

10

Evaluating and Sustaining PBSS Outcomes¹

The most important thing is to never stop questioning.

Albert Einstein

PBSS Implementation Case Study: The Arkansas Department of Education's State Improvement Grant, Little Rock, Arkansas

On October 1, 2003, the Arkansas Department of Education, Special Education Unit (ADE-SEU) began implementing a five-year \$1.6 million per year State Improvement Grant (SIG) awarded to it from the U.S. Department of Education, Office of Special Education Programs (OSEP). The overall purpose of the SIG was to enhance student outcomes by improving their literacy, social-behavioral, and self-management skills through the implementation of

- Research-based literacy instruction strategies and interventions for At-Risk, under-achieving, and unsuccessful elementary through high school students (Goal 1)
- Schoolwide discipline, behavior management, and school safety (Positive Behavioral Support) strategies and interventions, at the elementary school

levels, for all students, especially those demonstrating significant behavioral or mental health challenges (Goal 2)

- Effective recruitment, professional development, and retention strategies so that every school in Arkansas would have fully qualified staff capable of using research-based strategies to teach students across the general education through special education continuum (Goal 3)

SIG Goal 2 focused on implementing Positive Behavioral Support Systems (PBSS) using the Project ACHIEVE blueprint in schools and districts across Arkansas as well as piloting school-based mental health partnerships between select school and community mental health center grantees over a four-year period. Selected statewide outcomes included the following:

- District Leadership Teams (DLT) from 95 Arkansas school districts attended a series of five PBSS trainings on different facets of Project ACHIEVE's PBSS and Response-to-Instruction and Intervention (RTI²) approaches. Each DLT included a district-level administrator, elementary school principal, general and special education teachers, and at least one related services professional.
- A cadre of 110 school psychologists and counselors from across the state were parallel-trained in the same PBSS/RTI² content areas.
- By the end of the SIG, 40 schools representing 26 school districts were involved in the on-site implementation of the three-year PBSS process. These schools received intensive training in all facets of Project ACHIEVE's PBSS and RTI² and School Prevention, Review, and Intervention Team (SPRINT) approaches as well as ongoing on-site consultation and technical assistance from SIG staff. For example, during SIG Year 4, 78 on-site consultations occurred with PBSS schools, along with periodic conference calls, e-mail consultations, and off-site meetings.

Many of the evaluation tools and articulation processes outlined in this chapter were developed or refined during the SIG. Annual evaluation reports were submitted to OSEP, and the final PBSS report documented successes in the areas of strategic planning and organizational development, staff interactions and school climate, behavior management and school safety, student discipline and self-management, and classroom engagement and academic achievement.

INTRODUCTION

School improvement is a continuous process where professional development and capacity-building initiatives, activities that scale up and sustain success, and evaluations that assess short- and long-term outcomes—all at the system, school, staff, and student levels—never end. Similarly, the implementation of schoolwide PBSS is ongoing, facilitated by end-of-year activities that ensure that policies, procedures, practices, and other lessons learned are transferred systematically from one school year to the next.

As introduced in Chapter 1, Project ACHIEVE is a comprehensive pre-school through high school continuous improvement and school effectiveness program whose ultimate goal is to design and implement effective school and schooling processes that maximize the academic and social, emotional, and behavioral progress and achievement of all students. Using a strategic planning, capacity building, professional development, and technical assistance process that helps students, staff, schools, and systems to continuously improve and become independent over time, Project ACHIEVE's PBSS implementation blueprints, procedures, and strategies have been the foundation of most of the effective practices embedded throughout this book. In Chapter 2, a detailed four-year PBSS implementation blueprint was discussed. While some schools may implement it in more or less than four years, the blueprint, nonetheless, can be used to evaluate a school's progress in implementing essential activities and sustaining critical outcomes.

Consistent with the data management, evaluation, and accountability component in Project ACHIEVE's effective schools blueprint (see Chapter 1), this chapter discusses some instruments, tools, and approaches that exemplify different ways to evaluate the success of a PBSS initiative across its primary goals and objectives. It also addresses a number of systematic ways to transfer, or articulate, PBSS successes from year to year, so that every school year begins, on the first day of school, at full throttle.

REVISITING THE PRIMARY PBSS GOALS AND CONNECTING THEM TO EVALUATION

The ultimate PBSS goal of facilitating students' social, emotional, and behavioral competency and self-management has been infused and reinforced throughout this book, along with a number of complementary student, staff, and school goals (see Chapter 1). Integrating all of these goals together, a comprehensive PBSS focuses on these schoolwide outcomes:

- High levels of academic engagement and academic achievement for all students
- High levels of effective interpersonal, social problem-solving, conflict prevention and resolution, and emotional coping skills and behaviors by all students
- High levels of critical thinking, reasoning, and problem-solving skills by all staff and students
- High levels of teacher confidence relative to instruction, classroom management, and helping students with academic or behavior problems
- Consistently effective instruction and classroom management across all teachers and instructional support staff

- Low levels of classroom discipline problems, discipline problems that need to involve the principal, or discipline problems that require student suspensions or expulsions
- High levels of parent and community support and involvement in consistently facilitating, motivating, and holding students accountable for self-management

In order to evaluate the degree to which these goals are accomplished, formative (short-term) and summative (long-term, and at completion) evaluations should be integrated into all PBSS planning, preparation, and implementation processes. These evaluations help schools and staff to know when intervention decisions and plans are ready to be made and written, when strategic instructional or intervention approaches are ready to be formally implemented, whether interventions have been implemented with integrity and intensity, and whether short- and long-term goals and outcomes have been accomplished. As is evident from the PBSS goals above, evaluations occur at system, school, staff, student, and home or community levels, and at the prevention, strategic intervention, and intensive need or crisis management levels.

In the data-based, functional assessment problem-solving presentation in Chapter 8, the six ways to collect data were introduced through the acronym *RIOTSS*. Critically, these data collection approaches are the same whether they are used during functional assessment or formative and summative evaluation. In fact, the only difference involves the questions that the data help to answer. During functional assessment, the question is, “Why are the problems we are concerned about occurring?” During evaluation, the question is, “Are our interventions to solve the problems working (formative evaluation), and have they successfully resolved the problem (summative evaluation)?” Thus, formative and summative evaluations utilize data that can be collected in the following ways:

Review (e.g., records, work samples, planned assessments, databases);

Interview (e.g., parents, current teachers, current intervention specialists, the student);

Observe (e.g., in the classroom, during assessments or interventions, in related settings);

Test (e.g., group or individual cognitive, achievement, behavioral, or personality assessments);

Survey (e.g., a class of students, a grade level of teachers); and

Self-Report (e.g., when an individual, including the student of concern, provides relevant information without prompting).

As noted in Chapter 8, all of these approaches have relative strengths and weaknesses depending on the focus of the evaluations. Ultimately, what is needed are reliable and valid data that are collected from multiple settings and sources, using different instruments and approaches.

EVALUATING PBSS OUTCOMES: A SAMPLE OF NEWER TOOLS AND APPROACHES

Addressing some of the PBSS outcomes cited above, a number of newer evaluation tools and approaches are presented below. They include tools that provide information on (a) staff interactions and collaborations across the school, (b) staff perceptions and beliefs relative to student management and school safety, (c) office discipline referrals, (d) discipline-related classroom observations of students and staff, and (e) staff expertise relative to implementing different behavioral interventions. This is not an exhaustive list as other PBSS evaluation tools and resources are available from other sources and should be considered and reviewed.

Evaluating Perceptions of Staff Interactions and School Cohesion. In order to accomplish any of the seven PBSS goals above, the staff interactions across a school (and district) need to be collaborative, trusting, mission-driven, and based on a shared commitment to the students, the school, the community, and each other. *The Scale of Staff Interactions and School Cohesion* (Knoff, 2007g; SSISC) is a 25-item survey that measures these areas by asking the staff in a school to “rate these items based on the last two months of interactions across the staff in your school (or the last two months of the last school year, if it is now the beginning of a new school year).” Each item is rated along a five-point scale from 1—Excellent to 5—Poor (see Table 10.1), and the data can be pooled and analyzed (a) for the entire staff, (b) by different grade or instructional levels of staff, (c) by instructional versus administrative versus support staff, or (d) in some other functional way.

It is critical to note that this survey measures staff members’ perceptions and the interactions that they have observed (or heard about) over the previous two months. These perceptions may not be accurate, and individual staff members’ observations may not be representative of those across the entire staff and school. At the same time, for many staff members, perception is reality, and their behavior and interactions with colleagues are often driven by their beliefs, attitudes, attributions, and relationships. When staff members complete and receive the results from this tool, they have one assessment of their collective perceptions of the quality of the interactions and cohesion across the school. This feedback may initiate discussions and a greater understanding as to how these affect grade level, committee, and school culture, climate, and success, and what needs to be

Table 10.1 Scale of Staff Interactions and School Cohesion: Factor Analyzed Items and Rating Scale Used to Complete Items

Factor 1: Staff Understanding of the School’s Mission and Expectations				
1. Understanding of the school’s mission				
2. Understanding of their roles in the school				
3. Understanding of expected instructional outcomes within the school				
7. Impact of the school’s mission on staff’s instructional activities				
Factor 2: Staff Collaboration and Cohesion				
17. Staff communication				
18. Staff collaboration				
20. Staff celebration of accomplishments				
19. Staff commitment				
21. Commitment to shared or collaborative leadership				
22. Focus on progress and the growth and development of people				
4. Commitment to staff cohesion, support, and positive morale				
5. Interpersonal effectiveness				
Factor 3: Effective Staff Practices and Interactions				
12. Focus on problem solving, not blaming				
10. Willing to take risks/thrives on new challenges				
11. Focus on outcomes, principles, and doing the right thing				
13. Focus on skills and outcomes, not on hierarchies, power, and positions				
14. Create options for mutual (win-win) gain				
15. Ability to appropriately delay, at times, some decisions so that more options can be developed				
9. Respond to and use timelines or deadlines effectively				
24. Willing to model behavior				
25. Able to deal with problems and problematic colleagues				
8. Self- or independently motivated and enthusiastic				
16. Insist on using data and objective criteria to make decisions				
23. Able to set high, yet realistic, expectations				
6. Commitment to a staff or building agenda, not a personal agenda				
1	2	3	4	5
Excellent	Very Good	Good	Fair	Poor

Source: Project ACHIEVE Press. Dr. Howie Knoff (author).

done to improve and strengthen positive and prosocial staff-to-staff, staff-to-student, and student-to-student interactions.

The SSISC was developed by asking school staff from across the country to complete a longer, draft version of the survey. After a series of statistical analyses, three factors were identified for the resulting 25 items: Factor 1: Staff Understanding of the School's Mission and Expectations (4 items); Factor 2: Staff Collaboration and Cohesion (8 items); and Factor 3: Effective Staff Practices and Interactions (13 items). Factor 1 evaluates staff members' perceptions of their colleagues' understanding of the school's mission, and how the mission impacts instruction and instructional outcomes. Factor 2 evaluates staff members' perceptions of their colleagues' interpersonal and interprofessional collaboration and their commitment to professional growth, shared leadership, and staff cohesion. Factor 3 evaluates staff members' perceptions of their colleagues' focus on shared organizational goals, their commitment to contributing to and supporting others in meeting these goals, and their use of problem solving to identify new or needed changes when things are not going well.

From an evaluation perspective, a pre-post-post approach is typically the best way to use the SSISC. For example, the SSISC can be administered to a school's staff in early May as a pre-intervention assessment either (a) to help determine areas of concern relative to staff interactions or school cohesion, so that these can be analyzed over the summer and addressed at the beginning of the new school year; or (b) to measure the current status of the school in these areas, so that the impact of a schoolwide PBSS implemented during the next school year can be formally evaluated (pretest or baseline administration Year 1). After the implementation of needed interventions or a schoolwide PBSS during the next school year, the SSISC could be administered again as a posttest in either December or May (intervention implementation posttest Year 1), and the results would be compared and contrasted with the pretest or baseline assessment completed the May before. Finally, the SSISC could be administered in December or May of the next school year (intervention implementation post-test Year 2) and, again, compared and contrasted with the first two administrations to track continued improvement or to identify continuing areas of concern.

Whenever the SSISC is administered, feedback typically is provided using three formats: (a) summary scores and a discussion of the three SSISC factors; (b) individual item scores and a discussion of specific SSISC items that reflect school strengths and other items that reflect areas in need of further analysis, staff attention, or school improvement; and (c) a combination of (a) and (b) above. Strategically, SSISC feedback is given in a way that best facilitates the staff members' understanding of the results and the planning and intervention processes that may need to follow. This feedback might occur initially with the school's leadership team, then in small grade- or instruction-level teams, then followed up by a broader discussion at a faculty meeting. Or the feedback might occur initially at a faculty meeting, allowing the staff to then decide what needs to be done

(if anything) to further validate the results, to address the concerns, and to sustain the strengths.

Regardless of the meeting format or discussion and planning sequence, a written report of the SSISC results often is helpful. This report could be distributed prior to any of the planned meetings as an advanced organizer or after the meetings as a summary of the results presented. It also is important to decide who will present the results and how the school's strengths and weaknesses will be reported. Clearly, there are a number of strategic decisions to make after analyzing and interpreting the SSISC's results. These decisions, and their effective execution, may contribute as much to the productive use of the SSISC as the results themselves.

Evaluating Perceptions of Effective School Discipline and Safety. In order to track the processes that facilitate PBSS success, schools need to periodically survey their staff as to their perceptions and beliefs relative to PBSS implementation and whether they are seeing selected PBSS outcomes. *The Scale of Effective School Discipline and Safety* (Knoff, 2007f; SESDS) is a 58-item survey that helps measure a number of the research- and practice-based PBSS processes discussed throughout this book. Once administered and analyzed, its results provide information about the first six of the seven PBSS goals above. To complete the SESDS, school staff members are asked to "rate the discipline and behavior management statements below on your level of agreement based on your general and specific experiences at your school within the past two months (or based on last year if this questionnaire is being completed prior to the beginning of the school year)." Each item is rated along a five-point scale from 1—Strongly Agree to 5—Strongly Disagree (see Table 10.2), and the data are pooled and can be analyzed (a) for the entire staff, (b) by different grade or instructional levels of staff, (c) by instructional versus administrative versus support staff, or (d) in some other functional way. Like the SSISC, the SESDS is a staff perception tool, its results need to be cross validated with other assessments, and all of the information needs to be synthesized into an integrated profile of school strengths, weaknesses, and areas of PBSS concern.

The SESDS was developed by asking school staff from across the country to complete a longer, draft version of the survey. After a series of statistical analyses, five factors were identified for the resulting 58 items: Factor 1: Teachers' Effective Classroom Management Skills (24 items); Factor 2: Students' Positive Behavioral Interactions and Respect (11 items); Factor 3: Holding Students Accountable for Their Behavior: Administration and Staff (7 items); Factor 4: Teachers' Contribution to a Positive School Climate (9 items); and Factor 5: School Safety and Security: Staff, Students, and School Grounds (7 items). Factor 1 evaluates staff members' perceptions of their colleagues' social, emotional, and behavioral expectations of students—especially when they are in their classrooms; to what degree they consistently teach the behaviors representing these expectations; how they attend to and provide incentives, consequences, and feedback for

Table 10.2

Scale of Effective School Discipline and Safety: Factor Analyzed Items and Rating Scale Used to Complete Items

Factor 1: Teachers' Effective Classroom Management Skills (24 items)

55. Teachers at this school provide appropriate incentives to both individual students and groups of students.
53. Teachers at this school provide consistent, immediate, and appropriate responses for acceptable student behavior.
51. Teachers at this school continuously monitor students' academic and social behaviors.
54. Teachers at this school provide consistent, immediate, and appropriate responses for unacceptable student behavior.
58. Teachers at this school attend and acknowledge both acceptable and unacceptable student behaviors.
52. Teachers at this school use data (academic or behavioral) to make decisions about students.
56. Teachers at this school involve students in identifying and selecting appropriate incentives and reinforcements for acceptable behavior.
49. Teachers at this school believe that students' problems must be assessed within the context of the student, the classroom, the instruction within the classroom, and the curriculum.
57. Teachers at this school involve students in identifying and selecting appropriate consequences for unacceptable behavior.
29. Teachers have high and reasonable behavioral expectations of their students.
50. Teachers at this school believe that students' problems must be functionally assessed before appropriate interventions can be identified and implemented.
24. Students are taught school and classroom routines before being held accountable for them.
46. Teachers at this school are willing to look at students' strengths as well as their weaknesses.
28. Teachers have high and reasonable academic expectations of their students.
48. Teachers at this school are willing to give the student peer group some responsibility for monitoring its own members.
31. Students are provided multiple opportunities to practice and apply new social skills in both group and individual settings.
15. Students are frequently rewarded or praised by faculty and staff for following school rules.

(Continued)

Table 10.2 (Continued)

<p>47. Teachers at this school are willing to tolerate some negative behavior as long as it is decreasing over time.</p> <p>22. Teachers treat students with respect.</p> <p>19. Students are taught the school rules.</p> <p>10. Student at the school are prompted and encouraged to reinforce themselves when appropriate.</p> <p>8. Students at the school experience five positive interactions from teachers and other staff for each negative interaction.</p> <p>45. Teachers at this school willingly accept responsibility for every student in the building.</p> <p>34. Class starts promptly at the beginning of each instruction period.</p> <p>Factor 2: Students' Positive Behavioral Interactions and Respect (11 items)</p> <p>26. Students have the behavioral skills needed to work in cooperative learning groups.</p> <p>25. Students have the behavioral skills needed to work independently when required.</p> <p>27. Students consistently demonstrate appropriate levels of academic engagement and time on task.</p> <p>32. Students participate appropriately in all learning activities until the end of each instructional period.</p> <p>33. Class is rarely interrupted to discipline students.</p> <p>9. Students at the school experience five positive interactions from their peers for each negative interaction.</p> <p>11. Students treat each other respectfully and are not subject to verbal abuse by other students.</p> <p>17. Staff members are treated respectfully by students and not subject to verbal abuse.</p> <p>30. Time is allocated for social skill instruction consistently during each week.</p> <p>18. Most students in this school are eager and enthusiastic about learning.</p> <p>35. Students here care about the school.</p> <p>Factor 3: Holding Students Accountable for Their Behavior: Administration and Staff (7 items)</p> <p>23. Administrators enforce the student rules consistently and equitably.</p> <p>16. Administrators support teachers in dealing with student discipline matters.</p>

- 1. Students at this school are held accountable for maintaining school rules throughout the year.
- 14. Staff members enforce the student rules consistently and equitably.
- 20. Teachers, administrators, and students share responsibility for maintaining discipline in this school.
- 13. Few discipline problems are referred to the office.
- 6. There is a positive school spirit.

Factor 4: Teachers' Contribution to a Positive School Climate (9 items)
 Teachers at this school are:

- 37. . . . cohesive
- 41. . . . productive
- 38. . . . enthusiastic
- 44. . . . optimistic
- 43. . . . open to change
- 40. . . . satisfied
- 36. . . . involved
- 42. . . . innovative
- 39. . . . relaxed

Factor 5: School Safety and Security: Staff, Students, and School Grounds (7 items)

- 12. This school is a safe and secure place to work during the normal school day.
- 5. It is safe to work in this school after students are dismissed.
- 2. Property of staff members is secure.
- 7. Students and staff members take pride in the school and help to keep buildings and grounds clean and attractive.
- 21. Students generally believe that school rules are reasonable and appropriate.
- 3. Vandalism or destruction of school property by students is not a problem.
- 4. Property of students is secure.

1	2	3	4	5
Strongly Agree	Agree	Uncertain	Disagree	Strongly Disagree

appropriate and inappropriate behavior, respectfully; and whether they treat students with respect and accept responsibility to support all students.

Factor 2 evaluates staff members' perceptions of their students' social, emotional, and behavioral skills and interactions with staff and peers in both academic and social situations as well as their students' enthusiasm, engagement, and cooperation during learning opportunities. Factor 3 evaluates staff members' perceptions of how well their administrators and colleagues hold students accountable for appropriate behavior, how consistently school rules are encouraged and enforced, and whether there is positive school spirit and low numbers of office discipline referrals. Factor 4 evaluates staff members' perceptions of whether their colleagues contribute to a positive school climate due to their satisfaction, involvement, cohesiveness, and productivity. Finally, Factor 5 evaluates staff members' perceptions of how safe and secure the school is during and after school and whether students and staff work together to keep the school clean and attractive.

Like the SSISC, the SESDS often is used in a pre-post-post format, and its results are reported to the faculty using one of the three feedback approaches described above. Finally, the feedback and discussion sessions may highlight the need to further validate the results, to address identified concerns, and to take specific actions to sustain the recognized strengths. Ultimately, any recommended actions or interventions should be consistent with the school's current PBSS goals, action plans, and existing initiatives.

Evaluating Office Discipline Referrals. One of the important goals of a schoolwide PBSS is to decrease school suspensions and expulsions, discipline referrals to the principal's office, the need for classroom time-outs, and other minor classroom disruptions that disrupt the academic program and process. Beyond simply documenting the frequency of these disciplinary events over time, it is essential to collect contextual data that can help the functional assessment process. For example, rather than knowing the finite number of office discipline referrals (ODR) that occurred across a school or for a specific grade level last month, it is better to also know (a) when and where the discipline problems occurred; (b) whether the infractions involved one student, a small group, or a large group of students; (c) what led up to or triggered the event; (d) who sent the students to the office; and (e) what consequences followed the event. In this way, ODR patterns can be identified and further analyzed, high-problem settings and times can be discerned, and classroom or special situation analyses and interventions can be conducted and implemented.

The Automated Discipline Data, Review, and Evaluation Software System (ADDRESS) is a free downloadable software application that uses Microsoft Access to help schools track and analyze ODRs and other

classroom or school discipline events (go to the Data Analysis Warehouse at www.arstudentsuccess.org). The ADDRESS comes with preset fields that include the name of the student, date of the incident, referring adult, time of the incident, specific infraction, context for the incident (e.g., individual student, small group, large group, substitute teacher, teacher assistant), location of the incident, administrative/staff response or action, and a place for comments. Critically, many of these preset fields do not come with predetermined variables or descriptors that are locked into the program (for example, a preset list of infractions or administrative responses that cannot be adapted or modified). Instead, users can add their own variables or descriptors in the different ADDRESS fields during its initial setup and, later, as needed. Even where the ADDRESS has predetermined or preloaded specific variables, users can always delete them and add others of their own. This allows the ADDRESS to be customized completely to the needs or desires of the school and its staff.

The ADDRESS also allows staff to run a wide variety of prearranged data analysis reports or to create custom reports by clicking on and dragging desired variables onto the analysis screen. These reports pool different variables of interest (e.g., the number of discipline referrals last month is the sixth grade, organized by place and time of the day), presenting them in data tables, graphs, or diagrams. The ADDRESS also organizes data from year to year, and it can provide cross-year comparisons and analyses. Finally, the ADDRESS has a reporting function such that data can be e-mailed to other parties so that they can view and track a school's ODR outcomes.

The ADDRESS possesses additional advantages:

- It can be downloaded on any number of computers in a school and networked so that data entry and utilization are dependent on a single computer. The ability to utilize the ADDRESS across a closed network also allows a school or district to use it flexibly for specific strategic purposes. For example, teachers from one grade level could load and track their own data, or individual teachers could use the ADDRESS to collect and analyze their own classroom data.
- It is not web-based or dependent on the internet. This is especially important for schools that are technologically challenged (especially those in rural areas or that have limited budgets). In addition, as ADDRESS data are housed on a local computer or server, all data remain the property of the school or district, and the security and confidentiality of the data can be locally assured.
- Its files can be saved and are transportable, and they can be archived and recovered easily from year to year.
- It was designed to be user-friendly. Data entry, in particular, is highly efficient, and repetitive data entries are not required.

- It comes with a sample ODR form (see Table 10.3) used by staff when sending misbehaving students to the office that is adapted to reflect the specific variables or descriptors chosen by an individual school for tracking and entered into the software during its initial setup. Because the form is largely organized in check-off boxes, it can be completed quickly, it provides more information (at the office) than forms that ask for written descriptions of the discipline problem, and the data are easily transferred from the form into the ADDRESS database (for later cumulative analysis).

Observing and Evaluating Classroom Discipline and Behavior Management. During the past decade, walk-throughs have been recommended as a brief, time-effective way to evaluate the quality of instructional interactions within a classroom (Downey, Steffy, English, Frase, & Poston, 2004; Skretta, 2007). Typically involving three- to five-minute observations of specific classroom interactions, most of the published walk-throughs have focused on academic engagement or effective instruction. In 2008, staff from the Arkansas Department of Education's State Personnel Development Grant developed a behaviorally oriented walk-through protocol focusing on classroom management to extend the ADE's work with Teachscape, a company involved in applying technology to school improvement and success. Based on much of the behavioral and classroom management research and work cited in this book, the *Effective Classroom Management Classroom Walk-Through (CWT)* was developed for principals or others to evaluate the degree of positive, effective, and proactive classroom management approaches in classrooms across their school.

As designed, the Effective Classroom Management CWT protocol involves 23 items organized in three areas (see Table 10.4):

- The Evidence of Teacher's Effective Classroom Management area (9 items) looks at whether teachers specifically identify their behavioral expectations for students in the classroom, and then monitor, evaluate, and reinforce students for appropriate or prosocial behavior while responding to and correcting inappropriate or antisocial behavior. Students' academic engagement also is tracked here, as is the degree of respect demonstrated by teachers toward students.
- The Students' Positive Behavioral Interactions and Respect area (9 items) looks at the degree to which students are positive, prepared, engaged, and on-task throughout a class period along with how well they interpersonally relate to peers and adults and treat them with respect.
- The Classroom Safety and Security area (5 items) looks at the organization and arrangement of a school's classrooms, and whether emergency procedures are posted and can be physically and logistically followed.

(Text continued on page 268)

Table 10.3 ADDRESS Student Office Referral Form

STUDENT: _____ DATE: ____ \ ____ \ ____

REFERRING ADULT: _____ TIME OF INCIDENT: _____

INFRACTION: <i>Behavior Prompting Referral</i>				
<input type="checkbox"/> Significant refusal to follow adult directions <input type="checkbox"/> Verbal abuse toward staff <input type="checkbox"/> Taunting/physically threatening behavior (adult or student) <input type="checkbox"/> Overt/defiant swearing <input type="checkbox"/> Inappropriate racial/sexual language	<input type="checkbox"/> Throwing dangerous objects/furniture <input type="checkbox"/> Other hazardous/unsafe behavior <input type="checkbox"/> Vandalism/damage to property <input type="checkbox"/> Stealing <input type="checkbox"/> Physical abuse toward staff <input type="checkbox"/> Fighting/closed fist punching	<input type="checkbox"/> Sexually inappropriate behavior (touching/exposing body parts) <input type="checkbox"/> Sexual harassment <input type="checkbox"/> Leaving the building without permission <input type="checkbox"/> Possession of tobacco/drugs/alcohol <input type="checkbox"/> Possession of weapon or look-alike	<input type="checkbox"/> Possession: other restricted item	

CONTEXT OF THE INCIDENT <input type="checkbox"/> Individual student incident <input type="checkbox"/> Student with one other student <input type="checkbox"/> Student in small group <input type="checkbox"/> Student in large group	LOCATION: <input type="checkbox"/> Bus stop/bus/walking to school <input type="checkbox"/> On school grounds/outside building <input type="checkbox"/> Coming into building <input type="checkbox"/> Hallways <input type="checkbox"/> Cafeteria: breakfast <input type="checkbox"/> Classroom: at seat <input type="checkbox"/> Classroom: cooperative/other group	ANTECEDENT: Event(s) prior to incident Student: <input type="checkbox"/> Was asked to do something <input type="checkbox"/> Was asked to transition to a new activity <input type="checkbox"/> Could not get desired item <input type="checkbox"/> Was emotional or upset	INITIAL RESPONSES: by teacher/other adult <input type="checkbox"/> Verbal redirection <input type="checkbox"/> Physical redirection <input type="checkbox"/> Required to continue activity <input type="checkbox"/> Ignoring <input type="checkbox"/> Time-out (duration: _____) <input type="checkbox"/> Within room <input type="checkbox"/> To another room/office
---	---	---	---

(Continued)

Table 10.3 (Continued)

<p>CONTEXT OF THE INCIDENT</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Student-teacher interaction</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Student-other adult interaction</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Student-substitute teacher</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Student-support staff</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Other (specify):</p>	<p>LOCATION:</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Classroom: activity transition</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Transition between classes: line/hall</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Bathroom break</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Cafeteria: lunch</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Recess</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Special activity: _____</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Dismissal to bus/loading onto bus</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Bus ride home/walking to home</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Other (specify):</p>	<p>ANTECEDENT: Event(s) prior to incident</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Was provoked by another student</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Other (specify):</p> <p>Setting:</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Quiet, orderly environment</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Loud, disruptive environment</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Adult attending to other students</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Free/unstructured time between activities</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Cooperative learning groups</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Other (specify):</p>	<p>INITIAL RESPONSES: by teacher/other adult</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Interruption/blocking</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Separation of students</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Gave student additional task to complete</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Response cost:</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Lost time on recess</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Lost access to activity</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Lost access to items</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Parent Contact</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Other (specify):</p>	
<p>RESPONSES: Subsequent Actions Taken by Administration</p>				
<p>CONFERENCE with:</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Student</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Student and teacher</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Parent</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Student and parent</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Peer mediation</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> All of the above</p>	<p>REFERRAL to:</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Counselor</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> SPRINT team</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Mental health</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Superintendent</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Community resources:</p>	<p>Student Assignment</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Letter</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Written summary</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Contract</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> School assignment</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Call parent</p>	<p>COMMUNICATION DOCUMENTATION</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Parent</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Teacher</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> SPRINT team</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Superintendent</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Other (specify):</p>	<p>Detention:</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Recess</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Half day</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Full day</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> After school</p> <p>Suspension: # days:</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> In-school</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Out of school</p>

Source: Project ACHIEVE Press. Dr. Howie Knoff (author).

Table 10.4 The Effective Classroom Management Classroom Walk-Through: Items and Rating Format

Teacher's Name: _____ Grade Level: _____

School: _____

Date of Observation: _____ Observer's Name: _____

Classroom Walk-Through Observations

<i>Teacher's Effective Classroom Management</i>	<i>Ratings</i>
<p>Observation 1:</p> <p>The teacher's instruction or activities keep the students attentive and academically engaged.</p> <p> <input type="radio"/> 4—To a High Degree <input type="radio"/> 3—To a Moderate Degree <input type="radio"/> 2—To a Low Degree <input type="radio"/> 1—To No Degree <input type="radio"/> No—No opportunity to observe </p>	
<p>Observation 2:</p> <p>The teacher specifically states the behavioral expectations for students when introducing classroom tasks or activities.</p> <p> <input type="radio"/> 4—To a High Degree <input type="radio"/> 3—To a Moderate Degree <input type="radio"/> 2—To a Low Degree <input type="radio"/> 1—To No Degree <input type="radio"/> No—No opportunity to observe </p>	
<p>Observation 3:</p> <p>The teacher continuously monitors students' on-task and academic engagement behavior.</p> <p> <input type="radio"/> 4—To a High Degree <input type="radio"/> 3—To a Moderate Degree <input type="radio"/> 2—To a Low Degree <input type="radio"/> 1—To No Degree <input type="radio"/> No—No opportunity to observe </p>	

(Continued)

Table 10.4 (Continued)

<i>Teacher's Effective Classroom Management</i>	<i>Ratings</i>
<p>Observation 4: The teacher monitors student behavior as related to interpersonal interactions, classroom discipline, and student self-management.</p> <p> <input type="radio"/> 4—To a High Degree <input type="radio"/> 3—To a Moderate Degree <input type="radio"/> 2—To a Low Degree <input type="radio"/> 1—To No Degree <input type="radio"/> No—No opportunity to observe </p>	
<p>Observation 5: The teacher consistently provides specific feedback to students for appropriate/acceptable behavior along with periodic praise or rewards.</p> <p> <input type="radio"/> 4—To a High Degree <input type="radio"/> 3—To a Moderate Degree <input type="radio"/> 2—To a Low Degree <input type="radio"/> 1—To No Degree <input type="radio"/> No—No opportunity to observe </p>	
<p>Observation 6: The teacher consistently provides specific corrective prompts to students for mild inappropriate or unacceptable behavior.</p> <p> <input type="radio"/> 4—To a High Degree <input type="radio"/> 3—To a Moderate Degree <input type="radio"/> 2—To a Low Degree <input type="radio"/> 1—To No Degree <input type="radio"/> No—No opportunity to observe </p>	
<p>Observation 7: The teacher consistently provides specific consequences to students for moderate to severe inappropriate or unacceptable behavior.</p> <p> <input type="radio"/> 4—To a High Degree <input type="radio"/> 3—To a Moderate Degree <input type="radio"/> 2—To a Low Degree <input type="radio"/> 1—To No Degree <input type="radio"/> No—No opportunity to observe </p>	
<p>Observation 8: The teacher treats students with respect.</p> <p> <input type="radio"/> 4—To a High Degree <input type="radio"/> 3—To a Moderate Degree <input type="radio"/> 2—To a Low Degree <input type="radio"/> 1—To No Degree <input type="radio"/> No—No opportunity to observe </p>	

<i>Teacher's Effective Classroom Management</i>	<i>Ratings</i>
<p>Observation 9: Students in the classroom experience five positive interactions from teachers for each negative interaction.</p> <p> <input type="radio"/> 4—To a High Degree <input type="radio"/> 3—To a Moderate Degree <input type="radio"/> 2—To a Low Degree <input type="radio"/> 1—To No Degree <input type="radio"/> No—No opportunity to observe </p>	
<p>Notes:</p>	
<i>Students' Positive Behavioral Interactions and Respect</i>	<i>Ratings</i>
<p>Observation 10: Students demonstrate appropriate behavioral and interpersonal skills when the teacher is directly providing classroom instruction.</p> <p> <input type="radio"/> 4—To a High Degree <input type="radio"/> 3—To a Moderate Degree <input type="radio"/> 2—To a Low Degree <input type="radio"/> 1—To No Degree <input type="radio"/> No—No opportunity to observe </p>	
<p>Observation 11: Students demonstrate appropriate behavioral and interpersonal skills when working in cooperative learning groups.</p> <p> <input type="radio"/> 4—To a High Degree <input type="radio"/> 3—To a Moderate Degree <input type="radio"/> 2—To a Low Degree <input type="radio"/> 1—To No Degree <input type="radio"/> No—No opportunity to observe </p>	
<p>Observation 12: Students are prepared and on-task at the beginning of the instructional period or activity.</p> <p> <input type="radio"/> 4—To a High Degree <input type="radio"/> 3—To a Moderate Degree <input type="radio"/> 2—To a Low Degree <input type="radio"/> 1—To No Degree <input type="radio"/> No—No opportunity to observe </p>	

(Continued)

Table 10.4 (Continued)

<i>Students' Positive Behavioral Interactions and Respect</i>	<i>Ratings</i>
<p>Observation 13: Students demonstrate appropriate on-task behavior when working independently.</p> <p> <input type="radio"/> 4—To a High Degree <input type="radio"/> 3—To a Moderate Degree <input type="radio"/> 2—To a Low Degree <input type="radio"/> 1—To No Degree <input type="radio"/> No—No opportunity to observe </p>	
<p>Observation 14: Students are on-task until the end of each instructional period or activity.</p> <p> <input type="radio"/> 4—To a High Degree <input type="radio"/> 3—To a Moderate Degree <input type="radio"/> 2—To a Low Degree <input type="radio"/> 1—To No Degree <input type="radio"/> No—No opportunity to observe </p>	
<p>Observation 15: Students treat each other respectfully and no students are subject to inappropriate, negative, or verbal abuse by another student.</p> <p> <input type="radio"/> 4—To a High Degree <input type="radio"/> 3—To a Moderate Degree <input type="radio"/> 2—To a Low Degree <input type="radio"/> 1—To No Degree <input type="radio"/> No—No opportunity to observe </p>	
<p>Observation 16: Students treat the teacher with respect and do not subject the teacher to inappropriate, negative, or verbal abuse.</p> <p> <input type="radio"/> 4—To a High Degree <input type="radio"/> 3—To a Moderate Degree <input type="radio"/> 2—To a Low Degree <input type="radio"/> 1—To No Degree <input type="radio"/> No—No opportunity to observe </p>	
<p>Observation 17: Students in the classroom are eager and enthusiastic about learning.</p> <p> <input type="radio"/> 4—To a High Degree <input type="radio"/> 3—To a Moderate Degree <input type="radio"/> 2—To a Low Degree <input type="radio"/> 1—To No Degree <input type="radio"/> No—No opportunity to observe </p>	

<i>Students' Positive Behavioral Interactions and Respect</i>	<i>Ratings</i>
<p>Observation 18: Student misbehavior rarely interrupts classroom learning.</p> <p><input type="radio"/> Yes <input type="radio"/> No</p>	
<p>Notes:</p>	
<i>Classroom Safety and Security</i>	<i>Ratings</i>
<p>Observation 19: Classroom desks and other furniture, equipment, and materials are in good repair and organized in a safe and secure manner.</p> <p><input type="radio"/> Yes <input type="radio"/> No</p>	
<p>Observation 20: The classroom is clean.</p> <p><input type="radio"/> Yes <input type="radio"/> No</p>	
<p>Observation 21: The classroom is organized with sufficient space for students to move and walk around.</p> <p><input type="radio"/> Yes <input type="radio"/> No</p>	
<p>Observation 22: Appropriate emergency procedures are visibly posted.</p> <p><input type="radio"/> Yes <input type="radio"/> No</p>	
<p>Observation 23: The classroom has clear pathways to the exit in case of a fire (drill) or other emergency.</p> <p><input type="radio"/> Yes <input type="radio"/> No</p>	
<p>Notes:</p>	

Relative to use, the individual completing this classroom walk-through typically goes into the classroom and observes for 5 to 15 minutes. Because some teachers and students behave differently when an administrator or adult observer first enters a classroom, the first five minutes of the observation are not used in the evaluation, thereby allowing time to diminish any behavioral reactivity. After the observation, which may focus on one or more of the three areas above, the observer completes the ratings on the CWT protocol and describes any other relevant observations.

CWT data provide information on individual teachers and their students as well as observed classroom management approaches and outcomes. The CWT process and protocol should be discussed with classroom teachers before their use so that they understand why specific behaviors are being observed and what represents effective behavior. After enough observations have occurred—so that the data are both reliable and valid—the CWT results are pooled, analyzed, reported, and discussed with individual teachers (or even classrooms). These discussions focus on reinforcing the effective classroom management interactions that were observed, increasing nonexistent or lower levels of appropriate behavior, and eliminating or changing inappropriate behavior. CWT data from individual teachers also may be combined across time and classrooms with other observation or behavior rating data to get a global sense of how a grade level of teachers, or an entire school, is doing relative to the first six PBSS goals outlined at the beginning of this chapter. Thus, this tool can be used in both formative and summative assessments to facilitate classroom management improvements and to document that they have occurred.

Evaluating Staff Expertise in Behavioral Interventions. It is essential that schools and districts have a wide range of strategic and intensive social, emotional, and behavioral interventions available for students demonstrating challenges in these areas and enough experts to facilitate their implementation. In Chapter 9, a number of these interventions were outlined in the context of the seven high-hit reasons why some students do not demonstrate effective self-management or social competency behaviors and skills. These, and other, interventions can be integrated into a *Behavioral Intervention Survey* that is used to evaluate the consultation and intervention expertise of the school or district staff members who are most responsible for developing social, emotional, or behavioral interventions for challenging students.

A sample Behavioral Intervention Survey is provided in Table 10.5. The survey has brief descriptions of a range of interventions that should be available in any district (additional ones can be added at any time). Related services professionals (e.g., school psychologists, counselors, social workers), special education teachers, and other behavioral intervention specialists individually complete the survey, rating their ability to consult on and independently implement each intervention along a five-point scale from 1—Expert in Both Consulting and Independently Implementing This Intervention to 5—No Knowledge of This Intervention.

Table 10.5 The Behavioral Intervention Survey

Behavioral Intervention Survey

Howard M. Knoff, Ph.D.
 Director, Project ACHIEVE

Directions: Below is a list, with brief descriptions, of a number of specialized classroom or school behavioral interventions. All SPRINT teams need to have consultants on (or available to) the team who are able to implement (and work with teachers to assist their implementation of) these interventions in the classroom with specific students. Please read the description of each intervention below and rate your ability to consult on and independently implement each intervention along the following scale:

1	2	3	4	5
Expert in Both Consultation & Implementation	Very Skilled in Both Consultation & Implementation	Skilled Only in Implementation	Questionable Even in Implementation	No Knowledge of Intervention

Rating	Intervention
	Positive Reinforcement Schedules: Understanding the types of positive reinforcement schedules (continuous versus intermittent; ratio versus variable) helps teachers to increase student responses for less and less reinforcement over time.
	Extinction: A procedure where inappropriate behavior that has been previously reinforced is no longer reinforced resulting in a decrease and then elimination of the behavior.
	Stimulus Control and Cuing Procedures: Procedures where students are taught to respond to specific cues, conditions, or other stimuli (e.g., the presence of a specific person), thereby behaving in a desired way with a minimum of teacher effort.
	Task Analysis and Backward Chaining: The process of breaking a desired behavior that must be taught into specific subbehaviors and then the teaching process where the last steps of the behavior are taught first.
	Positive Approaches to Reducing Inappropriate Behavior: Using different reinforcement approaches, these interventions involve reinforcing low rates of behavior, other behavior, and competing behavior.

(Continued)

Table 10.5 (Continued)

1	2	3	4	5
Expert in Both Consultation & Implementation	Very Skilled in Both Consultation & Implementation	Skilled Only in Implementation	Questionable Even in Implementation	No Knowledge of Intervention
<i>Rating</i>	<i>Intervention</i>			
	<p>Peer/Adult Mentoring and Mediation: In general, mentoring programs connect students with a valued peer or adult who provides training, guidance, motivation, or consistency within the context of a close and positive relationship. Mediation programs are more specialized as they help individual or groups of students address (usually) emotional feelings or situations by teaching or encouraging interpersonal relationship, social problem-solving, conflict resolution, or emotional coping skills or behaviors.</p>			
	<p>The Educative Time-Out Process: A procedure where students who are demonstrating significantly disruptive through dangerous behavior are asked to sit in a time-out chair—either in their homeroom, in another teacher’s classroom, or in the principal’s office or administrative setting—as a consequence (not punishment) for their inappropriate behavior. After demonstrating appropriate behavior in time-out, they must positively practice the appropriate behavior that they should have done as part of their re-entry into the classroom and their seat.</p>			
	<p>Response Cost/Bonus Response Cost: An intervention approach that decreases inappropriate behavior by having students pay for the privilege of exhibiting the inappropriate behavior while they are positively reinforced for exhibiting fewer and fewer of these inappropriate behaviors over time.</p>			
	<p>Overcorrection—Positive Practice and Restitutional: Two related intervention procedures that help to reduce inappropriate behavior where students either must practice an appropriate response (which is the opposite of an undesired behavior) or must make amends for an already performed undesired behavior.</p>			
	<p>Group Contingency Interventions: Behavior management approaches where students in a classroom are organized into teams and they work for reinforcement as a team. Three different approaches can be used here: where all students must meet a set level of behavioral expectations; where any student can lose or earn points on behalf of a team; or where a specific student (rotating) can lose or earn points on behalf of a team.</p>			

1	2	3	4	5
Expert in Both Consultation & Implementation	Very Skilled in Both Consultation & Implementation	Skilled Only in Implementation	Questionable Even in Implementation	No Knowledge of Intervention

<i>Rating</i>	<i>Intervention</i>
	Behavioral Contracting: An approach where a teacher and student (and parent) literally write a contract to specify a specific set of expected (and low rates of undesired) behavior.
	Intensive or Individualized Social Skills or Socialization Training: More intensive or individualized small group instruction in the area of social skills or socialization using an evidence-based training program. This instruction focuses on more frequent or intensive training opportunities with more positive practice repetitions of targeted interpersonal, social problem-solving, conflict prevention and resolution, and emotional coping cognitions and behaviors. The specialized instruction includes supervising students in role-plays that simulate the emotionally charged situations that are problematic for them, better preparing them to handle a diverse range of real-life social-emotional circumstances.
	Thought Stopping Approaches: Techniques that condition students to stop focusing on certain inappropriate, negative, or off-task thoughts or thought patterns.
	Self-Awareness, Self-Instruction, Self-Monitoring, Self-Evaluation, and Self-Reinforcement Approaches: Techniques that teach students how to increase the self-management approaches listed above.
	Emotional Self-Control Approaches: Techniques that condition students to increase their emotional and physiological awareness to emotional situations and to increase or maintain appropriate levels of emotional self-control.
	Cognitive-Behavioral Interventions/Behavior Therapy Related to Post Traumatic Stress Syndrome or Similar Emotional Responses Related to Divorce, Loss, Trauma, Harassment, or Abuse. Cognitive-behavioral techniques that assist students in being able to physiologically, emotionally, and behaviorally cope with past or present situations, circumstances, or events that impact their social, emotional, and behavioral control on a regular basis and at an extreme level.

Source: Project ACHIEVE Press. Dr. Howie Knoff (author).

From a formative evaluation perspective, a school or district could pool the results of these self-evaluations to determine the current intervention expertise across its multidisciplinary professionals. When contrasting these results with the intervention needs of the school or district, this evaluation helps identify intervention gaps that need to be closed, for example, by hiring additional personnel or short-term consultants, or by investing in strategic training, professional development, and clinical supervision for existing personnel. From a summative evaluation perspective, this survey could be completed one or more years after, for example, a professional development initiative with existing intervention staff. After comparing the initial and second set of individual and pooled ratings, the school or district can determine its progress in the intervention areas evaluated, and the impact of the professional development on student behavior and staff satisfaction.

SUSTAINING PBSS OUTCOMES: IMPLEMENTING SYSTEMATIC ARTICULATION PROCESSES

In addition to evaluating PBSS outcomes, it is important that schools use an organized and transparent process so that effective system, school, staff, and student processes are transferred systematically from one school year to the next. In this way, the lessons learned during each school year—especially about students and how they most effectively learn—are articulated so that every new school year begins, on the first day of school, at full PBSS capacity. Effective articulation processes also minimize the wasted time and effort that sometimes occur when teachers do not receive important student information at the beginning of the school year (or receive it late), such that they end up reinventing the wheel. At times, this results in a delay of effective instruction, services, and supports for some students that, in turn, exacerbates their problems or delays their success.

In education, the term *articulation* refers to the planned and systematic transfer of school, staff, and student information, interventions, and other lessons learned from one school year to the beginning of the next school year. Typically, this transfer occurs from one classroom teacher to next year's classroom teacher, from one grade-level team to the next year's grade-level team, from the members of each building-level committee to the next year's members on the same committees, from one administrative team to the next year's administrative team, or from one school staff to the next year's school staff.

Unfortunately, many schools do not organize their articulation processes as planned, annual events. Indeed, at a school or committee level, organizational goals are discussed and determined, strategies are planned and implemented, outcomes are evaluated and attained, and progress is realized and celebrated every year. However, when these strategies and successes are not transferred systematically and systemically to the next

school year, organizational progress is disrupted, professional momentum is interrupted, productive time and energy are wasted, and staff become disenchanting and burned out. This lack of coordination and articulation represents organizational inefficiency.

Similarly, at the grade or teacher level, professional development, supervision, and technical assistance is delivered in most schools every year—often focused on evidence-based practices, differentiated instruction, and effective classroom management for all students. Yet, when the knowledge, skills, and confidence that teachers obtain because of this training are not shared across teachers and grade- or instruction-level teams, are not progressively built on from year to year, and are not provided to new staff at the beginning of each new school year, instructional collaboration, consistency, effectiveness, and efficiency are undermined and school success becomes more transitory. This lack of coordination and articulation results in a loss of information, experience, time, and success, and reflects professional inefficiency.

Finally, at the classroom or student levels, functional assessment, data-based problem solving, consultation, and strategic intervention are delivered every year—focused on students with significant academic or behavioral challenges who need these more intensive interventions and supports. Yet, when the academic or behavioral progress that teachers make with these challenging students is not shared, and when the lessons learned about how to effectively reach and teach them are not systematically transferred to the next year's grade-level team or teachers, these students may not receive the best, most proven approaches or materials required for their immediate success at the beginning of the new school year. When this occurs, student progress and achievement is disrupted, student motivation may be impaired, and student success may be compromised. This lack of coordination and articulation represents student services and support inefficiency.

Articulation, then, is a critical process that helps staff to evaluate the accomplishments of the current year, to plan smooth transitions to the next school year (at the school, staff, and student levels), and to maintain and extend the momentum of school and classroom academic, behavioral, and RTI² and SPRINT processes. But to be most successful, articulation activities need to occur at the end of a current school year so that schools are best prepared for the beginning of the next school year. Thus, the organizational principle underscoring all articulation processes is “the beginning of the new school year starts in April.”

While there are many areas of articulation that schools need to plan and execute, this section focuses on those that are directly related to PBSS processes:

- The school discipline/PBSS committee membership, and its annual strategic planning activities
- The Get-Go process

- Student Briefing Reports
- Special Situation Analysis
- Resource needs assessments, results, and planning

Prior to beginning these articulation activities in April, however, the documents and data detailed below need to be collected and available to those who will be involved in the respective articulation processes.

For the Committee Membership and Strategic Planning Activities

- The school discipline/PBSS committee's current membership and terms of offices and a roster of all of the staff in the school, including those who served on the school discipline/PBSS committee during the past six years
- The school's current School Improvement Plan (SIP), its current PBSS-related section or activities, the draft of the school's SIP for the coming school year, and blank copies of a SIP and a committee action plan form used by the school

For the Get-Go Process

- A roster of all IEP and 504 students in the school (or students who will likely be receiving such services on the first day of school in the new year)
- Student attendance printouts that differentiate the data by grade, by excused versus unexcused, and by student being absent or tardy, respectively. The data should be organized as follows: students absent/tardy: 0–4 times, 5–9 times, 10–14 times, 15 to 19 times, 20–29 times, more than 30 times
- Data, printouts, and charts documenting and analyzing the ODR, suspensions, and expulsions for the school year
- From each grade level and teacher, a functional assessment of the instructional or mastery level of each student in his or her class on the state's or school's curricular benchmarks or scope and sequence objectives and outcomes—at least in the areas of literacy, mathematics, and language arts
- From each grade level and teacher, a summary of students having attendance, medical, behavioral, social-emotional, or other difficulties with indications of their response to classroom interventions and the current severity status of the problem

For the Student Briefing Reports

- All of the descriptive information on the Get-Go and At-Risk students including any information on interventions implemented, progress monitoring data collected, and conclusions drawn

For the Special Situation Analysis

- All of the descriptive information and data related to the special situations that have been addressed during the current school year, and those that still exist

For Resource Mapping: General, Academic, and Behavioral Intervention Surveys

- Any resource maps completed in prior years along with a list of the resources that were acquired or developed during the current year as a result of SIP or school discipline/PBSS committee activities or initiatives
- A list of the resource needs identified by the school discipline/PBSS committee and other committees in the school for the next year's SIP
- A detailed list of all of the academic, behavioral, or other interventions needed by the Get-Go and At-Risk students after they have been identified through the Get-Go process
- A list of the resources needed by the school discipline/PBSS committee to successfully implement the special situations intervention plans written for the next school year
- A list of all of the professional development activities attended by (all, many, or some) staff in the school and on the school discipline/PBSS committee and how these activities were shared with the entire staff (if relevant) or used at the classroom level
- The results of all completed Behavioral Intervention Surveys across the school or district

THE SCHOOL DISCIPLINE/PBSS COMMITTEE MEMBERSHIP AND ITS ANNUAL STRATEGIC PLANNING

Activities. During its April meeting, the school discipline/PBSS committee looks at its current membership, analyzes its accomplishments during the current school year, and begins to address both areas relative to planning for the next school year. Relative to the first area, the committee looks at its current members' terms of office and identifies which individuals will be replaced by new members (see Chapter 3). If these new members can be chosen and confirmed in April, then they can attend the May and June meetings of the committee, giving them an early orientation to the committee and how it works and functions. During these meetings, they also can contribute to the committee's strategic planning discussions as the discipline/PBSS section of the new SIP is drafted for the next school year. Critically, the SLT needs to coordinate the new member selection process

for all of the school's committees so that a smooth, seamless transition occurs for everyone involved.

As noted above, the school discipline/PBSS committee also collects and evaluates the data and outcomes for all of the goals written in its section of the current SIP. Committee members then determine what goals, objectives, and activities need to continue into the new school year and what new goals and activities should be added. All of these projected goals and activities are documented on a SIP or committee action plan, and they are submitted to the School Leadership Team (SLT) for consideration and inclusion in the next formal SIP.

As part of the April planning process, the school discipline/PBSS committee also completes a number of tasks so that certain PBSS activities are ready to begin immediately at the start of the next school year. Relative to these tasks, the committee should

- prepare next year's Stop & Think Social Skills calendar, including an outline of the classroom and building routines that need to be taught at the beginning of the school year and that need to be reinforced after any vacations or significant breaks from school,
- look at and fine-tune (if needed) anything on the grade-level Behavioral Matrices, and prepare for the schoolwide and grade-level rollout of the Behavioral Matrices on the first day and weeks of school,
- identify what new or booster training will be needed for new and returning staff prior to the beginning of the next school year—especially in the area of social skills instruction, the implementation of the time-out process, and the response system that is built into the Behavioral Matrices, and
- take stock of what materials need to be ordered or prepared (e.g., social skill manuals and support materials; Behavioral Matrix posters; time-out logs, trackers, and passes), and what activities (e.g., getting the Behavioral Matrices printed into the school's student/parent handbook, updating the school's website) need to be accomplished during the summer so that PBSS activities can begin on the first day of school.

The Get-Go Process. The Get-Go process is a student review process where the progress and current status of every student in the school is discussed at the end of the school year to determine if he or she needs services, supports, strategies, or programs on the first day of the new school year or soon thereafter. Using this process, information and lessons learned about students during the current school year are systematically transferred to the teachers and others who will have them in their classrooms after the summer break. While this process is largely coordinated by the building-level SPRINT team in collaboration with each grade- or instruction-level team, the school discipline/PBSS committee is informally

involved as it shares (a) the results of the most recent ADDRESS (or other ODR) data—analyzed by student, teacher, and grade level for each quarter of the school year and cumulatively across the entire school year; (b) what social, emotional, and behavioral skills were actually taught at each grade level during the present school year; and (c) the results of any special situation analyses that were completed and implemented. Because there is at least one grade- or instruction-level team representative on the school discipline/PBSS committee, these representatives can discuss this information during the separate grade- or instruction-level Get-Go sessions.

When implemented, a Get-Go review generally takes no more than two to three minutes per student. Typically, representatives from the building-level SPRINT team and all of the instructional staff on a grade- or instruction-level teaching team simply go down a prepared list of all of their students, deciding together if each student is a Get-Go, At-Risk, Check-In, or No Problem student. The names of students identified in one of the first three categories are placed on a Get-Go Review and Analysis Form, and the specific areas of concern and any needed instructional or intervention approaches are briefly described. For the Get-Go and At-Risk students, these entries are more fully documented by teachers' completion of a Student Briefing Report (see the next articulation activity below). No Problem students are those students who the team believes will have no academic or social, emotional, or behavioral problems during the transition to the new school year. The names of these students do not appear on the Get-Go Review and Analysis Form.

By definition, a Get-Go student needs immediate instructional or intervention services, supports, strategies, or programs in place on the first day of the new school year. Students on IEPs, 504 Plans, and any other state- or district-mandated academic or behavioral intervention plan are automatically Get-Go students as their services or supports, by law or regulation, must be ready for implementation on the first day of the new school year.

An At-Risk student has received interventions during the past school year that were so successful that they are not needed to start the new school year, and yet, the staff at the meeting feel that the student may still be at risk for further difficulties. Given this and the intervention time and effort already invested, students are designated At Risk so that the instructional staff who teach these students during the next year can be systematically briefed as to each student's academic and behavioral history, and the reasons for and results of previous interventions. This briefing occurs both verbally, at the end of the current or prior to the beginning of the new school year, and through the written Student Briefing Report.

Check-In students are identified because staff want someone to check in with them at some point during their transition into the new school year. Some of these students have received and completed one or more successful interventions during the current year, and (unlike the At-Risk students) the staff feel that there is no need to extensively brief their next

year's teachers. Other students simply have a specific issue that the staff need or want to track into the next year. For all of these students, their check-in status puts an articulation safety net in place so that one or more designated individuals will look in on them at some point during the first quarter of the school year.

When identifying Check-In students, the SPRINT and grade-level team specifies and documents the areas of concern, when the check-in should occur (e.g., just prior to the beginning of the school year, or after Week 1, 2, 4, or 9), and who should complete and record the check-in and with whom. For some students, the check-in may involve calling the parents before the first day of school to remind them that the school year starts in two days, checking to see if they are in school on Day 1, and then running attendance reports after Weeks 1, 3, and 5. For others, it involves a scan of their report cards at the end of the first marking period to check their grades and progress. For still others, it involves asking a teacher to comment on their performance in the classroom at the end of the second week of school.

Ultimately, the goal of the Get-Go process is to make sure that specific students' instructional or intervention history, information, status, and needs are effectively and efficiently communicated to new teachers and support staff so that they will successfully transition into the new school year. Prior to each Get-Go meeting, the grade-level and building-level SPRINT teams need to review all of the students whose challenges were formally analyzed through the data-based functional assessment problem solving or who received early intervening services. Similarly, as noted above, any student on an IEP, 504, or academic or behavioral intervention plan should be designated as a Get-Go student prior to the meeting. Finally, it must be recognized that some students will be identified during the Get-Go process not because of academic or social, emotional, or behavioral concerns but because of (a) attendance issues (including being persistently late), (b) medical conditions that teachers and others need to know about, or (c) current or historical family issues that impact their performance at school. Depending on the severity of these conditions or the need for teacher training or briefing, these students could be identified as Get-Go, At-Risk, or Check-In students, respectively.

Student Briefing Reports. These reports are summaries of the most essential information about specific students as learned by their classroom teachers and teaching teams during a specific school year. Written primarily by students' general education teachers, these Briefing Reports could be included as part of a computerized student record database and organized as a cumulative, year-to-year running record to document specific students' academic and behavioral progress over time. As noted above, Student Briefing Reports must be written by every teacher and staff person who has worked with a student designated as a Get-Go or At-Risk student

for the next school year. For students with IEPs, or 504 or academic or behavioral intervention plans, these plans may substitute for the Briefing Report as long as all of the essential student information is present. Beyond this, any teacher can write a Briefing Report on any student to share any information that would help another colleague to understand, teach, motivate, or assist a student at the beginning of the next school year.

The primary goal of a Student Briefing Report, then, is to provide a functional overview of a selected student's academic and behavioral history and the lessons learned over the recent school year. As such, the Briefing Report should include the

- academic and behavioral background of the student—including critical factors (physical, medical, social, supportive) that impact or contribute to this background,
- academic and behavioral strengths and progress during the past school year,
- academic and behavioral weaknesses and the functional reasons why they exist,
- a description of successful strategies or interventions to address the student's needs and how they were implemented,
- a description of less successful or unsuccessful strategies or interventions for the student,
- keys to helping this student be successful, and
- other information of note.

When teachers have to write Student Briefing Reports for Get-Go or At-Risk students, we suggest that the reports be part of the check-out process whereby principals formally release their teachers for the summer at the end of the school year. In addition, we also strongly recommend that principals discuss a number of critical issues with staff before they begin writing their Briefing Reports—for example, confidentiality, maintaining objectivity, documenting data, keeping reports secure (especially if they are on an on-line computer database), and informing parents.

Once written, the Student Briefing Reports can be kept by the building principal or the chair of the building-level SPRINT team over the summer. During the week before the new school year, these reports are given to the new classroom teachers (and relevant others), and a series of meetings can be scheduled to provide additional information, consultation, and training (especially for the Get-Go students) so that all teachers are prepared for all of their students as the new year begins. For Get-Go students, the Student Briefing Reports provide the context and history that make the necessary before-school training (so that the interventions are available for Day 1 implementation) more meaningful. For At-Risk students, the Student Briefing Reports may provide all of the information needed by a teacher to effectively and successfully approach these students on the first day of school.

Special Situation Analysis. In April, the school discipline/PBSS committee needs to review and evaluate the special situations (see Chapters 6 and 7) that they have addressed during the current school year and those that still exist. For the former situations, the committee needs to ensure that the strategies, supports, and interventions implemented to resolve any setting- or student-specific special situations are systematically transferred to ensure their continued success into the new school year. For the latter situations, the school discipline/PBSS committee might prioritize any still-existing special situations and conduct a Special Situation Analysis on one of them prior to the end of the school year. In this way, the committee systematically articulates the school's special situation successes from one year to the next. It also implements or prepares to implement interventions for at least one additional special situation so that it might be prevented or resolved on the first day of the new school year.

In order to accomplish both of these outcomes, a possible chronology is suggested:

1. At the March meeting of the school discipline/PBSS committee, identify the special situations that have been addressed successfully during the current school year. Ask different members of the committee to prepare their suggestions as to what needs to occur to transfer these successes systematically into the new school year.
2. At the same meeting, identify one or more special situations that continue to exist, but have not been addressed during the current year. Ask different members of the committee to prepare a discussion of these situations for the April meeting so that one of them can be chosen to address by the end of the current school year.
3. At the April meeting of the committee, hear and discuss the suggestions as to how to transfer the current special situation successes into the new school year, and agree on a specific action plan.
4. At the same meeting, decide which new special situation will be addressed before the end of the current school year, and choose the leader and task force that will conduct the Special Situation Analysis and intervention planning process.
5. In April and May, the Special Situation Analysis is completed (see Chapters 6 and 7).
6. At the May meeting of the committee, the analysis and an intervention action plan for the new special situation is presented and approved.
7. From May through the first day of the new school year, those relevant aspects of the intervention action plan are implemented.
8. During the planning days immediately before school starts, on the first day of school, and during the weeks to follow, the intervention action plan continues to be implemented and outcomes are evaluated.

During some years, there are special situations that cannot be resolved until the current year ends or the new school year begins. This may occur, for example, because their interventions require money that was not budgeted during the current school year but that will be available when the new fiscal year begins in July. Or the special situation may require changes—for example, the redesign of the daily schedule, hallway traffic patterns, the physical organization of the cafeteria—that can only occur during the summer. The school discipline/PBSS committee needs to make note of these circumstances and integrate them into their articulation processes toward the end of every school year.

Resource Needs Assessments, Results, and Planning. Based on all of the articulation activities above, the school discipline/PBSS committee should compile a list of the resources and funds needed to complete them. The chair of the committee then should bring this list to the SLT meetings that focus on developing the goals, activities, and funding of the next SIP—meetings that typically occur toward the end of every school year. To make the strongest case possible, the committee and committee chair also need to analyze the PBSS resources provided and used during the past three years, and determine their return on investment relative to student, staff, and school outcomes. If fully funded, the committee will be ready to implement all of its planned activities in a timely way. If underfunded, the committee needs to analyze all of its activities, the resources needed, and once again, their relative return on investment, and select which articulation activities should be funded and implemented.

SUMMARY

Processes that evaluate short- and long-term PBSS outcomes and activities that scale up and sustain its success—at the system, school, staff, and student levels—never end. This chapter discussed a selected number of instruments, tools, and approaches that help to evaluate the success of a PBSS initiative across its primary goals and objectives. These tools included the *Scale of Staff Interactions and School Cohesion*, the *Scale of Effective School Discipline and Safety*, the *Automated Discipline Data, Review, and Evaluation Software System (ADDRESS)*, the *Effective Classroom Management Classroom Walk-Through (CWT)*, and the *Behavioral Intervention Survey*.

The chapter also addressed a number of systematic ways to transfer, or articulate, PBSS successes from year to year, so that every school year begins, on the first day of school, at the highest level of effectiveness and efficiency. More specifically, articulation activities were described in the following areas: school discipline/PBSS committee membership and strategic planning, the Get-Go process, the development of Student Briefing Reports, year-end special situation analyses, and resource needs assessments and planning.

In the end, like businesses, schools are usually successful on the strength of their strategic planning and effective execution of sound policies, procedures, and implementation activities—not because of good luck. Evaluation and articulation activities are essential to help schools, committees, and staff members evaluate the accomplishments of the past year, to plan for smooth transitions into the next school year, and to maintain and extend the momentum of the school’s academic and behavioral successes. While every school committee engages in articulation processes to some degree, those completed annually by the school discipline/PBSS committee refocus the school’s attention on its PBSS goals and outcomes and on the social, emotional, and behavioral self-management progress and proficiency of all students. Attending to evaluation and articulation processes is good business. Ultimately, good business in schools translates into staff effectiveness and productivity, and short- and long-term student success.

NOTE

1. Sections of this chapter were adapted from and/or taken directly from Knoff, H. M. (2010). End-of-year transition activities that sustain the RTI² process. In H. M. Knoff & C. Dyer, *RTI²—Response to Instruction and Intervention: Implementing successful academic and behavioral intervention systems* (pp. 315–335). Rexford, NY: International Center for Leadership in Education.