS.org
- Tracks office discipline referrals (ODRs)
- Also has component for Tier 2 Intervention
- SWIS is…
  - Data gathering system
  - Web-based application
  - Data-based decision making system
Tier 2

Overviews of Two Research Based Programs
Tier 2 Supports

Selected
(At-risk Students)
Classroom & Small Group Strategies
(10-20% of students)

Universal
(All Students)
School-wide, Culturally Responsive Systems of Support
(75-85% of students)

- Increased academic support and practice
- Increased social skills teaching
- Self-management training and support
- School based adult mentors (check in, check out)
- Parent training and collaboration
- Alternatives to out-of-school suspension
- Community and service learning

- Effective Academic Supports
- School wide social skills teaching
- Teaching school behavior expectations
- Effective classroom management
- Active supervision and monitoring in common areas
- Positive reinforcement systems
- Firm, fair, and corrective response to problem behavior
- Community and service learning

Source: Jeff Sprague, 2009
CICO has two key components: a daily behavior report card and an adult mentor with before and after school check ins. The daily behavior report card goals are based on the school umbrella rules and students receive ratings throughout the school day. Check in-Check out should have the capacity to serve many students and be able to do so in a timely manner. Self monitoring occurs after success has been achieved with teacher ratings.
First Step to Success

- At Risk Students from Kindergarten to 3rd Grade

Three Modules:

- Screening (multiple options)
  - Teacher nomination
  - Ranked against clearly defined examples of anti-social behavior
  - Rankings and ratings
    - After ranking (same as teacher nomination option) the teacher completes a short rating scale on the student
  - Direct observation
    - Most complex screening procedure involves multiple gates in including ranking, rating scales, and direct observation of target students

(Walker et al., 2009)

Three modules: Screening, school, and home.

Multiple gating screening procedure now known as Systematic Screener for Behavior Disorders.

Schools will need to weigh the cost and benefits of each of the screening options. Higher reliabilities are associated with more complex screening procedures but resources may be diverted from interventions to accommodate these procedures.
First Step to Success

- At Risk Students from Kindergarten to 3rd Grade
  - School Intervention
    - Group dependent contingency procedure: daily and then later weekly prizes (green card-red card)
    - Daily individual home rewards for school behavior
    - Praise is used frequently by school staff
    - Success is carefully monitored
  - Home intervention
    - After one week of school intervention, consultant completes home visit
    - Consultant works with parent on how to teach and practice specific and predefined behaviors (e.g., cooperation)

(Walker et al., 2009)

With school intervention, the consultant is responsible for the first week of intervention. After this point, the teacher is responsible for implementing the school intervention.
Tier 3
More intense and individualized; greater need for assessment; often require multiple agencies and supports.
Multiple Levels of Functional Assessment

- Simple (20-30 Minutes)
  - Interview only (e.g., FACTS)
- Full (a few hours)
  - Record review
  - Interview
  - Direct observation (e.g., FAO)
- Analysis (up to 20 hours)
  - Direct observation
  - Systematic manipulation

Crone & Horner, 2003

Free simple FBA manual now available through PBIS.org. Research demonstrates that school teams can be accurate in determining function when sufficient training has occurred. Functional Analysis on this slide refers to systematic manipulation not CA FAA.
Competing Behavior Pathway is a helpful visual to help teachers understand the function of behaviors and triggers.
Sustainability
A key component to SW-PBS is making data-based decisions. The SW-PBS team should continually be utilizing data to problem solve and adapt interventions. SWIS provides data collection tools for entire schools, tier 2 interventions (such as check in check out), and will soon monitor individual interventions.
Sustainability

- Reinforce the Adults
  - Celebrate the data!
  - Send champions to trainings
  - Develop cadres
- Communicate/engage w/ stakeholders
  - Newsletters etc.
  - Seek donations
  - Increase parent involvement
  - Assemblies

Be sure to share the data with the school staff at least monthly. Teachers who give out the most tickets/tokens can be recognized and rewarded. Have a community day where teachers play basketball against students, etc. SW-PBS team can seek donations from community members and businesses (such as gift certificates to meals, school supplies, etc.).
Staff Development

- Training
  - Leadership team is responsible for training staff (this is you!)
  - During 1st year of training, tier 1 is established
  - During 2nd and 3rd years, tiers 2 & 3 should be addressed
    - You will need to decide on which interventions you will be implementing and when you will receive staff development in these interventions

The team needs ongoing training and also needs to provide training to the rest of the staff. Often educators want to start with tier 3 (“what do I do with the most difficult students?”); however, if you start at the top of the triangle, when interventions are in place for the most challenging behaviors, more students will move up to tier 3. Strong tier 1, school-wide supports are an essential foundation to build prior to developing tier 2 and 3 interventions.
Final Activity

- In your teams, schedule team meeting/work times for the remainder of the school year. We would recommend that you meet at least two times per month for the first school year.

- If you would like to utilize the School Wide Information System (SWIS) you will need to contact a SWIS facilitator
Resources

- PBIS.org
- APBS.org
- Pbssurveys.org
- SWIS.org
- Journal of Positive Behavior Interventions (Sagepub)
- BEST Behavior: Building Positive Behavior Support in Schools (Sopris)
- Responding to Problem Behavior in Schools: The Behavior Education Program (Gilford)
- Responding to Problem Behavior in Schools: Functional Behavior Assessment (Gilford)
- First Steps to Success (SRI)
APPENDIX B

School-Wide Positive Behavior Supports Facilitator’s Guide

Intended Audience

This project, including the PowerPoint presentation, presentation notes, video, facilitator’s guide, and activities, are intended for use by school personnel to promote the understanding as well as the initial planning and development of school-wide positive behavior supports. The intended audience for this project include the site positive behavior support leadership team: a representative group of stakeholders including general and special education teaching staff, an administrator, support staff; classified staff, and parents.

Materials

The CD-ROM attached to this project includes all of the materials required to complete the workshop outlined in the previous sections. Specifically, the CD-ROM includes the presentation in PowerPoint format, the activities, the video imbedded in the presentation, and this facilitator’s guide.

The PowerPoint has been saved in pptx format and users will need to open this document using Microsoft Office Edition 2007 for PC, 2008 for Macintosh, or a newer format if available. Individuals not having access to these or newer versions will need to download and install the Microsoft Office Compatibility Pack from Microsoft.com. This software can be located via an Internet search engine by searching for the compatibility pack by name. Although this represents a viable option, users are encouraged to utilize
the most recent Microsoft Office versions to ensure the optimal display and functionality of the presentation.

The electronic copies of this facilitator’s guide and the activities have been saved in the docx format. These materials, like the PowerPoint, require the most updated version of Microsoft Office. Given this, they can be opened using the Microsoft Office Compatibility Pack mentioned above. This pack can be located and installed in the manner described in the previous paragraph.

The video provided as part of the presentation requires Quicktime to be played. Quicktime Player is available via free download from the Internet. To locate and download this software, the user is encouraged to visit www.apple.com/quicktime/. Once Macintosh users have obtained this software, they will want to link the video to the PowerPoint presentation. This can be done by first selecting slide 44 from the presentation, selecting the “Insert” dropdown tab from PowerPoint, selecting “Movie” from the dropdown and finally locating and selecting the video segment file. Users are encouraged to save the video file to the desktop of their computers before selecting the video to ensure faster playback. However, the video may be run from the CD. Microsoft Windows users will need to exit PowerPoint and play the movie directly from Quicktime.

Background Information and Slide Specific Notes

Background information and slide specific notes can be found in the notes section located on each slide. Additional knowledge can be gained from the Positive Behavior Interventions and Supports website located at www.PBIS.org. Reading the literature review of this project will also provide further background information. Additionally,
presenters would benefit from reading the BEST Behavior book (Sprague & Golly, 2005).

**Presentation Format and Sequencing**

Before the workshop contained in these materials can be provided, a representative school team must be selected and administrative support must be achieved. To begin this process, the authors recommend first meeting with the site administrator (and site leadership team if applicable) and briefly outlining the research that supports SW-PBS and the training requirements. If the administrator and leadership team agree to support the SW-PBS and set its implementation as one of the top three school-wide priorities, then this group should recruit the representative team that will be responsible for training and implementation. The workshop should then be scheduled.

Before the in-service is held, the presenters will need to photocopy the activities. Although only one copy of each activity is required for each team, the members will likely appreciate having their own copies. Additionally, because these activities will set the stage for the interventions and systems that will be put into place, providing a folder for the team to organize these materials will be helpful.

The presentation and activities are broken down into four key sections. The first of these areas is titled, “Why School-Wide Positive Behavior Supports?” This section sets the stage for SW-PBS and further creates a sense of urgency. This section includes a large number of slides with statistics and research topics and it is important that the presenters review these slides multiple times before presenting this material.
Section two, “What is SW-PBS?”, outlines the key components of school-wide PBS. Presenters introduce the multi-tiered preventative approach outlined by SW-PBS and also introduce the four SW-PBS elements: outcomes, systems, practices, and data. This section includes a number of important slides and presenters will want to focus on reviewing the slide 18 notes in particular.

The third section, “Getting SW-PBS Started at Your School,” provides a detailed presentation that is designed to set the stage for tier 1 supports and provides a brief introduction to tiers 2 and 3. It is important for the presenters to ensure that participants understand that they will need to meet regularly to put the systems into place and to develop and sustain SW-PBS. The presenters should make certain that participants understand that they will require additional training to establish tiers two and three.

Finally, the forth section provides an opportunity for the team to begin the planning process for how they will ensure SW-PBS is implemented at their school sites. Presenters need to ensure that school teams develop a meeting calendar and that coaching is scheduled. If this section is skipped, then schools will be very unlikely to implement what they have learned.

**Goals**

Participants will develop an understanding of and begin the initial processes required to implement SW-PBS at their school. In-service participants will develop a plan to finalize the implementation of tier 1 supports and to undertake additional training in data-based decision making, tier 2 supports, and tier 3 supports.
APPENDIX C

Presentation Handouts
### Activity 1:

**Number of Office Discipline Referrals at Schools Implementing PBS and at Your School**

Input your school data on the chart below. Then compare your school to the national sample of PBS schools.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Grade Range</th>
<th>Number of Schools</th>
<th>Mean Enrollment per school</th>
<th>Mean ODRs per 100 per school day</th>
<th>Number of ODRs per 100 at your school</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>K-6</td>
<td>2,162</td>
<td>450</td>
<td>.34 (sd = .49)</td>
<td>&lt;Input the number of ODRs per 100 kids per school day here&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6-9</td>
<td>602</td>
<td>657</td>
<td>.85 (sd = 1.11)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9-12</td>
<td>215</td>
<td>887</td>
<td>1.27 (sd = 2.39)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K-(8-12)</td>
<td>431</td>
<td>408</td>
<td>1.06 (sd = 2.60)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Activity 2:

Objective: Identify 3-5 positively stated expectations for your school

Things to consider:
- Developmental level of students
- Values of community and all stakeholders (what you come up with today may need to change as you include all stakeholders)
- Do you want to create a mnemonic to tie in the rules to your mascot?

You have 15 minutes to begin this process. Remember, these are the values that you will be teaching to your students.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Expectation 1</th>
<th>Expectation 2</th>
<th>Expectation 3 (if needed)</th>
<th>Expectation 4 (if needed)</th>
<th>Expectation 5 (if needed)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Activity 3:

Objective: Utilizing the provided materials, begin the process of completing your rule matrix (see following page)

Remember: Utilize positive language (i.e., what we expect our students to do)
# Classroom Rules Matrix

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Common Area</th>
<th>Expectation 1</th>
<th>Expectation 2</th>
<th>Expectation 3 (if needed)</th>
<th>Expectation 4 (if needed)</th>
<th>Expectation 5 (if needed)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<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>
</tr>
<tr>
<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>
</tr>
<tr>
<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>
</tr>
<tr>
<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>
</tr>
<tr>
<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>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Activity 4:

Objective: Working with your team, develop 3 lesson plans and create a schedule for when and where the lessons will be taught (use lesson plan template on next page)

You will also need to identify who will teach the lessons:
- Classroom teachers
- Rotations
Skill/Expectation:_________________________
Location for Lesson:_______________________
Person Teaching Lesson:___________________

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Step:</th>
<th>Action Plan</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Define the rule/expectation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Model/demonstrate the rule/expectation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Set-up role play</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conduct role play</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provide monitoring and feedback</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Activity 5:

In your teams, begin to define your school-wide recognition system.

- Remember, to include all of the important environments

- Also, begin to develop a timeline for when drawings will be conducted or for when tickets will be cashed in (if you are using a school store)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>What will be used as a token?</th>
<th>Who will use system to recognize students?</th>
<th>Will all behaviors be targeted or just specific behaviors?</th>
<th>Will students “buy” items/privileges or will there be a drawing?</th>
<th>When will rewards be distributed?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Final Activity:

In your teams, schedule team meeting/work times for the remainder of the school year.

- We would recommend that you meet at least two times per month for the first school year.

- If you would like to utilize the School Wide Information System (SWIS) you will need to contact a SWIS facilitator at:

## PBS Implementation Self-Assessment and Planning Tool

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FEATURE</th>
<th>IN PLACE STATUS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Leadership Team</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Team is developed with representation from appropriate range of stakeholders (special education, regular education, families, mental health, etc.).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Team determines how many schools are to be involved in the effort.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Team completes self-assessment.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Team completes a 3-5 year prevention-based action plan.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Team defines regular meeting schedule &amp; meeting process (agenda, minutes, etc.).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Coordination</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Coordinator(s) is identified who has adequate FTE to manage day-to-day operations.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Funding</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Funding sources to cover activities for at least three years can be identified.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Visibility</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Dissemination strategies are identified &amp; implemented to ensure that stakeholders are kept aware of activities &amp; accomplishments (e.g., website, newsletter, conferences, TV).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Political Support</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Student social behavior is one of the top five goals for the political unit (state, district, etc.).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Leadership team reports to the political unit at least annually on the activities &amp; outcomes related to student behavior goal.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. PBS policy statement developed &amp; endorsed.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Participation &amp; support by administrator from political unit.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Training Capacity</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. Leadership team has established trainers to build &amp; sustain school-wide PBS practices.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Coaching Capacity</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. Leadership team has developed a coaching network that builds &amp; sustains school-wide PBS</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. A coach is available to meet at least monthly with each emerging school team (emerging teams are teams that have not met the implementation criteria), and at least quarterly with established teams.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Demonstrations</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. At least 10 schools have adopted school-wide PBS, &amp; can be used</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18. School-based information systems (e.g., data collection tools &amp; evaluation processes) are in place.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19. At least quarterly dissemination, celebration &amp; acknowledgement of outcomes &amp; accomplishments</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Office of Special Education Programs Center on Positive Behavioral Interventions and Supports, 2004)
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