6-28-2012

Working Smarter with a Large Urban School District Implementing School-wide Positive Behavior Interventions and Supports: A Systematic Process to External Coaching

Kathryn Jean Nichols

Follow this and additional works at: https://digitalcommons.memphis.edu/etd

WORKING SMARTER WITH A LARGE URBAN SCHOOL DISTRICT
IMPLEMENTING SCHOOL-WIDE POSITIVE BEHAVIOR INTERVENTIONS AND
SUPPORTS: A SYSTEMATIC PROCESS TO EXTERNAL COACHING

by

Kathryn J. Nichols

A Dissertation

Submitted in Partial Fulfillment of the

Requirements for the Degree of

Doctor of Philosophy

Major: Educational Psychology and Research

The University of Memphis

August 2012

To my family

Sam and our three girls (Iris, Rose, and Ginger Lily)

in appreciation of your inspiration, sacrifice, and support

Acknowledgements

This dissertation research is the culmination of the education and experience I have gained over the past decade. I want to extend my sincerest gratitude toward my dissertation chair, Dr. Corinna "Bunty" Ethington, whom taught me that statistics can be exciting and accessible to everyone. Bunty maintained confidence in my ability to finish my dissertation even when I was dubious. Her encouraging and unflappable personality keep me composed and motivated. I want to thank Dr. John Smart for his sharp editorial sense, Dr. Yonghong Jade Xu for her flexibility, and Dr. Renee Murley for her substantive knowledge.

To Dr. Sara Bicard, my mentor, thank you for your inspiration and guidance. Collaborating with you has allowed me to hone my skills and knowledge, resulting in becoming a Board Certified Behavior Analyst. I look forward to continue to be inspired and invigorated by Sara to attain new goals and continue to grow as a researcher and practitioner.

I want to thank Esther Plank Bledsoe, Cara Richardson, and Judy Hylton for assisting with data collection, reporting results, and communicating with the schools participating in the study. This study would not have been possible without their dedication and effort.

Abstract

Nichols, Kathryn J. Ph.D. The University of Memphis. August 2012. Working Smarter with a Large Urban School District Implementing School-wide Positive Behavior Interventions and Supports: A Systematic Process to External Coaching. Major Professor: Corinna Ethington

School-wide Positive Behavior Interventions and Supports (SWPBIS) create an environment within the school that prevents problem behaviors via promotion of prosocial and learning behaviors. The framework of SWPBIS has built within it a system for evaluation, in which the school is evaluated as a unit. External SWPBIS coaches guide schools to engage in ongoing progress monitoring and action planning to direct PBIS efforts and facilitate accurate implementation of the key SWPBIS features. The reliability and concurrent validity of the current SWPBIS evaluations need to be established. Additionally, the ability of large urban school systems to implement SWPBIS with fidelity needs to continue to be examined. Finally, the effectiveness of providing evidence-based recommendations in a systematic format via external coaching to improve schools' fidelity of implementation of the key features of SWPBIS will be evaluated as a means for coaching a large number of schools within a system. Eighteen schools in a large urban system comprised the study sample.

The current study found that the evaluations have mixed reliability results but lacked concurrent validity. Evaluation results reveal that a large urban school system can implement SWPBIS with fidelity. Additionally, an external coaching procedure improved the results of one of the evaluations. Revisions to the evaluation tools should be considered to improve their reliability and validity. Urban school systems should support sustainment of SWPBIS efforts to promote appropriate behaviors. External coaches

should approach working with school systems in a systematic method to improve the

schools' effective implementation of SWPBIS.

Table of Contents

List of Tables

Chapter 1

Introduction

Overview of School-wide Positive Behavior Supports and Interventions

   School-wide Positive Behavior Supports and Interventions (SWPBIS) consist of a

continuum of practices that create an environment within the school that prevents

problem behaviors via promotion of prosocial and learning behaviors (Turnbull et al.,

2002). SWPBIS incorporates preventative and intervening practices aimed at creating a

school environment that encourages academic, behavioral, and social success (Sugai,

Horner, & Lewis, 2009). By promoting practices that prevent behavior problems,

SWPBIS creates an environment that is conducive to learning; thereby, decreasing the

amount of time teachers are spending in response to inappropriate behaviors (Kellam,

Mayer, Rebok, & Hawkins, 1998; Putnam, Horner, & Algozzine, 2006). SWPBIS

establishes an effective school disciplinary system which focuses on prevention of

problem behaviors, efficient identification and response for students with at-risk

behaviors, interventions for individuals engaging in chronic behaviors, and data

collection to guide decision making and evaluation (Horner, Sugai, & Horner, 2000).

   SWPBIS employs behavioral technologies that are preventive, evidence-based,

and applicable at the systems-level (Sugai & Horner, 2006). The framework for SWPBIS

utilizes a three-tier model of service delivery to prevent and respond efficiently and

effectively to problem behaviors (Sugai et al., 2010; Turnbull et al., 2002; Walker,

Ramsey, & Gresham, 2003-04). The three-tier format emphasizes prevention of problem

behaviors (e.g., Tier I, primary prevention, universal supports) and intervention for

intense and severe behaviors (e.g., Tier II or secondary intervention and Tier III or

tertiary interventions) (Office of Special Education Programs [OSEP] Technical

Assistance Center on Positive Behavioral Interventions & Supports [PBIS], 2011; Safran & Oswald, 2003; Walker et al., 1996). SWPBIS promotes academic and behavioral success by employing common behavioral practices such as defined behavioral expectations, systematic supervision, explicit teaching of expectations, frequent reinforcement for rule following, continuum of consequences for rule breaking, data-based decision making, and a range of interventions for students experiencing behavioral failure (Sugai & Lewis, 1999; Sugai et al., 2009).

SWPBIS have advanced from a growing movement in education to a standard practice in many schools throughout the United States (Horner, 2009). Schools that have implemented the practices and systems of SWPBIS have reported significant decreases in office discipline referrals (ODRs) and improvement in academic success (Horner, Sugai, Todd, & Lewis-Palmer, 2005; Sugai & Horner, 2006; Taylor-Green et al., 1997). Additionally, there is evidence that implementation of SWPBIS improves the academic and social success of students by creating an environment that prevents problem behaviors while utilizing evidence-based practices to teach and engage students (Putnam et al., 2006).

Tier I. Tier I of the SWPBIS framework targets the entire school population through universal supports to prevent problem behaviors, and teach and reinforce students to behave appropriately (Turnbull et al., 2002). The Tier I supports promoted by SWPBIS provide consistent teaching and recognition of appropriate behaviors to all students to minimize the number of discipline infractions. Tier I supports are available to all students, even those receiving more intensive interventions.

Lewis and Sugai (1999) detailed the key features present in Tier I supports which include: a) defined behavioral expectations (3-5), b) explicit instruction of behavioral expectations, c) recognition of the exhibition of behavioral expectations, d) responding to behavior problems with a continuum of consequences, e) ongoing evaluation of universal support systems, f) participation of administrative leaders, and g) support from district-level administration. The seven key features are present in schools fully implementing SWPBIS. An integrated approach that defines, teaches, and reinforces expected behaviors for the entire school, non-classroom and classroom settings, and at the individual level will assist schools to effectively manage behavior and provide individualized services to those students with the greatest need (i.e., 1-7% of student population with six or greater ODRs in an academic year) (Sugai & Horner, 1999). The OSEP PBIS Technical Assistance Center presents a continuum of the school-wide instructional and positive behavior support in the graphic format of a triangle. Within the triangle, 80% of students in a school are expected to respond positively to the Tier I supports (i.e., 80% receive 0-1 ODRs), 15% of student population will require a targeted intervention due to an increased rate of ODRs (2 to 5 ODRs), and 5% of the population will require individualized intervention to address frequent discipline infractions (6 or more ODRs) (Sugai et al., 2010). The discipline patterns of over 1,510 schools implementing SWPBIS were examined by Spraulding et al. (2010). Researchers indicated that schools implementing SWPBIS with fidelity reported that approximately 80% of the student population received 0 to 1 ODRs during the academic year, thus confirming the proposed benefits of SWPBIS of reducing the rate of discipline infractions at a school.

Tier II. The second tier of the SWPBIS framework emphasizes efficient identification and interventions to improve the behavior of students considered to be at-risk of social or behavioral failure (i.e., students who continue to engage in inappropriate behaviors despite Tier I supports aimed at preventing discipline problems; Horner et al., 2000; Horner, Sugai, & Anderson, 2010). Students engaging in similar behaviors receive targeted interventions that provide increased teaching and reinforcement of school-wide expectations and appropriate social behaviors (Turnbull et al., 2002). Students participating in Tier II interventions receive frequent feedback regarding behavior and progress is monitored to determine the success of the intervention.

Recent Tier II efforts have focused on the provision of interventions for targeted groups of students identified as at-risk for chronic behavior problems (Hawken & Horner, 2003; March & Horner, 2002; Simonsen, Myers, & Briere, 2010). Tier II supports utilize efficient interventions demonstrated to be effective in reducing non-violent behavior problems (Hawken, Adolphson, Macleod, & Schumann, 2009; Todd, Horner, Sugai, & Colvin, 1999), which can be implemented by school personnel with minimal training (Filter et al., 2007; Hawken et al., 2009; Hawken & Horner, 2003; Hawken, MacLeod, & Rawlings, 2007; March & Horner, 2002). Frequently utilized Tier II interventions include, but are not limited to, check in check out or behavior education program (Crone, Hawken, & Horner, 2010; Crone, Horner, & Hawken, 2004; Fairbanks, Sugai, Guardino, & Lathrop., 2007; Filter et al., 2007; Hawken, 2006; Hawken & Horner, 2003; Hawken et al., 2007; McCurdy, Kunsch, & Reibstein, 2007; Todd, Campbell, Meyer, & Horner, 2008), check, connect and expect (Cheney et al., 2009), first steps to success (Beard-Jordan & Sugai, 2004; Carter & Horner, 2007; Golly, Stiller, & Walker, 1998;

Rodriguez, Loman, & Horner, 2009; Sprague & Perkins, 2009; Walker et al., 2009), think time (Nelson & Carr, 2000), social skills groups, and daily behavior report cards (Burkwist, Mabee, & McLaughlin, 1987; Chafouleas, Christ, Riley-Tillman, Briesch, Chanese, 2007; Chafouleas, McDougal, Riley-Tillman, Panahon, & Hilt, 2005; Chafouleas, Riley-Tillman, & McDougal, 2002; Chafouleas, Riley-Tillman, & Sassu, 2006; Chafouleas, Riley-Tillman, Sassu, LaFrance, & Patwa, 2007; Fairchild, 1983, 1987; Schumaker, Hovell, & Sherman, 1977). The intent of each intervention is to provide additional teaching and reinforcement of the school-wide expected behaviors to students who continue to engage in discipline infractions despite exposure the Tier I supports provided to the entire school population (Hawken et al., 2007; Hawken et al., 2009).

Tier III. Tier III has been a long-established practice in education (Turnbull, Rainbolt, & Buchele-Ash, 1997; Wilcox, Turnbull, & Turnbull, 1999-2000) in which functional behavior assessments (FBAs) along with function-based interventions and/or wrap-around services are provided at the individual level for students exhibiting chronic behavior problems (e.g., highly disruptive, serious, and/or frequent major misbehaviors (Horner et al., 2000; March & Horner, 2002). Research of FBAs has consistently demonstrated that its outcomes lead to an increase in appropriate behaviors and reduction in undesirable behaviors (Brooks, Todd, Tofflemoyer, & Horner, 2003; Burke, Hagan-Burke, & Sugai, 2003; Crone, Hawken, & Bergstrom, 2007; Erving, DuPaul, Kern, & Friman, 1998; Fairbanks et al., 2007; Ingram, Lewis-Palmer, & Sugai, 2005; Kern, Hilt, & Gresham, 2004; Lucyshyn et al., 2007; Newcomer & Lewis, 2004; Preciado, Horner, & Baker, 2009; Smith & Sugai, 2000).

Tier III supports involve intensive, individualized interventions for students identified as engaging in chronic and/or serious behaviors (Horner et al., 2010). Students identified as meeting the criteria for a Tier III intervention are provided a function-based intervention derived from the FBA examining the pattern and hypothesized purpose served by problem behaviors (Turnbull et al., 2002). The individualized intervention focuses on preventing additional misbehaviors, teaching and reinforcing alternative behaviors, and eliminating reinforcement for the problematic behavior(s). Similar to Tier II interventions, the student receives frequent feedback regarding behavior, ongoing progress monitoring occurs, decisions regarding effectiveness are based on data, and fidelity of intervention implementation is determined.

Evidence-based Practice. As reported by Horner et al. (2010), SWPBIS is being implemented in over 13,000 schools in the United States. The array of supports and systems associated with SWPBIS meet the criteria to be considered an evidence-based practice (Horner et al., 2010). Specifically, SWPBIS has clearly defined the effectiveness of practices utilized, settings implemented, populations targeted, qualifications of implementers required, outcomes expected, and the theories and frameworks from which it is derived. An analysis of the body of SWPBIS research by Horner et al. (2010) confirmed that it is an evidence-based practice providing a range of interventions responsive to students' needs, encourages data-based decision making, exposes all students to preventive practices, co-exists with schools' academic goals, and can be implemented by staff with high fidelity.

Tier I of SWPBIS incorporates systems and practices that guide functioning of the SWPBIS team, implementation at the school-wide level, analysis of data and decision-

making, and staff training (Horner et al., 2010). Review of SWPBIS research reveal that universal supports can be implemented by school staff with fidelity (Bradshaw, Mitchell, & Leaf, 2010). Furthermore, schools implementing SWPBIS report a reduction in the rates of ODRs and out-of-school suspensions (Nelson, 1996; Nelson, Dupong Hurley, Synhorst, & Epstein, 2008; Nelson, Martella, & Garland, 1998; Nelson, Martella, & Marchand-Martella, 2002; Safran & Oswald, 2003). Although a functional relation between implementation of SWPBIS and improvement in academic outcomes at schools has yet to be established, the assumption in the field is that the framework of SWPBIS creates a predictable and safe environment that is conducive to academic success (Bradshaw et al., 2009; Horner et al., 2009; Horner et al., 2010; Luiselli, Putnam, Handler, & Fienberg, 2005; McIntosh, Chard, Boland, & Horner, 2006; McIntosh, Horner, Chard, Boland, & Good, 2006; Metzler, Biglan, Rusby, & Sprague, 2001; Muscot et al., 2008).

SWPBIS Leadership Team. Implementation, success, and sustainment of SWPBIS depend on a team-based approach. The SWPBIS leadership team selects and implements the systems of support at the school-wide level. (Sugai & Horner, 2006). The leadership team represents school staff and stakeholders including special and general educators, administrators, family and community members, students, and mental health providers. The team members work together to facilitate systems change and the implementation of SWPBIS practices (Sugai et al., 2010). The leadership team is responsible for training and coaching staff regarding SWPBIS practices, evaluating outcomes of practices, engaging in data-based decision making, and communicating progress to stakeholders. The leadership team develops an action plan to guide their

efforts and address needs that become apparent during assessment activities. The team meets on a regular schedule (e.g., monthly) and has the capacity for making decisions and implementing procedures school-wide (Sugai & Horner, 2002).

SWPBIS Evaluations

Outcome data inform decisions regarding effectiveness of systems of support, achievement of short- and long-term goals, selection of practices and interventions, and systems needed to create enduring change (Sugai & Horner, 2006). The framework of SWPBIS has built within it a system for evaluation of the context, input, fidelity, and impact of its supports (Algozzine et al., 2010). Implementation of SWPBIS is driven by measurable outcomes, evidence-based and contextually relevant practices, data-based decision making, and systems to support implementation and sustainment (Sugai & Horner, 2006).

When analyzing SWPBIS, the school is evaluated as a unit, considering the actions of all the staff as contributing to the school as a whole (Sugai & Horner, 2006; Sugai et al., 2009). The sustainability of SWPBIS is dependent on establishing ongoing procedures to evaluate and make data-based decisions regarding the need for and effectiveness of positive behavior support interventions (Lewis-Palmer, Sugai, & Larson, 1999). Continued data collection is necessary for schools to implement new practices, evaluate and modify current systems, and terminate programs that are redundant or ineffective. Data collection and analysis will enable schools to successfully implement and sustain programs in an efficient and effective manner. Furthermore, data-based decisions will assist schools in identifying procedures that need to be modified and, specifically, which features need adjustment. The collection and analysis of SWPBIS

outcome data allow school staff to modify its supports to produce an enduring program promoting appropriate student behavior (Luiselli, Putnam, & Sunderland, 2002).

It is assumed that the cyclical evaluations will allow SWPBIS to be successfully implemented and modified in a consistent manner leading to a sustained effort. Ongoing evaluation of SWPBIS not only assists schools with determining the impact of its practices but also communicates to relevant stakeholders (e.g., district-level administration, state-level personnel, and parents) the impact the preventative measures are having at the school. Critical elements to be considered when designing a data collection system include frequency, persons responsible, and purpose for the data (Horner et al., 2001). In order for data to be used by schools the recording and summarizing of the data needs to be simple and occur cyclically. Ongoing progress monitoring of ODRs, fidelity, and effectiveness are built into the SWPBIS framework; therefore, the SWPBIS program remains a fluid process that is adaptable to the needs of the school and its population.

The evaluation of SWPBIS utilizes indicators to guide implementation of the key features and determine the extent of implementation and the impact on the school as a whole. The *Evaluation Blueprint for School-wide Positive Behavior Support* developed by the OSEP Technical Assistance Center on PBIS has defined effective evaluation as one that consists of four key features: a) a plan for anticipated outcomes, b) documentation of what is needed to implement the plan, c) measures of the extent to which the plan is implemented, and d) a comparison of the actual implementation to the ideal model. The results of SWPBIS evaluations are utilized for the creation and

execution of an action plan to address any features needing to be implemented or improved (Algozzine et al., 2010).

Effective Behavior Supports Self-Assessment Survey v.2.0 (EBSSAS). The EBSSAS (Sugai, Horner, & Todd, 2003) was developed to assist SWPBIS teams with evaluating their efforts when initiating SWPBIS and as an ongoing annual evaluation of PBIS systems (Safran, 2006). As an initial evaluation tool, the EBSSAS assesses the school's implementation of PBIS and assists the PBIS team with developing an action plan to address its needs and improve implementation of PBIS systems and practices. The EBSSAS provides annual progress monitoring of execution of the SWPBIS plan, supports decision making regarding effectiveness of PBIS efforts, and guides future action planning (Hagan-Burke et al., 2005; Safran, 2006). The EBSSAS consists of four sections to assess behavior support systems at the (a) school-wide level, (b) non-classroom settings, (c) classroom settings, and (d) individual level (Sugai et al., 2003). Each section is comprised of a number of items assessing supports associated with that specific system. The responders evaluate each item regarding the level to which it is in present ("In Place," "Partially in Place," or "Not in Place") and the priority for improvement ("High," "Medium," or "Low"). The current status and priority for improvement are summarized for each system and displayed in a graphical format to be utilized for PBIS team action planning.

With regard to the reliability of the measure of current status of PBIS features and priority for improvement, two studies have been published. The reliability of the school-wide subscale was evaluated by Hagan-Burke et al. (2005). The researchers examined the EBSSAS results of 37 schools and determined that the reliability of the current status

portion of the school-wide subscale was high *(α = .88)* and all subscale items contributed to the reliability of the scale. Similarly, the reliability of the measure for priority for improvement on the school-wide scale was also high ($α = .94$). Safran (2006) utilized the EBSSAS results of two elementary schools and one middle school to examine the internal consistency of all four subscales of the EBSSAS. Analyses determined the total scale consistency for the current status and improvement priority to be ($α = .85$) and ($α = .94$), respectively. The school-wide subscale had an alpha coefficient of .75 for the current status measure and .85 for the improvement priority measure.

Both reported studies were conducted on the original version of the EBSSAS, which had only 15 items in the school-wide subscale. Furthermore, validity data has not been examined on the EBSSAS to determine whether it truly measures implementation of key SWPBIS practices. Analyses of the reliability and validity of the current version are imperative given that the EBSSAS is an integral component of the evaluation process.

School-Wide Evaluation Tool v.2.1 (SET). The SET (Sugai, Lewis-Palmer, Todd, & Horner, 2001) serves as a research tool to evaluate the implementation of the seven key features associated with Tier I supports (Horner et al., 2004; Vincent, Spaulding, & Tobin, 2010). Consisting of 28 evaluation items grouped together into seven subscales, the SET evaluates the features of universal supports in place at a school, assesses fidelity of implementation, identifies areas of need, and measures improvement in PBIS efforts (Horner et al., 2004; Vincent et al., 2010). The seven subscales of the SET include: a) expectations defined, b) expectations taught, c) reward system, d) violation system, e) monitoring and evaluation, f) management, and g) district support (Sugai et al., 2001). The SET is completed annually by an outside evaluator and consists

of a series of structured interviews of a minimum of 10 staff members and 15 students, permanent products review, and observation to determine to what level the universal supports are being implemented in a specific school. The items of each subscale are scored on a scale of 0-2 (0 = *not in place*, 1 = *partially in place*, 2 =*f ully in place*) and a summary score for each subscale is created by dividing the sum of points assigned to each item in the subscale divided by total possible points. The overall score is calculated by averaging the subscale scores together (Horner et al., 2004). A school is considered to be implementing Tier I with fidelity if they earned a score of 80% or greater on both the SET overall score and the *Teaching Expectations* subscale. This fidelity criterion is frequently referred to as meeting 80/80 on the SET (Todd et al., 2005).

Analysis of the psychometric properties of the SET reveal adequate internal consistency (α = .96), test-retest reliability (α = .97), and construct validity (r = 0.75, $p \leq$ .01) when compared to the EBSSAS (Horner et al., 2004), verifying its utility as a tool to measure changes in levels of implementation of school-wide practices. Given the ease of administration and interpretation, the SET is a popular evaluation tool utilized by schools implementing SWPBIS and by technical assistance providers to target training and improvement efforts (Vincent et al., 2010).

The accuracy and utility of the SET was reexamined by Vincent et al. (2010), which reaffirmed the SET as a reliable and valuable tool to measure implementation of Tier I supports. Involving a larger sample representing elementary, middle, and high school levels, the researchers identified the strengths and weaknesses of the tool and suggested improvements to future revisions of the tool items and administration procedures. Specifically, the results revealed that the majority of the schools in the

sample were implementing SWPBIS with fidelity - meeting the 80/80 criteria. The abundance of schools identified as "full implementers" (i.e., implementing with fidelity) may indicate a flaw in the tool given that it may be relatively easy to achieve the maximum score on a scale without differentiating among schools that are full or partial implementers of SWPBIS. All school levels scored comparably on the majority of SET subscales; however, high schools did not perform as high on the teaching expectations and rewarding behavior subscales. The differences in high schools scores may indicate a potential problem with the construct being measured or reflecting a difference in the high school environment and values as compared to elementary and middle schools.

Additionally, there appear to be issues related to the SET evaluation process that may result in an over or underestimation of the implementation of specific SWPBIS features. First, the SET manual requires the random interviewing of a minimum of 10 staff members and 15 students with a scripted list of questions; however, this does not take into account the school population size. Depending on the school size, the recommended number of people to interview may be appropriate but it may also result in an under- or over-sampling of the population. Vincent et al. (2010) suggested that a revision to the SET would include a recommendation to interview a specific percentage of the staff and student populations rather than a set number of people, thereby, including a representative sampling that may more accurately reflect current implementation of SWPBIS. Additionally, younger student respondents may not comprehend the question regarding earning a reward within a specified time period for displaying expected behaviors. A further issue related to the administration of the SET involves the review of permanent products (e.g., Discipline plan, PBIS manual, ODR form). Schools may

provide written evidence of their SWPBIS procedures and receive credit on the specific item assessing it but they may not actually be utilized in practice; therefore, schools may appear to have systems and practices in place that are not being used in reality.

To date, PBIS teams' priority for conducting ongoing evaluation and comprehension of results has not been studied. Further research should examine how PBIS teams utilize evaluation results to introduce or modify their Tier I supports. Additionally, examining the means by which the interpretation and utilization of evaluation results can be systematized to increase efficiency in monitoring and implementing evidence-based practices will be beneficial as SWPBIS becomes a standard practice throughout the nation.

Action Planning

Subsequent to completion of SWPBIS evaluations, the indicators determined to be "partially in place" or "not in place" should be incorporated into a plan with specific actions and a timeline to guide the team to effectively and efficiently employ or enhance SWPBIS efforts (Algozzine et al., 2010). Action planning is a process in which the SWPBIS team develops measurable outcomes that assist making data-based decisions, prioritizes improvement and sustainability efforts, and determines the success of implementation of SWPBIS practices and systems (Sugai et al., 2010). The action plan should emphasize the use of evidence-based practices to implement or enhance preventative, school-wide supports (Sugai & Horner, 2002).

The *School-wide Positive Behavior Support: Implementers' Blueprint and Self-Assessment* (Sugai et al., 2010) developed by the OSEP Technical Assistance Center on PBIS has identified questions to facilitate action planning:

1) What need (problem, issue, concern, etc.) are we trying to address?

2) What evidence do we have to confirm, understand, characterize, etc. the need?

3) What factors seem to be contributing to the need?

4) How high of a priority is addressing this need?

5) What would the solution (data, strategy, policy, etc.) look like to address the need?

6) What existing activities also are addressing this need?

7) What would we see if we have been successful in addressing this need in 3 months, 1 year, 2 years, etc.?

8) What would a 1-3 year action plan look like to address this need?

9) What factors ($, roadblocks, agreements, capacity, leadership, etc.) need to be considered to support and maximize the successful implementation of this action plan?

Urban Schools

Urban school settings have a host of unique circumstances and obstacles that make the learning environment more challenging for educators to effectively teach and manage behavior (Warren et al., 2003). Challenges experienced in urban school settings include: higher rates of poverty, diverse languages and cultures, larger populations with fewer resources, and communities with increased rates of violence. Additionally, discipline data from urban schools reflect a higher rate and intensity of problem behaviors displayed by the student population (Warren et al., 2003). Schools must balance the implementation of evidence-based practices and school reforms for larger populations with fewer resources (Netzel & Eber, 2003). Furthermore, there are a larger

percentage of students requiring tier II and III interventions to address academic and behavioral deficits (Turnbull et al., 2002; Warren et al., 2003).

Several research studies have been published investigating the benefits associated with implementing SWPBIS in urban school settings. Luselli et al. (2005) described the successful implementation of the key features of SWPBIS at an urban elementary school. The implementation of SWPBIS practices over several years was attributed to the reduction in disciplinary problems, as evidenced by the decrease in ODRs and suspensions, and an improvement in reading and math performance, as measured by standardized testing. Rey, Their, Handler, and Putnam (2007) evaluated the impact of teaching school-wide expectations on discipline and fidelity of implementation of SWPBIS. Examining the SET results and disciplinary rates at eight middle schools and two elementary schools, the researchers identified indicators of increased fidelity and decreased rates in disciplinary actions, specifically out-of-school suspensions. Schools demonstrating higher levels of implementation fidelity were those that scored high ratings on the teaching expectations and school leadership scales measured by the SET. Furthermore, schools with a higher proportion of surveyed students correctly identifying the school-wide expectations had lower rates of out-of-school suspensions. In 2006, Bohanon et al. reported the reduction of ODRs and percentage of students with 2 or greater ODRs in a large inner-city high school after the first year of SWPBIS implementation. Lassen, Steele, and Sailorgeo (2006) measured the link between SWPBIS and academic achievement at an inner-city middle school. A one-way analysis of variance (ANOVA) results revealed a significant decrease in the average number of

ODRs per student and average number of long-term suspensions. Additionally, math and reading standardized scores improved significantly by Year 3 of implementation.

The impact of the schoolwide applications model (SAM), a schoolwide reform process encompassing several initiatives including SWPBIS was evaluated by Sailor, Zuna, Choi, Thomas, and McCart (2006) within an urban school district. The researchers determined that there was a significant increase in scores on standardized assessments. There was also a significant correlation between the SWPBIS feature of SAM and performance on standardized assessments.

Warren et al. (2006) described a case study of an urban middle school implementing SWPBIS. A reduction in ODRs (20%), time-outs (23%), and in-school suspensions (5%) by the second year of implementation (Warren et al., 2006) was observed. Unfortunately, the implementation of SWPBIS was not sustained fully during the third year due to implementation of a school uniform requirement which resulted in punitive consequences for being out of dress code and use of a "zero-tolerance" policy for significant incidences. These competing initiatives reduced the amount of time the school was able to direct toward teaching and reinforcing expected behaviors and, conversely, increased staff's focus on punishment.

Several barriers were identified related to the application of SWPBIS in urban high schools by Bohanon et al. (2006) including: a) implementing a system for school-wide reinforcement, b) teaching school-wide expectations, c) coordinating the SWPBIS systems, d) utilizing a consistent continuum of responses for discipline infractions, and e) adapting ODRs to collect relevant data. A survey titled the "Barriers to Implementation and Sustainability of School-wide PBS in Urban School Systems" was administered at

the Fourth Annual Meeting of the Association for Positive Behavior Supports (as cited in Putnam, McCart, Griggs, & Choi, 2009). The responders ranked the three greatest challenges to urban application of SWPBIS as being: a) high teacher turnover and number of inexperienced teachers; b) complex district bureaucracy, leadership and administrative turnover, and a difference in school and district-level priorities; and (c) history of failed or competing district initiatives. Given the large number of SWPBIS research studies, minimal attention has been directed specifically toward the impact of SWPBIS implementation in urban school settings facing numerous challenges (Warren et al., 2003) or how to work effectively with the faculty and district-level administration to successfully utilize SWPBIS to create predictable environments in which the students can learn and behave.

SWPBIS Coaching

Coaches guide schools to engage in ongoing progress monitoring and action planning to direct SWPBIS efforts. Coaching can facilitate accurate implementation of the key SWPBIS features (Lewis & Sugai, 1999). The primary responsibility of SWPBIS coaches is to ensure accurate implementation of SWPBIS practices following training (George, Kincaid, & Pollard-Sage, 2009). The responsibilities of the SWPBIS coach include: a) serving as primary contact person between school and district, b) understanding Tier I systems and practices, c) facilitating the SWPBIS team, d) participating actively in team meetings and trainings, and e) engaging in additional professional development trainings (George et al., 2009).

Coaching can be provided in person or remotely (Scott & Martinek, 2006) via phone, email, video conferencing, etc.. Internal or on-site coaches are school-based

personnel who are responsible for facilitating the implementation of SWPBIS. External coaches are district personnel or technical assistance providers from grant-funded projects. External coaches provide schools with reminders to engage in data analysis and guidance regarding improvement; however, direct contact may be required for more intensive supports (Lewis, Barrett, Sugai, & Horner, 2010; Scott & Martinek, 2006). Additional research should investigate how coaching can assist urban school districts with implementing SWPBIS at multiple schools given their particular challenges and needs including significantly higher rates of problem behaviors and decreased funding supports.

Purpose of Study

The reliability and concurrent validity of the current versions of the SET v.2.1 and EBSSAS v.2 need to be established given the standard of using the two evaluation tools to monitor and modify SWPBIS programs. Additionally, the ability of large urban school systems to implement SWPBIS with fidelity needs to continue to be examined. Finally, the effectiveness of providing evidence-based recommendations in a systematic format via external coaching to improve schools' fidelity of implementation of the key features of SWPBIS will be evaluated as a means for coaching a large number of schools within a system.

Research Questions

The current study sought to create subscales within the EBSSAS v.2 schoolwide measure that evaluate the implementation of key features of SWPBIS similar to the subscales of the SET v.2.1. Secondly, the study will identify whether a large urban school system can successfully implement SWPBIS with integrity. Furthermore, the impact of

providing evidence-based recommendations using a reporting template on fidelity of SWPBIS implementation will be evaluated.

1. Determine whether the subscales on the SET v.2.1 and the school-wide portion of the EBSSAS v.2 measure the same features of SWPBIS by establishing reliability and concurrent validity.

2. Determine whether urban schools can implement SWPBIS with fidelity as measured by the SET v.2.1 and EBSSAS v.2 evaluations when compared to their criteria of earning a mean score of 80% on both the Teaching Expectations subscale and Total Scale score (80/80).

3. Determine whether external coaching using specific, evidence-based recommendations improved implementation of SWPBIS systems and practices as measured by pre and post SWPBIS evaluations.

Hypotheses

1. The items of the school-wide portion of the EBSSAS v.2 can be arranged into subscales to measure the key features of SWPBIS similar to those of the SET v.2.1 and have adequate reliability and concurrent validity.

2. Urban schools can implement SWPBIS with fidelity as measured by meeting the established criteria of 80/80 on the SET v.2.1 and EBSSAS v.2 Teaching Expectations subscale and Overall Scale mean score.

3. SWPBIS implementation fidelity on the spring evaluations after receiving the evidence-based recommendations based on their fall evaluations.

Chapter 2

Method

Participants and Setting

Data for this study were collected during the 2008-09 academic year from a large urban school system in the mid-south. The school system was comprised of 199 schools with a student population of 104,829 students. Within the student population, 86% are classified as African American, 7% White, 6% Hispanic, and 1% Asian. The majority of the student population, specifically 86%, is identified as being economically disadvantaged (Tennessee Department of Education, 2009). At the time of the study, the school system was in its third year of implementing SWPBIS at the district level. The sample of schools included in the study consisted of 57 schools identified by the school system as actively participating in training activities and implementing elements of SWPBIS. The school system referred to this sample of schools as the "Tier I Cohort." Of the 57 Tier I Cohort schools, 34 schools completed the fall and spring EBSSAS v.2, 27 schools completed the fall and spring SET v.2.1, and 18 schools completed both the fall and spring SWPBIS assessments (i.e., SET v.2.1 and EBSSAS v.2). The 18 schools (12 elementary, 2 middle, 4 high/alternative) that completed both assessments in the fall and spring comprise the sample analyzed in this study given their full participation in the evaluation process. Demographic information presented in Table 1.

Variables

The variables of the study include the level of implementation of SWPBIS key features as measured by the SET v.2.1 and the school-wide portion of the EBSSAS v.2.

Table 1

2008-09 Tennessee State Report Card Demographic Data

School	Grades Served	Enrollment	% of White Students	% of Non-white Students	% of Economically Disadvantaged Students
1	PK-6	503	33.1	66.9	>95
2	PK-6	320	0.6	99.4	>95
3	9-12	1120	3.5	96.5	83.6
4	6-8	841	3.9	96.1	86.3
5	PK-5	1017	1.1	98.9	>95
6	PK-6	447	0.0	100	93.4
7	PK-6	640	6.5	93.5	69.8
8	9-12	992	1.1	98.9	94
9	9-12	NA	NA	NA	NA
10	PK-5	531	5.2	94.8	87.7
11	9-12	921	19.8	80.2	85.6
12	PK-5	247	0.0	100	>95
13	PK-6	421	0.0	100	94.1
14	PK-6	632	0.3	99.7	94.7
15	PK-6	407	6.1	93.9	85.5
16	PK-5	387	0.0	100	>95
17	7-12	498	2.2	97.8	>95
18	PK-5	461	0.8	99.2	>95

Procedures

The Tier I Cohort schools participated in the SWPBIS evaluations conducted in the fall and spring semesters of the 2008-09 academic year. The EBSSAS v.2 was completed via SurveyMonkey®. The survey was available for completion during a 2-week time interval. The internal coaches of each school were provided with instructions and examples to explain the responding procedures for the EBSSAS v.2. The responses for each school were collected from SurveyMonkey® by the external coaches and condensed into an Excel spreadsheet to determine the level of implementation and priority for improvement for schoolwide, nonclassroom, classroom, and individual systems as perceived by the school staff. The school-wide portion of the EBSSAS v.2 is available in Appendix A.

The SET v.2.1 was conducted by external coaches from a technical assistance grant agency funded by the state department of education, special education division. The external coaches followed the manual's procedures to administer and score the SET v.2.1: (a) interviewing an administrator at the school, (b) observing the presence of posted school-wide expectations and emergency procedures throughout the building, (c) conducting random interviews of 10-15 staff and 15 students regarding SWPBIS elements, and (d) reviewing permanent products to determine the level of implementation of SWPBIS practices. The SET v.2.1 manual does not specify how to randomly select the 10-15 staff and 15 students to interview; therefore, the sampling process at each school may have differed significantly. The complete version of the SET v.2.1 may be viewed in Appendix B.

Upon completion of the evaluations and calculation of scores, the schools'

internal coaches were provided instructions for understanding the report (see Appendices

C and D), summary of the evaluation results and specific recommendations to be utilized

for action planning by the SWPBIS team to address all SWPBIS elements not fully in

place at the time of the evaluation. The report provided to each participating school was

created by utilizing a report template developed by the researcher to systematically and

efficiently report results and provide evidence-based recommendations that could be

immediately incorporated into action plans by the SWPBIS team. The scoring and report

development process for each evaluation took approximately 1 to 1.5 hours per

participating school. The EBSSAS v.2 and SET v.2.1 report and action plan templates

can be viewed in Appendices E, F, and G. The list of the evidence base citations for the

recommendations provided in the report templates are presented in Appendices H and I.

Data Analysis

Two research tools utilized in this study to determine whether schools were

accurately implementing SWPBIS. The EBSSAS v.2 is a survey completed by all school-

building staff to measure the presence of SWPBIS systems and practices in place at the

school and identify priority for improvement on any elements not fully in place. The

EBSSAS v.2 is comprised of four sections (Schoolwide, Nonclassroom, Classroom, and

Individual Student), for the purpose of this study, only the schoolwide portion of the

EBSSAS will be utilized. The EBSSAS v.2 provides annual progress monitoring of

execution of the SWPBIS plan, supports decision making regarding effectiveness of PBIS

efforts, and guides future action planning (Hagan-Burke et al., 2005; Safran, 2006). The

SET v.2.1 includes 28 items arranged into 7 scales to evaluate the level of

implementation of the key features of SWPBIS. The SET v.2.1, completed annually by an external evaluator, includes a series of planned and random interviews, records review, and observations. The SWPBIS team is encouraged to create an action plan to address all items identified as being partially or not in place. Schools are deemed to be implementing SWPBIS with fidelity if they earn a score of 80% or greater on the second scale (Expectations Taught) and the Overall Scale. This established criterion of fidelity is known as scoring 80/80 on the SET v.2.1 (Todd et al., 2005).

1. To establish the reliability and concurrent validity, the items of the EBSSAS v.2 were arranged into subscales to mimic those of the SET v.2.1 measuring the seven key features of SWPBIS. The reliability of the SET v.2.1 and EBSSAS v.2 overall scale and subscales will be determined by using Cronbach's alpha. Concurrent validity will be established by examining the correlations between the EBSSAS v.2 and SET v.2.1.

2. To determine whether a large urban school system can successfully implement SWPBIS, the Spring PBIS evaluation results on the Expectations Taught and Overall Score were compared to the identified 80/80 criteria in which the ideal outcomes are that the school will earn a score of 80% or greater on the Expectations Taught and Total Scale of the SET v.2.1 and the school-wide portion of the EBSSAS v.2.

3. The effectiveness of the report template recommendations on implementation of SWPBIS practices will be determined by comparing the scores on spring EBSSAS v.2 and SET v.2.1 evaluations to those on the fall evaluations using a

paired samples t-test. Effect size for any significant comparisons will be

determined by calculating Cohen's *d*.

Chapter 3

Results

Analyses conducted in this study sought to establish the reliability and concurrent

validity of two common assessment tools in the field of SWPBIS to verify their utility in

assessing fidelity of SWPBIS practices. Additionally, the spring evaluation results of

participating schools were compared to the established criterion of 80/80 on the

Expectations Taught subscale and Overall Scale to confirm that SWPBIS can be

implemented with fidelity in a large urban school system. Finally, the impact of

providing evidence-based recommendations based on evaluation results was evaluated to

determine whether a systematic approach to external coaching is efficacious.

Reliability and Concurrent Validity of the SET v.2.1 and EBSSAS v.2 (School-wide

Portion)

To establish the reliability and concurrent validity, the items of the EBSSAS v.2

were arranged into subscales to mimic those of the SET v.2.1 measuring the seven key

features of SWPBIS. The arrangement of the EBSSAS v.2 subscales is presented in

Appendix J. The reliability of the SET v.2.1 and EBSSAS v.2 overall scale and subscales

was determined by calculating Cronbach's alpha for any subscale containing two or more

items. The reliability of the overall scale for the fall and spring administration of the

EBSSAS v.2 and SET v.2.1 was adequate (i.e., $\alpha \geq .60$). On the fall and spring EBSSAS,

subscales with adequate reliability included: System for Responding to Behavioral

Violations, Monitoring & Decision Making, Management, and District-level Support. On

the Behavioral Expectations Taught subscale, the spring EBSSAS had adequate

reliability; however, the fall score on the subscale was low ($\alpha = .406$). Reliability was not

established for the EBSSAS v.2 Expectations Defined and On-going System for

Rewarding Behavioral Expectations subscales because each contained only one item.

The Behavioral Expectations Taught subscale had adequate reliability on the fall

and spring SET v.2.1 scores. Additionally, the On-going System for Rewarding

Behavioral Expectations subscale on the fall SET v.2.1 was determined to be reliable.

Reliability for the Monitoring and Decision Making subscale on the spring administration

of the SET v.2.1 could not be determined due to a lack of variability among the scale

items. The reliability of several of the SET v.2.1 subscales (i.e., System for Responding

to Behavioral Violations, Monitoring & Decision Making, Management, and District-

level Support) was inadequate or non-existent. Results of the calculation of Cronbach's

alpha for EBSSAS v.2 and SET v.2.1 subscales and overall scale are presented in Table

2.

Table 2

Reliability of EBSSAS v.2 and SET v.2.1 Subscales

Subscale	EBSSAS		SET	
	Fall	Spring	Fall	Spring
	α	α	A	α
Expectations Defined			.441	.314
Behavioral Expectations Taught	.406	.762	.770	.610
On-going System for Rewarding Behavioral Expectations			.679	.468
System for Responding to Behavioral Violations	.880	.942	.483	-.156
Monitoring & Decision Making	.889	.923	.527	
Management	.915	.679	.205	-.198
District Level Support	.766	.748	.000	-.366
Overall Scale	.929	.947	.734	.731

To calculate the concurrent validity, a comparison of the degree of association between the mean scores on the overall scale and the Expectations Taught subscale of the EBSSAS v.2 and SET v.2.1 was conducted by calculating Pearson's product-moment correlation coefficients (results can be viewed in Table 3). Comparisons revealed no significant correlations; therefore, concurrent validity was not established for the EBSSAS v.2 when compared to the SET v.2.1.

Table 3

Pearson's Product-Moment Correlations Comparing Mean Scores on the SET v.2.1 &

EBSSAS v.2 Overall Scale and Expectations Taught Subscale.

Measure	r	p
Fall EBSSAS & SET Overall Scale	.404	.098
Spring EBSSAS & SET Overall Scale	-.151	.550
Fall EBSSAS & SET Expectations Taught Subscale	.285	.252
Spring EBSSAS & SET Expectations Taught Subscale	-.188	.455

*p < .05

Fidelity of SWPBIS Implementation in Large Urban School Systems

To determine whether a large urban school system can successfully implement

SWPBIS with fidelity, the spring PBIS evaluation results on the Expectations Taught

subscale and Overall Scale were compared to the identified 80/80 criteria. The ideal

evaluation outcomes are that the school will earn a score of 80% or greater on the

Expectations Taught and Total Scale of the SET v.2.1 and the school-wide portion of the

EBSSAS v.2 (see Table 4). Of the 18 participating schools, 13 (72%) schools met the

80/80 criteria on the Spring EBSSAS v.2 evaluation. Furthermore, 10 of the 18

participating schools (56%) scored 80% or higher on the Expectations Taught subscale

and the Total Scale on the SET v.2.1. Only 6 of the 18 schools (33%) met the 80/80

criteria on both the EBSSAS v.2 and the SET v.2.1, illustrating the lack of relationship

between EBSSAS v.2 and SET v.2.1 scores in the participating sample of schools.

Improvement in Fidelity Following Systematic Coaching

A paired samples *t* test was calculated to compare the fall and spring SET v.2.1 scores to establish the improvement in the spring assessments results after being provided evidence-based recommendations to address SWPBIS features not fully in place, as measured by the fall evaluations. Results indicated a significant difference in the scores for the fall SET v.2.1 (*M* = .840, *SD* = .094) compared to the spring SET v.2.1 Overall scale (*M* = .902, *SD* = .081; *t*(17) = -4.04, *p* = .001). Additionally, the comparison of the scores on the Expectations Taught subscale revealed a significant difference: fall SET Expectations Taught (*M* = 3.528, *SD* = 1.144) and spring SET Expectations Taught (*M* = 4.111, *SD* = .91644; *t*(17) = -3.207, *p* = .005). The effect size for the significant comparisons was calculated using Cohen's *d*. The effect sizes for the difference in the fall & spring SET Overall Scale (*d* = .952) and the fall & spring SET Expectations Taught subscale (*d* = .7558) were large. The results of the paired samples *t* test are presented in Table 5.

Given the inadequate reliability on the fall EBSSAS Behavioral Expectations Taught subscale, a paired samples *t* test was calculated only on the fall and spring Overall Scale. There was a significant difference in the fall and spring Overall Scale; however, the scores decreased rather than improved on the spring evaluation. Therefore, the schools did not improve the level of SWPBIS implementation, as measured by the EBSSAS v.2, in the spring semester after receiving their evidence-based recommendations related to their fall evaluation performance.

Table 4

EBSSAS v.2 & SET v.2.1 Mean Overall Scores and Expectations Taught

School	EBSSAS					SET				
	Overall		*Expectations Taught*			*Overall*		*Expectations Taught*		
	Fall	*Spring*	*Fall*	*Spring*	*80/80*	*Fall*	*Spring*	*Fall*	*Spring*	*80/80*
19	93	98	94	100	*	91	88	90	70	
20	94	76	96	89		88	96	60	90	*
21	92	87	98	94	*	73	95	50	90	*
22	98	78	100	82		88	93	90	90	*
23	90	94	94	97	*	91	96	90	100	*
24	98	90	100	97	*	80	86	50	60	
25	96	77	98	72		95	100	100	100	*
26	78	72	84	77		77	79	60	50	
27	83	93	90	97	*	80	91	80	80	*
28	96	80	97	91	*	88	95	80	100	*
29	89	97	87	99	*	61	75	30	60	
30	100	94	100	98	*	95	98	90	100	*
31	86	96	88	100	*	84	91	40	70	
32	93	76	93	85		84	100	80	100	*
33	91	91	91	93	*	100	96	100	100	*
34	90	83	96	89	*	71	75	90	100	
35	93	80	100	89	*	84	86	50	60	
36	92	92	92	97	*	84	84	40	60	
Mean	92	86	94	91		84	90	71	82	

*meets 80/80 criteria

Table 5

Results of Paired Samples t test Comparing Mean Scores of Fall and Spring SET

v.2.1 and EBSSAS v.2

Pair	*t*	*p*	*M*	*SD*
EBSSAS Overall Score	2.242	.039*	.055	.103
SET Overall Score	-4.040	.001**	-.062	.065
SET Expectations Taught Subscale Score	-3.207	.005**	-.117	.154

*p < .05.   ** *p* < .01.

Chapter 4

Discussion

SWPBIS Evaluations Reliability and Concurrent Validity

The arrangement of the EBSSAS v.2 schoolwide items into subscales, similar to the SET v.2.1, reveal adequate reliability for the Overall scale and all subscales that include two or more items. Likewise, the SET v.2.1 has adequate reliability for the Overall scale and the Expectations Taught subscale, but a number of scales had little to no reliability. Furthermore, concurrent validity cannot be established between the SET v.2.1 and EBSSAS v.2 revealing a lack of relationship between similar scales on the two evaluation tools.

Although the SET v.2.1 and EBSSAS v.2 are designed and utilized to measure and improve implementation of SWPBIS, evidently the evaluations are not measuring equivalent constructs. A possible explanation for the lack of relationship between the SET v.2.1 and EBSSAS v.2 items may be attributed to the nature of the evaluations (i.e., direct evaluation versus survey). The SET v.2.1 requires verification of SWPBIS implementation through interviews, observation, and review of permanent products. Conversely, the EBSSAS v.2 is a survey based on the respondents' perceptions and does not require evidence to verify their ratings. Therefore, perception and reality may differ greatly regarding the implementation of SWPBIS practices. Taking into consideration these issues, the results of the SET v.2.1 and EBSSAS v.2 evaluations must be interpreted with caution. Further analyses of the administration and scoring procedures should be conducted to improve the psychometric properties of the evaluation tools.

Urban School SWPBIS Implementation Fidelity

The results of the PBIS evaluations reveal that schools in a large urban setting can implement SWPBIS with fidelity. Considering the higher rates of discipline issues and high-risk environmental factors associated with large urban school settings, it is critical that the literature base emphasize SWPBIS as effective in prevent behavioral problems and improve social and academic competence.

In addition to the presence of many of the identified barriers to SWPBIS implementation in urban settings, further difficulties within the system included in the study involved a recent paradigm shift and an insistence on modifying PBIS practices to fit their system contextually. Prior to implementing SWPBIS district-wide two years preceding the study, the school system relied primarily on punitive consequences, including corporal punishment, to address discipline infractions. A decision was made at the district-level to discontinue the use of corporal punishment and begin implementation of SWPBIS; however, buy-in was not sought at the individual school level. Consequently, a number of schools were resistant to implementing SWPBIS with fidelity. Furthermore, the superintendent whom was influential in the adoption of SWPBIS for the district soon left the system for a new employment opportunity. Thusly, the support for SWPBIS implementation waned with administrative changes and schools were permitted to implement SWPBIS with varying fidelity and with continued reliance on punitive consequences such as suspending students (Bledsoe, 2010).

An additional impediment with consulting with the school district in the study was their resolve to develop unique discipline documentation and data collection procedures rather than following guidelines and programs supported by the OSEP

Technical Assistance Center on PBIS. The accuracy of discipline data collection was frequently called into question by the district and school-level PBIS team members. Despite these potential obstacles, the participating schools were able to implement SWPBIS with fidelity by meeting the 80/80 criteria on the SET v.2.1 and EBSSAS v.2. However, the results of the study should only be generalized toward school systems with similar demographics and individualized approach to SWPBIS.

Impact of Report and Recommendations Template

The participating schools demonstrated significant improvement in their spring SET v.2.1 results subsequent to being provided evidence-based recommendations to address all SWPBIS features not implemented fully at the time of the fall evaluation. The spring SET v.2.1 scores on the Expectations Taught subscale revealed an unanticipated downward trend in scores. This unexpected decrease in performance can be attributed to a confounding factor occurring in proximity to the spring evaluations. Specifically, at the time of the evaluations, the participating schools had recently completed state-mandated testing. During the time of the testing, the teachers had to remove all items from their walls including the school-wide rules. After completing the state-mandated testing, the majority of teachers had not reposted the rules because the semester was nearing its conclusion and classrooms have to be emptied for summer cleaning. A number of schools received a lower score on the Expectations Taught subscale because the rules were not posted in the locations specified on the SET (e.g., three classrooms). The decrease in the scores on this specific subscale was not a reflection of a lack of implementation of SWPBIS features, just unfortunate timing. Evaluators should be aware of such factors or

events that may create similar situations that do not reflect the true implementation of SWPBIS.

The evidence-based results did not have a significant impact on the spring EBSSAS v.2 results, possibly an indication that the recommendations for the EBSSAS v.2 were utilized differently than those for the SET v.2.1. The EBSSAS v.2 reflects the staff members' perceptions of SWPBIS implementation, which may be influenced by a number of factors. Similar to the time that the spring SET v.2 .1 evaluations were conducted; the schools' emphasis may have shifted from SWPBIS to performance on state-mandated testing. With this potential shift in priorities, the staff may have perceived that many of the SWPBIS practices were no longer being implemented at the schools. Additionally, to address concerns related to academic performance and discipline challenges, the district-level administrators instituted partial to total administration changes for some of the participating schools after the fall semester. The new building-level administration may have focused on different or competing initiatives resulting in a de-emphasis of SWPBIS practices.

Limitations

A number of limitations can be identified regarding the design of the study. In particular, the study's design did not incorporate a control group for comparison of SET v.2.1 and EBSSAS v.2 evaluation scores with the experimental group. When conducting research in applied settings, it can be difficult to determine the full impact of the intervention or treatment if there is not a control group to hold constant for comparison. Research conducted in natural settings, such as schools, may be more susceptible to the confounding effects of variables outside the control of the experimenter (Cooper, Heron,

& Heward, 2007). Specifically with this study, a commitment had been made to the participating school system to provide technical assistance in the described systematic format to all schools that completed the PBIS evaluations. Therefore, the circumstances prevented the establishment of a control group that would have completed the evaluations but not received any technical assistance in return. The establishment of a quid pro quo relationship when conducting research allows for research in applied settings, yet limits the impact of the research results.

Several limitations can be identified with the PBIS evaluations utilized in the study. To begin with, the EBSSAS v.2 is designed to be completed by the entire staff at a school. The benefit of surveying all staff is that it will represent the perceptions of the staff members and identify areas that need to be addressed either through improvement in procedures or informing staff of supports in place. The EBSSAS v.2 results in this study show a decline in the implementation of SWPBIS features; however, this may have not been an accurate representation of what is being done at school settings. Unlike the SET v.2.1, the EBSSAS v.2 is strictly a survey; therefore, there is no verification of item responses by providing evidence through permanent products or interviews. A number of survey takers may not be aware that specific practices are being implemented. Stagnation or even decreases in SWPBIS implementation, as perceived by the staff, may potentially be the result of not adequately providing frequent trainings and status updates to maintain an informed staff. Therefore, a number of the EBSSAS v.2 recommendations emphasize increasing staff involvement and accountability with implementing and maintaining SWPBIS.

Furthermore, staff members, particularly those not involved with the SWPBIS team or classroom instruction may not fully comprehend the survey questions on the EBSSAS v.2 and guessed at the status of implementation of SWPBIS systems. Finally, although the schools were instructed to have all staff complete the survey, the percentage of staff that completed the survey at each school and at each administration (i.e., fall and spring) varied significantly. To be included in the sample, the school was required to have at least 10 respondents for each administration of the EBSSAS v.2; however, this may have been a very small proportion of the schools' staff.

Multiple concerns regarding the administration of the SET v.2.1 need to be addressed to improve its utility. For example, the sampling procedures for interviewing staff and students should specify a percentage of the population, rather than the established procedure of interviewing 10-15 staff and 15 students at a school. For example, the SET manual could specify that 15% of the staff and student population should be randomly interviewed. To illustrate, consider school A and B. School A has a population of 1,000 students and 63 staff members. In contrast, school B has 600 students and 36 staff members. At school A, if the sampling criterion of 15% was employed, 150 students and 9 staff members would be randomly interviewed. At school B, 90 students and 5 staff members would be sampled. The new sample size would significantly increase the amount of students to interview; however, the results would more accurately represent the presence of SWPBIS practices and systems available at the school.

An additional concern regarding sampling procedures of the SET v.2.1 relates to the process of selecting staff and students randomly for the interviews. Sampling procedures may vary significantly at different school sites. The SET v.2.1 manual

indicates that classroom instruction should not be interrupted to interview staff and students, thusly; students and staff should be selected from settings in which they are readily accessible. For example, the cafeteria, hallways, teacher work room, and the playground are environments that staff and students may be available to direct a minute or two of their time and attention toward answering the interview questions. Unfortunately, this is a sample of convenience and may not represent the full impact of SWPBIS practices. Specifically, when selecting from limited locations, there may be an overrepresentation of a grade level (e.g., only first and second graders are in the cafeteria) or type of staff (e.g., primarily paraprofessionals in the break room), which may skew the results. Additionally, the SWPBIS team leader or an administrator may accompany the evaluator during the administration and influence whom is interviewed or the locations visited, as compared to the evaluator walking through the school unaccompanied. Evaluators can prepare for the interviews by procuring the daily transition schedule and map of the school site. Thus, allowing evaluators to select specific locations and times to target for more diverse sampling from a variety responders (e.g., two 1st graders, two 2nd graders, two 3rd graders, 3 teachers, 1 paraprofessional, 1 custodian, 1 office staff, etc.); thereby increasing the variability in the sampled population.

Implications for Practice

The expansion of SWPBIS practices in school systems throughout the United States illustrates the need for PBIS experts to evaluate processes for providing training, assistance, and progress monitoring efficiently to a large number of schools. Specifically, this study verifies that external coaches can effectively provide technical assistance

within a large urban school system via utilization of a reporting and recommendations template to improve fidelity of implementation at multiple school sites.

Schools could potentially improve the validity of EBSSAS v.2 results with an effort to educate and reinforce staff participation. Prior to administering the EBSSAS v.2, the SWPBIS team should provide a brief update to all staff about the PBIS practices implemented at the school and its impact on preventing behavioral infractions. The update would serve the purpose of increasing staff members' awareness of their school's SWPBIS efforts and commitment to preventing discipline problems. Further booster sessions throughout the academic year would increase staff members' understanding of SWPBIS practices and the vocabulary or jargon associated with SWPBIS, consequently increasing their comprehension of the EBSSAS v.2 questions.

To increase staff participation with completing the EBSSAS v.2, an incentive could be made available upon completion of the survey. Examples of potential incentives may include: a pass to wear blue jeans to work, snacks available in the room where the survey is completed, or public acknowledgement by administration during daily announcements. Once the SWPBIS team receives the results of the EBSSAS v.2 and recommendations to improve features not in place, the results and future actions should be shared with the entire staff to demonstrate the importance of the survey outcomes and how issues will be addressed by the team.

In this study, the results revealed an absence of reliability for a number of the SET v.2.1 subscales and a lack of relationship between the SET v.2.1 and EBSSAS v.2. These results elucidate the need for further revisions to the measures to enhance their reliability and validity, and, consequently, increase their utility as progress monitoring and

improvement tools. Concerns expressed about the SET v.2.1 sampling procedures and staff participation in and comprehension of the EBSSAS v.2 evaluation need to be addressed to increase the reliability and validity of these tools.

To enhance the impact and utility of the PBIS evaluation results, the reporting and recommendations template should be incorporated into the evaluation procedures available via PBIS Assessment© (www.pbisassessment.org), a web-based application developed to assist schools with the administration and scoring of PBIS evaluations. Local coordinators assist schools with completing annual and progress monitoring assessments. Upon completion of the evaluations, results are sent to the schools' PBIS internal coaches to utilize for action planning. Currently, the website does not provide specific recommendations to address features needing improvement or implementation. The inclusion of evidence-based recommendations with the evaluation results report may increase the efficacy of improvement efforts facilitated by PBIS teams.

Future Directions

To gain more evidence that the reporting process with evidence-based recommendations result in improvement in implementation of SWPBIS with fidelity, future research designs should include a control group (i.e., no recommendations provided) to examine the difference in spring PBIS evaluation results. It would be hypothesized that the experimental group provided a tailored report with evidence-based recommendations would demonstrate improvement in their evaluation scores and meet the 80/80 fidelity criteria when compared to the control group.

Additional research should focus on the application of the provided evidence-based recommendations. In particular, a permanent products review of PBIS teams'

evaluation action plans to identify number of recommendations utilized and implemented should be conducted. This investigation would provide further evidence regarding the efficaciousness of the SWPBIS team in improving their SWPBIS systems, data, and practices when provided evidence-based recommendations and specific instructions on developing actionable steps to address features not in place.

Future research activities should integrate a social validity measure to determine whether the external coaching process was contextually appropriate. Social validity can improve applied research in school settings by gaining subjective information from participants regarding perceived impact and significance of the intervention (Kennedy, 2005). A social validity measure should include the following questions to determine the acceptability of the evaluation and reporting process:

1. Did PBIS team find the results reporting process helpful?

2. Did PBIS team utilize recommendations in action planning?

3. Did the recommendations help the PBIS teams comprehend evaluation results better?

To continue to improve implementation and sustainability of SWPBIS within urban school districts, further research should measure administrators' and staff members' commitment to PBIS throughout the academic year to determine whether waning commitment is a factor associated with decreased fidelity. Additionally, research should compare fidelity of implementation at urban schools that emphasize SWPBIS as their primary discipline procedure versus schools that utilize competing initiatives such as zero-tolerance policies and other punitive consequences (e.g., corporal punishment, suspensions, and time-out).

The SET v.2.1 administration, recording, and scoring process could be improved by creating an electronic version (e-SET) that would allow administrators to utilize an electronic device to collect and record required information. The use of technology facilitates implementation and progress monitoring of selected interventions by automatically completing some tasks such as data graphing (Bicard, Bicard, Nichols, & Plank, 2011). Prior to entering the school to conduct the SET, the evaluator would enter the student and staff population and the e-SET would generate the appropriate number of response fields needed to randomly interview 15% of the population. The entire scoring and reporting process would automatically be completed upon conclusion of the evaluation. The evaluator would have the ability to customize the report to address the specific strengths and needs of the evaluation site and email the results to the internal PBIS coach at evaluated schools.

Conclusion

Despite the known challenges associated with establishing and sustaining district-wide initiatives within large urban school systems, this study reaffirms that SWPBIS can be implemented in such environments with high fidelity (80/80 on SET v.2.1 and EBSSAS v.2). Furthermore, the results of the study indicate that external coaching can be provided to a large number of schools in a systematic method to improve implementation of SWPBIS practices. Further revisions should be considered for the SET v.2.1 and EBSSAS v.2 to improve its validity and utility as a progress and improvement monitoring tool for schools implementing SWPBIS.

<center>**References**</center>

Algozzine, B., Horner, R. H., Sugai, G., Barrett, S., Dickey, S. R., Eber, L., Kincaid, D., Lewis, T., & Tobin, T. (2010). *Evaluation blueprint for school-wide positive behavior support*. Eugene, OR: National Technical Assistance Center on Positive Behavior Interventions and Support. Retrieved from www.pbis.org

Austin, J. L., & Soeda, J. M. (2008). Fixed-time teacher attention to decrease off-task behaviors of typically developing third graders. *Journal of Applied Behavior Analysis*, 41, 279-283.

Beard-Jordan, K., & Sugai, G. (2004). First Step to Success: An early intervention for elementary children at risk for antisocial behavior. *Behavioral Disorders*, 29, 396-409.

Bicard, S. C., Bicard, D. F., Nichols, K. J., & Plank, E. (2011). Technology for multi-tiered interventions for reading and behavior in early childhood education. In S. Blake, D. Windsor, & L. Allen (Eds.), *Child development and the use of technology: Perspectives, applications and experiences.* Hershey, PA: IGI.

Bledsoe, E. P. (2010). *The correlation between punitive consequences and the implementation of school-wide positive behavior support in an urban school district in the south* (Unpublished doctoral dissertation). The University of Memphis, Memphis, TN.

Bohanon, H., Fenning, P., Carney, K., Minnis, M., Anderson-Harris, S., Moroz, K., Hicks, K. J., Kasper, B. B., Culos, C., Sailor, W., & Piggott, T. D. (2006). School-wide application of urban high school positive behavior support: A case study. *Journal of Positive Behavior Interventions*, 8, 131-145.

<center>45</center>

Bradshaw, C., Debnam, K., Koth, C., & Leaf, P. (2009). Preliminary validation of the
implementation phases inventory for assessing fidelity of school-wide positive
behavior supports. *Journal of Positive Behavior Interventions*, 11(3), 145-160.

Bradshaw, C., Koth, C., Bevans, K., Ialongo, N., & Leaf, P. (2008). The impact of
school-wide positive behavioral interventions and supports (PBIS) on the
organizational health of elementary schools. *School Psychology Quarterly*, 23(4),
462-473.

Bradshaw, C., Mitchell, M., & Leaf, P. (2010). Examining the effects of school-wide
positive behavioral supports on student outcomes: Results from a randomized
controlled effectiveness trail in elementary schools. *Journal of Positive Behavior
Interventions,* 12(3), 133-148.

Brooks, A., Todd, A. W., Tofflemoyer, S., & Horner, R. H. (2003). Use of functional
assessment and a self-management system to increase academic engagement and
work completion. *Journal of Positive Behavior Intervention*, 5, 144-152.

Buluc, B. (2006). An analysis of classroom rules in secondary schools in Turkey.
Educational Research Quarterly, 29(3), 30.

Burke, M. D., Hagan-Burke, S., & Sugai, G. (2003). The efficacy of function-based
interventions for students with learning disabilities who exhibit escape-maintained
problem behavior: Preliminary results from a single case study. *Learning
Disabilities Quarterly*, 26, 15-25.

Burkwist, B. J., Mabee, W. S., & McLaughlin, T. F. (1987). The effect of a daily report
card system on inappropriate classroom verbalizations with a junior high school
learning-disabled student. *Techniques: A Journal for Remedial Education and*

Counseling, 3, 265-272.

Carter, D. R., & Horner, R. H. (2007). Adding functional behavioral assessment to first

 step to success: A case study. *Journal of Positive Behavior Interventions*, 9(4):

 229-238.

Chafouleas, S. M., Christ, T. J., Riley-Tillman, T. C., Briesch, A. M., & Chanese, J. A.

 M. (2007). Generalizability and dependability of direct behavior ratings to assess

 social behavior of preschoolers. *School Psychology Review*, 36(1), 63-79.

Chafouleas, S. M., McDougal, J. L., Riley-Tillman, T. C., Panahon, C. J., & Hilt, A. M.

 (2005). What do daily behavior report cards (DBRCs) measure? An initial

 comparison of DBRCs with direct observation for off-task behavior. *Psychology

 in the Schools*, 42(6), 669-676.

Chafouleas, S. M., Riley-Tillman, T. C., & McDougal, J. L. (2002). Good, bad, or in-

 between: How does the daily behavior report card rate? *Psychology in the

 Schools*, 39(2), 157-169.

Chafouleas, S. M., Riley-Tillman, T. C., & Sassu, K. A. (2006). Acceptability and

 reported use of daily behavior report cards among teachers. *Journal of Positive

 Behavior Interventions*, 8(3), 174-182.

Chafouleas, S., Riley-Tillman, C., Sassu, K., LaFrance, M., & Patwa, S., (2007) Daily

 behavior report cards: An investigation of the consistency of on-task data across

 raters and methods. *Journal of Positive Behavior Interventions*, 9(1), 30-37.

Cheney, D. A., Stage, S. A., Hawken, L. S., Lynass, L., Mielenz, C., & Waugh, M.

 (2009). A 2-year outcome study of the check, connect, and expect intervention for

 students at risk for severe behavior. *Journal of Emotional and Behavioral*

*Disorders¸*17(4), 226-243.

Cooper, J. O., Heron, T. E., & Heward, W. L. (2007). *Applied behavior analysis* (2nd
   ed.). Upper Saddle River, NJ: Prentice Hall.

Crone, D., Hawken, L., & Bergstrom, M., (2007). A demonstration of training,
   implementing and using functional behavioral assessment in 10 elementary and
   middle school settings. *Journal of Positive Behavior Interventions,* 9(1), 15-29.

Crone, D., Hawken, L., & Horner, R. (2010). *Responding to problem behavior in schools,
   second edition: The behavior education program. The Guilford Practical
   Intervention in the Schools Series.* New York, NY: Guilford Press.

Crone, D., A., Horner, R., H., & Hawken, L. S. (2004). *Responding to problem behavior
   in schools: The behavior education program.* New York, NY: Guilford Press.

Dixon, M. R., & Tibbetts, P. A. (2009). The effects of choice on self-control. *Journal of
   Applied Behavior Analysis,* 42(2), 243-252.

Ervin, R. A., DuPaul, G. J., Kern, L., & Friman, P.C. (1998). Classroom-based functional
   and adjunctive assessments: proactive approaches to intervention selection for
   adolescents with attention deficit hyperactivity disorder. *Journal of Applied
   Behavior Analysis,* 31(1), 65-78.

Ervin, R. A., Kern, L., Clarke, S., DuPaul, G. J., Dunlap, G., & Friman, P. C. (2000).
   Evaluating assessment-based intervention strategies for students with ADHD and
   comorbid disorders within the natural classroom context. *Behavioral Disorders*,
   25, 344-358.

Fairbanks, S., Sugai, G., Guardino, D., & Lathrop, M. (2007). Response to intervention:
   Examining classroom behavior support in second grade. *Exceptional Children,*

73(3), 288-310.

Fairchild, T. N. (1983). Effects of a daily report card system on an eighth grader

exhibiting behavioral and motivational problems. *The School Counselor*,

September, 83-86.

Fairchild, T. N. (1987). The daily report card. *Teaching Exceptional Children*, 19(2), 72-

73.

Filter, K. J., McKenna, M. K., Benedict, E. A., Horner, R. H., Todd, A. W., & Watson, J.

(2007). Check in/check out: A post-hoc evaluation of an efficient, secondary-

level targeted intervention for reducing problem behaviors in schools. *Education*

and Treatment of Children, 30(1), 69-84.

George, H. P., Kincaid, D., & Pollard-Sage, J. (2009). Primary-tier interventions and

supports. In W. Sailor, G. Dunlap, G. Sugai, & R. Horner (Eds.), Handbook *of*

positive behavior support. New York, NY: Springer.

Golly, A., Stiller, B., & Walker, H. M. (1998). First Step to Success: Replication and

Social Validation of an Early Intervention Program. *Journal of Emotional and*

Behavioral Disorders, 6(4), 243-250.

Gottfredson, D. C, Gottfredson, G. D., & Hybl, L. G. (1993). Managing adolescent

behavior: A multiyear multischool study. *American Educational Research*

Journal, 30(1), 179-215.

Hagan-Burke, S., Burke, M. D., Martin, E., Boon, R. T., Fore, III, C., & Kirkendoll, D.

(2005). The internal consistency of the school-wide subscales of the effective

behavior support survey. *Education and Treatment of Children*, 28(4), 400-413.

Hawken, L. S. (2006). School psychologists as leaders in the implementation of a

targeted intervention: The behavior education program. *School Psychology Quarterly*, 21(1), 91- 111.

Hawken, L. S, Adolphson, S. L., Macleod, K. S., & Schumann, J. (2009). Secondary-tier interventions and supports. In W. Sailor, G. Dunlap, G. Sugai, & R. Horner (Eds.), Handbook *of positive behavior support.* New York, NY: Springer.

Hawken, L. S., & Horner, R. H. (2003). Evaluation of a targeted intervention within a schoolwide system of behavior support. *Journal of Behavioral Education*, 12(3), 225-240.

Hawken, L. S., Macleod, K. S., & Rawlings, L. (2007). Effects of the *behavior education program* (BEP) on office discipline referrals of elementary school students. *Journal of Positive Behavior Interventions*, 9(2), 94-101.

Horner, R. (2009, March 26). *Extending the science, values and vision of Positive Behavior Support*. Speaker at Sixth International Conference on Positive Behavior Support, Jacksonville, FL.

Horner, R. H., Sugai, G., & Anderson, C. M. (2010). Examining the evidence base for school-wide positive behavior support. *Focus on Exceptional Children*, 42(8), 1-14.

Horner, R. H., Sugai, G., & Horner, H. F. (2000). A schoolwide approach to student discipline. *School Administrator*, 57(2), 20-27.

Horner, R. H., Sugai, G., Smolkowski, K., Eber, L., Nakasato, J., Todd, A. W., & Esperanza, J. (2009). A randomized, wait-list controlled effectiveness trial assessing school-wide positive behavior support in elementary schools. *Journal of Positive Behavior Interventions*, 11(3), 133-144.

Horner, R. H., Sugai, G., & Todd, A. W. (2001). "Data" need not be a four-letter word: Using data to improve schoolwide discipline. *Beyond Behavior*, 11(1), 20-22.

Horner, R. H., Sugai, G., Todd, A. W., & Lewis-Palmer, T. (2005). School-wide positive behavior support. In L. Bambara & L. Kern (Eds.), *Individualized supports for students with problem behaviors: Designing positive behavior plans* (pp. 359-390). New York: Guilford.

Horner, R. H., Todd, A. W., Lewis-Palmer, T., Irvin, L., K., Sugai, G., & Boland, J. B. (2004). The school-wide evaluation tool (SET): A research instrument for assessing school-wide positive behavior support. *Journal of Positive Behavior Interventions*, 6(1), 3-12.

Ingram, K., Lewis-Palmer, T., & Sugai, G. (2005). Function-based intervention planning: Comparing the effectiveness of FBA indicated and contra-indicated intervention plans. *Journal of Positive Behavior Interventions*, 7, 224-236

Kartub, D., Taylor-Greene, S., March, R., & Horner, R. (2000). Reducing hallway noise: A systems approach. *Journal of Positive Behavior Intervention*, 2(3), 179-182.

Kellam, S. G., Mayer, L. S., Rebok, G. W., & Hawkins, W. E. (1998). The effects of improving achievement on aggressive behavior and of improving aggressive behavior on achievement through two prevention interventions: An investigation of causal paths. In Dohrenwend, B. (Ed.) *Adversity, stress, and psychopathology* (pp. 486-505). Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Kennedy, C. H. (2005). *Single-case designs for educational research*. Boston, MA: Allyn and Bacon.

Kern, L., Hilt, A. M., & Gresham, F. (2004). An evaluation of the functional behavioral

    assessment process used with students with or at risk for emotional and behavioral

    disorders. *Education & Treatment of Children*, 27(4), 440-452.

Lassen, S. R., Steele, M. M., & Sailor, W. (2006). The relationship of school-wide

    positive behavior support to academic achievement in an urban middle school.

    Psychology in the Schools, 43, 701-712.

Lewis, T. J. (2009). Increasing family participation through schoolwide positive behavior

    supports. In W. Sailor, G. Dunlap, G. Sugai, & R. Horner (Eds.), *Handbook of*

    positive behavior support. New York, NY: Springer.

Lewis, T. J., Barrett, S., Sugai, G., & Horner, R. H. (2010). *Blueprint for school-wide*

    positive behavior support training and professional development. Eugene, OR:

    University of Oregon.

Lewis, T. J., & Sugai, G. (1999). Effective behavior support: A systems approach to

    proactive schoolwide management. *Focus on Exceptional Children*, 31(6), 1-24.

Lewis-Palmer, T., Sugai, G., & Larson, S. (1999). Using data to guide decisions about

    program implementation and effectiveness. *Effective School Practices*, 17, 47-

    53.

Lucyshyn, J., Albin, R., Horner, R.H., Mann, J. C., Mann, J. A., & Wadsworth, G.

    (2007). Family Implementation of Positive Behavior Support with a Child with

    Autism: A Longitudinal, Single Case Experimental and Descriptive Replication

    and Extension. *Journal of Positive Behavior Interventions*, 9(3), 131-150

Luselli, J. K., Putnam, R. F., Handler, M. W., & Feinberg, A. B. (2005). Whole-school

    positive behavior support: Effects on student discipline problems and academic

performance. *Educational Psychology*, 25(2-3), 183-198.

Luiselli, J. K., Putnam, R. F., & Sunderland, M. (2002). Longitudinal evaluation of

behavior support intervention in a public middle school. *Journal of Positive

Behavior Interventions*, 4(3), 182-188.

Madsen, C. H., Becker, W. C., & Thomas, D. R. (1968). Rules, praise, and ignoring:

Elements of elementary classroom control. *Journal of Applied Behavior Analysis,*

1(2), 139-150.

March, R. E., & Horner, R. H. (2002). Feasibility and contributions of functional

behavioral assessment in schools. *Journal of Emotional and Behavioral

Disorders*, 10(3), 158-170.

McCurdy, B. L., Kunsch, C., & Reibstein, S. (2007). Secondary prevention in the urban

school:Implementing the behavior education program. *Preventing School Failure*,

51(3), 12-19.

McIntosh, K., Chard, D. J., Boland, J. B., & Horner, R. H. (2006). Demonstration of

combined efforts in school-wide academic and behavioral systems and incidence

of reading and behavior challenges in early elementary grades. *Journal of Positive

Behavior Interventions*, 8, 146-154.

McIntosh, K., Horner, R. H., Chard, D. J., Boland, J. B., & Good, R. H., III. (2006). The

use of reading and behavior screening measures to predict nonresponse to school-

wide positive behavior support: A longitudinal analysis. *School Psychology

Review*, 35, 275-191.

McKevitt, B. C., & Braaksma, A. (2008). Best practices in developing a positive behavior

support system at the school level. In A. Thomas & J. Grimes (Eds.), *Best*

practices in school psychology, fifth edition (pp. 735-747). Bethesda, MD: National Association of School Psychologists.

Metzler, C. W., Biglan, A., Rusby, J. C., & Sprague, J. R. (2001). Evaluation of a comprehensive behavior management program to improve school-wide positive behavior support. *Education and Treatment of Children*, 24(4), 448-479.

Muscott, H., Mann, E., & LeBrun, M. (2008). Positive behavioral interventions and supports in New Hampshire: Effects of large-scale implementation of schoolwide positive behavior support on student discipline and academic achievement. *Journal of Positive Behavior Interventions*, 10(3), 190-205.

Nelson, J. R. (1996). Designing schools to meet the needs of students who exhibit disruptive behavior. *Journal of Emotional and Behavioral Disorders*, 4(3), 147-161.

Nelson, J.R., & Carr, B.A. (2000). *The Think Time strategy for schools.* Denver, CO: Sopris West.

Nelson, J. R., Duppong Hurley, K., Synhorst, L., & Epstein, M. (2008). The Nebraska three-tiered behavioral prevention model case study. In C. Greenwood, T. Kratochwill, and M. Clements (Eds.). *Schoolwide prevention models: Lessons learned in elementary schools* (pp. 61-86). New York, NY: Guilford.

Nelson, J. R., Martella, R., & Galand, B. (1998). The effects of teaching school expectations and establishing a consistent consequence on formal office disciplinary actions. *Journal of Emotional and Behavioral Disorders*, 6(3), 153-161.

Nelson, J. R., Martella, R. C., & Marchand-Martella, N. E. (2002). Maximizing student

learning: The effects of a comprehensive school-based program for preventing disruptive behaviors. *Journal of Emotional and Behavioral Disorders*, 10, 136-148.

Nersesian, M., Todd, A., Lehmann, J., & Watson, J. (2000). School-wide behavior support through district-level system change. *Journal of Positive Behavior Interventions*, 2, 244-247.

Netzel, D. M., & Eber, L. (2003). Shifting from reactive to proactive discipline in an urban school district: A change of focus through PBIS implementation. *Journal of Positive Behavior Interventions*, 5(2), 71-79.

Newcomer, L. L., & Lewis, T. J. (2004). Functional behavioral assessment: An investigation of assessment reliability and effectiveness of function-based interventions. *Journal of Emotional and Behavioral Disorders*, 12(3), 168-181.

Preciado, J., Horner, R. H., & Baker, S. (2009). Using a function-based approach to decrease problem behavior and increase academic engagement for Latino English Language Learners. *Journal of Special Education*, 42(4), 227-240.

Putnam, R., Horner, R. H., & Algozzine, R. (2006). Academic achievement and the implementation of school-wide behavior support. *Positive Behavior Interventions and Supports Newsletter*, 3(1). Available from http://www.pbis.org/news/New/Newsletters/Newsletter1.aspx

Putnam, R., McCart, A., Griggs, P., & Choi, J. H. (2009). Implementation of schoolwide positive behavior support in urban settings. In W. Sailor, G. Dunlap, G. Sugai, & R. Horner (Eds.), *Handbook of positive behavior support* (pp. 443-463). New York, NY: Springer.

Rey, J., Their, K., Handler, H., & Putnam, R. Primary prevention in urban schools: Are teachers 'Ready to Teach' prevention? Unpublished manuscript.

Rodriguez, B. J., Loman, S. L., & Horner, R. H. (2009). A preliminary ananlysis of the effects of coaching feedback on teacher implementation fidelity of *first step to success*. *Behavior Analysis in Practice*, 2(2), 11-21.

Rosenberg, M. S. (1986). Maximizing the effectiveness of structured classroom management programs: Implementing rule-review procedures with disruptive and distractible students. *Behavioral Disorders*, 11(4), 239.

Safran, S. P. (2006). Using the effective behavior supports survey to guide development of schoolwide positive behavior support. *Journal of Positive Behavior Interventions,* 8(1), 3-9.

Safran, S. P., & Oswald, K. (2003). Positive behavior supports: Can schools reshape disciplinary practices? *Exceptional Children*, 69(3), 361-373.

Sailor, W., Zuna, N., Choi, J. H., Thomas, J., & McCart, A. (2006). Anchoring school-wide positive behavior support in structural school reform. *Research and Practice for Persons with Severe Disabilities*, 31, 18-30.

Schumaker, J. B., Hovell, M. F., & Sherman, J. A. (1977). An analysis of daily report cards and parent-managed privileges in the improvement of adolescents' classroom performance. *Journal of Applied Behavior Analysis*, 10, 449-464.

Scott, T. M., Alter, P. J., Rosenberg, M., & Borgmeier, C. (2010). Decision-making in secondary and tertiary interventions of school-wide systems of positive behavior support. *Education & Treatment of Children*, 33(4), 513-535.

Scott, T. M., & Martinek, G. (2006). Coaching positive behavior support in school

settings: Tactics and data-based decision making. *Journal of Positive Behavior Interventions*, 8(3), 165-173.

Scott, J. S., White, R., Algozzine, B., & Algozzine, K. (2009). Positive unified behavior support on instruction. *The International Journal on School Disaffection*, 6(2), 41-48.

Simonsen, B., Myers, D., & Briere, III, D. E. (2010). Comparing a behavioral check-in/check-out (CICO) intervention to standard practice in an urban middle school setting using an experimental group design. *Journal of Positive Behavior Interventions*, 13, 31-48.

Smith, B., & Sugai, G. (2000). A self-management functional assessment-based behavior support plan for a middle school student with EBD. Journal of Positive Behavior Interventions, 2, 208-217.

Spaulding, S. A., Irvin, L. K., Horner, R. H., May, S. L., Emeldi, M., Tobin, T. J., & Sugai, G. (2010). Schoolwide social-behavioral climate, student problem behavior, and related administrative decisions: Empirical patterns from 1,510 schools nationwide. *Journal of Positive Behavior Interventions*, 12(2), 69-85.

Sprague, J., & Perkins, K. (2009). Direct and collateral effects of the first step to success program. *Journal of Positive Behavior Interventions*, 11(4), 208-221.

Sprague, J., Walker, H., Golly, A., White, K., Myers, D. R., & Shannon, T. (2001). Translating research into practice: The effects of a universal staff and student intervention on indicators of discipline and school safety. *Education and Treatment of Children*, 24(4), 495-511.

Sugai, G., & Horner, R. R. (1999). Discipline and behavioral support: Practices, pitfalls,

and promises. *Effective School Practices*, 17(4), 10-22.

Sugai, G., & Horner, R. R. (2002). The evolution of discipline practices: School-wide positive behavior supports. *Child & Family Behavior Therapy*, 24(1-2), 23-50.

Sugai, G., & Horner, R. R. (2006). A promising approach for expanding and sustaining school-wide positive behavior support. *School Psychology Review*, 35(2), 245-259.

Sugai, G., & Horner, R. R. (2009). Defining and describing schoolwide positive behavior support. In W. Sailor, G. Dunlap, G. Sugai, & R. Horner (Eds.), *Handbook of positive behavior support.* New York, NY: Springer.

Sugai, G., Horner, R. H., Algozzine, R., Barrett, S., Lewis, T., Anderson, C., Bradley, R., Choi, J. H., Dunlap, G., Eber, L., George, H., Kincaid, D., McCart, A., Nelson, M., Newcomer, L., Putnam, R., Riffel, L., Rovins, M., Sailor, W., & Simonsen, B. (2010). *School-wide positive behavior support: Implementers' blueprint and self-assessment.* Eugene, OR: University of Oregon.

Sugai, G., Horner, R. H., & Lewis, T. (2009). *School-wide positive behavior support implementers' blueprint and self-assessment*. Eugene, OR: OSEP TA-Center on Positive Behavioral Interventions and Supports.

Sugai, G., Horner, R. H., Lewis-Palmer, T., & Todd, A. (2005). *School-wide positive behavior support training manual*. Eugene, OR: Educational and Community Supports, University of Oregon.

Sugai, G., Horner, R. H., & Todd, A. (2003). *Effective behavior support self-assessment survey (EBS-SAS)*. Eugene, OR: University of Oregon.

Sugai, G., & Lewis, T. J. (1999). Developing positive behavioral support systems. In G.

Sugai & T. J. Lewis (Eds.). *Developing positive behavioral support for students with challenging behaviors* (pp.15-23). Alexandria, VA: Council for Children with Behavioral Disorders.

Sugai, G., Lewis-Palmer, T., Todd, A., & Horner, R. H. (2001). *The school-wide evaluation tool (SET).* Eugene, OR: University of Oregon.

Taylor-Green, S., Brown, D., Nelson, L., Longton, J., Gassman, T., Cohen, J., Swartz, J., Horner, R. H., Sugai, G., & Hall, S. (1997). School-wide behavioral support: Starting the year off right. *Journal of Behavioral Education*, 7, 99-112.

Taylor-Greene, S., & Kartub, D. (2000). Durable implementation of school-wide behavior support: The high five program. *Journal of Positive Behavior Interventions*, 2(4), 233-235.

Tennessee Department of Education (2009). *Tennessee Department of Education Report Card*. Nashville, TN: Author. Available at http://tn.gov/education/reportcard/index.shtml

Todd, A. W., Campbell, A. L., Meyer, G. G., & Horner, R. H. (2008). The effects of a targeted intervention to reduce problem behaviors: Elementary school implementation of check in-check out. (Report). *Journal of Positive Behavior Interventions*, 10(1), 46-56.

Todd, A. W., Horner, R. H., Sugai, G., & Colvin, G. (1999). Individualizing school-wide discipline for students with chronic problem behaviors: A team approach. *Effective School Practices*, 17, 72-82.

Todd, A. W., Lewis-Palmer, T., Horner, R. H., Sugai, G., Sampson, N. K., & Phillips, D. (2005). *School-wide evaluation tool manual*. Eugene, OR: University of Oregon.

Turnbull, A., Edmonson, H., Griggs, P., Wickham, D., Sailor, W., Freeman, R.,

    Guess, D., Lassen, S., McCart, A., Park, J., Riggel, L., Turnbull, R., & Warren, J.

    (2002). A blueprint for schoolwide positive behavior support: Implementation of

    three components. E*xceptional Children*, 63, 337-402.

Turnbull, R., Rainbolt, K., & Buchele-Ash, A. (1997). *Individual with Disabilities Act:*

    Digest and significance of 1997 amendments. Beach Center on Families and

    Disability, Lawrence, KS: University of Kansas.

Vincent, C., Spaulding, S., & Tobin, T. J. (2010). A reexamination of the psychometric

    properties of the school-wide evaluation tool (SET). *Journal of Positive Behavior*

    Interventions, 12(3), 160-179.

Walker, H. M., Horner, R. H., Sugai, G., Bullis, M., Sprague, J. R., Bricker, D., &

    Kaufman, M. J. (1996). Integrated approaches to preventing antisocial behavior

    patterns among school-age children and youth. *Journal of Emotional and*

    Behavioral Disorders, 4(4), 194-209.

Walker, H. M., Ramsey, E., & Gresham, F. M. (2003-04). Heading off disruptive

    behavior: How early intervention can reduce defiant behavior – and win back

    teaching time. *American Educator*, Winter, 6-21.

Walker, H. M., Seeley, J. R., Small, J., Severson, H. H., Graham, B. A., Feil, E. G.,

    Serna, L., Golly, A. M., & Forness, S. R. (2009). Randomized controlled trial of

    the first step to success early intervention: Demonstration of program efficacy

    outcomes in a diverse, urban school district. *Journal of Emotional and Behavioral*

    Disorders, 17(4), 197-212.

Warren, J. S., Bohanon-Edmonson, H. M., Turnbull, A. P., Sailor, W., Wickham, D.,

Griggs, P., & Beech, S. E. (2006). School-wide positive behavior support: Addressing behavior   problems that impede student learning. *Educational Psychology Review*, 18, 187-198.

Warren, J. S., Edmonson, H. M., Griggs, P., Lassen, S. R., McCart, A., Turnbull, A., & Sailor, W. (2003). Urban applications of school-wide positive behavior support: Critical issues and lessons learned. *Journal of Positive Behavior Interventions,* 5(2), 80-91.

Wheatley, R. K., West, R. P., Charlton, C. T., Sanders, R. B., Smith, T. G., & Taylor, M. J. (2009). Improving behavior through differential reinforcement: A praise note system for elementary school students. *Education and Treatment of Children*, 32(4), 551-572.

Wilcox, B. L., Turnbull, H. R., & Turnbull, A. P. (1999-2000). Behavioral issues and IDEA: PBS and the FBA in the disciplinary context. *Exceptionalities*, 8(3), 173-187.

Appendix A

Effective Behavior Support (EBS)

Self-Assessment Survey

Version 2.0

Data Collection Protocol

✓ Conducted annually, preferably in spring.
✓ Completed by all staff.
✓ Use results to design annual action plan.

Effective Behavior Support (EBS) Survey

Assessing and Planning Behavior Support in Schools

Name of school _____   Date _____

District _____   State _____

Person Completing the Survey:

· Administrator   · Special Educator   · Parent/Family member

· General Educator   · Counselor   · School Psychologist

· Educational/Teacher Assistant   · Community member · Other_____

1. Complete the survey independently.

2. Schedule 20-30 minutes to complete the survey.

3. Base your rating on your individual experiences in the school. If you do not work in
    classrooms, answer questions that are applicable to you.

To assess behavior support, first evaluate the <u>status</u> of each system feature (i.e. *in place,
partially in place, not in place*) (left hand side of survey). Next, examine each feature:

a. "What is the <u>current status</u> of this feature (i.e. *in place, partially in place, not in
     place*)?"
b. For those features rated as partially in place or not in place, "What is the <u>priority for
     improvement</u> for this feature (i.e., *high, medium, low*)?"

3. Return completed survey to: _____

SCHOOL-WIDE SYSTEMS

Current Status			Feature	Priority for Improvement		
In Place	Partial in Place	Not in Place	**School-wide** is defined as involving all students, all staff, & all settings.	High	Med	Low
			1. A small number (e.g. 3-5) of positively & clearly stated student expectations or rules are defined.			
			2. Expected student behaviors are taught directly.			
			3. Expected student behaviors are rewarded regularly.			
			4. Problem behaviors (failure to meet expected student behaviors) are defined clearly.			
			5. Consequences for problem behaviors are defined clearly.			
			6. Distinctions between office v. classroom managed problem behaviors are clear.			
			7. Options exist to allow classroom instruction to continue when problem behavior occurs.			
			8. Procedures are in place to address emergency/dangerous situations.			
			9. A team exists for behavior support planning & problem solving.			
			10. School administrator is an active participant on the behavior support team.			
			11. Data on problem behavior patterns are collected and summarized within an on-going system.			
			12. Patterns of student problem behavior are reported to teams and faculty for active decision-making on a regular basis (e.g. monthly).			
			13. School has formal strategies for informing families about expected student behaviors at school.			

Current Status			Feature	Priority for Improvement		
In Place	Partial in Place	Not in Place	**School-wide** is defined as involving all students, all staff, & all settings.	High	Med	Low
			14. Booster training activities for students are developed, modified, & conducted based on school data.			
			15. School-wide behavior support team has a budget for (a) teaching students, (b) on-going rewards, and (c) annual staff planning.			
			16. All staff are involved directly and/or indirectly in school-wide interventions.			
			17. The school team has access to on-going training and support from district personnel.			
			18. The school is required by the district to report on the social climate, discipline level or student behavior at least annually.			

Appendix B

School-wide Evaluation Tool
(SET)
Version 2.1

<u>Data Collection Protocol</u>

✓   Conducted annually.

✓   Conducted before school-wide positive behavior support interventions begin.

✓   Conducted 6-12 weeks after school-wide positive behavior support interventions are implemented.

School-wide Evaluation Tool

(SET)

Overview

<u>Purpose of the SET</u>

The School-wide Evaluation Tool (SET) is designed to assess and evaluate the critical features of school-wide effective behavior support across each academic school year. The SET results are used to:

1. assess features that are in place,
2. determine annual goals for school-wide effective behavior support,
3. evaluate on-going efforts toward school-wide behavior support,
4. design and revise procedures as needed, and
5. compare efforts toward school-wide effective behavior support from year to year.

Information necessary for this assessment tool is gathered through multiple sources including review of permanent products, observations, and staff (minimum of 10) and student (minimum of 15) interviews or surveys. There are multiple steps for gathering all of the necessary information. The first step is to identify someone at the school as the contact person. This person will be asked to collect each of the available products listed below and to identify a time for the SET data collector to preview the products and set up observations and interview/survey opportunities. Once the process for collecting the necessary data is established, reviewing the data and scoring the SET averages takes two to three hours.

Products to Collect

1. _____ Discipline handbook
2. _____ School improvement plan goals
3. _____ Annual Action Plan for meeting school-wide behavior support goals
4. _____ Social skills instructional materials/ implementation time line
5. _____ Behavioral incident summaries or reports (e.g., office referrals, suspensions, expulsions)
6. _____ Office discipline referral form(s)
7. _____ Other related information

<u>Using SET Results</u>

The results of the SET will provide schools with a measure of the proportion of features that are 1) not targeted or started, 2) in the planning phase, and 3) in the implementation/ maintenance phases of development toward a systems approach to school-wide effective behavior support. The SET is designed to provide trend lines of improvement and sustainability over time.

School-wide Evaluation Tool (SET)

Implementation Guide

School _____ **Date** _____

District _____ **State** _____

Step 1: Make Initial Contact
Identify school contact person & give overview of SET page with the list of products needed. Ask when they may be able to have the products gathered. Approximate date: _____ Get names, phone #'s, email address & record below. Name _____ Phone _____ Email _____ **Products to Collect** 1. _____ Discipline handbook 2. _____ School improvement plan goals 3. _____ Annual Action Plan for meeting school-wide behavior support goals 4. _____ Social skills instructional materials/ implementation time line 5. _____ Behavioral incident summaries or reports (e.g., office referrals, suspensions, expulsions) 6. _____ Office discipline referral form(s) 7. _____ Other related information
Step 2: Confirm the Date to Conduct the SET
Confirm meeting date with the contact person for conducting an administrator interview, taking a tour of the school while conducting student & staff interviews, & for reviewing the products. Meeting date & time: _____
Step 3: Conduct the SET
Conduct administrator interview. Tour school to conduct observations of posted school rules & randomly selected staff (minimum of 10) and student (minimum of 15) interviews. Review products & score SET.
Step 4: Summarize and Report the Results
Summarize surveys & complete SET scoring. Update school graph. Meet with team to review results. Meeting date & time: _____

School-wide Evaluation Tool

(SET)

Scoring Guide

School _____   **Date** _____

District _____   **State** _____

Pre _____   **Post** _____   **SET data collector** _____

Feature	*Evaluation Question*	Data Source (circle sources used) P= product; I= interview; O= observation	Score: 0-2
A. Expectations Defined	1. Is there documentation that staff has agreed to 5 or fewer positively stated school rules/ behavioral expectations? (0=no; 1= too many/negatively focused; 2 = yes)	Discipline handbook, Instructional materials **P** Other _____	
	2. Are the agreed upon rules & expectations publicly posted in 8 of 10 locations? (See interview & observation form for selection of locations). (0= 0-4; 1= 5-7; 2= 8-10)	Wall posters **O** Other _____	
B. Behavioral Expectations Taught	1. Is there a documented system for teaching behavioral expectations to students on an annual basis? (0= no; 1 = states that teaching will occur; 2= yes)	Lesson plan books, Instructional materials **P** Other _____	

Feature	*Evaluation Question*	Data Source (circle sources used) P= product; I= interview; O= observation	Score: 0-2
	2. Do 90% of the staff asked state that teaching of behavioral expectations to students has occurred this year? (0= 0-50%; 1= 51-89%; 2=90%-100%)	Interviews **I** Other _____	
	3. Do 90% of team members asked state that the school-wide program has been taught/reviewed with staff on an annual basis? (0= 0-50%; 1= 51-89%; 2=90%-100%)	Interviews **I** Other _____	
	4. Can at least 70% of 15 or more students state 67% of the school rules? (0= 0-50%; 1= 51-69%; 2= 70-100%)	Interviews **I** Other _____	
	5. Can 90% or more of the staff asked list 67% of the school rules? (0= 0-50%; 1= 51-89%; 2=90%-100%)	Interviews **I** Other _____	
C. On-going System for Rewarding Behavioral Expectations	1. Is there a documented system for rewarding student behavior? (0= no; 1= states to acknowledge, but not how; 2= yes)	Instructional materials, Lesson Plans, **P** Interviews Other _____	
	2. Do 50% or more students asked indicate they have received a reward (other than verbal praise) for expected behaviors over the past two months? (0= 0-25%; 1= 26-49%; 2= 50-100%)	Interviews Other _____ **I**	

Feature	*Evaluation Question*	Data Source (circle sources used) P= product; I= interview; O= observation	Score: 0-2
	3. Do 90% of staff asked indicate they have delivered a reward (other than verbal praise) to students for expected behavior over the past two months? (0= 0-50%; 1= 51-89%; 2= 90-100%)	Interviews Other _____ **I**	
D. System for Responding to Behavioral Violations	1. Is there a documented system for dealing with and reporting specific behavioral violations? (0= no; 1= states to document; but not how; 2 = yes)	Discipline handbook, Instructional materials **P** Other _____	
	2. Do 90% of staff asked agree with administration on what problems are office-managed and what problems are classroom–managed? (0= 0-50%; 1= 51-89%; 2= 90-100%)	Interviews Other _____ **I**	
	3. Is the documented crisis plan for responding to extreme dangerous situations readily available in 6 of 7 locations? (0= 0-3; 1= 4-5; 2= 6-7)	Walls Other _____ **O**	
	4. Do 90% of staff asked agree with administration on the procedure for handling extreme emergencies (stranger in building with a weapon)? (0= 0-50%; 1= 51-89%; 2= 90-100%)	Interviews Other _____ **I**	

Feature	*Evaluation Question*	Data Source (circle sources used) P= product; I= interview; O= observation	Score: 0-2
E. Monitoring & Decision-Making	1. Does the discipline referral form list (a) student/grade, (b) date, (c) time, (d) referring staff, (e) problem behavior, (f) location, (g) persons involved, (h) probable motivation, & (i) administrative decision? (0=0-3 items; 1= 4-6 items; 2= 7-9 items)	Referral form (circle items present on the referral form) **P**	
	2. Can the administrator clearly define a system for collecting & summarizing discipline referrals (computer software, data entry time)? (0=no; 1= referrals are collected; 2= yes)	Interview Other _____ **I**	
	3. Does the administrator report that the team provides discipline data summary reports to the staff at least three times/year? (0= no; 1= 1-2 times/yr.; 2= 3 or more times/yr)	Interview Other _____ **I**	
	4. Do 90% of team members asked report that discipline data is used for making decisions in designing, implementing, and revising school-wide effective behavior support efforts? (0= 0-50%; 1= 51-89%; 2= 90-100%)	Interviews Other _____ **I**	

Feature	*Evaluation Question*	Data Source (circle sources used) P= product; I= interview; O= observation	Score: 0-2
F. Management	1. Does the school improvement plan list improving behavior support systems as one of the top 3 school improvement plan goals? (0= no; 1= 4th or lower priority; 2 = 1st- 3rd priority)	School Improvement Plan, **P** Interview **I** Other _____	
	2. Can 90% of staff asked report that there is a school-wide team established to address behavior support systems in the school? (0= 0-50%; 1= 51-89%; 2= 90-100%)	Interviews **I** Other _____	
	3. Does the administrator report that team membership includes representation of all staff? (0= no; 2= yes)	Interview **I** Other _____	
	4. Can 90% of team members asked identify the team leader? (0= 0-50%; 1= 51-89%; 2= 90-100%)	Interviews **I** Other _____	
	5. Is the administrator an active member of the school-wide behavior support team? (0= no; 1= yes, but not consistently; 2 = yes)	Interview **I** Other _____	
	6. Does the administrator report that team meetings occur at least monthly? (0=no team meeting; 1=less often than monthly; 2= at least monthly)	Interview **I** Other _____	
	7. Does the administrator report that the team reports progress to the staff at least four times per year? (0=no; 1= less than 4 times per year; 2= yes)	Interview **I** Other _____	

Feature	Evaluation Question	Data Source (circle sources used) P= product; I= interview; O= observation	Score: 0-2
	8. Does the team have an action plan with specific goals that is less than one year old? (0=no; 2=yes)	Annual Plan, calendar **P** Other _____	
G. District-Level Support	1. Does the school budget contain an allocated amount of money for building and maintaining school-wide behavioral support? (0= no; 2= yes)	Interview **I** Other _____	
	2. Can the administrator identify an out-of-school liaison in the district or state? (0= no; 2=yes)	Interview **I** Other _____	
Summary Scores:	A = /4 B = /10	C = /6 D = /8 E = /8	
	F = /8 G = /4 Mean = /7		

Administrator Interview Guide

Let's talk about your discipline system

1) Do you collect and summarize office discipline referral information? Yes   No
   If no, skip to #4.
2) What system do you use for collecting and summarizing office discipline referrals?)
   a) What data do you collect? _____
   b) Who collects and enters the data? _____
3) What do you do with the office discipline referral information? (E3)
   a) Who looks at the data? _____
   b) How often do you share it with other staff? _____
4) What type of problems do you expect teachers to refer to the office rather than
   handling in the classroom/ specific setting? (D2)

5) What is the procedure for handling extreme emergencies in the building (i.e. stranger
   with a gun)? (D4)

Let's talk about your school rules or motto

6) Do you have school rules or a motto? Yes   No   If no, skip to # 10.
7) How many are there? _____
8) What are the rules/motto? (B4, B5)

9) What are they called? (B4, B5)

10) Do you acknowledge students for doing well socially? Yes   No   If no, skip to # 12.

11) What are the social acknowledgements/ activities/ routines called (student of month,
    positive referral, letter home, stickers, high 5's)? (C2, C3)

Do you have a team that addresses school-wide discipline? If no, skip to # 19

12) Has the team taught/reviewed the school-wide program with staff this year? (B3)
     Yes   No
13) Is your school-wide team representative of your school staff? (F3) Yes   No
14) Are you on the team? (F5) Yes   No
15) How often does the team meet? (F6) _____
16) Do you attend team meetings consistently? (F5) Yes   No
17) Who is your team leader/facilitator? (F4) _____
18) Does the team provide updates to faculty on activities & data summaries? (E3, F7)
      Yes   No

If yes, how often? _____

19)   Do you have an out-of-school liaison in the state or district to support you on positive behavior support systems development? (G2) Yes   No
If yes, who? _____

20)   What are your top 3 school improvement goals? (F1)

21)   Does the school budget contain an allocated amount of money for building and maintaining school-wide behavioral support? (G1) Yes   No

Additional Interviews

In addition to the administrator interview questions there are questions for Behavior Support Team members, staff and students. ***Interviews can be completed during the school tour.*** Randomly select students and staff as you walk through the school. Use this page as a reference for all other interview questions. Use the interview and observation form to record student, staff, and team member responses.

Staff Interview Questions

Interview a minimum of 10 staff

1. What are the _____ (school rules, high 5's, 3 bee's)? (B5)

2. (Define what the acronym means)

3. Have you taught the school rules/behavioral expectations this year? (B2)

4. Have you given out any _____ since _____? (C3)

5. (rewards for appropriate behavior)   (2 months ago)

6. What types of student problems do you or would you refer to the office? (D2)

7. What is the procedure for dealing with a stranger with a gun? (D4)

8. Is there a school-wide team that addresses behavioral support in your building?

9. Are you on the team?

Team Member Interview Questions

1. Does your team use discipline data to make decisions? (E4)

2. Has your team taught/reviewed the school-wide program with staff this year? (B3)

3.   Who is the team leader/facilitator? (F4)

Student interview Questions

Interview a minimum of 15 students

1.   What are the _____ (school rules, high 5's, 3 bee's)? (B4)
        (Define what the acronym means.)

2.   Have you received a _____ since _____?
        (C2) (reward for appropriate behavior)   (2 months ago)

Interview and Observation Form

	Staff questions (Interview a minimum of 10 staff members)							Team member questions			Student questions	
	What are the school rules? Record the # of rules known.	*Have you taught the school rules/ behave. exp. to students this year?*	*Have you given out any _____ since _____? (2 mos.)*	*What types of student problems do you or would you refer to the office?*	*What is the procedure for dealing with a stranger with a gun?*	*Is there a team in your school to address SW behavior support systems?*	*Are you on the team? If yes, ask team questions*	*Does your team use discipline data to make decisions?*	*Has your team taught/ reviewed SW program w/staff this year?*	*Who is the team leader/ facilitator?*	*What are the (school rules)? Record the # of rules known*	*Have you received a _____ since _____?*
1		Y N	Y N			Y N	Y N	Y N	Y N		1	Y N
2		Y N	Y N			Y N	Y N	Y N	Y N		2	Y N
3		Y N	Y N			Y N	Y N	Y N	Y N		3	Y N
4		Y N	Y N			Y N	Y N	Y N	Y N		4	Y N
5		Y N	Y N			Y N	Y N	Y N	Y N		5	Y N
6		Y N	Y N			Y N	Y N	Y N	Y N		6	Y N
7		Y N	Y N			Y N	Y N	Y N	Y N		7	Y N
8		Y N	Y N			Y N	Y N	Y N	Y N		8	Y N
9		Y N	Y N			Y N	Y N	Y N	Y N		9	Y N

#	Front hall/office	Class 1	Class 2	Class 3	Cafeteria	Library	Other setting	Hall 1	#	Hall
10		Y N	Y N			Y N	Y N	Y N	Y N		10	Y N
11		Y N	Y N			Y N	Y N	Y N	Y N		11	Y N
12		Y N	Y N			Y N	Y N	Y N	Y N		12	Y N
13		Y N	Y N			Y N	Y N	Y N	Y N		13	Y N
14		Y N	Y N			Y N	Y N	Y N	Y N		14	Y N
15		Y N	Y N			Y N	Y N	Y N	Y N		15	Y N
Tot						**X**					Total	

Location	Front hall/ office	Class 1	Class 2	Class 3	Cafeteria	Library	Other setting (gym, lab)	Hall 1	Hall 2	Hall 3
Are rules & expectations posted?	Y N	Y N	Y N	Y N	Y N	Y N	Y N	Y N	Y N	Y N
Is the documented crisis plan readily available?	Y N	Y N	Y N	Y N	Y N	Y N	Y N	**X**	X	X

Appendix C

Understanding EBSSAS Results and Recommendations

Dear Administrators and PBIS Team Leaders:

The Effective Behavior Supports Self-Assessment Survey (SAS) has been completed by your staff. The purpose of the EBSSAS is to assess staff's perceptions of the current status of the PBIS program at your school. Enclosed are the results of the EBSSAS that the PBIS team can utilize to develop action steps for any SAS items that were scored as "Not In Place" or "Partially In Place." Items highlighted as yellow are "Partially In Place" and those highlighted as red are "Not In Place." The ideal results are 80% or greater for each School-wide Positive Behavior Support feature assessed by the EBSSAS. Some features may be rated as "Not In Place" or "Partially In Place" despite them being in place. This may be an issue of the PBIS team needing to communicate with the staff the proactive procedures that are in place at the school to prevent problem behaviors. Recommendations are provided to improve or initiate features rated as "Not In Place" or "Partially In Place."

Appendix D

Understanding SET Results and Report

Dear Administrators and PBIS Team Leaders:

The School-wide Evaluation Tool (SET) has been completed for your school. The purpose of the SET is to assess the current status of the PBIS program at your school. Enclosed are the results of the SET that the PBIS team can utilize to develop action steps for any SET items that were scored as "Not In Place" or "Partially In Place." The ideal results are 80% or greater for the Teaching Behavioral Expectations subscale and the Overall Mean score for the SET. Recommendations are provided to improve or initiate features rated as "Not In Place" or "Partially In Place."

Appendix E

EBSSAS Report Template & Recommendations

School-wide Systems
Supports "In Place"
1. A small number (e.g., 3-5) of positively & clearly stated student expectations or rules are defined.
2. Expected student behaviors are taught directly.
3. Expected student behaviors are rewarded regularly.
4. Problem behaviors (failure to meet expected student behaviors) are defined clearly.
5. Consequences for problem behaviors are defined clearly.
6. Distinctions between office v. classroom managed problem behaviors are clear.
7. Options exist to allow classroom instruction to continue when problem behavior occurs.
8. Procedures are in place to address emergency/dangerous situations.
9. A team exists for behavior support planning & problem solving.
10. School administrator is an active participant on the behavior support team.
11. Data on problem behavior patterns are collected and summarized within an on-going system.
12. Patterns of student problem behavior are reported to teams and faculty for active decision-making on a regular basis (e.g. monthly).

13. School has formal strategies for informing families about expected student behaviors at school.	
14. Booster training activities for students are developed, modified, & conducted based on school data.	
15. School-wide behavior support team has a budget for (a) teaching students, (b) on-going rewards, and (c) annual staff planning.	
16. All staff are involved directly and/or indirectly in school-wide interventions.	
17. The school team has access to on-going training and support from district personnel.	
18. The school is required by the district to report on the social climate, discipline level or student behavior at least annually.	

Recommendations: No actions needed; continue with current classroom supports in place at the school

Supports "Partially In Place"	**Priority Level**
1. A small number (e.g. 3-5) of positively & clearly stated student expectations or rules are defined.	

Recommendations: Develop 3-5 umbrella rules that apply to all settings in the school building. Rules should be concise and easy to remember. The rules should tell students "what to do" instead of "what not to do." Example: "Be Respectful," "Be Responsible," & "Be Safe"

2. Expected student behaviors are taught directly.	

Recommendations: Develop a Behavior Expectation Matrix that describes what appropriate behaviors the students should display in the various settings of the building. The behavioral expectations should fall under the 3-5 School-wide rules. Expectation Matrix should be displayed in all locations of the school building (i.e., classrooms, hallways, bathrooms, cafeteria, playground, main office, auditorium, etc.). The students should be directly taught the expected behaviors for each location.

3. Expected student behaviors are rewarded regularly.	

Recommendations: A school-wide system of reinforcement should be developed to encourage students to engage in appropriate behaviors. The school-wide reinforcement

program should allow all building staff to randomly "catch students being good." All reinforcement should incorporate a verbal praise and tangible reward component. Students should have the opportunity to receive reinforcement for appropriate behaviors on a daily, weekly, monthly, quarterly, and yearly basis.	
4. Problem behaviors (failure to meet expected student behaviors) are defined clearly.	
Recommendations: All behavioral infractions should have a written description to ensure that all staff are able to consistently identify problem behaviors.	
5. Consequences for problem behaviors are defined clearly.	
Recommendations: A flowchart should be developed that identifies the procedures for responding to misbehaviors, including repeated infractions.	
6. Distinctions between office v. classroom managed problem behaviors are clear.	
Recommendations: Behavioral infractions should be described in a manner in which all staff can consistently identify which infractions should be handled by the staff and those that should be handled immediately by an administrator.	
7. Options exist to allow classroom instruction to continue when problem behavior occurs.	
Recommendations: Teach staff how to respond to "minor" behavioral infractions in the classroom that will reduce the likelihood of escalation of behaviors that will impede students' ability to learn in the classroom. Specific procedures on how to report "major" infractions and transport the student to the office should be taught to staff.	
8.Procedures are in place to address emergency/dangerous situations.	.
Recommendations: Develop and publish procedures for responding to emergency situations. Train entire staff using scenarios in which they have to practice the appropriate response procedures.	
9. A team exists for behavior support planning & problem solving.	
Recommendations: Develop a team that is representative of the staff. The purpose of the team is implement and monitor positive behavior supports.	

10. School administrator is an active participant on the behavior support team.	
Recommendations: Recommendation: PBIS administrator must be completely available during monthly PBS meetings and training activities (i.e., physically present at entire meeting, actively engaging in the team's roles and activities, etc.)	
11. Data on problem behavior patterns are collected and summarized within an on-going system.	
Recommendations: Inform staff of data collection procedures and system currently utilized by the school. Provide monthly progress reports to entire staff to demonstrate how the data is utilized for problem solving and progress monitoring of current positive behavior supports.	
12. Patterns of student problem behavior are reported to teams and faculty for active decision-making on a regular basis (e.g. monthly).	
Recommendations: PBIS team analyzes patterns of referrals as categorized by "Average Referrals per Day per Data Period," "Infraction/Problem Behavior," "Location," "Time of Day," and "Students with 1 or more Major referrals" at each meeting to problem solve how to improve positive behavior support.	
13. School has formal strategies for informing families about expected student behaviors at school.	
Recommendations: School provides written documentation of the school-wide rules and expected behaviors in the student handbook. The rules/expectations and PBIS program should be discussed at all school functions that families attend.	
14. Booster training activities for students are developed, modified, & conducted based on school data.	
Recommendations: Extra training sessions to practice expected behaviors should be provided to students throughout the academic year. Planning booster sessions for times of the year that historically have higher rates of discipline referrals (e.g., After Spring Break) to prevent spikes in referrals will be advantageous. Additional booster sessions should be conducted when discipline data indicates an increase in referral rates.	
15. School-wide behavior support team has a budget for (a) teaching students, (b) on-going rewards, and (c) annual staff planning.	
Recommendations: Annual budget planning should allot monies to sustain the PBIS program at the school.	

16. All staff are involved directly and/or indirectly in school-wide interventions.	
Recommendations: All staff (including support teachers, paraprofessionals, office staff, custodians, etc.) should be trained to respond to appropriate and inappropriate behaviors according to the school's PBIS program. All staff should be responsible for providing rewards to students for good behavior and reporting any behavioral infractions with appropriate referral form and procedures.	
17. The school team has access to on-going training and support from district personnel.	
Recommendations: District-level PBIS liaison should provide activities to the entire staff that train and reinforce the PBIS program. The PBIS team should provide monthly updates regarding discipline data and PBIS activities to the district-level liaison.	
18. The school is required by the district to report on the social climate, discipline level or student behavior at least annually.	
Recommendations: Provide annual reports to the district-level liaison regarding the status of the PBIS program at the school. Inform staff that updates are provided to the district regarding the PBIS program.	
Supports "Not In Place"	**Priority Level**
1. A small number (e.g. 3-5) of positively & clearly stated student expectations or rules are defined.	
Recommendations: Develop 3-5 umbrella rules that apply to all settings in the school building. Rules should be concise and easy to remember. The rules should tell students "what to do" instead of "what not to do." Example: "Be Respectful," "Be Responsible," & "Be Safe"	
2. Expected student behaviors are taught directly.	
Recommendations: Develop a Behavior Expectation Matrix that describes what appropriate behaviors the students should display in the various settings of the building. The behavioral expectations should fall under the 3-5 School-wide rules. Expectation Matrix should be displayed in all locations of the school building (i.e., classrooms, hallways, bathrooms, cafeteria, playground, main office, auditorium, etc.). The students should be directly taught the expected behaviors for each location.	
3. Expected student behaviors are rewarded regularly.	

Recommendations: A school-wide system of reinforcement should be developed to encourage students to engage in appropriate behaviors. The school-wide reinforcement program should allow all building staff to randomly "catch students being good." All reinforcement should incorporate a verbal praise and tangible reward component. Students should have the opportunity to receive reinforcement for appropriate behaviors on a daily, weekly, monthly, quarterly, and yearly basis.	
4. Problem behaviors (failure to meet expected student behaviors) are defined clearly.	
Recommendations: All behavioral infractions should have a written description to ensure that all staff are able to consistently identify problem behaviors.	
5. Consequences for problem behaviors are defined clearly.	
Recommendations: A flowchart should be developed that identifies the procedures for responding to misbehaviors, including repeated infractions.	
6. Distinctions between office v. classroom managed problem behaviors are clear.	
Recommendations: Behavioral infractions should be described in a manner in which all staff can consistently identify which infractions should be handled by the staff and those that should be handled immediately by an administrator.	
7. Options exist to allow classroom instruction to continue when problem behavior occurs.	
Recommendations: Teach staff how to respond to "minor" behavioral infractions in the classroom that will reduce the likelihood of escalation of behaviors that will impede students' ability to learn in the classroom. Specific procedures on how to report "major" infractions and transport the student to the office should be taught to staff.	
8.Procedures are in place to address emergency/dangerous situations.	.
Recommendations: Develop and publish procedures for responding to emergency situations. Train entire staff using scenarios in which they have to practice the appropriate response procedures.	
9. A team exists for behavior support planning & problem solving.	
Recommendations: Develop a team that is representative of the staff. The purpose of the team is implement and monitor positive behavior supports.	

10. School administrator is an active participant on the behavior support team.	
Recommendations: Recommendation: PBIS administrator must be completely available during monthly PBS meetings and training activities (i.e., physically present at entire meeting, actively engaging in the team's roles and activities, etc.)	
11. Data on problem behavior patterns are collected and summarized within an on-going system.	
Recommendations: Inform staff of data collection procedures and system currently utilized by the school. Provide monthly progress reports to entire staff to demonstrate how the data is utilized for problem solving and progress monitoring of current positive behavior supports.	
12. Patterns of student problem behavior are reported to teams and faculty for active decision-making on a regular basis (e.g. monthly).	
Recommendations: PBIS team analyzes patterns of referrals as categorized by "Average Referrals per Day per Data Period," "Infraction/Problem Behavior," "Location," "Time of Day," and "Students with 1 or more Major referrals" at each meeting to problem solve how to improve positive behavior support.	
13. School has formal strategies for informing families about expected student behaviors at school.	
Recommendations: School provides written documentation of the school-wide rules and expected behaviors in the student handbook. The rules/expectations and PBIS program should be discussed at all school functions that families attend.	
14. Booster training activities for students are developed, modified, & conducted based on school data.	
Recommendations: Extra training sessions to practice expected behaviors should be provided to students throughout the academic year. Planning booster sessions for times of the year that historically have higher rates of discipline referrals (e.g., After Spring Break) to prevent spikes in referrals will be advantageous. Additional booster sessions should be conducted when discipline data indicates an increase in referral rates.	
15. School-wide behavior support team has a budget for (a) teaching students, (b) on-going rewards, and (c) annual staff planning.	
Recommendations: Annual budget planning should allot monies to sustain the PBIS program at the school.	

16. All staff are involved directly and/or indirectly in school-wide interventions.	
Recommendations: All staff (including support teachers, paraprofessionals, office staff, custodians, etc.) should be trained to respond to appropriate and inappropriate behaviors according to the school's PBIS program. All staff should be responsible for providing rewards to students for good behavior and reporting any behavioral infractions with appropriate referral form and procedures.	
17. The school team has access to on-going training and support from district personnel.	
Recommendations: District-level PBIS liaison should provide activities to the entire staff that train and reinforce the PBIS program. The PBIS team should provide monthly updates regarding discipline data and PBIS activities to the district-level liaison.	
18. The school is required by the district to report on the social climate, discipline level or student behavior at least annually.	
Recommendations: Provide annual reports to the district-level liaison regarding the status of the PBIS program at the school. Inform staff that updates are provided to the district regarding the PBIS program.	

Appendix F

SET Report & Recommendations

A. Expectations Defined		
Evaluation Questions	**Evidence**	**Status**
1. Is there documentation that staff has agreed to 5 or fewer positively stated school rules/behavioral expectations?		
Comments:		
Recommendations: • Involve staff in developing brief, positively stated rules that will apply to all locations of the school building. Rules should be selected based on a consensus of the group. • Have rules describe what students should do rather than what they should not do. • All rules and procedures at the school should align with the school-wide rules. • Further define how students are expected to behave using the Expectation Matrix. Make sure that the rules listed are the school-wide rules with specific expectations listed for the various building locations. • Ensure that teachers have aligned their classroom rules with the school-wide rules. Specifics regarding rules should be provided in the behavior expectations for the classroom.		
2. Are the agreed upon rules & expectations publicly posted in 8 of 10 locations?		
Comments:		
Recommendations: • Create posters listing the 3-5 school rules. • Rules should be posted in classrooms, main office, hallways, gymnasium/auditorium, cafeteria, computer lab, library, etc. • Make sure that posted rules do not compete with each other (e.g., posting school-wide rules and hallway rules next to each other). The specifics procedures for the hallway should be listed as Hallway expectations that fall under the school-wide rules. • Make sure posted rules are visible, appealing, and large enough to be read.		

B. Behavioral Expectations Taught		
Evaluation Questions	**Evidence**	**Status**
1. Is there a documented system for teaching behavioral expectations to students on an annual basis?		
Comments:		
Recommendations: • Develop lesson plans that teach examples and non-examples of the behavioral expectations. • Include written lesson plans in PBIS documents. • Provide opportunities for students to practice the behavioral expectations throughout the locations of the building.		
2. Do 90% of the staff interviewed state that teaching of behavioral expectations to students has occurred this year?		
Comments:		
Recommendations: • Involve all staff (including paraprofessionals, cafeteria workers, safety officers, office staff, etc.) in the teaching of school-wide rules and behavioral expectations. • Provide training to staff on how to teach school-wide rules and expectations.		
3. Do 90% of PBIS team members interviewed state that the school-wide program has been taught/reviewed with staff on an annual basis?		
Comments:		
Recommendations: • Provide training to entire school staff prior to the return of students on the rationale and procedures for school-wide positive behavior support. Review PBIS procedures throughout the year at staff meetings.		
4. Can at least 70% of interviewed students state 67% of the school rules?		
Comments:		
Recommendations: • Make sure that rules are easy to remember. • Review rules with students on a daily basis. • Provide booster sessions to retrain or reinforce the teaching of the school-wide		

rules and expectations throughout the academic year.
• Develop opportunities among the grades to demonstrate understanding of the rules (e.g., skits, posters, essay contests, chants, songs).
• Develop a name for the school-wide rules (e.g., "The Three Bee's") to help students remember the school-wide rules.

5. Can 90% or more of interviewed staff state 67% of the school rules?		

Comments:

Recommendations:
- Make sure that rules are easy to remember.
- Stress the importance for all staff to know the rules.
- Have entire staff participate in the development and posting of the school-wide rules and behavior expectations.

C. On-going System for Rewarding Behavioral Expectations

Evaluation Questions	Evidence	Status
1. Is there a documented system for rewarding student behavior?		

Comments:

Recommendations:
- Reinforcement program description should include all of the logistics necessary for maintaining the reinforcement program throughout the school year.
- Make sure that school-wide reinforcement program is in place prior to the students beginning the school year.
- Develop a "catchy" name for the school-wide reinforcement program (e.g., "Caught Being Good" or "DHS 200 Club").
- Include written description of School-wide reinforcement program in PBIS materials.

2. Do 50% or more interviewed students indicate they have received a reward (other than verbal praise) for expected behaviors over the past two months?		

Comments:

Recommendations:
- Train all staff to randomly reinforce students for engaging in expected behaviors. Reinforcement should not be available only for the "good kids" or the "trouble students."
- Provide training to students on what the school-wide reinforcement program is called and how they can earn reinforcement for engaging in expected behaviors.
- Make sure students know the name of the school-wide reinforcement program.
- Reinforcement of students should be occurring on a daily, weekly, monthly, quarterly, and yearly basis. If students have to wait too long to collect their reinforcement, they are less likely to make the connection between the reward and their good behavior.
- Develop a recording system to document the names of students who have earned the school-wide reinforcement.
- Always pair verbal praise describing the appropriate behavior when delivering a tangible reinforcer to a student.

3. Do 90% of staff indicate they have delivered a reward (other than verbal praise) for expected behaviors over the past two months?		

Comments:

Recommendations:
- Develop a school-wide reinforcement program in which all staff have the opportunity to reinforce students on a daily basis.
- Train the staff on the importance of reinforcing expected behaviors.
- Allow staff to be responsible for recruiting and delivering incentives to students.

D. System for Responding to Behavioral Violations

Evaluation Questions	Evidence	Status
1. Is there a documented system for dealing with and reporting specific behavior violations?		

Comments:

Recommendations:
- Develop procedures and train all staff on how to document and report behavioral violations.
- Provide specific definitions and examples of behavior violations to ensure consistency in reporting.

2. Do 90% of the staff interviewed agree with administration on what problems are office-managed		

and what problems are classroom-managed?		
Comments:		
Recommendations: • Train staff on which behaviors are "major" and must be sent directly to the office versus "minor" behaviors that can be handled in the setting they occur. • Develop a response flowchart to identify the procedures for responding to minor and major behaviors. • Include procedure in flowchart regarding the response to recurring behavioral violations. • Provide staff with examples of how to consequent "minor" behavioral violations. • Include written definition of behavioral violations and flowchart in PBIS materials.		
3. Is the documented crisis plan for responding to extreme dangerous situations posted in 6 of 7 locations?		
Comments:		
Recommendations: • Ensure that crisis plan is immediately available in all locations of the school building including the classrooms, main office, gymnasium/auditorium, cafeteria, computer lab, and library.		
4. Do 90% of interviewed staff agree with administration on the procedure for handling extreme emergencies (e.g., person in the building with a weapon)?		
Comments:		
Recommendations: • Train all support staff on emergency procedures. • If the school has a code word to notify the staff of the need to "lockdown" the building, make sure that everyone knows the code word and it is easy to remember.		

E. Monitoring & Decision Making

Evaluation Questions	Evidence	Status
1. Does the discipline referral form list (a)student/grade, (b)date, (c)time, (d)referring staff, (e)problem behavior, (f)location, (g)persons involved, (h)probable motivation, & (i)administrative decision?		

Comments:		
Recommendations: • Make sure all relevant information is on office referral forms.		
2. Can the administrator clearly define a system for collecting & summarizing discipline referrals?		
Comments:		
Recommendations: • Identify the district's discipline data collection system. Attend trainings on how to use the system (if necessary).		
3. Does the administrator report that the team provides discipline data summary reports to the staff at least three times/year?		
Comments:		
Recommendations: • Include time for data reporting during scheduled staff professional development days.		
4. Do 90% of interviewed team members report that discipline data is used for making decisions in designing, implementing, and revising school-wide effective behavior support efforts?		
Comments:		
Recommendations: • Incorporate data analysis review into every PBIS team meeting.		
F. Management		
Evaluation Questions	**Evidence**	**Status**
1. Does the school improvement plan list improving behavior support systems as one of the top 3 school improvement plan goals?		
Comments:		
Recommendations: • Develop goals that incorporate positive behavior supports, school climate and/or attendance.		

2. Can 90% of interviewed staff report that there is a school-wide team established to address behavior support systems in the school?		
Comments:		
Recommendations: • Identify PBIS team members at staff trainings.		
3. Does the administrator report that team membership includes representation of all staff?		
Comments:		
Recommendations: • Allow opportunities for different staff members to join the PBIS team each year while maintaining the core team.		
4. Can 90% of interviewed team members identify the team leader?		
Comments:		
Recommendations: • Develop a list of team members with the team leader identified. • Ensure that team has nominated the team leader by consensus.		
5. Is the administrator an active member of the school-wide behavior support team?		
Comments:		
Recommendations: • PBIS administrator must be completely available during monthly PBS meetings and training activities (i.e., physically present at entire meeting, actively engaging in the team's roles and activities, etc.)		
6. Does the administrator report that team meetings occur at least monthly?		
Comments:		
Recommendations: • Develop an annual PBIS calendar that includes dates for monthly meetings, training activities, data reports, assessments, etc.		
7. Does the administrator report that the team reports progress to the staff at least four times per year?		

Comments:

Recommendations:
- Plan opportunities to share discipline data with entire staff at faculty meetings and/or professional development activities.
- Develop reporting format that is easy present and explain to all staff.
- Display data in staff work room with brief explanations.
- Celebrate successes related to school-wide discipline.

8. Does the team have an action plan with specific goals that is less than one year old?		

Comments:

Recommendations:
- Develop annual action plan based on assessment, referrals, academic, and attendance data with measurable goals and realistic timelines. Review status of action plan at each PBIS meeting.
- Include written annual action plan in PBIS materials (e.g., staff handbook, school discipline plan, etc.).

G. District Level Support

Evaluation Questions	Evidence	Status
1. Does the school budget contain an allocated amount of money for building and maintaining school-wide behavioral support?		

Comments:

Recommendations:
- Review school's budget for any monies allocated to improving students' behavior, attendance, and/or school climate that can be utilized to maintain the PBIS program.
- Work with district PBIS liaison to identify funding that may be available to support the school's PBIS program.

2. Can the administrator identify an out-of-school liaison in district or state?		

Comments:

Recommendations:
- Contact district to determine appropriate liaison to support the school's efforts with PBIS.
- Invite district liaison to attend/participate in monthly PBIS meetings, training activities, and assessments.

Appendix G

SET/EBSSAS Action Plan				
Area(s) of Need	**A. Expectations Defined**			
Assigned Person(s)	**Action/Task**		**Expected Completion**	**Follow-up**

Area(s) of Need	B. Behavioral Expectations Taught			
Assigned Person(s)	Action/Task		Expected Completion	Follow-up

Area(s) of Need	C. On-going System for Rewarding Behavioral Expectations		
Assigned Person(s)	**Action/Task**	**Expected Completion**	**Follow-up**

Area(s) of Need	D. System for Responding to Behavioral Violations		
Assigned Person(s)	**Action/Task**	**Expected Completion**	**Follow-up**

Area(s) of Need	E. Monitoring & Decision Making			
Assigned Person(s)	Action/Task		Expected Completion	Follow-up

Area(s) of Need	F. Management			
Assigned Person(s)	Action/Task		Expected Completion	Follow-up

Area(s) of Need	G. District Level Support			
Assigned Person(s)	Action/Task		Expected Completion	Follow-up

Appendix H

Evidence Base for EBSSAS Report Recommendations

EBSSAS Recommendations (School-wide Level)		
SAS Item	**Recommendation(s)**	**Evidence Base**
1	• Develop 3-5 umbrella rules that apply to all settings in the school building. Rules should be concise and easy to remember. The rules should tell students "what to do" instead of "what not to do." Example: "Be Respectful," "Be Responsible," & "Be Safe"	Madsen, Becker, & Thomas, 1968 Nelson, Martella, & Galand, 1998 Nelson, 1996 Sprague, et al., 2001
2	• Develop a Behavior Expectation Matrix that describes what appropriate behaviors the students should display in the various settings of the building. The behavioral expectations should fall under the 3-5 School-wide rules. Expectation Matrix should be displayed in all locations of the school building (i.e., classrooms, hallways, bathrooms, cafeteria, playground, main office, auditorium, etc.). The students should be directly taught the expected behaviors for each location.	Sugai & Horner, 2009
3	• A school-wide system of reinforcement should be developed to encourage students to engage in appropriate behaviors. The school-wide reinforcement program should allow all building staff to randomly "catch students being good." All reinforcement should incorporate a verbal praise and tangible reward component. Students should have the opportunity to receive reinforcement for appropriate behaviors on a daily, weekly, monthly, quarterly, and yearly basis.	Austin & Soeda, 2008 Dixon & Tibbetts, 2009 Sprague, et al., 2001 Taylor-Greene, et al., 1997
4	• All behavioral infractions should have a written description to ensure that all staff are able to consistently identify problem behaviors.	Bradshaw, et al., 2008 McKevitt & Braaksma, 2008 Madsen, et al., 1968

5	• A flowchart should be developed that identifies the procedures for responding to misbehaviors, including repeated infractions.	Bradshaw, et al., 2008 Madsen, et al., 1968 Scott, Alter, Rosenberg, & Borgmeier, 2010
6	• Behavioral infractions should be described in a manner in which all staff can consistently identify which infractions should be handled by the staff and those that should be handled immediately by an administrator.	Bradshaw, et al., 2008 McKevitt & Braaksma, 2008 Madsen, et al., 1968 Scott, et al., 2010
7	• Teach staff how to respond to "minor" behavioral infractions in the classroom that will reduce the likelihood of escalation of behaviors that will impede students' ability to learn in the classroom. Specific procedures on how to report "major" infractions and transport the student to the office should be taught to staff.	Bradshaw, et al., 2008 Madsen, et al., 1968 Scott, Alter, Rosenberg, & Borgmeier, 2010
8	• Develop and publish procedures for responding to emergency situations. Train entire staff using scenarios in which they have to practice the appropriate response procedures.	Sugai, Horner, & Todd, 2003
9	• Develop a team that is representative of the staff. The purpose of the team is to implement and monitor positive behavior supports.	Lewis & Sugai, 1999 Sugai & Horner, 2002
10	• PBIS administrator must be completely available during monthly PBS meetings and training activities (i.e., physically present at entire meeting, actively engaging in the team's roles and activities, etc..)	Gottfredson, Gottfredson, & Hybl, 1993 Sugai & Horner, 2009
11	• Inform staff of data collection procedures and system currently utilized by the school. Provide monthly progress reports to entire staff to demonstrate how the data is utilized for problem solving and progress monitoring of current positive behavior supports.	McKevitt & Braaksma, 2008

12	• PBIS team analyzes patterns of referrals as categorized by "Average Referrals per Day per Data Period," "Infraction/Problem Behavior," "Location," "Time of Day," and "Students with 1 or more Major referrals" at each meeting to problem solve how to improve positive behavior support.	Sugai & Horner, 2009
13	• School provides written documentation of the school-wide rules and expected behaviors in the student handbook. The rules/expectations and PBIS program should be discussed at all school functions that families attend.	Lewis, 2009
14	• Extra training sessions to practice expected behaviors should be provided to students throughout the academic year. Planning booster sessions for times of the year that historically have higher rates of discipline referrals (e.g.., After Spring Break) to prevent spikes in referrals will be advantageous. Additional booster sessions should be conducted when discipline data indicates an increase in referral rates.	Sugai, Horner, & Todd, 2003
15	• Annual budget planning should allot monies to sustain the PBIS program at the school.	Sugai, Horner, Lewis-Palmer, & Todd, 2005
16	• All staff (including support teachers, paraprofessionals, office staff, custodians, etc..) should be trained to respond to appropriate and inappropriate behaviors according to the school's PBIS program. All staff should be responsible for providing rewards to students for good behavior and reporting any behavioral infractions with appropriate referral form and procedures.	Lewis & Sugai, 1999
17	• District-level PBIS liaison should provide activities to the entire staff that train and reinforce the PBIS program. The PBIS team should provide monthly updates regarding discipline data and PBIS activities to the district-level liaison.	Lewis, Barrett, Sugai, & Horner, 2010

18	• Provide annual reports to the district-level liaison regarding the status of the PBIS program at the school. Inform staff that updates are provided to the district regarding the PBIS program.	Lewis, Barrett, Sugai, & Horner, 2010

Appendix I

Evidence Base for SET Report Recommendations

SET Item	Recommendation(s)	Evidence Base
A1	- Involve staff in developing brief, positively stated rules that will apply to all locations of the school building. Rules should be selected based on a consensus of the group. - Have rules describe what students should do rather than what they should not do. - All rules and procedures at the school should align with the school-wide rules. - Further define how students are expected to behave using the Expectation Matrix. Make sure that the rules listed are the school-wide rules with specific expectations listed for the various building locations. - Ensure that teachers have aligned their classroom rules with the school-wide rules. Specifics regarding rules should be provided in the behavior expectations for the classroom.	Buluc, 2006 Madsen, et al. 1968 Nelson, Martella, & Galand, 1998 Nelson, 1996 Sugai, et al. 2005
A2	- Create posters listing the 3-5 school rules. - Rules should be posted in classrooms, main office, hallways, gymnasium/auditorium, cafeteria, computer lab, library, etc. - Make sure that posted rules do not compete with each other (e.g., posting school-wide rules and hallway rules next to each other). The specifics procedures for the hallway should be listed as Hallway expectations that fall under the school-wide rules. - Make sure posted rules are visible, appealing, and large enough to be read.	Madsen, et al., 1968 Nelson, Martella, & Galand, 1998 Nelson, 1996 Sprague, et al., 2001
B1	- Develop lesson plans that teach examples and non-examples of the behavioral expectations. - Include written lesson plans in PBIS documents. - Provide opportunities for students to practice the behavioral expectations throughout the locations of the building.	Kartub, Taylor-Greene, March, & Horner, 2000

B2	• Involve all staff (including paraprofessionals, cafeteria workers, safety officers, office staff, etc.) in the teaching of school-wide rules and behavioral expectations. • Provide training to staff on how to teach school-wide rules and expectations.	Sprague, et al., 2001 Wheatley, et al., 2009
B3	• Provide training to entire school staff prior to the return of students on the rationale and procedures for school-wide positive behavior support. Review PBIS procedures throughout the year at staff meetings.	Bradshaw, et al., 2008 Taylor-Greene, et al., 1997
B4	• Make sure that rules are easy to remember. • Review rules with students on a daily basis. • Provide booster sessions to retrain or reinforce the teaching of the school-wide rules and expectations throughout the academic year. • Develop opportunities among the grades to demonstrate understanding of the rules (e.g., skits, posters, essay contests, chants, songs). • Develop a name for the school-wide rules (e.g., "The Three Bee's") to help students remember the school-wide rules.	Madsen, Becker, & Thomas, 1968 Nelson, Martella, & Galand, 1998 Rosenberg, 1986
B5	• Make sure that rules are easy to remember. • Stress the importance for all staff to know the rules. • Have entire staff participate in the development and posting of the school-wide rules and behavior expectations.	Bradshaw, et al., 2008 Buluc, 2006 Madsen, Becker, & Thomas, 1968
C1	• Reinforcement program description should include all of the logistics necessary for maintaining the reinforcement program throughout the school year. • Make sure that school-wide reinforcement program is in place prior to the students beginning the school year. • Develop a "catchy" name for the school-wide reinforcement program (e.g., "Caught Being Good" or "DHS 200 Club"). • Include written description of School-wide reinforcement program in PBIS materials.	Scott, White, Algozzine, & Algozzine, 2009 Taylor-Greene, et al., 1997

C2	• Train all staff to randomly reinforce students for engaging in expected behaviors. Reinforcement should not be available only for the "good kids" or the "trouble students." • Provide training to students on what the school-wide reinforcement program is called and how they can earn reinforcement for engaging in expected behaviors. • Make sure students know the name of the school-wide reinforcement program. • Reinforcement of students should be occurring on a daily, weekly, monthly, quarterly, and yearly basis. If students have to wait too long to collect their reinforcement, they are less likely to make the connection between the reward and their good behavior. • Develop a recording system to document the names of students who have earned the school-wide reinforcement. • Always pair verbal praise describing the appropriate behavior when delivering a tangible reinforcer to a student.	Austin & Soeda, 2008 Dixon & Tibbetts, 2009 Taylor-Greene, et al., 1997
C3	• Develop a school-wide reinforcement program in which all staff have the opportunity to reinforce students on a daily basis. • Train the staff on the importance of reinforcing expected behaviors. • Allow staff to be responsible for recruiting and delivering incentives to students.	Sprague, et al., 2001 Taylor-Greene, et al., 1997
D1	• Develop procedures and train all staff on how to document and report behavioral violations. • Provide specific definitions and examples of behavior violations to ensure consistency in reporting.	Bradshaw, et al., 2008 McKevitt & Braaksma, 2008
D2	• Train staff on which behaviors are "major" and must be sent directly to the office versus "minor" behaviors that can be handled in the setting they occur. • Develop a response flowchart to identify the procedures for responding to minor and major behaviors. • Include procedure in flowchart regarding the response to recurring behavioral violations. • Provide staff with examples of how to consequent "minor" behavioral violations.	Bradshaw, et al., 2008 Madsen, Becker, & Thomas, 1968 Scott, Alter, Rosenberg, & Borgmeier, 2010

	• Include written definition of behavioral violations and flowchart in PBIS materials.	
D3	• Ensure that crisis plan is immediately available in all locations of the school building including the classrooms, main office, gymnasium/auditorium, cafeteria, computer lab, and library.	Horner et al., 2004
D4	• Train all support staff on emergency procedures. • If the school has a code word to notify the staff of the need to "lockdown" the building, make sure that everyone knows the code word and it is easy to remember.	Horner et al., 2004
E1	• Make sure all relevant information is on office referral forms.	Sugai & Horner, 2009
E2	• Identify the district's discipline data collection system. Attend trainings on how to use the system (if necessary).	Sugai & Horner, 2009
E3	• Include time for data reporting during scheduled staff professional development days.	Sugai & Horner, 2009
E4	• Incorporate data analysis review into every PBIS team meetings.	Taylor-Greene, et al., 1997
F1	• Develop goals that incorporate positive behavior supports, school climate and/or attendance.	Sugai, Horner, Lewis-Palmer, & Todd, 2005
F2	• Identify PBIS team members at staff trainings.	Horner et al., 2004
F3	• Allow opportunities for different staff members to join the PBIS team each year while maintaining the core team.	Taylor-Greene & Kartub, 2000

F4	• Develop a list of team members with the team leader identified. • Ensure that team has nominated the team leader by consensus.	Sugai, Horner, Lewis-Palmer, & Todd, 2005
F5	• PBIS administrator must be completely available during monthly PBS meetings and training activities (i.e., physically present at entire meeting, actively engaging in the team's roles and activities, etc.)	Gottfredson, Gottfredson, & Hybl, 1993 Sugai & Horner, 2009
F6	• Develop an annual PBIS calendar that includes dates for monthly meetings, training activities, data reports, assessments, etc.	Lewis & Sugai, 1999
F7	• Plan opportunities to share discipline data with entire staff at faculty meetings and/or professional development activities. • Develop reporting format that is easy present and explain to all staff. • Display data in staff work room with brief explanations. • Celebrate successes related to school-wide discipline.	McKevitt & Braaksma, 2008
F8	• Develop annual action plan based on assessment, referrals, academic, and attendance data with measurable goals and realistic timelines. Review status of action plan at each PBIS meeting. • Include written annual action plan in PBIS materials (e.g., staff handbook, school discipline plan, etc.).	Lewis & Sugai, 1999
G1	• Review school's budget for any monies allocated to improving students' behavior, attendance, and/or school climate that can be utilized to maintain the PBIS program. • Work with district PBIS liaison to identify funding that may be available to support the school's PBIS program.	Sugai, Horner, Lewis-Palmer, & Todd, 2005
G2	• Contact district to determine appropriate liaison to support the school's efforts with PBIS. • Invite district liaison to attend/participate in monthly PBIS meetings, training activities, and assessments.	Nersesian, Todd, Lehmann, & Watson, 2000

Appendix J

Subscales of SET and EBSSAS Measuring Key Features of SWPBIS

SWPBIS Feature	SET Item	EBSSAS Items
Expectations Defined	A1. Is there documentation that staff has agreed to 5 or fewer positively stated school rules/ behavioral expectations? A2. Are the agreed upon rules & expectations publicly posted in 8 of 10 locations? (See interview & observation form for selection of locations).	1. A small number (e.g., 3-5) of positively & clearly stated student expectations or rules are defined.
Behavioral Expectations Taught	B1. Is there a documented system for teaching behavioral expectations to students on an annual basis? B2. Do 90% of the staff asked state that teaching of behavioral expectations to students has occurred this year? B3. Do 90% of team members asked state that the school-wide program has been taught/reviewed with staff on an annual basis? B4. Can at least 70% of 15 or more students state 67% of the school rules? B5. Can 90% or more of the staff asked list 67% of the school rules?	2. Expected student behaviors are taught directly. 16. All staff are involved directly and/or indirectly in school-wide interventions.
On-going system for Rewarding Behavioral Expectations	C1. Is there a documented system for rewarding student behavior? C2. Do 50% or more students asked indicate they have received a reward (other than verbal praise) for expected behaviors over the past two months? C3.Do 90% of staff asked indicate they have delivered a reward (other than verbal praise) to students for	3. Expected student behaviors are rewarded regularly.

	expected behavior over the past two months?	
System for Responding to Behavioral Violations	D1. Is there a documented system for dealing with and reporting specific behavioral violations? D2. Do 90% of staff asked agree with administration on what problems are office-managed and what problems are classroom–managed? D3. Is the documented crisis plan for responding to extreme dangerous situations posted in 6 of 7 locations? D4. Do 90% of staff asked agree with administration on the procedure for handling extreme emergencies (stranger in building with a weapon)?	4. Problem behaviors (failure to meet expected student behaviors) are defined clearly. 5. Consequences for problem behaviors are defined clearly. 6. Distinctions between office v. classroom managed problem behaviors are clear. 7. Options exist to allow classroom instruction to continue when problem behavior occurs.
Monitoring & Decision Making	E1. Does the discipline referral form list (a) student/grade, (b) date, (c) time, (d) referring staff, (e) problem behavior, (f) location, (g) persons involved, (h) probable motivation, & (i) administrative decision? E2. Can the administrator clearly define a system for collecting & summarizing discipline referrals (computer software, data entry time)? E3. Does the administrator report that the team provides discipline data summary reports to the staff at least three times/year? E4. Do 90% of team members asked report that discipline data is used for making decisions in designing, implementing, and revising school-wide effective behavior support efforts?	11. Data on problem behavior patterns are collected and summarized within an on-going system. 12. Patterns of student problem behavior are reported to teams and faculty for active decision-making on a regular basis (e.g. monthly).
Management	F1. Does the school improvement plan list improving behavior support systems as one of the top 3 school improvement plan goals? F2. Can 90% of staff asked report that there is a school-wide team established to address behavior support	9. A team exists for behavior support planning & problem solving. 10. School administrator is an active participant on the behavior support team.

	systems in the school? F3. Does the administrator report that team membership includes representation of all staff? F4. Can 90% of team members asked identify the team leader? F5. Is the administrator an active member of the school-wide behavior support team? F6. Does the administrator report that team meetings occur at least monthly? F7. Does the administrator report that the team reports progress to the staff at least four times per year? F8. Does the team have an action plan with specific goals that is less than one year old?	
District Level Support	G1. Does the school budget contain an allocated amount of money for building and maintaining school-wide behavioral support? G2. Can the administrator identify an out-of-school liaison in the district or state?	15. School-wide behavior support team has a Budget for (a) teaching students, (b) on-going rewards, and (c) annual staff planning. 17. The school team has access to on-going training and support from district personnel. 18. The school is required by the district to report on the social climate, discipline level or student behavior at least annually.