



All Theses and Dissertations


2011-12-13

Examining Implementation Processes of Positive Behavior Support

Julia Helzer Rollins

Brigham Young University - Provo

Follow this and additional works at: <https://scholarsarchive.byu.edu/etd>

 Part of the [Counseling Psychology Commons](#), and the [Special Education and Teaching Commons](#)

BYU ScholarsArchive Citation

Rollins, Julia Helzer, "Examining Implementation Processes of Positive Behavior Support" (2011). *All Theses and Dissertations*. 2895.
<https://scholarsarchive.byu.edu/etd/2895>

This Thesis is brought to you for free and open access by BYU ScholarsArchive. It has been accepted for inclusion in All Theses and Dissertations by an authorized administrator of BYU ScholarsArchive. For more information, please contact scholarsarchive@byu.edu, ellen_amatangelo@byu.edu.

Title: Examining Implementation Processes of Positive Behavior Support

Julia Helzer Rollins

A thesis submitted to the faculty of
Brigham Young University
in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of

Educational Specialist in School Psychology

Ellie Young, Chair
Timothy Smith
Ellen Williams

Department of Counseling Psychology and Special Education

Brigham Young University

December 2011

Copyright © 2011 Julia Helzer Rollins

All Rights Reserved

ABSTRACT

Title: Examining Implementation Processes of Positive Behavior Support

Julia Helzer Rollins

Department of Counseling Psychology and Special Education
Educational Specialist in School Psychology

This study is a summary of themes found in the meeting notes of school teams implementing school-wide Positive Behavior Support. Positive Behavior Support (PBS) is a systems change process of reorganizing a school's discipline structure to put in place a positive, teaching and reinforcing focus for the improvement of student behavior (Sugai & Horner, 2006). In recent years, education researchers have established that school-wide PBS is an effective way to deliver research-based interventions to improve student behavior (Colvin & Kameenui, 1993, Gottfredson, Gottfredson, & Hybl 1993; Taylor-Green & Kartub, 2000). This study focused on the implementation process in order to gain insights on successes and difficulties encountered by school teams during implementation of PBS.

This study utilized meeting notes from 22 school teams that received implementation support from Utah's Academic, Behavior and Coaching Initiative (ABC-UBI). These school teams had at least 3 years of implementation support from ABC-UBI and 3 years of data from the School-Wide Evaluation Tool (SET). The SET provided data indicating the fidelity of implementation of PBS. From these 22 school teams, 628 total meeting notes were examined using grounded theory and an open-coding process. School teams were divided into 3 implementation patterns according to their SET data: consistently high implementing schools, increasing implementation schools and inconsistently implementing schools. A total of 13 themes were established, through multiple measures of inter-rater reliability, as being present in the meeting notes.

According to prevalence rates, there were 2 major themes and 4 minor themes indicated in the meeting notes. The major themes indicated that making assignments and data collection were important to successful school teams. The minor themes indicated that meaningful individual rewards for students, regular staff professional development, utilization of tools provided by ABC-UBI and teaching and posting expectations were important to successful schools. Difficulties with data collection were indicated as being associated with inconsistently implementing schools. From the themes it was inferred that public accountability and the creation of professional learning communities were important factors in consistent and successful PBS implementation.

Keywords: Positive Behavior Support, systems change, professional learning communities.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I have several people to acknowledge for their guidance, support and endurance over the course of completing this thesis project. Without the support of each of these people, this project could not have been completed. I am profoundly grateful for the contribution of each person and for all I have learned from them during this time.

I would like to thank my committee, with special regards to my chair, Ellie Young. Ellie kept me motivated and confident throughout the whole process. I also appreciate all the time she gave to meaningful and detailed feedback. Tim Smith was integral in helping me find a way to meaningfully analyze the data given to me. He told me the difficult truth when needed and that shaped the path of this research. Ellen Williams contributed her vast experience in education and the research literature. She is an exceptional educator and helped me to see beyond my results to the bigger picture.

I would like to thank Heidi Mathie Mucha for granting me the right to use ABC-UBI's data and for letting me raid her office to find every last bit of SET data. I would also like to thank Stephanie Deverich Davis, Nichole Johnson Soelberg and Susan Hardman for their work as research assistants. Their help in coding the notes was invaluable for establishing inter-rater reliability. Stephanie's collaboration on calculating inter-rater reliability was a blessing!

I would also like to thank and acknowledge my family for all their support and love. Thanks mom for all the supportive phone calls telling me to keep on writing when I did not want to look at my thesis anymore. Thank you grandma for giving me free housing, so I could afford to continue school! Finally, a special thanks to my husband Brian for his support during the last phases of writing. My favorite chocolate was always an awesome gift to keep me motivated!

TABLE OF CONTENTS

ABSTRACT.....	ii
ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS.....	iii
TABLE OF CONTENTS.....	iv
LIST OF TABLES.....	vi
Introduction.....	1
Defining Positive Behavior Support (PBS)	3
Understanding the Multi-Tiered Approach.....	4
Coaching PBS	6
Measuring Fidelity of Implementation	7
Statement of the Problem.....	9
Statement of Purpose	10
Research Questions.....	10
Review of Literature	11
The Origin of PBS	12
The Application of PBS in Schools	15
The Role of Systems Change in School-wide PBS	17
The Benefits of Technical Assistance to Support PBS Systems Change	19
Statewide Models of PBS Implementation.....	20
Summary of the Evolution of PBS.....	22
Method	24
Participants.....	24
Settings.....	25
Data Collection	26
Measures	27
Procedures.....	29
Research Design.....	29

Data Analysis	30
Summary	33
Results	34
Deriving and Confirming Themes.	35
Defining the Themes	38
Connecting the Themes to Research Questions	46
Summarizing Theme Connections	53
Discussion	54
Reflection on Themes	55
Major Themes	55
Minor Themes	62
Limitations	65
Implications for Future Research	67
Implications for Practitioners	68
Conclusion	72
References	75
APPENDIX C: Instruments	88

LIST OF TABLES

Table	Page
1. Three Years of Overall SET scores	32
2. Interrater Reliability Results	36
3. Results from Qualitative Analysis of Meeting Notes.....	47
4. Top Five Themes for the Implementation Patterns.....	48

Introduction

In recent years, educational and psychological researchers have called for an increase of empirically supported and evidence-based interventions to help all students succeed in school (Kratochwill, 2005). Key qualities of evidenced-based interventions include: (a) evaluated using sound experimental design and methodology, (b) demonstrated to be effective, and (c) supported by empirical research (Simonsen et. al., 2008). The Positive Behavior Support (PBS) model utilizes evidence-based interventions and has been researched in an effort to provide effective ways to facilitate positive outcomes for students.

PBS is a model that endorses key concepts of systems change, including the following: (a) the importance of collecting and analyzing data, (b) the importance of environmental context in creating effective interventions, and (c) the idea that positive outcomes can result from changing how a problem behavior is approached (Dunlap et al., 2009). The PBS model specifically focuses on having empirically supported, data-based interventions and methods because it relies on a system of data collection to guide its development and implementation in schools (Carr, 2007). School teams will collect data regularly related to the goals of PBS implementation that they have subscribed to (e.g. lowering tardies, decreasing student fights, or increasing positive interactions between students and faculty).

A wide variety of schools and state educational agencies are collecting data that illustrate how PBS is being implemented in their respective sites. Most of the research reported examines how individual schools collect and use data. Fewer research articles address the involvement of state agencies and how they use data generated from school teams that are participating in their

implementation programs. Data collected by state agencies about a large number of school teams participating in their implementation process could prove to be a valuable resource for further knowledge.

The state education agency in Utah established to provide support, training, and accountability when implementing PBS is Utah's Academic, Behavior and Coaching Initiative (ABC-UBI). This agency currently provides training and technical assistance for 147 schools across 19 school districts (Utah Personnel Development Center, 2011). ABC-UBI provides frequent regional trainings, support for building and district coaches, a system for data collection, and opportunities to collaborate with other PBS schools in the state.

In order to access the training and support provided by ABC-UBI, individual school teams have been required to submit data from the School-wide Evaluation Tool (SET) scores and monthly meeting notes. These notes typically describe challenges and strategies concerning the development and implementation of PBS to an online database maintained by ABC-UBI. The implementation data from the meeting notes can be used to identify key activities or strategies by school teams that have successfully maintained PBS strategies in their school.

Reviewing the data submitted to ABC-UBI may reveal characteristics of school teams or processes that promote sustainability. Furthermore, reviewing minutes of school-based teams can help ABC-UBI and other state agencies understand the process of creating a culture of PBS and data-based decision making. This study will consider data from high implementing schools that are participating in the ABC-UBI programs in order to understand how ABC-UBI can improve their efforts to support schools in implementing a sustainable PBS model.

Defining Positive Behavior Support

Positive Behavior Support (PBS) is a systems change process that focuses on prevention of problem behaviors through teaching, modeling, and reinforcing positive behaviors (Sugai & Horner, 2006). Positive behaviors might include walking through the halls appropriately, taking your seat quietly when entering the classroom, keeping appropriate space boundaries with teachers and peers, helping others, and speaking respectfully to others. PBS uses a proactive approach to solving behavioral concerns. Rather than waiting for problems to occur and then punishing misbehaviors, this model uses a proactive approach that teaches positive expectations, gives opportunity for practice, provides feedback, and opportunities to deliver praise (Lewis & Sugai, 1999).

PBS focuses on identifying positive outcomes and behaviors for students, then teaching , and reinforcing those behaviors. A school might start this process by collecting data about where most incidences of negative behavior are occurring. If they identify, for example, the hallways as being a problem area, the school team could focus their intervention efforts on preventing negative behaviors in the hallway. Teachers and other staff intentionally use instructional time to directly teach positive hallway behaviors (e.g. walking quietly with hands at your side, walking at a safe pace, and using appropriate ways to greet friends and other classmates in the hall). These behaviors would be modeled by teachers and practiced by students. The PBS leadership team would develop a reinforcement plan that could include having hall monitors reward students with tickets that could be used at a student store or be turned in for a drawing.

Another key component of PBS is to create a context of explicit, positive expectations for

the behaviors of students (Lewis & Sugai 1999). School teams are expected to create an overall theme of general expectations. This is usually done through creation of 3-5 general school rules (Horner et al., 2009). Examples of what these three school-wide rules could be are as follows: (a) Respect Ourselves, (b) Respect Others, (c) Respect Property. The school team matches their interventions to meet the specific categories created by the general expectations. For example, fighting on the playground could fall under Respect Others, while littering in the hallway could fall under Respect Property.

The theme creates an integrated way to address behavioral concerns, and create a common language for positive behavioral expectations for adults and students. Addressing behaviors through PBS also occurs on a continuum and is accomplished through the use of a three-tiered model to conceptualize and deliver evidence-base interventions. Services to students occur at the universal, targeted, and intensive levels and can be related to a theme at each level of intervention.

Understanding the Multi-Tiered Approach

An intervention at the universal level, sometimes labeled tier one, involves defining, teaching and reinforcing behavioral expectations that apply to all students and are implemented by all staff across the school. An example of intervention at the universal level is the creation of school-wide rules as mentioned above. School-wide rules that are posted, taught, and reinforced are a universal level tactic because it applies to all students and makes the core behavioral curriculum explicit. These rules would be posted in key areas of the school such as the classroom, hallways, and lunchroom. Students would be taught the rules through instruction and

modeling. Students may be reinforced for following those rules either individually or through group contingencies. Some type of recognition or reward for knowing and meeting the positive expectations is a key piece of the model. For example, a school could implement the example of school-wide rules above and reinforce them using Caught ya' Cards. At random intervals, when a staff or faculty member sees a student following the rules, they issue the student a Caught ya' Card. The students then turn in the card for an immediate prize or they are entered in a drawing. The reinforcement depends on how the school wishes to budget their rewards.

The intended outcome of these efforts is that all students will benefit from instruction in understanding positive behavioral expectations. By attending to and creating a strong core curriculum, some behavior problems that are typical will not occur. This level of service is actually considered prevention, rather than intervention; through creating a healthy, safe, positive environment that decreases the possibility of difficulties before the problems are even evident (Sugai & Horner, 2008).

A targeted level intervention, also known as tier two intervention, provides additional support to the students who do not respond to a universal level prevention and demonstrate behavioral patterns that may necessitate a more intensive response. Interventions at this level are usually delivered in small group settings. The targeted interventions tend to be delivered through small groups that focus on teaching skill deficits. These interventions are intended to facilitate increased participation in tier one or the universal level of intervention. An example of a targeted level intervention could be teaching a bully prevention program to a specific class that has data indicating more bullying is occurring in this setting than in other settings. Rather than punishing

students for bullying behaviors, this targeted response directly addresses the needs of the group by teaching adaptive replacement behaviors. School wide data may indicate the intervention is not needed for all students, but data do indicate that this smaller group of students would likely benefit from this tactic (DeRosier, 2004).

An intensive level intervention, also known as tier three, provides individualized attention from specialists such as school psychologists, counselors, or special educators to create a comprehensive behavior plan (Lohrmann, Forman, Martin, & Palmieri, 2008; Sugai & Horner, 2006). This level focuses on remediation and providing close management of significant problems for those students with the most severe behavioral concerns. For example, if a student is being a bully, creating a behavior contract that emphasizes positive interactions with his classmates, and is coupled with teaching and practicing appropriate interaction with peers, could be an intensive level intervention. These interventions tend to be time and resource intensive because they are individualized.

A three-tiered proactive model is a stark contrast from how schools tend to handle problems (Lewis & Sugai 1999). A complete systems change is often necessary for most schools to integrate PBS principles (Sugai et al., 2005). PBS research indicates that having a coach to assist in the systems change process creates better sustainability (Lewis, Sugai, & Colvin, 1998).

Coaching PBS

Historically state educational offices have provided support, guidance, resources, and a means of accountability of school districts and individual schools that are developing and then implementing PBS models. During the planning and initial phases in implementation, personnel

from the state agency (e.g., ABC-UBI) often assign coaches that provide technical assistance to the schools. Coaches are an extremely important factor to ensure that staff and administrators appropriately understand how general PBS principles can be applied to specific settings (Barret, Bradshaw, & Lewis, 2008; Warren et al., 2003).

When using a coaching model for implementation, coaches instruct educators in PBS principles and methods. Coaches help facilitate effective problem solving in school teams during implementation of PBS (Scott & Martinek, 2006). Coaches can keep contact with their teams off-site (e.g. through email or by phone) or on-site by visiting the school in person. The *PBS Implementer's Blueprint* (Sugai et. al., 2004) recommends that a coach reside within 50 miles of the school they support, make contact with school team leader at least monthly, and attend team meetings quarterly.

Coaches provide benchmarks and constructive feedback through use of measures that track the school team's implementation progress. These are tools designed to yield data that is useful in guiding the schools in strengthening PBS practices. The data gathered from these tools help coaches to ensure that PBS principles and strategies are implemented with fidelity (Horner et. al., 2004).

Measuring Fidelity of Implementation

Fidelity of implementation is one particular outcome that is especially interesting to state education agencies because it measures and addresses the effectiveness of the training provided by the agency (Barrett, Bradshaw, & Lewis-Palmer, 2008). Fidelity of implementation refers to how uniformly adopted, accurately implemented, appropriately contextualized and sustained an

intervention is within a school (Sugai & Horner, 2008). If a state education agency invests its time, energy and allotted money in an intervention, they plan for meaningful outcomes to occur from their investment. Treatment fidelity are measures of accountability that state education agencies typically want incorporated into interventions because they are related to predicting positive outcomes (Greenwood, 2009). Therefore, high degrees of treatment fidelity in interventions such as PBS tend to indicate that strategies are effective and that the outcomes will be meaningful (Roach & Elliot, 2008). Conversely, if PBS is not implemented with fidelity then the desired outcomes may not reasonably be expected to happen (Sanetti & Kratochwill, 2009).

The School-Wide Evaluation Tool (SET) is a metric used for assessing the fidelity of implementation of school-wide PBS practices. Because the SET measures whether PBS structures are in place, it is often used as a treatment fidelity measure (Bohanon, Flannery, Malloy, & Fenning, 2009; Mass-Galloway, Panyan, Smith, & Wessendorf, 2008). The SET consists of 28 items that are organized into seven subscales that represent the seven key structures of school-wide PBS. There are seven subscales of the SET, including: (a) behavioral expectations defined, (b) expectations are taught to all children in the school, (c) rewards are provided for following the expectations, (d) a consistently implemented continuum of consequences for problem behavior is put in place, (e) problem behavior patterns are monitored and the information is used for ongoing decision-making (f) an administrator actively supports and is involved, and (g) the school district provides support on policies, allows staff training opportunities, and supports data collection practice and analysis (Horner et al., 2004). The SET is often given by coaches to measure whether PBS structures are in place in the system of the

school. Part of the SET includes interviewing the school's team, a necessary PBS organizational component.

PBS researchers strongly suggest that the school should have a team consisting of different members of the faculty, staff, and administration of the school that meets regularly to review school data and progress in implementing PBS (Simonsen, Sugai, & Negrón, 2008). Having the school team consist of members of the local school culture is important for the success of the systems change process (Shapiro, 2006). The school team drives intervention in the school by evaluating the data and making decisions concerning the data that impact the whole school site (Center on Positive Behavioral Interventions and Supports, 2005).

At school team meetings, notes are taken and in some cases submitted to a database of the supervising state agency. Submitting these notes can be important data for coaches and administrators; reviewing the meeting notes can help in making decisions about intervention or prevention efforts (Stoller, Poth, Curtis, & Cohen, 2006). Examining these notes could reveal themes in the decisions and evaluations of these teams that may lead to sustainability of high implementation of PBS.

Statement of the Problem

If a state education agency were to consider and evaluate data from the SET and information from the meeting notes, they may describe and report important information related to the successful implementation of PBS. Understanding what effective teams are doing helps in the promotion and maintenance of successful implementation of PBS. The data collected from schools that have navigated the implementation process can help form a picture of what

implementation of PBS looks like on the school, district, and state levels.

Statement of Purpose

The purpose of this research is to examine team meeting notes for the purpose of identifying themes that could lead to useful practices or important pitfalls encountered by school teams implementing state agency supported school-wide Positive Behavior Support.

Research Questions

This study will address the following research questions:

1. What themes were most prevalent for Consistently High Implementing schools?
2. What were the themes that were most prevalent for Increasing Implementation schools and what are the differences between year 1 and year 3 themes?
3. What were the differences in themes for Inconsistently Implementing schools between a “good” year that received a high SET (i.e. in the 90s) versus a “bad” year that the same school received a low SET score (i.e. in the 70 to 80 range)?
4. Is there any evidence of a gradual transfer of leadership from the coach to the school team?

Review of Literature

Positive Behavior Support (PBS) is not a new concept, but the way that PBS has been implemented and services delivered has evolved over time as a result of research and development (Dunlap et al., 2008). PBS started as a way of conceptualizing individual and group interventions for individuals with disabilities (Foster-Johnson & Dunlap, 1993). Over time researchers realized that this conceptualization of effective behavioral support could be implemented at a systems level that could proactively prevent problem behaviors in a large amount of a school population, while still addressing the needs of the students causing the majority of problem behaviors (Sailor, 2005). As PBS gained popularity as a school-wide systems change, researchers began looking at the most effective way to implement PBS in schools (Kincaid, Childs, Blase, & Wallace, 2007).

Statewide implementation of the PBS model is still a relatively new aspect of the research literature. This study intends to explore the process of factors that contribute or are evidenced by sustained, high implementation of PBS ideals by using data that are submitted to a statewide database. By exploring these data, the relationships between the data points gathered and the demographic characteristics of the schools may extend the extant understanding about the statewide process of implementation. Additionally, we can better understand what schools and state educational agencies may be doing to make PBS a successful service delivery model for their school.

The purpose of this literature review is to establish the research basis for the key factors and evolution of PBS. The research will explain the historical beginnings of PBS as an individualized intervention for individual with severe behavior problems. Then as the ideas are applied to other settings and larger groups of individuals, the research will track the evolution of PBS as it becomes a state supported school-wide model of promoting positive behavior for in all students. In addition, this literature review will set up the context for the purpose of the current study.

The Origin of PBS

The passing of the Education for All Handicapped Children Act in 1975, later renamed the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA), helped to lead the movement towards the de-institutionalization of individuals with severe disabilities. When individuals were institutionalized, Applied Behavior Analysis (ABA) therapy was frequently used to manage the behavior of persons with severe disabilities. ABA therapy often incorporated the use of aversive consequences for their behaviors. These aversive responses included electric shock or water sprayed in the face often called misting. Recognizing that these aversives would not be widely accepted as humane treatment outside of an institutional setting, researchers and interventionists began to look for more positive ways to encourage socially appropriate behaviors (Dunlap et al., 2009). Originally known as non-aversive behavior management, researchers agreed on the name positive behavioral support (Horner et al., 1990).

Initial research on PBS methods focused on interventions for individuals and small groups. In one study, Carr and Durand (1985) found that four children with disabilities ranging

from autism to brain damage to severe developmental disabilities replaced problem behaviors with positive communicative behaviors when they identified communication to be the function of problem behaviors. Data was initially gathered to target when behaviors occurred to determine the function of the problem behaviors. From that information, the researchers were able to develop a positive intervention of teaching the children communication skills.

Durand and Kishi (1987) completed another study in which they used the same structure to assess the needs of five institutionalized students with severe intellectual disabilities, but instead of delivering direct interventions, these researchers consulted with institution and school staff to have them deliver the interventions. Data was collected using functional behavioral assessment (FBA). The function of the self-injurious behaviors of these students was to communicate basic needs. The communication skills of these students were limited, but when these students were taught ways to communicate basic needs, researchers saw a reduction of self-injurious, disruptive behaviors. This study indicated that teaching positive behaviors to replace negative behaviors resulted in an individual being able to function more appropriately in their environment.

Similarly, Donellan et al. (1985) completed Functional Behavior Analyses with several individuals. The data was collected helped determine the function of the problem behavior. Then a nonadversive, or positive, intervention was created to address the problem behavior. In this case, children with autism were reinforced on a specific time scale. An example of a time scale could be every half hour. If during that half hour the child did not engage in a problem behavior (e.g. biting or hitting their head against the wall), then the child would receive reinforcement. For

a more gradual approach, some children were also reinforced for performing problem behaviors at a lower rate.

Depending on their problem behavior, many individuals had different combinations of these same interventions along with parent training and the gradual teaching of new replacement behaviors. Though similar to previous research, the goal of this study was broader than just considering the needs of the individuals. The researchers wanted to help these individuals function outside of an institution and return to community settings. While this goal was achieved, showing preliminary results of being able support individuals in more than one setting, researchers indicated a need to replicate this result (Donellan et. al., 1985).

Favell and Reid (1988) wrote an article calling for better generalization of clinical results in other settings with the suggestion that if the interventions were consistently and correctly implemented across settings, then results would occur across settings. They recommended training of those that would serve the students in other settings, such as school and home, in order to generalize lab results to other settings. In that same year, Berkman and Meyer (1988) conducted a case study concerning long-term behavior change for an individual with severe self-injurious behavior. Interventions were being delivered in a technical assistance model that could be implemented by people who were not the research experts, so that the individual could return to home and community settings. In another setting, Lalli, Browder, Mace, and Brown (1993) conducted a study concerning the effectiveness of teaching teachers to do positive behavioral interventions in the classroom. They found that teachers were able reduce classroom disruptions and successfully implement these interventions in the classroom. These studies showed that

positive behavioral supports could be taught to non-clinical personnel for the benefit of individuals across different settings.

The Application of PBS in Schools

A study done by Mayer (1995) found that high rates of antisocial behavior in schools were associated with punitive disciplinary strategies, lack of clarity about rules, expectations, and consequences, lack of staff support, and failure to consider and accommodate individual differences. A PBS model seeks to address all of these areas to prevent problem behaviors. Sugai (1992) posited that if teachers taught social behaviors like they taught academic material, then they would be able to dramatically reduce disruptive classroom behaviors. He suggested that classroom teachers (a) proactively teach a new skill, (b) respond to infrequent errors, (c) respond to chronic errors, and (d) reinforce desired behavior. If behavior management is approached in this manner, the classroom would be designed to reduce classroom disruption, respond appropriately to disruptive behaviors, and to prevent their reoccurrence. This proposed classroom instruction model focuses on making sure that students know what the rules and expectations are, what happens when the inappropriate behavior reoccurs, and acknowledges that variability exists among students in their ability to understand and attend to social rules and norms.

In the early years of PBS in schools, implementation was primarily targeted at children with disabilities in school to provide effective support in the school setting (Horner & Carr, 1997; Bambara, Mitchell-Kvacky, & Iacobelli, 1994). When researchers realized the impact that positive behavioral interventions were having with individuals and students with severe

disabilities, they sought to extend the benefits to all students (Dunlap, Sailor, Horner, & Sugai, 2009).

Researchers have suggested that a school-wide continuum of positive behavioral supports would help to appropriately implement the Individualized Education Plans (IEP) of mainstreamed students with disabilities, in addition to producing benefits for all students (Sugai, Simonsen, & Horner, 2008). The continuum is implemented as a multi-tiered model of support with three tiers: universal, targeted and individual level of intervention. These levels of intervention work together to change how the school conceptualizes discipline (Sugai & Horner, 2008). If schools are putting interventions and structure in place to prevent problem behaviors, then a student who has an IEP that addresses problem behaviors may be supported with school-wide, targeted group and individual interventions that every teacher on campus will know how to implement in their classroom (Simonsen, Sugai, & Negron, 2008).

This first real reconceptualization of school discipline programs into a school-wide PBS model was Project PREPARE (Colvin & Kameenui, 1993). This model promoted a consistent, positive, preventative approach to managing problem behaviors with involvement of school leaderships and effective teacher and staff development. This model acknowledged that the system needed to change in order for PBS to benefit all students in a school. The researchers evaluated their model and found that in the control school, incidences of disruptive behavior slowly increased, while the school that implemented Project PREPARE saw a 50% decrease in disruptive behaviors.

Despite this success, the researchers wondered about the sustainability of their program.

Were there appropriate structures built into this model to keep the momentum going once the research was completed and they left the school? Since Project PREPARE, other attempts at implementation of School-wide PBS models have been made and documented (Gottfredson, Gottfredson, & Hybl 1993; Taylor-Green & Kartub, 2000). The barriers and facilitators of School-wide PBS implementation have been examined and a better understanding of systems change has been identified as a key factor in improving implementation of a school-wide PBS model (Kincaid, Childs, Blase, & Wallace, 2007; Sugai et al., 2000).

Implementing a PBS model typically requires a systems change approach because it dictates that many, if not all, elements of a system shift from a reactive and punitive approach to a proactive approach to dealing with student behaviors. Teachers, administrators, and other school personnel may need to learn new skills, receive feedback, analyze data, use professional collaboration, and a variety of other skills and activities to implement and maintain the model (Chitiyo & Wheeler, 2009).

The Role of Systems Change in School-wide PBS

Schools have traditionally used a reactive model of discipline where students' misbehavior was treated separately and out of context with other occurrences (Netzel & Eber, 2003). The reactive approach to discipline has been found to be an inefficient and ineffective way of dealing with student problems because the problems are addressed after the fact rather than using preventative, proactive measures (Stollar et al, 2006). It is not ideal because students are punished for individual behavior as though it existed in a vacuum, when the environment and context of the problem play a significant role in understanding and responding to behavior.

Based on Mayer's (1995) study, if a school team wants to decrease antisocial behavior, instead of punishing individuals, they would want to clarify rules, expectations and consequences. The school team would also want to increase staff support and consider the environment in which behaviors are occurring and the individual within their context. For many schools this transition requires a thorough systems change, as even the most basic structures for PBS, such as praise for effort, may not exist (Singer, 2000).

Typically, systems change is seen as a linear relationship between the development of a good intervention, a change in policy, and then a collection of outcome measures that show how the system has changed (Foster-Fishmen, Nowell, & Yang, 2007). The School-wide Evaluation Tool (SET) is one of the frequent outcome measures used by schools that are implementing PBS models. The SET is used to measure whether PBS structures such as the presence of a data collection system, posting of school rules and random interviews with staff and students (Horner et. al, 2004). In this way, the SET is a measure of treatment fidelity.

Sugai and Horner (2001) reported that implementation of school-wide PBS is possible within 1-2 years. However, McIntosh (2004) reported that in elementary schools the process take 3-5 years, whereas in high schools the process generally take 5-8 years. Throughout that process, SET can be administered yearly to show fidelity of implementation and a time line of SET scores can show sustainability over time (Sugai, Lewis-Palmer, Todd, & Horner, 2001).

To truly achieve a system-wide change, the barriers to implementation must be overcome. The PBS model reframes the conceptualization of school discipline from the individual needing to change to a focus on how the school can change to support, teach, and

sustain positive behaviors (Dunlap et al., 2009). This can prove to be a difficult adjustment in some cases. Shapiro (2006) noted in an editorial article that a change of policy is not enough to foster systems change. Instead, he suggested that a school must also develop and use internal resources in order to keep a commitment to long-term systemic change. Many studies have labeled these internal resources as: (a) staff knowledge of PBS principles and interventions, (b) administration support, (c) establishment of an action team made up of key stakeholders, (d) a plan in place to account for staff and administrator turn-over, and (e) the ability to track and evaluate progress (Chitiyo & Wheeler, 2009; Handler et al., 2007; Kreger, Brindis, Manuel, 2007; Mitchem, Richards, & Wells, 2001).

The Benefits of Technical Assistance to Support PBS Systems Change

Coaching and technical assistance a key factor in sustaining implementation through supporting teachers and other school personnel during the learning and changing process (Handler et al., 2007). Mitchem and colleagues (2001) noted that although teachers from the four schools in their study were able to implement interventions correctly, they did not know what to do with the data they had collected. Handler and his fellow researchers (2007) identified coaches as the stakeholder that keep schools on track during initial phases of implementation so that they build those key internal structures that maintain sustainability.

A common predicament in the research literature is that once the expert and their resources leave the implementation site, the intervention dies with them (Fuchs & Fuchs 2001). This likely applies to the strategies ABC-UBI uses to support schools. They could be considered the experts, and they definitely provide resources. In order for systems change to be effective and

long-standing, supports around the system need to be in place over time and incorporated into the culture. These supports typically include coaching, opportunities for accountability, responsibility for data collection and analyses, and collaboration within the school and with others schools that can serve as a model (Sugai et al., 2005). PBS implementers across the nation have usually relied on experts from state education offices to provide this support. State involvement can be a key to sustaining educational initiatives because they create local readiness for change, provide fiscal resources, and can assist with on-going evaluation (Grimes, Kums, & Tilly, 2006).

Statewide Models of PBS Implementation

Since the introduction of PBS as a serious, viable service delivery model, many state education offices have created divisions or units within the state office for the purpose of supporting the implementation of the PBS model in school. The results have been encouraging, and meaningful outcomes have been documented. According to the U.S. Office of Special Education Programs National Technical Assistance Center on Positive Behavioral Interventions and Supports, PBS has been implemented in over 5,600 schools in 40 states across the nation (George & Kincaid, 2008; Sugai & Horner, 2008). Reported outcomes include improved academic achievement, enhanced social competence, and safer learning and teaching environments (Bohanon et al., 2006).

Statewide organizations are useful in implementing school-wide PBS because they provide a specialist instructor or coach, which, along with teacher collaboration, has long been rated by teachers as being most effective way to learn new educational innovations (Smylie,

1989). While many statewide organizations have been developed and have been supporting the implementation PBS in schools, they are just beginning to receive enough data to analyze and understand state agency implementation strategies.

For example, Maryland started implementing PBS in schools in 1999. The 14 schools that they started with has grown to 467 with 258 coaches to offer technical assistance (Barrett, Bradshaw, & Lewis-Palmer, 2008). After nearly ten years of implementation, they have sufficient data to measure their program effectiveness. Because they primarily collected quantitative data, they were only able to show that their program was effective, but not what they could do to improve their service. In 2005, a qualitative survey was completed by participating school teams from which detailed information about what their schools needed to help further sustain their implementation of PBS. Many other states and PBS organizations can follow Maryland's example in looking at the data they have collected.

Other states are beginning to review the data they have collected over time to improve implementation efforts from a state agency perspective. For example, the data from Michigan's PBS model emphasized how using parents as PBS trainers can be an effective practice (Ballard-Krishnan et al., 2003). Iowa's research focused on outcome data such as the SET, a Team Implementation Checklist and ODRs to show program effectiveness (Mass-Galloway, Panyan, Smith, & Wessendorf, 2008). New Hampshire's statewide team was able to show program effectiveness by examining the data from 28 schools that were able to implement PBS in 2 years and then sustain that implementation for a third year (Muscott, Mann, & LeBrun, 2008). Even the researchers from the University of Oregon, that use the data from their own national online

database called the School-Wide Information System (SWIS), are only starting to publish results on the 2005-2006 school year (Spaulding et al., 2010). Reviewing this research informs future research.

Horner et al. (2009) studied the effectiveness of state personnel implementing PBS in schools in Illinois and Hawaii. Like other statewide programs previously mentioned, their research showed program effectiveness through a reduction of ODRs and an increase in academic gains for schools implementing PBS. They suggested that the research should next focus on what influences or predicts these effective outcomes. Other researchers have also suggested that research should next focus on how teams are productively overcoming barriers to implementation (Lohrmann, Forman, & Martin, 2008). This proposed study can extend the literature by not just evaluating Utah's statewide implementation platform, but by looking for what is influencing effective outcomes through analyzation of the qualitative data contained in the meeting notes.

Summary of the Evolution of PBS

PBS has evolved from the concepts of Applied Behavior Analysis (ABA) therapy to a school-wide service delivery model to prevent problem behaviors for all students (Dunlap, Carr, Horner, Zarcone, & Swartz, 2008). School-wide Positive Behavior Support was developed for the purpose of extending the benefits of PBS interventions to all students (Dunlap et al., 2009). Examination of models for implementing PBS in schools showed that long-term systems change was a key factor in success (Kincaid, Childs, Blase & Wallace, 2007; Sugai et al. 2000). Further examination of PBS and systems change revealed that coaching and technical assistance is

necessary to make sure that key internal resources could be developed to sustain long-term change (Handler et al., 2007). Statewide initiatives were identified as are sources that could play important roles as coaches that do not recede too soon (Grimes, Kums, & Tilly, 2006). While many states have begun by publishing results on their program effectiveness, there has been a lack of research concerning factors that influence sustainability and high implementation (Horner et al., 2009; Lohrmann, Forman & Martin, 2008)

This study wishes to examine the meeting notes of schools that have implemented PBS with high fidelity. By doing this, key facilitating factors in the statewide implementation process of PBS will be identified. This study wishes to answer four questions that would extend the existing literature:

1. What themes were most prevalent for Consistently High Implementing schools?
2. What were the themes that were most prevalent for Increasing Implementation schools and what are the differences between year 1 and year 3 themes?
3. What were the differences in themes for Inconsistently Implementing schools between a “good” year that received a high SET (i.e. in the 90s) versus a “bad” year that the same school received a low SET score (i.e. in the 70 to 80 range)?
4. Is there any evidence of a gradual transfer of leadership from the coach to the school team?

Method

Data for this study was obtained from the online database of Utah's Academic, Behavior and Coaching Initiative (ABC-UBI). ABC-UBI is part of a collaborative training platform for implementing Response to Intervention (RtI) and Positive Behavior Support in Utah schools. ABC-UBI works in partnership with many state organizations such as the Utah State Office of Education, the Utah Personnel Development Center and the Utah State Personnel Development Improvement Grant. ABC-UBI also works in collaboration with behavioral experts from the major institutes of higher education in the state, state and district educational personnel, and local mental health agency personnel. The purpose of these collaborative efforts is to provide statewide personnel development needs that are identified by the Utah Special Education Consortium.

Participants

The 2008-2009 school year was the seventh year that ABC-UBI has provided training and technical assistance for public school. Currently, 19 public school districts, and 147 schools within those districts, participate in the ABC-UBI training platform. To be included in the training platform schools must apply to become part of the project, demonstrate their readiness and commitment to systems change, and be willing to submit their data to ABC-UBI for accountability and research purposes. Submission of data is done online through the ABC-UBI's website. The coaches and school personnel are given a password that gives them access to a form that allows them to submit their data. The data that ABC-UBI has required schools to submit over the years has evolved. Initially data collection only involved the completion of the

School-Wide Evaluation Tool (SET) scores, but currently SET scores, ODR data, academic benchmarks and meeting notes are required for continued participation. To be part of this study, a school had to have at least three years of data from the SET. This is required because the SET data indicates sustainability and fidelity of implementation over time (Horner et al., 2004). For the purposes of this study, the school teams needed to have three years of SET data to participate in this study. There were 22 schools total that met these requirements, which consisted of 20 elementary schools and 2 junior high schools.

The actual data from this study is extracted from team meeting notes. The meeting notes are submitted regularly to the ABC-UBI database by a school team. According to ABC-UBI, team participants would ideally include: a teacher from each grade level, an administrator, and a parent representative. Having auxiliary personnel such as a secretary, school psychologist, or counselor to participate was an additional recommendation.

Settings

The 22 school teams that were eligible for inclusion in this study are located in 10 school districts throughout Utah and are part of the ABC-UBI network of partner schools. This network of partner schools consists of elementary, middle, junior high, high schools, and charter schools, although only elementary and junior high schools had sufficient data at the time for inclusion. The average school enrollment of the different schools included in this analysis is 615. There is an average class size of 21.5 students per teacher. The demographics of the schools in this analysis are as follows: 51.3 % are male and 48.7 % are female. In the participating schools, 70.0 % White, 1.6 % Black, 23.5 % Hispanic, 1.7 % Asian, 1.6 % Pacific Islander and 1.0 %

American Indian/Alaska Native, with 45% of students receiving free and reduced lunch (Utah State Office of Education, 2009).

The participating schools had demographic characteristics that were similar to the statewide demographics. In Utah 51.3 % of students are male and 48.6 % of students are female. In the schools, 78.4 % of students are White, 1.5 % Black, 14.7 % Hispanic, 1.8 % Asian, 1.6 % Pacific Islander and 1.4 % American Indian/Alaska Native with 36.4 % of students receiving free and reduced lunch (Utah State Office of Education, 2009). Because of the similarities in demographic characteristics, it is assumed this study has a sample that can be construed as representative of schools in Utah. If there is more than one setting involved in the study, describe them all, using separate headings.

Data Collection

The data from the School-wide Evaluation Tool (SET) and the information provided by the meeting notes are the core pieces of data for the completion of this study. These data were submitted to an online database maintained by ABC-UBI. Staff or personnel from the participating school reported meeting notes and coaches from ABC-UBI designated to provide technical assistance to the school submit the SET scores. The SET is given by coaches on a yearly basis and should have an entry for each year the school has participated in ABC-UBI. Meeting notes are entered on a monthly basis. All data were accessed through a login and password. All school characteristics and demographic data were obtained from the Utah State Office of Education.

Measures

The only standardized measure used in this study is the School-Wide Evaluation Tool (Sugai, Lewis-Palmer, Todd, & Horner, 2001). The SET is used by ABC-UBI to assess the implementation of PBS structures in schools. The SET consists of 28 items organized into seven subscales that represent the seven key features of school-wide PBS: Expectations Defined, Behavioral Expectations Taught, System for Rewarding Behavioral Expectations, System for Responding to Behavioral Violations, Monitoring and Evaluation, Management, and District-Level Support. Each item of the SET is scored on a three-point scale with 0 representing not implemented, 1 representing partial implementation, and 2 representing full implementation. Each of the seven subscales is represented by a percentage (from 0% to 100%) that is then averaged to yield an overall SET score. In order for implementation of PBS structures to be considered successful, a school should score 80 percent or higher on all seven domains of the SET (Sugai & Horner, 2006). Both subscale percentage scores and overall SET scores are reported on the online database (Sugai et al., 2001).

During a SET assessment, the trained observer determines the degree to which a school had each of the model's seven critical features in place. The observer would review written materials and established discipline procedures, such as school improvement goals and behavioral incident summaries. SET assessors are also required to note visual displays of the three to five expected behaviors posted in 10 specified locations throughout the school (e.g., hall, classrooms, cafeteria, library). The SET assessor would also conduct brief interviews about school procedures, policies, and standards for positive behavior and rule infractions several

individuals at the school. The assessor would interview: administrators (30 minutes each), 2 students per class per grade level (1-3 minutes each, at least one boy and one girl), and school staff (using a random number table, at least 10 staff members were interviewed for approximately 2-5 minutes each). The SET is conducted biannually or annually and can take approximately two to five hours to administer (Sugai et al., 2001).

SET authors have reported excellent psychometric properties for the SET (Horner et al, 2004.) The SET has a reported overall reliability of .96 which attests to the consistency of the instrument. It also has a test-re-test reliability of 97.3%. This means when a SET is given and re-given the results are consistent and do not vary significantly if the school environment it is evaluating has not changed significantly.

When compared to the Effective Behavior Support Survey (Horner et al, 2004), the SET has a correlation of .75. This correlation provides evidence of meaningful construct validity, which means that the SET and the Effective Behavior Support Survey (EBSS) appear to measure a similar construct of PBS implementation. The EBSS was designed to be completed by education personnel for initial action planning and annual evaluation of support systems in individual schools (Safran, 2006). One of the major differences is that the EBSS was designed to discover staff attitudes and observations of behavior support systems that are in place in the school. In contrast, the SET uses a separate rater that interviews various levels of school personnel and students to determine if the school environment has changed to coincide with the philosophies of PBS. Having high construct validity with the EBSS indicates that the SET is, in fact, measuring that PBS structures are in place.

Procedures

The data for the analysis in this study was obtained through access to ABC-UBI's online database. SET data were collected by ABC-UBI coaches and meeting notes were submitted online to ABC-UBI's database by school personnel. Both of these sources of data are password protected, but accessible on ABC-UBI's website.

The SET is given annually by assigned coaches to all schools that participate in the ABC-UBI network of schools. The coach administers the SET to the school and then submits the results of the SET to ABC-UBI using the online database. The data reported in the database includes individual subtest percentage scores (which are based on the 7 key features) and the overall percentage score. For the purposes of this study, the overall percentage score will represent implementation progress for that year. Subtest percentages may be used if there is a need for further information on areas of weakness when overall percentages fall below 80% standard.

Meeting notes are generated from monthly meetings of the school's implementation team. The team consists of key members of the school's faculty and staff that work to implement PBS in their school. Occasionally the ABC-UBI coach also attended the meeting. During these meetings, the team discussed data that they have collected or need to collect and goals that they are working on or new goals that they want to set.

Research Design

The four research questions all address aspects of different implementation paths of PBS. The meeting notes from the participating school teams could offer additional information about

the school team experiences during the implementation process. In order to answer the research questions, the notes were first examined using the open-coding method. Then the schools were divided into implementation patterns based on SET scores and the meeting notes were read again. This was done for two reasons: to confirm, add or redefine initial themes and to see how the prevalence of each theme varied across different implementation patterns.

Data Analysis

The method of coding used in this study was derived from the grounded theory of qualitative research (Straus & Corbin, 1990). The coding process is more specifically called open-coding. Straus and Corbin describe open-coding as an identification of themes as they emerge from raw data. More specifically stated, the researcher identifies and names conceptual categories. The categories are defined through common words and phrases that create a multi-level definition. These categories can be modified or replaced in subsequent analyses.

Open-coding was used in this study by analyzing the qualitative data contained in the notes and then coding the key words and phrases. The notes will be coded as having a 1 or 0 for each theme. Receiving a coding of 1 indicated that a theme was present in the meeting note and a 0 indicated the theme was not present. The themes are rated as being present when the researchers found items of discussion that corresponded with the definition of that theme. An initial analysis of all the meeting notes occurred before dividing the school teams by implementation pattern. Thus, initial analysis yielded general categories and themes that were derived from raw data. These definitions were then modified when the notes were re-analyzed to see how the themes varied according to the implementation pattern of the school.

The definition of the categories or themes in the notes will then be confirmed through measures of inter-rater reliability between the primary researcher and the two assistants. Inter-rater reliability will be measured using intraclass correlations. Intraclass correlations are a good measure of consistency and conformity of quantitative data between multiple raters (Shrout & Fleiss, 1979). Ultimately, this study is striving for qualitative data, but the open-coding method provides the quantitative piece that is needed to confirm inter-rater reliability.

After the initial open-coding process, the schools in this study were divided into varying categories of implementation based on patterns found in their overall SET scores. The notes were then examined again in order to confirm or redefine initial themes. The categories of implementation were: consistently high implementing, increasing implementation and inconsistently implementing. Table 1 shows the overall SET score from the 22 schools over three years of data collection. These SET scores prompted the different implementation categories.

A school that consistently attained a SET score of 88 percent and above all three years was considered consistently high implementing. A school that showed a linear progression of SET score improvement over time (e.g. the score could start below 80 and builds to a high 90 to 100 percent by the third year) was considered to be increasing implementation. This growth prompted the question concerning the difference between year 1 themes and year 3 themes. Some schools had SET scores that were up and down with no sense of growth or consistency. For example, there were schools that were able to attain the 80% overall score standard for high implementation for one year, but then attained a score below 80% another year. These schools were considered inconsistently implementing and prompted the question of the difference in

themes between a good and bad year. By these criteria 9 schools fell under consistently high implementing, 8 schools fell under increasing implementation and 5 schools fell under inconsistently implementing. In order to answer the specific research questions about each implementation pattern, the notes were examined to see how common themes varied based on implementation pattern. Table 1 below displays three years of SET scores and resulting implementation pattern for each school.

Table 1

Three years of Overall SET scores

School Number	SET Year 1	SET Year 2	SET Year 3	Resulting Category
1	79	89	97	Increasing Implementation
2	83	90	95	Increasing Implementation
3	79	98	89	Inconsistently Implementing
4	92	98	89	Consistently High Implementing
5	90	92	77	Inconsistently Implementing
6	95	79	92	Inconsistently Implementing
7	97	93	96	Consistently High Implementing
8	88	71	94	Inconsistently Implementing
9	88	100	100	Consistently High Implementing
10	91	90	90	Consistently High Implementing
11	88	96	97	Consistently High Implementing
12	90	89	93	Consistently High Implementing
13	82	91	100	Increasing Implementation
14	87	94	100	Increasing Implementation
15	87	93	100	Increasing Implementation
16	87	91	99	Increasing Implementation
17	90	90	97	Consistently High Implementing
18	87	93	100	Increasing Implementation
19	77	88	97	Increasing Implementation
20	92	98	96	Consistently High Implementing
21	89	95	91	Consistently High Implementing
22	94	76	97	Inconsistently Implementing

The last question involved examining the notes for evidence of coaching. This might be noting if a coach attended a meeting, was consulted on a problem, or was asked to assist in professional development for the school's faculty and staff. The primary researcher obtained a list from ABC-UBI personnel of all their coaches of record during the time period the meeting notes were submitted. The primary researcher looked for any pattern in the meeting notes concerning the gradual transfer of leadership from the coach to the school team.

Summary

School teams participating in ABC-UBI's program to implement school-wide Positive Behavior Support regularly submit meeting notes and other data to ABC-UBI's online database. Meeting notes from schools with three years of the fidelity measure SET were examined in order to answer questions about implementation of PBS. The findings that address the research questions will be presented in the following chapter.

Results

The intent of this research was to identify themes in the meeting notes of schools that had implemented Positive Behavioral Support (PBS). The first part of the analysis of the meeting notes was conducted in order to identify themes. The notes were read through several times and 13 themes were identified and confirmed through multiple measures of inter-rater reliability. The second part of the analysis involved comparing the themes according to the different implementation patterns of various schools.

Schools involved in this research had one of three implementation patterns, which included the following: (a) Consistently High Implementing schools that had SET scores above 80, the passing score, during all three years of data collection; (b) Increasing Implementing schools are those schools that showed a linear pattern of growth with a SET score at or below 80 that then increased to a score 90 and above by the third year of implementation; and (c) Inconsistently Implementing schools that had no consistent pattern or order to their SET scores (e.g., SET scores over the years of data collection may have been 88, 90, 73 or 95, 75, 88).

The research questions are related directly to the implementation patterns for the schools. The research focused on the following questions: a) What themes were most prevalent for Consistently High Implementing schools, b) What were the themes that were most prevalent for Increasing Implementation schools and what are the differences between year 1 and year 3 themes, and c) What were the differences in themes for Inconsistently Implementing schools between a “good” year that received a high SET (i.e. in the 90s) versus a “bad” year that the same school received a low SET score (i.e. in the 70 to 80 range). The purpose of the final

research question was to discern if there was any evidence of a gradual transfer of leadership from the coach to the school team.

Deriving and Confirming Themes

The first part of the analysis was done to establish themes found in the meeting notes. In this analysis, the primary researcher identified common themes in the meeting notes of high-implementing schools, which were defined at that time as schools that had at least three years of notes with SET scores. A total of 13 themes were identified and included topics such as data collection, assigning roles to team members, and the individual positives given to students for keeping the school rules. The themes were discovered through an open coding process of adding in themes as they were found and repeated throughout the meeting notes of various school teams. The many resulting themes were then refined, combined, or rejected as related to inter-rater reliability.

Over the course of the analysis, inter-rater agreement was measured 3 times using random samples of 10% of the meeting notes. This was done in order to confirm the presence of themes in the meeting notes and the accuracy of the definition of the themes. Inter-rater agreement was calculated using intraclass correlations. The primary researcher and two other graduate student researchers participated in the measuring of inter-rater agreement. Intraclass correlations were used because they are a good measure of consistency and conformity of quantitative data between multiple raters (Shrout & Fleiss, 1979). The quantitative data used for the intraclass correlations came from a coding process. This coding process involved the primary researcher and the two other graduate student researchers. They each coded a 10% sample of the

meeting notes as having a 1 or 0 for each theme. Receiving a coding of 1 indicated that a theme was present in the meeting note and a 0 indicated the theme was not present. The themes were rated as being present when the researchers found items of discussion that corresponded with the definition of that theme. The inter-rater agreement ranged from 80-95% and the overall average inter-rater agreement was 86%. The themes and their individual inter-rater reliability are listed in Table 1 in order of the strength of theme. The strength of theme was determined by the theme's overall prevalence, or how often it was present in all of the meeting notes.

Table 2

Inter-rater Reliability Results

Theme	Overall Prevalence	Inter-rater Reliability
Make Assignments	71%	90%
Use Data	71%	82%
Give Individual Rewards	38%	83%
Provide Prof. Development	37%	80%
Integrate ABC-UBI Tools	35%	88%
Teach/Post Expectations	33%	83%
Develop Discipline Plans	29%	86%
Celebrate Successes	23%	89%
Collaborate with Others	22%	85%
Coach School Teams	22%	83%
Reward Teachers	17%	95%
Involve Parents	15%	83%
Plan Budgets	13%	93%

Overall, the data in the Table 2 shows that, across all implementation patterns, the school teams spent 50-80% their time in meetings assigning roles and discussing data. Other themes that were present in 30-50% of the meeting notes across all the different implementation patterns

included individual rewards, staff professional development, teach and post expectations and UBI tools. The remaining themes had sufficient inter-rater reliability to be included in the study, but were not found in high percentages of the meeting notes.

Some of the variability in the inter-rater reliability may be attributed to a single phrase in a meeting note that may have prompted the rater to indicate multiple themes. For example, meeting notes may have documented the use of a computer program called Discipline Tracker. Discipline Tracker allowed the school to keep track of data related to discipline such as tardies, detentions, and referrals for inappropriate behaviors. Depending on how this item was discussed, it could indicate the presence of three different themes including: discipline, UBI tools, and data. The theme of discipline was indicated because talking about the data from Discipline Tracker may prompt further discussion about their discipline procedures as well, thus fitting in with the theme of Discipline. The theme of UBI tools was indicated because Discipline Tracker was a tool that the coaches from ABC-UBI encouraged their schools to use if they did not already have comparable tool in place. Thus it would also indicate the theme of UBI tools as being present. And finally, because Discipline Tracker was a data collection tool, it could also be included in the theme of data.

Another example of the notes discussing one item that may fit in multiple themes was when the school teams discussed professional development. There were examples in the meeting notes where the team members came to faculty meeting to instruct their staff and faculty on how to implement a program or intervention. In some cases the team solicited their UBI coach to come and give the instruction. When that happened, the one item in the note would then fall

under the theme of staff professional development and the theme of coaching. Despite one item of discussion prompting the presence of multiple themes in some cases, each theme has been confirmed by inter-rater reliability as being separate and individual themes.

Defining the Themes

The following paragraphs describe the 13 themes that were derived from the meeting notes. The paragraph includes a brief definition, an example in context and the inter-rater reliability for the theme. In order to protect the anonymity of participants and schools, names and other identifying features have been changed. The themes are presented according to the strength of theme as determined by their overall prevalence in the meeting notes.

Make assignments. The researchers found that high implementing schools would often make assignments for their team members in each meeting. For example, a meeting note might document this theme by recording, “Julie is in charge of getting supplies for the no-tardy party this month. Dave is going to collect and compile data from paws tickets and office referrals. Gloria is going to the team leader meeting to present ideas on future no tardy parties. Alice will talk to the PTA about using the snow cone machine for the party.”

Using data. School teams discussed data, which could include data that needs to be collected or that has been collected. Schools teams often followed a pattern of gathering data to evaluate an intervention or program the school team was implementing (e.g., a survey for teachers, office discipline referrals, tardies, or positive tickets given to students), then they discussed the data collected to problem solve or improve the intervention or program. An example of soliciting for data was in this note from one school team, “Send out teacher feedback

form, including specific note to respond about the Level II white slip.” In this instance, the team asked the teachers for data about an intervention and for a specific response about a piece of that intervention. A discussion about data that has been collected was recorded like this school team wrote, “The data indicates that our red slips [office discipline referrals] are being received by newer students.” Another school team recorded their discussion about their data and the subsequent decision based on the data by noting, “Steady improvement is being made with tardies. Students may need to have zero tardies in order to attend the No-tardy party and we may need to implement Friday School for [students with] chronic tardies.” All of these school teams talked about data they were going to collect or had collected for the purpose of evaluating goals that they had set up (i.e. reducing office discipline referrals and reducing student tardiness), which defined the theme of data.

Give individual rewards. Team members often discussed this theme in the context of what they wanted to use for individual rewards. Individual rewards tended to be tickets or praise notes that could be turned in for a prize or a drawing. A school might discuss their tickets like this, “Revise tickets: color code, put dates on them before copying them for grade teams.” And then discussed how to use them like this, “Reinforcement ideas: drawing numbers from power log, drawings per grade levels, continue with Bingo. Administration will take care of prizes for drawings.”

Provide professional development. The researchers noted that the UBI teams would talk about training their faculty or staff when they wanted to start a new program or to increase the number of teacher and staff participating in the implementation of a program. Members of the

school team might conduct an in-service at faculty meeting or, as mentioned in some examples from the theme coaching, a coach might serve as an expert to instruct the faculty and help them understand the basic UBI principles when a new program or an intervention was being implemented. One school team recorded their discussion about staff professional development in this manner, “Prepare short presentation to staff about how to access BEP program,” while another school team indicated that they wanted to re-train their staff on the how to do an intervention called Think Time.

Integrate ABC-UBI tools. The tools endorsed by ABC-UBI were a variety of research-based programs that were documented in many of the notes. These were tools recommended by ABC-UBI to as a way to begin implementing PBS strategies. These starter programs included the following: (a) the Principal’s 200 club, a program where students write their name up on a grid and win a prize if they are part of a row that was completed, (b) Discipline Tracker, a computer program for collecting office discipline referrals, and (c) the Behavioral Evaluation Plan (BEP) a tool to monitor and track student behavior. Some school teams personalized their Principal’s 200 club by retaining the basic features but calling it something different. For example, one school called their 200 club the Bulldog’s Best Club in accordance with their school mascot. The same school team talked about how they might change their previously established procedure in this manner: “Discussion of Bulldog Best club. [It is] suggested [that the] kids draw numbers when they sign book [then] announce winners of 10 in a row next morning.” An example of how Discipline Tracker was recorded in the notes is the following: “Discipline Tracker shows 23 lunch detentions for March. Ouch.” A school team may have

talked about the BEP in this way, “Teachers have identified 3 new students that may benefit from being part of the BEP” or the notes may mention it as a source of data that they are discussing.

Teach and post expectations. ABC-UBI encouraged their schools to frequently teach and re-teach their school rules and expectations so that students clearly understood behavioral expectations. When one of the school teams wanted to have the lunch rules re-taught, it was documented by this note, “There will be lunch room training on Friday October 26th. Everyone was given a schedule to follow. The times are times to be there with no travel time. The training is by the student government people. Teachers have been teaching these rules.” Posting and teaching the school rules and expectations often occurs together. The school team may have talked about the initial creation of school rules and how to display them. The school team may have developed acronyms to organize their rules and to talk about options for the acronyms in their notes. The school team may also have focused on a different expectation, “The new 200 board target behavior for this month will be ‘I can follow adult directions the first time.’”

Develop discipline plans. Each school team needed to develop a discipline plan to complement their positive reinforcement. There needed to be multiple levels of discipline procedures for the school. Discipline procedures included: developing a hierarchy of consequences for different student offences, office discipline referrals that detailed what misbehavior students were doing and what their consequences were or changes they may make based on data from the computer program Discipline Tracker that summarizes office discipline referral data. One school team recorded a typical example of how discipline is discussed when

they wrote, “Review and revise discipline and reinforcement protocols. We went through and fine-tuned write-ups on praise tickets, 200 club cards, sit away, think time, minor referrals (oops), major referrals (O.R.), and restricted recess.” In this example the school was mentioning items that are part of both their reinforcement and discipline procedures. Praise tickets and 200 club cards are part of the reinforcements. Sit away involves a student sitting in a separate area away from other students in the classroom. Think time is where a student would leave their classroom and go to another classroom to write up why they were sent out and then meet with his classroom teacher later to resolve the problem that prompted the think time. Minor and major referrals refer to the difference between a smaller event that might get students sent to the office (e.g. spitting at recess or throwing a tantrum in class) and a larger offence that a student would get sent to the office for (e.g. bringing a weapon to school or physical assault of another student). Restricted recess was also referred to as structured recess and involves students earning access to equipment or playing certain games at recess. Sit away, think time, major and minor referrals, and restricted recess were all part of the discipline procedures for this school team.

Celebrate successes. Researchers indicated the presence of this theme by finding examples in the notes of when the schools celebrate their successes. Schools have celebrated their successes by having parties to reward students for meeting an expectation (i.e., having perfect attendance, having no tardies or being able to recite and follow school rules). Celebration would also include when the UBI team recognized themselves and the school for the completion of a school goal. For example, one set of notes documented, “Next 200 club party make Valentine cookies, decorate them and play bingo.” The 200 club was an individual and group

reward used to reward a student for following the school rules. The student draws a random number on a grid of 200 squares. When a row was filled with student names that entire row received a prize (i.e. the party to celebrate their success at keeping the school rules) and the board would be erased and the process would begin again. Another school team documented, “At the end of the month we will have a celebration week where we will review the school-wide expectations and at the end of the week there will be some sort of treat and extra recess for the entire school as long as they can recite the expectations.” Another example shows how a team recognized their efforts, “Celebrate!! First of all we need to recognize how far we have come as a school and in looking at our school's improvement plan we are meeting our goals as a whole, if not higher than we actually set our sights!”

Collaborate with others. According to the meeting notes, ABC-UBI encouraged school teams to collaborate with other schools and outside agencies. One school team may have collaborated with another school in setting up their PBS structures (e.g. school-wide rules or reinforcement and discipline procedure) or to observe a program or intervention another school is developing. One school team recorded this, “Alice will be talking with the UBI team from [the other UBI school in our district] about their BEP process; hopefully this will help us to make a smooth transition as we implement this program.” ABC-UBI also encouraged collaboration with outside agencies to help fund interventions or to help provide extra services for students. One school team wanted to encourage their teachers to increase supervision of students in the hallways, so they asked a local healthcare agency if they would donate pedometers to their teachers. The pedometer would then be used to have a walking contest to record which teachers

were walking the most with their students. One school team found and applied for a grant to help provide funds to increase mental health services available to students with frequent behavioral referrals. Collaborating with groups related to the school like the PTA or the student council was also counted as part of the theme of collaboration. The inter-rater agreement on this theme was 85%.

Coach school teams. As noted in the literature review section of this paper, having access to coaching and technical assistance is important to help schools implement PBS with fidelity (Horner et. al., 2004). This might be noting if the coach attended the meeting, if the team mentioned consulting with the coach about a problem or a new program. For example, one school contacted their coach to help settle a debate among team members about the school's end of year celebration. There were also examples in the meeting notes where school teams ask the coach to help train the faculty in a new program like this school recorded, "Find a date for [our coach] to teach the room away procedure to our staff." In addition, a school may have wanted their coach to come to faculty meeting in order to create more buy-in by having the coach speak about the value and importance of the basic principles of PBS. One school recorded an example of this use of the coach in this manner, "We will be scheduling a day when [the coach] can come in and talk to the faculty about teaching to the expectations. [We want her to speak about] making sure that there is time each day set aside to teach expectations, procedures, and social skills for every class."

Reward teachers. This theme was present when teams talked about incentives for teachers when tasks or responsibilities related to the implementation of PBS were completed.

For example, this could include turning in data, supporting implementation of a perfect attendance program or giving out tickets to individual students for following school rules. For example, one school team recorded, “Make up a checklist for teachers to mark off if they taught this month’s school-wide expectation and reviewed dismissal expectations. Make sure teachers are rewarded.” Another school team recorded discussing teacher rewards in this manner: “Ask the PTA about funding for teacher incentives.” Three meetings later the same school recorded, “Gift cards for teacher rewards are being purchased by the PTA.” One school team even created a 200 club board for their staff and discussed what they wanted to do for incentives. Different incentives included preferred parking spaces, special luncheons or staff parties, candy bars and other treats or gift cards like mentioned above.

Involve parents. This theme was noted anytime a parent attended a meeting or the team talked about involving the PTA. For example, one team recorded this in their notes, “A survey on how the parents feel about the social skills and how well the students learned them was sent home.” The same note included an example of a different way to record parent involvement when they recorded, “We've decided to go with the PTA Walk-a-thon [for the end of year celebration].”

Plan budget. This theme revolved around the money the school needed to implement school-wide plans. A school team may have discussed applying for money from ABC-UBI or problems with their own school’s budget that may be affecting their plans for the school. As an example, one school recorded, “James will look into getting our funding approved by UBI. We need to let him know what we want to spend the funding on (specific incentives for teachers and

students).”

Connecting the Themes to the Research Questions

The research questions were derived by dividing the participating schools into groups according to implementation patterns described above. Three implementation patterns were derived from SET scores over the implementation process. A consistently high implementing school received high passing SET scores (above 80) during all three years of implementation. An increasing implementing school had SET scores that were lower and below passing in the first year of implementation and then increased to a high passing score by the third year of implementation. An inconsistently implementing school attained passing SET scores some years and other years they attained SET scores below passing. From the groupings of the schools into different implementation patterns, a series questions were developed based on the implementation pattern.

Table 3 displays the prevalence of each theme across the different parts of the implementation patterns. The percentage reflects how often that specific theme appeared in the meeting notes. The percentages do not add up to 100% because the percentage represents how often the theme appeared in the meeting notes. For example, the number in the first column and first row was 82% because it appeared in 248 of the 347 notes from consistently high implementing schools. The table represents all of the results of the 13 themes across implementation patterns. The table will highlight the significant difference in prevalence for each theme with asterisks on the highest and lowest prevalence rate. If the largest difference is 20 points or more, then there will be two asterisks next to the two percentages (e.g. 80%**). If the

largest difference is between 10 and 19 points, then there will be one asterisk next to the two percentages (e.g. 80%*). Differences lower than 10 points will not be noted. The discussion in the paragraphs following the table addresses the results of themes that had the highest prevalence rates in relation to the implementation pattern of the schools the notes were obtained from and also address the specific aims of each research question

Table 3

Results from Qualitative Analysis of Team Meeting Notes

Theme	Consistent Schools	Increasing Year 1	Increasing Year 3	Inconsistent Good Year	Inconsistent Bad Year
Make Assignments	82%**	80%	78%	58%	55%**
Use Data	77%	50%**	71%	71%	88%**
Give Individual Rewards	51%**	34%	41%	33%	30%**
Provide Prof. Development	31%	50%*	40%	25%*	41%
Integrate ABC-UBI Tools	40%*	39%	33%	38%	27%*
Teach/Post Expectations	41%*	33%	22%*	37%	34%
Develop Discipline Plans	39%*	22%	39%	25%	20%*
Celebrate Successes	38%**	26%	23%	20%	9%**
Collaborate with Others	34%**	21%	28%	20%	9%**
Coach School Teams	17%	17%	55%**	8%**	13%
Reward Teachers	27%*	11%*	16%	15%	16%
Involve Parents	21%*	18%	7%*	8%	20%
Plan Budgets	19%	8%	8%	17%	13%

** Indicates the difference of 20+ points; *Indicates the difference between 10 and 19 points.

When each implementation pattern is closely examined, they each have 5 themes that were in approximately 30% or more of the notes. The top five themes of each implementation

pattern are listed in Table 4. The contents of Table 4 are discussed in the paragraphs following the table.

Table 4

Top Five Themes for the Implementation Patterns

Theme Rank	Consistent Schools	Increasing Year 1	Increasing Year 3	Inconsistent Good Year	Inconsistent Bad Year
Most Prevalent	Make Assignments	Make Assignments	Make Assignment	Use Data	Use Data
Second Highest	Use Data	Use Data	Use Data	Make Assignments	Make Assignments
Third Highest	Individual Rewards	Provide Prof. Development	Coach School Teams	ABC-UBI Tools	Provide Prof. Development
Fourth Highest	Teach/Post Expectations	ABC-UBI Tools	Individual Rewards	Teach/Post Expectations	Teach/Post Expectations
Fifth Highest	ABC-UBI Tools	Individual Rewards	Provide Prof. Development	Individual Rewards	Individual Rewards

Consistently high implementing schools. The first research question sought to discover what the most prevalent themes were for schools that were considered consistently high implementing. The first question was addressed by reading the notes of the schools that qualified for those specific conditions, coding the notes for what themes were present in each notes and then calculating the percentage of how often the theme was present in the notes. The five most prevalent themes in the notes of consistently high implementing schools included: make assignments (82 %), use data (77%), give individual rewards (51%), teach and post expectations (41%), and integrate ABC-UBI tools (40%). Other themes that were also present in 30% or more of the notes were: develop discipline plans (39%), celebrate successes (38%), collaborate with

others (34%), and provide professional development (31%). Consistently high implementing schools had a total of 9 themes in 30% or more of the notes that was more than any of the implementation patterns.

Increasing Implementation Schools. The second research question sought to discover what the most prevalent themes were in the meeting notes for schools that increased their SET scores from the first year to the third year of implementation. This research question also considered the differences between the first and third year of increasing implementation. This was done if change over time was reflected in the prevalence of the themes presented above.

In the first year of increasing implementation schools, there were 5 themes that were in 30% or more of the meeting notes: make assignments (80 %), use data and provide professional development tied for second (50 %), integrate ABC-UBI tools (39 %), give individual rewards (34 %), and teaching and posting expectations (33%). All of these themes are the same as consistently high implementing schools with the exception of provide professional development having a prevalence of 50%, thus earning it a higher placement on the list.

By year three, the schools in the increasing implementation pattern received all SET score of 85-100. This means their level of implementation may be comparable to schools from the consistently high implementing implementation pattern. Despite being at a comparable level of implementation, the results were different. The top five themes for year 3 of increasing implementation were: make assignments (78 %), use data (71%), coach school teams (55%), give individual rewards (41%) and provide professional development (40%). There were two other themes that were also in 30% or more of the meeting notes. They were: develop discipline

plans (39%) and integrate ABC-UBI tools (33%).

As mentioned above, schools in the third year of increasing implementation should be at a comparable level of implementation as consistently high implementing schools. Despite this, there are distinct differences in the results of the prevalence of themes. The theme of coach school teams and the theme of provide professional development were more prevalent in the notes of increasing implementing schools. In consistently high implementing schools the theme of provide professional development was present in 31% of meeting notes. This was not much lower than increasing implementation schools, which had the theme of provide professional development in 40% of their meeting notes. The more notable difference was with the theme coach school teams. In increasing implementation schools, the theme of coach school teams was present in 55% of meeting notes. In contrast the theme was only present in 17% percent of the notes of consistently high implementing schools.

The differences between year 1 and year 3 of increasing implementation schools were very similar to the differences between year 3 of increasing implementation schools and consistently high implementing schools. This was because, as mentioned previously, year 1 of increasing implementation had all the same themes as consistently high implementing schools, with exception of provide professional development. In consistently high implementing schools provide professional development was 31%, whereas in year 1 of increasing implementation schools it was 50%.

Prevalence in a “good” year versus a “bad” year. The third question sought to determine if differences existed in the meeting note themes of a “good” year that received a high

SET score (i.e., 90 or above) versus a “bad” year that the same school received a low SET score (i.e., between 70 and 80). Unlike the second question where the researcher was looking specifically at the first year of implementation versus the third year of implementation, a “good” year and a “bad” did not have to be in sequential order. The school could have had two years where they had excellent SET scores, but then had a “bad” year where they received a poor SET score. They could also have one good year, one bad year and then the next year was good again. The researcher picked the highest SET score year to examine the notes and then picked the lowest SET score year to examine those notes for the purpose of seeing what the differences were in the prevalence of themes.

The themes present in 30% or more of the meeting notes of a “good” year were as follows: use data (71%), make assignments (58%), integrate ABC-UBI tools (38%), teaching and posting expectations (37%), and give individual rewards (33%). These themes are all the same as the first five most prevalent themes of consistently high implementing schools. The differences between the “good” year of inconsistently implementing schools and consistently high implementing schools were variations in the prevalence of the themes. For example, in consistently high implementing schools, the theme of make assignments was present in 82% of the meeting notes, whereas in the “good” year of inconsistently implementing schools the theme of make assignments was only present in 58% of meeting notes.

The themes present in 30% or more of the meeting notes of a “bad” year of implementation were as follows: use data (88%), make assignment (55%), provide professional development (41%), teaching and posting expectations (34%) and give individual rewards

(30%). The themes from the notes of a “bad” year were almost the same as themes from a “good” year. There were only a few percentage points of difference between the themes of the “good” and “bad” years. The only exception was that in the “bad” year of inconsistently implementing schools provide professional development made the list instead of UBI tools.

An unusual similarity between the two years of inconsistent implementation was that the theme of make assignments was present in 58% and 55% of the notes in a “good” and “bad” year respectively. In every other implementation pattern, make assignments was generally present in about 80% or more of the meeting notes. Thus, this similarity between the “good” year and “bad” year sets the Inconsistent Implementation pattern apart from the other implementation patterns.

Evidence of coaching. The fourth research question sought to discover evidence of the transfer of leadership from coaches to the school team and to find out if the transfer pattern varied across all the implementation patterns. Evidence of coaching was identified as the team discussing something they wanted the coach to do, discussing advice obtained from the coach or if the coach attended the meeting. At times, this was difficult information to obtain because it was not always easy to identify the coach in the notes. (The schools did not always provide the name of the coach, and ABC-UBI provided an incomplete list the coaches that worked in the schools during that time frame.) Furthermore, before the 2008-2009 school year, whether a coach was present at a meeting was not consistently recorded. This is because ABC-UBI added a checkmark to their online meeting note submission to include whether the coach was present at the meeting. This required the teams specifically report whether the coach attended or not. For

these reasons, confirmed evidence of coaching in the meeting notes were not reliable until 2008. There is evidence of coaching in the meeting notes, but the reliability of this data must be questioned. For example, the data shows that evidence of coaching increased from 17% in year one of increasing implementation to 55% in year three of the same implementation pattern. However, many meeting notes from year three of increasing implementation were recorded in 2008, so the increase could be due to the increase in reporting.

Summarizing Theme Connections

The results of this analysis identified 13 common themes that existed in the notes of schools that had access to technical assistance from the state initiative ABC-UBI. The schools were then grouped into different implementation patterns according to their scores on the SET over their three years of monitored implementation. The data revealed that the themes varied in subtle ways when the schools were grouped by their implementation patterns. The themes of make assignments, use data, and give individual rewards appear in the top results of each implementation pattern. Other themes such as teach and post expectations, provide professional development, and Integrate ABC-UBI tools had high prevalence rates in concordance with different implementation patterns. For example, Teach and Post Expectations was one of the top five themes for consistently high implementing schools, year 1 of increasing implementation schools, and the good and bad of inconsistently implementing schools. Gathering evidence of coaching from the meeting notes was problematic because coaches were not consistently identified by UBI or by the school teams until teams were required to report if the coach attended the meeting.

Discussion

Positive Behavior Support (PBS) has grown from a way to design and implement individual interventions for students with severe behavior problems to means of conceptualizing interventions and prevention efforts for all students (Foster-Johnson & Dunlap, 1993; Sailor, 2005). In the process of that evolution there have been many articles and published works generated to understand how to use the principles of PBS to help students be successful at school (O'Dell et. al., 2011; Sailor, Dunlap, Sugai, & Horner, 2009). Individual researchers and statewide initiatives have published results about their program effectiveness, which is important in showing that PBS is an effective and useful service delivery model (Horner et al., 2009; Lohrmann, Forman & Martin, 2008). While research has been published concerning factors that influence sustainability and high implementation, they have been done through reviews of case studies and through post-implementation interviews of key stakeholders (Bambara, Nonnemacher & Kern, 2009; McIntosh et al., 2010; Young, Caldarella, Richardson & Young, 2011). These articles identified several common factors: readiness or school culture, staff and faculty buy-in through professional development, and continuous data collection.

This study aimed to identify factors that influenced sustainability; the findings were generated from team meeting notes during the implementation process. Because participating schools had various implementation patterns, the author also explored how these factors varied according to implementation pattern. This was done through systematic examination of team meeting notes recorded by school teams during the process of implementation. These meeting notes contained information concerning the process of implementation as well as the struggles

and successes that the school teams reported during the process of implementation of school-wide PBS.

Reflection on Themes

An initial analysis of the meeting notes of high implementing schools identified common themes present in the meeting notes. The analysis yielded 13 themes that ranged in prevalence from 7-82% of the meeting notes and had inter-rater agreement ranging between 80-95%. The themes were (a) make assignments, (b) use data, (c) give individual rewards, (d) provide professional development, (e) integrate ABC-UBI tools, (f) teach and post expectations, (g) develop discipline plans, (h) celebrate successes, (j) collaborate with others, (k) coach school teams, (l) reward teachers, (m) involve parents, and (n) plan budget. Two themes that were present in more than half of the all the meeting notes were: make assignments and use data. There were four other themes in a third or more of all the meeting notes. These themes included the following: give individual rewards, provide professional development, teach and post expectations and integrate ABC-UBI tools. The following paragraphs are a reflection on possible explanations concerning the major and minor themes.

Major themes. The major themes from the results dominated all other themes by being the most consistently discussed in the meeting notes. They appeared in over 50% of meeting notes across implementation patterns. Because these themes appeared in so many meeting notes, the themes of make assignments and use data may be considered the most important factors to school teams in this study during the process of implementation of PBS and in terms of sustainability of PBS.

Makes assignments. The theme of make assignments appeared in an average of 71% of the notes across implementation patterns. In systems change research Shapiro (2006) noted that simply changing policy is not enough to create real change in a system, but internal resources must be used in order to keep the commitment to long-term real change. One of those internal resources and an important factor in establishing long-term systems change with PBS is the establishment of an action team made up of key stakeholders (Handler et al., 2007). According to the notes, ABC-UBI school teams were made up of an administrator, a teacher from each grade level and a parent. These individuals create the action plan that helps create the long-term systems change that is required for PBS to truly succeed in the school.

The theme of make assignments could be representative of the school team taking action to implement PBS in their school. The results from Table 3 tend to indicate that assigning tasks may be an important factor in keeping the team members actively involved in implementing PBS in the school. It could also indicate that the team leader may have wanted to record team assignments for the purpose of following up on those assignments in the next meeting. These theories are supported by the data from the results from the inconsistently implementing schools.

Regardless of whether it was a note from a good year, where the school attained a passing SET score of 80 or above, or an incident from a bad year, a SET score below 80, the theme of make assignments was only marked as being in 58 and 55% of team notes, respectively. This number becomes more significant when considering data on the theme of make assignments from consistently high implementing schools and increasing implementing schools. Both of these implementation patterns had the theme of make assignment appear in 78-82% of their notes. Therefore, these data trends tend to suggest that regularly recording assignments to team members in the meeting notes may help to increase the consistency or growth of the implementation of PBS in schools.

Examination of specific content of a sample of meeting notes also tended to support these theories. For example, the primary researcher examined more closely the notes of one elementary school team in the implementation category of inconsistently implementing schools. During a bad year, this particular elementary team only recorded their assignments in 4 out of 16 meeting notes. It was so sporadic that none of the assignments given related to any of the other assignments in that set of notes. During a good year, there were still few assignments made, but the recorded assignments were in consecutive notes in the middle of the sample and consisted of related topics. In contrast, a school team from the consistently high implementing category often recorded their assignments and specifically mentioned in their notes that they reviewed their assignments. This suggests that for a certain period during the year, the school team from the inconsistently implementing category was operating like a consistently high implement school, but for whatever reason, that school team was not able to sustain the change.

According to information from personnel, ABC-UBI encouraged their school teams to review main points from their previous meetings. As mentioned above, there is evidence in the meeting notes that this occurred with consistent and successful teams. If assignments are recorded in the notes, it is easier for the team leader to follow-up on whether those tasks are completed. The primary researcher also noted that some of the meeting notes included congratulations for team members when they accomplished assigned tasks. These examples suggest that these school teams are creating an atmosphere of public accountability and reinforcement for positively contributing to the team and the goals of the school. Also, the notes tended to show that team members that were assigned tasks most frequently were often the members that attended the meeting consistently. Team members that consistently attended meetings also completed their assignments, which led to the school team being more consistent in their implementation. Ultimately, the factors associated with consistently implementing schools represented a sustained systems change.

Use data. The theme of use data appeared on average in 71% of the meeting notes examined in this research. Data collection has long been identified as a best practice in sustained systems change (Curtis, Castillo & Cohen, 2008; Curtis & Stollar, 2002). In the research literature, data are collected for the team to engage in data-based decision making or problem solving in the following ways: the evaluation of interventions being implemented, to determine areas in the school that need attention, and to evaluate the overall effectiveness of school's implementation of PBS (Spaulding et. al., 2010; Dunlap et. al., 2009; Barrett, Bradshaw & Lewis-Palmer, 2008; Blonigan et. al., 2008;). The data collected and discussed by the school

teams from this study were generally for similar purposes.

An example of intervention data includes when a school introduces positive behavior tickets when students follow the rules. The school team would collect data through counting the tickets used and through surveying teachers about changes needed for the intervention. In order to determine an area of need, a member of the school team could examine the office discipline referrals (ODR). The ODRs might reveal where problem behaviors occur most (e.g. students using the bathroom during lunch) and then developing a procedure to reduce the problem (e.g. student monitors are placed at the doors to the bathrooms and check students in and out of the bathroom). Evaluating the effectiveness of school's implementation of PBS, depending on the school team's goal, might show as a reduction in general ODRs, tardies, or the number of students being sent to the office for a specific reason. The data that the school team collects should be related to the goals that the school team has for changing their school. In this sense, the data collected becomes benchmark measures of systems change in the school that measure whether the school is getting closer to their goals which is why data collection is

The theme of use data for increasing implementation schools seems easily explained. The results from year 1 of increasing implementing schools recorded the theme of data as being present in only 50% of notes versus year 3 when the theme of use data is present 71%. Taking into consideration that consistently high implementing schools, which were often further along in the implementation process than the other school examined, discussed the theme of use data in 77% of meeting notes, the explanation for the trend between year 1 and year 3 seems simple. The easiest explanation appears to be that the school teams were starting out in implementation in the

first year and therefore not discussing data as much as during the third year, when data is collected and discussed regularly. In reading the notes of year 1 school teams, the primary researcher found evidence that in year 1 of implementation, school teams tended to discuss how they want to use PBS in their schools, what UBI tools they want to incorporate into their plan, and how to build staff buy in. These contextual pieces fit with the data that suggests that the themes of individual rewards, UBI tools and staff professional development were highly prevalent for year 1 of increasing implementation school teams.

The results for inconsistently implementing schools tended to prompt more questions than answers. The “bad” years of inconsistently implementing schools documented the theme of use data in 88% of the meeting notes. In contrast, the “good” year of inconsistently implementing had the theme of use data in 71% of their notes. To add further context, consistently high implementing schools were recording the theme of use data in 77% of their meeting notes. Why are school teams discussing data significantly more during the “bad” year of implementation? The simplest explanation may be that the school teams are using data to improve their practice. While there is evidence in the notes that this was certainly the case for some school teams, the notes also suggest other explanations.

Another explanation could be that inconsistently implementing school teams may have been trying to collect too much data, making it difficult to maintain regular collection of the data or to glean meaningful interpretations from too much information. For example, a school team maybe trying to change too many school structures at once. They could be taking data on tardies, trying to collect data on playground problems in order to change playground procedures, keeping

track of how often teachers are giving out a school-wide individual reward for following general rules and trying to establish whether staff is open to starting the principal's 200 club. If a school team is trying to accomplish all of these goals at once, then it is possible that several of these endeavors may not succeed, which in turn may decrease staff-buy resulting in a decrease in implementation of school-wide PBS.

Another possible explanation could be that the school teams were talking a lot about their data, but then not following through with actions prompted by the data. This could certainly be the case as inconsistently implementing schools had the lowest prevalence rate for the theme of assign roles. In the section of this paper concerning the theme of make assignments, it was established that inconsistent schools tended to not record their assignments and not follow through on assignments for the bad implementation year. In a sample from the good year, recording and following through assignments only tended to happen sporadically. In both cases, the school teams were not following through with assignments and those assignments could possibly be related to data collection. The result could be a high instance of discussing data and what the school team wanted to do with their data, but not a lot of follow through concerning those ideas, which is a scenario that could fit with the data in Table 3.

One last possible explanation also stems from an idea mentioned in the theme of assign roles. In the theme of assign roles, the fulfillment of assignments was noted to have been reviewed during subsequent meetings and even commented on with congratulations. Thus, the school teams had created a system of public accountability where one member of the team was checking up on assignment to make sure they were completed. This practice was associated with

consistently implementing schools. Public accountability may reinforce team members for completing assignments and encourage them to perform to the same level in the future. There was little to no evidence of this system of public accountability from samples of inconsistently implementing schools. So once again, we have schools that may have aspirations toward collecting data, which results in a high prevalence of the theme of use data, but the follow-through may not be happening because there is no one holding team members accountable.

Minor themes. Four other more minor themes were present in the meeting notes from the school teams that also have their place in the literature as important factors for implementing school-wide PBS. The minor themes were present in 30% or more of the meetings notes. These themes were: individual rewards, staff professional development, teaching and posting expectations and UBI tools.

Give individual rewards. According to the literature, Positive Behavior Support started out as an individualized intervention before becoming a school-wide service delivery model (Dunlap et al., 2008). As it developed into a school-wide model for the prevention of problem behaviors, there was always a focus on rewarding individual students for displaying positive behaviors in order to reinforce those positive behaviors (Dunlap et al., 2009; Sugai & Horner, 2006; Lewis & Sugai, 1999). School teams that were consistently high implementing included discussions concerning individual rewards in 51% of their meeting notes, which is more than any of the other implementation patterns. Discussions about individual rewards in this research tended to be concerned with whether faculty and staff were giving out individual rewards or whether the individual rewards were still meaningful to the students. This may indicate that a

school team that is consistent in their implementation of PBS will also be consistent in making sure their faculty and staff regularly distribute and have meaningful individual rewards for their students.

Provide professional development. The theme of provide professional development was another one of the minor themes present in 30% or more of all of the meeting notes. Although it is sometimes called capacity building, provide professional development is mentioned in the literature as one of the key factors in creating sustainability and high-fidelity implementation of PBS (Bambara, Nonnemacher, & Kern, 2009; McIntosh et al., 2010). Although, the studies listed here found it as an important factor through an interview done with key stakeholders post-implementation, the research from this study indicates that it also appears as a theme in meeting notes during implementation. It is possible that this theme appears in fewer notes than a theme like use data or make assignments simply because school teams only discuss it around the time the professional development occurs.

The results of this research showed the highest prevalence of the theme of provide professional development (50%) was during the first year of increasing implementation schools. The next highest prevalence rate of the theme of provide professional development (41%) was during the “bad” year of inconsistently implementing schools. This may be due to the school teams focusing on trying to increase the ability of the staff and faculty to perform their necessary roles in intervention and prevention programs being implemented by the school team (Young et al., 2011). In the third year of increasing implementation schools, provide professional development drops to 40%, but it is one of the top five themes for that implementation pattern,

so it was still a topic that was being discussed in a preponderance of the meeting notes.

Consistently high implementing schools recorded the theme in 31% of their notes. This suggests that they still had professional development as an important part of their model, but it did not take precedence over other topics of discussion that were prevalent in more of the meeting notes. Staff professional development was discussed the least in notes from the “good” year of inconsistently implementing schools, which suggests that this was not an important theme to a majority of the school teams of that implementation pattern during that time.

Teach and post expectations. This theme is an aspect that is often mentioned in the research literature as an important factor for the appropriate implementation of PBS (Barrett, Bradshaw & Lewis-Palmer, 2008; Bohanon et. al., 2009). Despite being listed as an important factor, it only appeared in 30% or more of all the meeting notes in this research study. The data from this study poses possible explanations for why this occurs. Consistently high implementing schools had the highest percentage of the theme recorded in their meeting notes at 41%. This seemed to be an unusual result because data from increasing implementation school teams indicates that the theme of teaching and posting expectations is higher in year 1 of implementation (33%), but slightly lower by year 3 (22%). Those results seem to indicate that as school teams progress in implementation, and move on from one of the initial steps of setting up their school rules, the discussion about teaching and posting expectations decreases. So then, why do consistently high implementing schools, which are generally in the later stages of implementation, have the highest percentage of the theme of teach and post expectations? In examining the meeting notes, many school teams from consistently high implementing schools

chose to re-teach one of the expectations each month. If this theme was mentioned each month, by even a few school teams, it could account for the higher percentage. It would also suggest that effective school teams continue to attend to core PBS principles, like teaching and re-teaching expectations, as they progress into later years of PBS implementation.

Integrate ABC-UBI tools. This last minor theme could be represented in the literature as various models or tools in the literature that researchers would promote as being in line with general PBS principles. For example, the check-in, check-out system is a program for schools that has been promoted by ABC-UBI in the past years (Crone, Horner & Hawken, 2004.) This program has also been endorsed as effective part of school-wide PBS by many researchers (Todd et. al., 2008; Filter et. al., 2007; McCurdy & Reibstein, 2007; Hawken & Horner, 2003). The highest prevalence is once again in the consistently high implementing schools (40%), while the other implementation patterns show prevalence levels at or around 30%. Once again, these results have meaning when put into context of the schools. A school that was consistently high implementing generally already had procedures for regular data collection, had specific roles regularly assigned to teams members, established their rules and discipline procedures, and now could add research-based interventions, which are often ABC-UBI tools, that are compatible to a school-wide PBS discipline structure. Other schools that were less consistent during the early phases of the implementation process may still be focusing on restructuring their school and establishing the basic elements of implementation. The school teams also may show an increase in discussions concerning ABC-UBI tools because they attended ABC-UBI's biannual Fall or Spring Institute and are interested in establishing the ABC-UBI programs discussed at Fall or

Spring Institute in the future.

Limitations

One limitation of this study is the restricted ethnic diversity in the participating schools. The demographic statistics of the schools in this study reflected a sample of school populations that were 70% white, 23% black, and about 1% of all other ethnicities. Because of this factor, this study was unable to address many cultural issues. There was only one school that was concerned with translating their school rules into Spanish. Beyond that, there were no indications of multicultural issues affecting implementation of PBS.

Another limitation of this study was mentioned in the results section of this paper. This limitation concerned the inability to properly identify the coaches in the meeting notes. Because early records did not include the coaches' names, the primary researcher had to rely on what personnel at ABC-UBI remembered or whether the team members recording the meeting notes chose to indicate that a person was the coach. ABC-UBI had two levels of coaching: a state level coach from ABC-UBI and a district level coach. There was no information available to the primary researcher about district level coaches, so these names were not known at the time this study was conducted.

A final limitation of this study was the challenge of establishing inter-rater reliability. The meeting notes were dense and sometimes difficult to understand. The second and third readers often reported that they needed to read through a few notes from a particular school in order to capture their style of note taking before being able to properly code the notes. The primary researcher had to read the notes of several schools multiple times in order to confirm

that the themes recorded were indeed present in the meeting notes. In establishing a culture of school-wide PBS, there is almost another language being spoken in the notes that must be learned through knowledge of the ABC-UBI program and the PBS literature. The secondary researchers often needed help in understanding the terminology in order to establish the presence of the themes. Ultimately, these challenges were addressed and overcome, but it would be a difficulty faced by any researcher choosing to use meeting notes as a data source.

Implications for Future Research

Many of the schools that were part of this study participated in the ABC-UBI program for several years in order to have enough data and meeting notes to be considered for this research. Long-term sustainability of interventions in general and especially PBS has been sought after in the research literature (McIntosh et. al., 2009; Grimes, Kurns & Tilly, 2006). While the research from this paper brought forth some insights about sustainability, a follow-up study that includes these participating schools would certainly add more to the literature about long-term sustainability of PBS. Results from a follow-up study would be especially interesting because of the continued technical support from ABC-UBI received by schools participating in the program. These supports include continued contact from a district coach and opportunities for professional development provided by ABC-UBI. This follow-up study could be done using post-implementation interviews with administrators, team leaders, and teachers.

There are several research questions that could be addressed by a follow-up study of the schools from this research. Would the schools from this study pass a SET measure today? Would a school that was characterized as a consistently high implementing school still be considered

high implementing? Is there still a school team that meets regularly? Has the school team stayed in contact with UBI? Changes in administration and school climate may effect whether a school continued the procedures and prevention programs set in place by the school team years ago. It would be a meaningful extension of this research and the research literature to find out how these schools' current status with PBS and what factors have influenced that outcome.

The data from this study was obtained from an existing database that has been amassed over several years. In examining all the data contained in the database, the primary researcher was not able to find much information on low implementing schools. While this study included information about inconsistently implementing schools, there were no consistently low implementing schools. The primary researcher assumed that there were no consistently low implementing schools because they did not submit data or meeting notes to the database. While engaging in further investigation concerning possible reasons why this may have occurred, the primary researcher learned from ABC-UBI personnel that there are certain standards and a culture of readiness that must be met before school teams can join the ABC-UBI's technical assistance program. In order to gain more information about the difficulties low-implementing school's face, it would be beneficial to learn more about the process of acceptance into the program and the challenges and successes of schools seeking technical assistance from ABC-UBI

Implications for Practitioners

The school teams that contributed their meeting notes to this research faced various successes and failures in their process of implementing school-wide PBS that have been discussed in the previous paragraphs. As a practitioner trying to make a difference for a school

team, based on this research, some of the following practices would be helpful to considering when implementing PBS and system change. The implications for practice from this research are primarily drawn from discussions about the major and minor themes.

According to the data from this research, school team members should practice effective team behaviors associated with consistently high implementing schools such as the following: having regular roles and responsibilities, following through with proposed actions that contribute to the success of the current goals of the school team and promote public accountability for successes and failures of the team. If school teams cannot accomplish the basics of effective team behaviors, then they will probably struggle to effectively implement PBS in their school. For example, public accountability was one of the most common ideas across themes that contributed to effective implementation. As team members were accountable and reported on their assignments the importance and value of the team's work was made public. Consistently high implementing schools provided a good example of this practice. According to specific examples in the notes, consistently high implementing schools reviewed previous assignments and would congratulate team members on their completion of assignments. Considering the consistent success of these school teams during the year examined, these results suggest that publicly reviewing and acknowledging completion of assignments would be a good practice to incorporate in an effective team.

Collecting and discussing data is a very important priority for school teams successfully implementing PBS. As mentioned above, the theme of data was recorded in 71% of all of the meeting notes that were examined in this study. Data trends from the results of the research

indicated that school teams that were beginning the process of implementation or were working on increasing their implementation and recorded the theme the least at 50% because they were more concerned with establishing consistent school rules or creating an action plan rather than continuous data collection. In contrast, schools that were consistent or more established in increasing implementation tended to record the theme of data in 70% or more in their notes. The odd result that particularly highlighted the pitfalls of data collection were found in the notes of inconsistently implementing schools. Almost in direct opposition of the data trends between consistent and increasing implementation schools, inconsistently implementing school teams recorded data at a higher percentage of 88%. There were several reasons discussed previously to account for the higher percentage in struggling schools including the following: collecting more data to ameliorate problems, collecting too much data without being able to reasonably handle all the projects related to the data, discussing data without following through on assignments and a lack of public accountability to encourage team members to follow through with assignments related to data.

School teams should reward individual students in a way that is meaningful for the students. This theme was something that was discussed often by successful school teams. Data trends indicated that school teams that were more consistent in implementation tended to discuss individual rewards for students more (50%) than school teams that were less consistent in their implementation (30%). Typical conversations about individual rewards may include whether the faculty and staff are giving out the rewards consistently or if the rewards need to be changed based on whether the rewards are still meaningful to students.

School teams should provide faculty and staff the opportunity to participate in regular professional development in order to promote correct implementation of PBS programs and interventions. This theme appeared in 50% of the notes for year 1 of increasing implementation schools, which indicated that staff professional development was most important at the beginning of implementation. School teams that were struggling with their implementation of PBS had the theme of staff professional development in 41% of their meeting notes. This may have been to create staff buy in or could have been due to the school team having trouble establishing opportunities to have professional development beyond those provided by ABC-UBI, therefore it continued to be a topic of discussion in several notes.

School teams can be creative in how these professional development meeting are delivered. Examples from the meeting notes included calling in someone from the state office of education, a coach that is helping with the implementation process or even calling on members of the school team. Examples from the notes also indicated that professional development provided by UBI through Fall and Spring Institute help school teams pull together plans and data for collaboration sessions and the poster session. During collaboration sessions, the school teams meet together with members of their own teams and with other schools in the nearby area to discuss information from presentations and how they could incorporate it into their school plan. The poster promenade during the Spring Institute is done for the purpose of displaying the progress of school teams in their implementation process. Once again, a form of public accountability is playing a part in an important factor in successful PBS implementation.

The last implication for practice is the most significant message that stands out in the

data. Table 3 highlights the significant differences in each theme; and almost every theme had an asterisk under consistently high implementing schools, with the percentage under consistently high implementing schools being the higher of the two. The implication of this data has been mentioned in brief before, but will be discussed more in depth here. That implication previously mentioned was that consistently implementing schools have established the basic structures and important practices for successful PBS practice and are now able to incorporate other practices such as the following: involving parents, rewarding teachers, celebrating successes and collaborating with other schools and outside agencies. These schools have expanded their PBS practice beyond the school to a whole community practice that is essentially a process systems change. System change often incorporates professional learning communities, which are a collaborative effort by the school as a team to sustain continuous school improvement (Hord, 1997). Schools that strive to become professional learning communities tend to focus on changing the culture of the school rather than just restructuring the school (Louis, 2006). Perhaps this is the biggest difference between consistently high implementing schools and the schools in the other implementation patterns. Consistently high implementing schools were not just trying to change their school structure, but instead they were using ABC-UBI supported school-wide PBS to add to their process of creating a culture of continuous school improvement.

Conclusion

In recent years, educators and school psychologists have been searching for empirically supported and data-based interventions to help all students succeed in school (Kratochwill, 2005). Positive Behavior Support has emerged as a systems change process that focuses on

prevention of problem behaviors through teaching, modeling, and reinforcing positive behaviors (Sugai & Horner, 2006). This model for change differs from previous models for dealing with problem behaviors. The main difference is that instead of waiting for problems to occur and then punishing misbehaviors, PBS uses a proactive approach that teaches positive expectations, gives opportunity for practice, feedback, and praise (Lewis & Sugai, 1999).

PBS can take 3-5 years to implement because it is such a dramatic systems change for schools (McIntosh, 2004). During the planning and initial phases in implementation, schools may turn to state agencies (e.g., ABC-UBI) to access assistance from coaches that would provide technical assistance to the schools. This has been found to be an extremely important factor to ensure that staff and administrators appropriately understand how general PBS principles can be applied to specific settings (Barret, Bradshaw, & Lewis, 2008; Warren et al., 2003). Some of the most recent PBS research has focused on factors that influenced successful implementation of PBS (Young et. al., 2011; McIntosh et al., 2010; Bambara, Nonnemacher & Kern, 2009). The data from previous research generally comes from literature reviews or post-implementation interviews. Data collected from school teams during the implementation process might yield more information to add to current knowledge.

This study set forth to discover major themes of schools implementing PBS and whether those themes varied across implementation patterns. This was done by systematic examination of team meeting notes. Results indicated the presence of thirteen themes. Two major themes and four minors themes emerge from the results as being points of discussion for current and future research of PBS implementation. Make assignments and use data were the main themes of this

research and the ultimate implications for practice due to their appearance in the discussions of over 70% of all meeting notes examined. A practitioner hoping to improve their school teams' functioning may want to emphasize recording and reviewing assignments made to team members. Practitioners must also emphasize the importance of continuous data collection and discussion in order to promote consistent implementation in their school. In addition, the meeting notes seem to indicate that public accountability could be the important factor in making the most prevalent themes effective.

References

- Ballard-Krishnan, S.A, McClure, L., Schmatz, B., Travnika, G.F., Nolan, M. (2003). The Michigan PBS Initiative: Advancing the Spirit of Collaboration by Including Parents in the Delivery of Personnel Development Opportunities. *Journal of Positive Behavior Interventions*, 5(2), 122–126.
- Bambara, L.M., Mitchell-Kvacky, N.A., Iacobelli, S. (1994). Positive behavioral support for students with severe disabilities: An emerging multicomponent approach for addressing challenging behaviors. *School Psychology Review*, 23(2), 263–278.
- Bambara, L.M., Nonnemacher, S., Kern, L. (2009). Sustaining School-Based Individualized Positive Behavior Support : Perceived Barriers and Enablers. *Journal of Positive Behavior Interventions*, 11(3), 161–176.
- Barrett, S. B., Bradshaw, C. P., & Lewis-Palmer, T. (2008). Maryland statewide PBIS initiative. *Journal of Positive Behavior Interventions*, 10(2), 105-114.
- Berkman, K.A., & Meyer, L.H. (1988). Alternative strategies and multiple outcomes in the remediation of severe self-injury: going “all out” nonaversively. *The Association for Persons with Severe Handicaps*, 13(2), 76-86.

- Bohanon, H., Fenning, P., Carney, K. L., Minnis-Kim, M., Anderson-Harriss, S., Moroz, K. B., et al. (2006). Schoolwide application of positive behavior support in an urban high school: *Journal of Positive Behavior Interventions*, 8(3), 131-145.
- Carr, E. G. (2007). The expanding vision of positive behavior support: Research perspectives on happiness, helpfulness, hopefulness. *Journal of Positive Behavior Interventions*, 9(1), 3-14.
- Carr, E.G., & Durand, V.M. (1985). Reducing behavior problems through functional communication training. *Journal of Applied Behavior Analysis*, 18(2), 111-126.
- Chitiyo, M., & Wheeler, J. J. (2009). Challenges faced by school teachers in implementing positive behavior support in their school systems. *Remedial and Special Education*, 30(1), 58-63
- Center on Positive Behavioral Interventions and Supports, (2005). School-wide positive behavior support implementer's blueprint and self-assessment. Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Education, Office of Special Education Programs. Retrieved from <http://www.pbis.org/tools.htm>
- Colvin, G. & Kameenui, E.J. (1993). Reconceptualizing behavior management and school-wide discipline and general education. *Education & Treatment of Children*, 16(4), 361-382.
- Curtis, M. J., Castillo, J. M., & Cohen, R. M. (2008). Best practices in system-level change. In A. Thomas, J. Grimes, A. Thomas & J. Grimes (Eds.), *Best practices in school psychology V (vol. 3)*. (pp. 887-901). Washington, DC US: National Association of School Psychologists.

- Curtis, M. J., & Stollar, S. A. (2002). Best practices in system-level change. In A. Thomas, J. Grimes, A. Thomas & J. Grimes (Eds.), *Best practices in school psychology IV (vol. 1, vol. 2)*. (pp. 223-234). Washington, DC US: National Association of School Psychologists.
- DeRosier, M.E. (2004). Building relationships and combating bullying: effectiveness of a school-based social skills group intervention. *Journal of Clinical Child & Adolescent Psychology*, 33(1), 196-201
- Donellan, A.M., LaVigna, G.W., Zambito, J., Thvedt, J. (1985). A time-limited intensive intervention program model to support community placement for persons with severe behavior problems. *The Association for Persons with Severe Handicaps*, 10(3), 123-131.
- Dunlap, G., Carr, E.G., Horner, R.H., Zarcone, J.R., & Swartz, I. (2008). Positive behavior support and applied behavior analysis: a familial alliance. *Behavior Modification*, 32(5), 682-698.
- Dunlap, G., Sailor, W., Horner, R.H., Sugai, G. (2009). Overview and History of Positive Behavior Support. In Sailor, W. , Dunlap,G. Sugai, G., Horner, R.H. (Eds). *Issues in Clinical Psychology: Handbook of Positive Behavior Support*. Springer: New York, NY.
- Durand, V. M., & Kishi, G. (1987). Reducing severe behavior problems among persons with dual sensory impairments: an evaluation of a technical assistance model. *The Association for Persons with Severe Handicaps*, 12(1), 2-10.

- Favell, J. E., & Reid, D. H. (1988). Generalizing and maintaining improvement in problem behavior. In R. H. Horner, G. Dunlap, & R. L. Koegel (Eds.), *Generalization and maintenance* (pp. 171–196). Baltimore: Brookes.
- Foster-Johnson, L., & Dunlap, G. (1993). Using functional assessment to develop effective individualized interventions for challenging behaviors. *Teaching Exceptional Children, 25*(2), 44-50.
- Foster-Fishman, P., Nowell, B., & Yang, H. (2007). Putting the system back into systems change: A framework for understanding and changing organizational and community systems. *American Journal of Community Psychology, 39*(3), 197-215.
- Fuchs, L.S., & Fuchs, D. (2001). Principles for sustaining research-based practice in the schools: a case study. *Focus on Exceptional Children, 33*(6), 1-16.
- George, H. P., & Kincaid, D. K. (2008). Building district-level capacity for positive behavior support. *Journal of Positive Behavior Interventions, 10*(1), 20-32.
- Greenwood, C.R. (2009). Treatment integrity: revisiting some big ideas. *School Psychology Review, 38*(4), 547-553.
- Grimes, J., Kums, S., & Tilly, W.D. (2006). Sustainability: An Enduring Commitment to Success. *School Psychology Review, 35*(2), 224-244.

- 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.
- Handler, M.W., Rey, J., Connell, J., Thier, K., Feinberg, A., Putnam, R. (2007). Practical considerations in creating school-wide positive behavior support in public schools. *Psychology in the Schools*, 44(1), 29-39.
- Hord, S. M. (1997a). *Professional learning communities: Communities of continuous inquiry and improvement*. Austin: Southwest Educational Development Laboratory.
- Horner, R.H., & Carr, E.G. (1997). Behavioral support for students with severe disabilities: Functional assessment and comprehensive intervention. *The Journal of Special Education*, 31(1), 84-104.
- Horner, R.H., Dunlap, G., Koegal, R.L., Carr, E.G., Sailor, W., Anderson, J., Albin, R.W., O'Neill, R.E. (1990). Toward a technology of "nonaversive" behavioral support. *The Association for Persons with Severe Handicaps*, 15(3), 125-132.
- 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.
- 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.

Kincaid, D., Childs, K., Blasé, K. A., & Wallace, F. (2007). Identifying barriers and facilitators in implementing schoolwide positive behavior support. *Journal of Positive Behavior Interventions*, 9(3), 174-184.

Kratochwill, T. R. (2005). Theories of change and adoption of innovations: The evolving evidence-based intervention and practice movement in school psychology. *Psychology in the Schools*, 42(5), 475-494.

Kreger, M., Brindis, C. D., Manuel, D. M., & Sassoubre, L. (2007). Lessons learned in systems change initiatives: Benchmarks and indicators. *American Journal of Community Psychology*, 39(3), 301-320.

Lalli, J.S., Browder, D.M., Mace, F.C., & Brown, D.K. (1993). Teacher use of descriptive analysis data to implement interventions to decrease students' problem behaviors. *Journal of Applied Behavior Analysis*, 26(2), 227-228.

Lewis, T.J., Sugai, G., & Colvin, G. (1998). Reducing problem behavior through a school-wide system of effective behavioral support: investigation of a school-wide social skills training program and contextual interventions. *School Psychology Review*, 27(3), 446-460.

- Lewis, T. J., & Sugai, G. (1999). Effective behavior support: A systems approach to proactive schoolwide management. *Focus on Exceptional Children, 31*(6), 1-24.
- Lohrmann, S., Forman, S., Martin, S., & Palmieri, M. (2008). Understanding school personnel's resistance to adopting schoolwide positive behavior support at a universal level of intervention. *Journal of Positive Behavior Interventions, 10*(4), 256-269.
- Louis, K. S. (2006). Changing the culture of schools: Professional community, organizational learning, and trust. *Journal of School Leadership, 16*(5), 477-489.
- Mass-Galloway, R. L., Panyan, M. V., Smith, C. R., & Wessendorf, S. (2008). Systems change with school-wide positive behavior supports: Iowa's work in progress. *Journal of Positive Behavior Interventions, 10*(2), 129-135.
- Mayer, G. R. (1995). Preventing antisocial behavior in the schools. *Journal of Applied Behavior Analysis, 28*(4), 467-478.
- McIntosh, K. (2004). Use of Targeted Group Interventions in High Schools. In Bohanon-Edmonson, H., Flannery, K. B., Eber, L., & Sugai, G. (2004). *Positive Behavior Support in High Schools: Monograph from the 2004 Illinois High School Forum of Positive Behavioral Interventions and Supports*. University of Oregon unpublished manuscript.

- Mitchem, K., Richards, A., & Wells, D. (2001). Implementing and evaluating effective professional development in functional behavioral assessment in rural schools (ERIC Document Reproduction Services No. ED453034). San Diego, CA: U.S. Department of Education.
- Muscott, H. S., Mann, E. L., & LeBrun, M. R. (2008). Positive behavioral interventions and supports in new hampshire. *Journal of Positive Behavior Interventions*, *10*(3), 190-205.
- 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.
- O'Dell, S.M., Vilaro, B.A., Kern, L., Kokina, A., Ash, A.N., Seymour, K.J., Castrantas, L.M., Kollar, R.B., Wagner, A.M., Bartholomew, A., & Thomas, L.B. (2011). JPBI 10 years later: trends in research studies. *Journal of Positive Behavior Interventions*, *13*(2), 78-86.
- Roach, A. T., & Elliott, S. N. (2008). Best practices in facilitating and evaluating intervention integrity. In A. Thomas & J. Grimes (Eds.), *Best practices in school psychology* (Vol. 2., 5th ed., pp. 195–208). Bethesda, MD: National Association of School Psychologists.
- Sailor, W. (2005). Positive Behavior Support. *Encyclopedia of School Psychology*. Sage Reference:Thousand Oaks.
- 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.

- Sanetti, L. M. H., & Kratochwill, T. R. (2009). Toward developing a science of treatment integrity: introduction to the special series. *School Psychology Review, 38*(4), 445-459.
- Shapiro, E.S. (2006). Are We Solving the Big Problems? *School Psychology Review, 35*(2), 260 -265.
- Shrout, P.E. & Fleiss, J.L. (1979). Intraclass Correlations: Uses in Assessing Rater Reliability. *Psychological Bulletin, 2*, 420-428.
- Simonsen, B., Fairbanks, S., Briesch, A., Myers, D., Sugai, G. (2008). Evidence-based practices in classroom management: considerations for research to practice. *Education & Treatment of Children, 31*(3), 351-380.
- Simonsen, B., Sugai, G., & Negron, M. (2008). Schoolwide Positive Behavior Supports Primary Systems and Practice. *Council for Exceptional Children, 40*(6), 32-40.
- Singer, G. H. S. (2000). Ecological Validity. *Journal of Positive Behavior Interventions, 2*(2), 122-124.
- Smylie, M. A. (1989). Teachers' views of the effectiveness of sources of learning to teach. *The Elementary School Journal, 89*, 543-558.
- 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.

Stollar, S. A., Poth, R. L., Curtis, M. J., & Cohen, R. M. (2006). *Collaborative strategic planning as illustration of the principles of systems change*. National Association of School Psychologists.

Strauss, A., & Corbin, J. (1990). *Basics of qualitative research: grounded theory procedure and techniques*. Newbury Park, Sage Publications, Inc.

Sugai, G. (1992). The design of instruction and proactive management of social behaviors. *LD Forum*, 17(2), 20-23.

Sugai, G., & Horner, R. H. (2001). *School climate and discipline: Going to scale*. Eugene, OR: University of Oregon.

Sugai, G., Horner, R. H., Dunlap, G., Hieneman, M., Lewis, T. J., Nelson, C. M., Scott, T., Liaupsin, C., Sailor, W., Turnbull, A. P., Turnball, H. R., Wickham, D., Wilcox, B., Ruef, M. (2000). Applying positive behavior support and functional behavioral assessment in schools. *Journal of Positive Behavior Interventions*, 2(3), 131-143.

Sugai, G., Horner, R.H., Sailor, W., Dunlap, G., Eber, L., Lewis, T., Kinciad, D., Scott, T., Barrett, S., Algozzine, R., Putnam, R., Massanari, C., & Nelson, M. (2005). *School-wide positive behavior support: Implementers' blueprint and self-assessment*. Eugene, OR: University of Oregon.

Sugai, G., & Horner, R. H. (2006). *A promising approach for expanding and sustaining school wide positive behavior support*. National Association of School Psychologists.

Sugai, G., & Horner, R. H. (2008). What we know and need to know about preventing problem behavior in schools. *Exceptionality, 16*(2), 67-77.

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

Sugai, G., Simonsen, B., & Horner, R. H. (2008). Schoolwide positive behavior supports: a continuum of positive behavior supports for all students. *Teaching Exceptional Children, 40* (6), 5.

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

Utah Personnel Development Center Multi-Tiered System of Support. (2010). Retrieved from <http://www.updc.org/abc/>

Utah State Office of Education UPASS Reports. (2009). Retrieved from <http://www.schools.utah.gov/main/DATA-STATISTICS/Accountability/Accountability-Reports.aspx>

Warren, J. S., Edmonson, H. M., Griggs, P., Lassen, S. R., McCart, A., Turnbull, A., et al. (2003).

Urban applications of school-wide positive behavior support: Critical issues and lessons learned.

Journal of Positive Behavior Interventions, 5(2), 80.

Young, E.L., Caldarella, P., Richardson, M. J., & Young, K.R. (2011). *Positive Behavior Support in*

Secondary Schools: A Practical Guide. New York: Guilford Press.

APPENDIX C: Instruments

**School-wide Evaluation Tool
(SET)****Version 2.1****Data Collection Protocol**

- ✓ 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

Purpose of the SET

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

School-wide Evaluation Tool version 2.1, June 2005

© 2001 Sugai, Lewis-Palmer, Todd & Horner

Educational and Community Supports

University of Oregon



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.

<u>Products to Collect</u>	
1. _____	Discipline handbook
2. _____	School improvement plan goals
3. _____	Annual Action Plan for meeting school-wide behavior support goals

Using SET Results

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 version 2.1, June 2005

© 2001 Sugai, Lewis-Palmer, Todd & Horner

Educational and Community Supports

University of Oregon



School-wide Evaluation Tool

(SET)

Implementation Guide

School _____

Date _____

District _____

State _____

Step 1: Make Initial Contact

School-wide Evaluation Tool version 2.1, June 2005

© 2001 Sugai, Lewis-Palmer, Todd & Horner

Educational and Community Supports

University of Oregon



- A. Identify school contact person & give overview of SET page with the list of products needed.
 B. Ask when they may be able to have the products gathered. Approximate date: _____
 C. 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

School-wide Evaluation Tool version 2.1, June 2005

© 2001 Sugai, Lewis-Palmer, Todd & Horner

Educational and Community Supports

University of Oregon



Step 2: Confirm the Date to Conduct the SET

- A. 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

- A. Conduct administrator interview.
 B. Tour school to conduct observations of posted school rules & randomly selected staff (minimum of 10) and student (minimum of 15) interviews.
 C. Review products & score SET.

Step 4: Summarize and Report the Results

- A. Summarize surveys & complete SET scoring.
 B. Update school graph.
 C. Meet with team to review results.

Meeting date & time: _____

School-wide Evaluation Tool version 2.1, June 2005

© 2001 Sugai, Lewis-Palmer, Todd & Horner

Educational and Community Supports

University of Oregon



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 _____	

School-wide Evaluation Tool version 2.1, June 2005

© 2001 Sugai, Lewis-Palmer, Todd & Horner

Educational and Community Supports

University of Oregon



Feature	Evaluation Question	Data Source (circle sources used) P= product; I= interview; O= observation	Score: 0-2
	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 Other _____ O	
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 Other _____ P	
	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 Other _____ I	
	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 Other _____ I	
	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 Other _____ I	
	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 Other _____ I	

School-wide Evaluation Tool version 2.1, June 2005

© 2001 Sugai, Lewis-Palmer, Todd & Horner

Educational and Community Supports

University of Oregon



Feature	Evaluation Question	Data Source (circle sources used) P= product; I= interview; O= observation	Score: 0-2
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, Interviews Other _____ P	
	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	
	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 Other _____ P	
	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	

School-wide Evaluation Tool version 2.1, June 2005

© 2001 Sugai, Lewis-Palmer, Todd & Horner

Educational and Community Supports

University of Oregon



Feature	Evaluation Question	Data Source (circle sources used) P= product; I= interview; O= observation	Score: 0-2
	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	
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	

School-wide Evaluation Tool version 2.1, June 2005

© 2001 Sugai, Lewis-Palmer, Todd & Horner

Educational and Community Supports

University of Oregon



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= 4 th or lower priority; 2 = 1 st - 3 rd priority)	School Improvement Plan, P Interview Other _____ I	
	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 _____	

School-wide Evaluation Tool version 2.1, June 2005

© 2001 Sugai, Lewis-Palmer, Todd & Horner

Educational and Community Supports

University of Oregon



Feature	Evaluation Question	Data Source (circle sources used) P= product; I= interview; O= observation	Score: 0-2		
	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 Other _____ I			
	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 Other _____ P			
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 Other _____ I			
	2. Can the administrator identify an out-of-school liaison in the district or state? (0= no; 2=yes)	Interview Other _____ I			
Summary Scores:	A = /4	B = /10	C = /6	D = /8	E = /8
	F =	G = /4	Mean = /7		

School-wide Evaluation Tool version 2.1, June 2005

© 2001 Sugai, Lewis-Palmer, Todd & Horner

Educational and Community Supports

University of Oregon



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? (E2)
 - 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)

School-wide Evaluation Tool version 2.1, June 2005

© 2001 Sugai, Lewis-Palmer, Todd & Horner

Educational and Community Supports

University of Oregon



- 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

School-wide Evaluation Tool version 2.1, June 2005

© 2001 Sugai, Lewis-Palmer, Todd & Horner

Educational and Community Supports

University of Oregon



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)
(Define what the acronym means)

- 2) Have you taught the school rules/behavioral expectations this year? (B2)

- 3) Have you given out any _____ since _____? (C3)
(rewards for appropriate behavior) (2 months ago)

School-wide Evaluation Tool version 2.1, June 2005

© 2001 Sugai, Lewis-Palmer, Todd & Horner

Educational and Community Supports

University of Oregon



- 4) What types of student problems do you or would you refer to the office? (D2)
- 5) What is the procedure for dealing with a stranger with a gun? (D4)
- 6) Is there a school-wide team that addresses behavioral support in your building?
- 7) 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

School-wide Evaluation Tool version 2.1, June 2005

© 2001 Sugai, Lewis-Palmer, Todd & Horner

Educational and Community Supports

University of Oregon



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)

School-wide Evaluation Tool version 2.1, June 2005

© 2001 Sugai, Lewis-Palmer, Todd & Horner

Educational and Community Supports

University of Oregon



Interview and Observation Form

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

School-wide Evaluation Tool version 2.1, June 2005



© 2001 Sugai, Lewis-Palmer, Todd & Horner

Educational and Community Supports

University of Oregon

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
10		Y N	Y N			Y N	Y N	Y N	Y N		10	Y N

School-wide Evaluation Tool version 2.1, June 2005



© 2001 Sugai, Lewis-Palmer, Todd & Horner

Educational and Community Supports

University of Oregon

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
Total							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	

School-wide Evaluation Tool version 2.1, June 2005



© 2001 Sugai, Lewis-Palmer, Todd & Horner

Educational and Community Supports

University of Oregon

Is the documented crisis plan readily available?	Y N	Y N	Y N	Y N	Y N	Y N	Y N	X	X	X
--	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	---	---	---

School-wide Evaluation Tool version 2.1, June 2005

© 2001 Sugai, Lewis-Palmer, Todd & Horner

Educational and Community Supports

University of Oregon

