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Program Evaluation Question(s)
How does student data in Positive Behavioral Interventions and Supports (PBIS) drive change in instruction and professional development?

I. Program/Service Information
1. Name of Program or Services: SSD Professional Development, specifically Positive Behavioral Interventions and Supports (PBIS)

2. Personnel Responsible for Evaluation and Program:
   a. Ros VanHecke, Director of Learning and Assessment

3. Demographic Description of Programs:

   The Positive Behavioral Interventions and Supports (PBIS) program began ten years ago. Positive behavioral interventions and supports is an application of a behaviorally-based systems approach to enhance the capacity of schools, families, and communities to design effective environments that improve the link between research-validated practices and the environments in which teaching and learning occurs. By using data, attention is focused on creating and sustaining primary (i.e., school-wide), secondary (i.e., classroom/targeted group), and tertiary (i.e., individual) systems of support that improve lifestyle results (e.g., personal, health, social, family, work, recreation) for all children and youth by making problem behavior less effective, efficient, and relevant, and desired behavior more functional.

   The 2007-2008 SSD PBIS staff at SSD include three facilitators, three coaches, and a PBIS data specialist. The PBIS facilitators coordinate PBIS at the SSD and partner district level, develop effective systems to ensure PBIS is implemented with integrity, and assist in the analysis of student data on a regular basis. They collaborate and network with national, state and local stakeholders to compile, use, and disseminate current evidence-based practices. In most situations, the facilitators provide direct support to districts and schools to facilitate implementation of PBIS and to provide technical support as teams develop. The PBIS coach position is new to the district this current fiscal year. In direct coordination with the PBIS facilitators, the PBIS coach’s primary focus is to provide direct support to PBIS schools by: 1) facilitating the implementation of PBIS at the school level, 2) participating in building team meetings, and 3) providing technical assistance to schools. The PBIS data specialist provides the PBIS facilitators, coaches, districts and schools 1) technical assistance that includes training and consultation to develop systems to collect, display and analyze data, 2) data analysis for individual
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Since 1998, 123 St. Louis County schools have completed universal (i.e., school-wide) team training in PBIS. Entities trained represent 22 St. Louis County Districts and include (a) 3 early childhood buildings, (b) 80 elementary schools, (c) 24 middle schools, (d) 5 high schools, (e) 6 alternative sites, and (f) 5 SSD schools. Figure 1 indicates the number of new schools trained each year as well as the cumulative number of schools actively implementing PBIS. Active implementation of PBIS is defined as: (1) having an identified PBIS leadership team that meets regularly, (2) using data to make decisions, and (3) having administrative support.

As noted in Figure 1, 99 St. Louis County schools are currently implementing PBIS. Of the 123 schools trained since 1998, 24 schools are not currently implementing PBIS due to factors such as (a) failure to adopt the PBIS initiative, (b) school closings, (c) changes in administration, and (d) adoption of competing initiatives. According to Sugai (2001),
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The lifespan of most behavior initiatives is approximately 17 months due to failure of schools to initiate change that includes a system to sustain their efforts and plan for systematic expansion. With regard to currently active PBIS schools, administrators reported they were excited to participate in an education initiative in which general education and special education collaborate to improve the academic and social learning skills of all students. In addition, active schools also noted appreciation of on-going professional development focused on building and sustaining PBIS in their buildings.


5. Goal of Program:

The goal of PBIS SSD Professional Development is to provide intensive, ongoing professional development that addresses research-based instructional practices related to student achievement and safety issues identified in the SSD Rolling Plan and the SSD Comprehensive School Improvement Plan. In addition to this, the PBIS program evaluation focuses on the MSIP standards 6.6 and 6.7; student data is used to drive change in instruction and professional development. PBIS data is evaluated to assess how student data is used to change instruction and professional development.

The overall goals of PBIS are:

1. Student(s) will demonstrate minimum decreases of 20% in problem behaviors as measured by office referrals comparing year 1 Office Discipline Referrals (ODR) data to subsequent years of ODR data.
2. Eighty percent of the students(s) interviewed (School-wide Evaluation Tool: SET) will demonstrate knowledge of expected behaviors and will state they have received acknowledgement from staff within the building for meeting these expectations.
3. Students will view their school as safe and orderly.

6. Brief description of relationship between program goals, CSIP and MSIP Standards:

The PBIS professional development addresses MSIP 4th cycle standard 6.6 which states “schools are orderly; staff and students indicate they feel safe at school” and standard 6.7 which states “professional development is an integral part of the educational program and all school improvement initiatives”. The SSD Rolling Plan reiterates the goal of maintaining safe and orderly schools through the implementation of PBIS. Professional development is critical to the PBIS program. PBIS uses data to inform the effectiveness
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of professional development in improving instruction and student achievement. This evaluation looks at the use of data to drive instruction and professional development.

II. Evaluation Criteria for Programs/Services Offered
The goal of this program evaluation is to analyze the use of student data in Positive Behavioral Interventions and Supports (PBIS). The following data sources have been used for this purpose:

- Office Discipline Referrals (ODR)
- School-wide Evaluation Tool (SET)
  - Interviews
  - Observations
  - Anecdotal comments
- Support logs

III. Description of Stakeholders Engagement in Program Evaluation
The PBIS Leadership Team is comprised of stakeholders that include facilitators (i.e., PBIS, instructional, character education, regional), area coordinators, partner-district administrators, school psychologists, social workers, university-affiliated PBIS National Center partner, state education agency representative, parent, SSD Associate and Assistant Superintendents and a Regional Professional Development Center (RPDC) representative (Tables 1 and 2). The goal of the SSD Leadership Team is to improve the efficacy and success of large-scale replication of SW-PBIS, thereby maximizing opportunities for students to increase academic, social, and lifestyle skill competence. The SSD PBIS Leadership Team goal is realized through their Action Plan by increasing the system’s capacity in seven primary areas (Funding, Visibility, Political Support, Training, Coaching, Evaluation and Coordination). For the next two years, however, the leadership team is focusing on three primary areas:

1. Evaluation Capacity – the ability to:
   a. Establish measurable outcomes
   b. Evaluate progress toward those outcomes
   c. Modify the action plan based on the evaluations

2. Coordination/Collaboration Capacity – the ability to:
   a. Establish an operational organization and system that enables effective and efficient use of materials, time, and personnel in the implementation of the action plan
   b. Collaborate with local and state education agencies to support policy, organizational leadership, implementation resources, and resource management that collectively serve as the foundation for district and school-wide implementation of PBIS.
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3. Coaching/Training Capacity – the ability to:
   a. Self-assess for program and professional development needs and objectives
   b. Develop a professional development plan
   c. Invest in local training capacity
   d. Implement effective and efficient professional development activities for both initial and on-going implementation support

Table 1. SSD PBIS Leadership Team (2006-2007)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Member</th>
<th>Role</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lisa Powers</td>
<td>PBIS Facilitator, Learning and Assessment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kate Bell</td>
<td>PBIS Facilitator, Learning and Assessment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Donna Schultz</td>
<td>Instructional Facilitator, Learning and Assessment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charlotte Nations</td>
<td>Character Education Facilitator, Learning and Assessment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maryann Hatlelid</td>
<td>Social Worker, Bayless/Hancock</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maggie Travers</td>
<td>School Psychologist, Normandy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kim Stallons</td>
<td>Area Coordinator, Bayless</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Julie Hahn</td>
<td>PBIS Coach, Ritenour</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lori Newcomer</td>
<td>Assistant Professor, UM-St. Louis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Julia LePage</td>
<td>Interim Director – Effective Practices, DESE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ros VanHecke</td>
<td>Director, Learning &amp; Assessment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paul Bauer</td>
<td>Director, Special Education and Court Schools</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joan Zavitsky</td>
<td>Associate Superintendent, Learning and Assessment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michele Kelk</td>
<td>PBIS Facilitator, Learning and Assessment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lynn Yokoyama</td>
<td>PBIS Data Specialist, Learning and Assessment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mary Ellen O’Hare</td>
<td>Instructional Facilitator, Learning and Assessment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Patty Polster</td>
<td>Regional Facilitator, North Region</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nancy Wood</td>
<td>Parent, Clayton</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heather Davidson</td>
<td>School Psychologist, Ritenour</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Catina Lyles</td>
<td>Area Coordinator, Ferguson-Florissant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carol Fouse</td>
<td>Administrator, Hazelwood</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tim Lewis</td>
<td>Professor, UM-Columbia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mickey Hughes</td>
<td>PBS Consultant, St. Louis RPDC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Donald McCary</td>
<td>Director, Applied Behavior Analysis (ABA)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mary Ann Tietjens</td>
<td>Assistant Superintendent, Special Education</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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The PBIS evaluation sub-committee involved in this program evaluation is listed below.

Table 2. PBIS Evaluation Sub-committee

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Member</th>
<th>Role</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lisa Powers</td>
<td>PBIS Facilitator, Learning and Assessment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kate Bell</td>
<td>PBIS Facilitator, Learning and Assessment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Julie Hahn</td>
<td>PBIS Coach, Ritenour</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ros VanHecke</td>
<td>Director, Learning &amp; Assessment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pablo Flinn</td>
<td>Effective Practice Specialist, Emotional Behavior Disorder</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Member</th>
<th>Role</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Michele Kelk</td>
<td>PBIS Facilitator, Learning and Assessment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lynn Yokoyama</td>
<td>PBIS Data Specialist, Learning and Assessment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Patty Polster</td>
<td>Regional Facilitator</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Donald McCary</td>
<td>Director, Applied Behavior Analysis (ABA)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mary Ann Tietjens</td>
<td>Assistant Superintendent, Special Education</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

IV. Results
Data collected for this evaluation included a review of PBIS program changes since inception, results of the School-wide Evaluation Tool (Appendix 1), Office Discipline Referral data, and Support Logs Database (Appendix 2). PBIS Facilitators routinely use the aforementioned information to gauge the level of professional development schools are receiving and determine continued needs. School-teams use the information to guide planning and instruction of school-wide (SW) lessons. By using data, schools teach prosocial behaviors in an effort to reduce disciplinary action and increase academic engagement.

PBIS Program Changes
Since 1998, PBIS has evolved based on data analysis within SSD as well as changes in research at the national level. These changes have resulted in county-wide growth in the quantity of schools implementing PBIS, the quality of implementation, and the sustainability of school-wide PBIS systems in schools over time. Major highlights include the following:

- Professional development and on-site support has been continually refined to include all stakeholders and to focus on specific skills schools need to initiate PBIS and to move to their next level of implementation.
- A system to collect student data was developed and is continually expanded and refined by the PBIS data specialist and facilitators. Training in the use of the data system has expanded and includes on-site support to meet individual school needs.
- The development of the SSD PBIS District-wide Leadership Team has provided structure and a means to collaborate with local and state stakeholders.
Over the years, the PBIS facilitators have taken advantage of numerous networking opportunities. As a result of their work, they are regarded as experts in the implementation of PBIS and have been able to develop working relationships with leaders in the field of PBIS who are both practitioners and researchers.

Several evaluation tools have been developed by the SSD PBIS facilitators and data specialist as well as others across the country. SSD PBIS has been able to triangulate multiple data sources to systematically guide schools and districts in their implementation process.

PBIS coach positions have been added to the budget for the 2007-2008 school year to assist in providing intensive support to schools.

As indicated, this evolution has been extensive and has spanned approximately ten years. Appendix 3 provides a detailed historical outline of the changes in the PBIS program throughout St. Louis County. Currently active PBIS schools are listed in Appendix 4.

School-wide Evaluation Tool (SET)
The School-wide Evaluation Tool (Sugai, G., Lewis-Palmer, T., Todd, A., & Horner, R., 2001) is an instrument designed to assess and evaluate the critical features of school-wide positive behavior support across each academic school year. The SET has a test-retest reliability of .97, inter-observer reliability of .99 and correlates well ($r = .71$) with other measures of school-wide positive behavior supports implementation. The SET consists of 7 subscales (i.e., Expectations Defined, Expectations Taught, Expectations Rewarded, Responding to Behavioral Violations, Monitoring & Decision Making, Leadership / Management, and District-Level Support), which are assessed to determine levels of implementation and to guide facilitators’ frequency and intensity of follow-up support. The criterion level for each subscale is 80%. According to the authors of the SET, research shows schools implementing with a score of “80/80” are implementing with fidelity. An “80/80” score is a Total SET score of 80% or higher in conjunction with a score of 80% or higher on the Expectations Taught subscale.

The SET, initially designed in 2001, is the most rigorous measure of PBIS implementation because it is based not on the perceptions of teams or faculty, but the direct observation from an outside trained professional. Information necessary for this assessment tool is gathered through multiple sources including review of permanent products, observations, and interviews or surveys of administration, staff, and students. Currently, the SET evaluation process occurs annually in the spring. The results are used to:

1. Assess features that are in place
2. Determine annual goals for school-wide positive behavior support
3. Evaluate on-going efforts toward school-wide positive behavior support
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4. Design and revise procedures as needed
5. Compare efforts toward school-wide positive behavior support from year to year

SSD PBIS facilitators piloted the use of the SET and the evaluation process in the state of Missouri in 2001. Because it was an experimental research tool, it was not widely used in schools across St. Louis County or the nation. It has only recently become one of the standardized processes connected to professional development. After conducting the SET, the data obtained has proven to be essential for schools developing action plans and for facilitators in planning professional development. While essential in shaping professional development and in helping schools with their action plans, it has proven time and resource intensive to administer. The process includes: (a) training to conduct the SET, (b) preparing and conducting a SET for each school, (c) scoring the SET, (d) fidelity checks on scored SETs, and (e) follow-up conversations by PBIS Facilitators to assist school teams in analyzing and using the data for progress and developing action plans. The entire process takes approximately 8-10 hours per school.

Figure 2 illustrates the number of SETs that have been completed over a four year period and the level of implementation of PBIS within those schools. It should be noted that the number of SETs completed has been contingent on the time and resources available to conduct the SETs and complete the process with schools.
Figure 2 shows an increase in the number of schools with SET data from 6.45% (4 schools) in 2003-04 to 77.27% (68 schools) in 2006-07. This increase is likely due to additional PBIS staff, increased accountability, a routine for schools to evaluate their implementation, more staff trained and coordinated to conduct SETs in the schools, increased motivation for recognition through the PBIS Award of Excellence, and the expectation of the SSD Rolling Plan to increase not only the quantity of schools trained but the quality (i.e., fidelity) of PBIS implementation. In addition to the increase in schools that completed the SET, the percentage of active schools who reached the “80/80” criteria has also increased from no schools in 2003-2004 to 37 schools (54.42%) in 2006-07.

As of the spring of 2006, the goal is for all schools to participate in the SET process. Information is provided to each school; however, some schools have been unable to complete the SET process due to MAP testing, scheduling conflicts, and availability of resources during a concentrated period of time. Two school administrators chose not to participate in the 2006-07 SET but continued to implement PBIS.

When considering the schools that did complete a SET and have not reached criteria, some factors include:

- “High risk” schools (e.g., frequent turnover by administration/staff, lower academic success rates, high poverty rates, high student-teacher ratios, etc.) require more frequent coaching and support than the resources available.
- Some of the components of PBIS are more difficult to implement (i.e., directly teaching behavior is more difficult than defining student expectation).
- Some of the teacher-leaders, chairs, administrators who are trained and well-versed in PBIS move to other schools and/or districts.
- SET interview data indicated that, as a group, special education teachers and students in classrooms who have limited contact with general education were often not directly teaching expectations nor connecting classroom rules with school-wide expectations. When interviewed, this group (special education teachers and students) was less likely to be able to define the school-wide expectations. However, SSD teachers who directly teach school-wide expectations to their students and who link their classroom rules and incentives to those school-wide expectations have reported that students with disabilities are supported through the PBIS structures in their school.

Information gathered from the SET is used to make professional development decisions and strategic follow-up support for PBIS school-wide implementation (i.e., increase frequency of PBIS facilitator support at team meetings, additional resources needed, and on-site professional development).
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development). The analysis of school SET scores that have not met criteria have impacted significant changes in professional development. Additional professional development opportunities are provided for specific audiences in a variety of formats to meet the needs of the staff (e.g., on-site overviews for new staff in a school, book studies, professional learning communities, and skill building for internal coaches and administrators, etc.).

Office Discipline Referral (ODR) Data
Schools use Office Discipline Referral (ODR) data systems for documenting and monitoring time spent on disciplinary action to evaluate the cost effectiveness of prevention/intervention efforts. An Excel based information system was developed to help school personnel use office discipline referral data to design school-wide and individual student interventions. The three primary elements are: (1) an efficient system for gathering information, (2) computer application for data entry and report generation, and (3) a practical process for using information for decision making. Each active school is provided the computer-based system and technical support. The data may be summarized to provide information about individual students, groups of students, or the entire student body over any specified time period. Both numerical printouts and graphs are created for use in decision-making. While the data system is flexible and can be adapted to the needs of individual schools, the major uses involve monitoring (a) the number of ODRs per month, (b) the type of problem behavior leading to ODRs, (c) the location of problem behavior events, (d) problem behavior events by time of day, and (e) the students receiving ODRs. Schools are provided professional development at the initial summer symposium on how to organize their data collection systems including items such as: specific components required on the office discipline referral forms, who can complete the form, the process for turning in the form and process for entering data into the data system. Each school develops their own system but typically one of the school secretaries or someone identified as the PBIS data manager enters the data. In four of the districts that have district-wide support for PBIS, an export has been designed to work with the district’s existing school data system (e.g., SIS, Power School, Pentamation). We are currently working on exports in four more districts. Figure 3 shows the percentage of active schools that reported ODR data during the past four years.
Using data is a critical tenant of PBIS. Figure 3 indicates that schools are developing structures and systems for maintaining and sustaining use of data over the years. The number of active schools reporting ODR data has increased from 77.42% in 2003-2004 to 88.64% in 2006-2007.

As the PBIS program has evolved, structures to support reporting and using data by schools have been put into place. Experience has shown that schools not reporting data often are still developing their data systems and/or, in some cases, a team leader or administrator has left at a critical juncture in the school’s implementation. It is important to note, that due to these contextual changes (e.g., administration, staff, and adoption of new initiative), the number of active schools fluctuate from year to year. Many schools had no data system to organize and disaggregate data prior to using the SSD PBIS data system.

Since adopting the PBIS data system, schools have been able to generate reports for visual analysis and are able to use data to make decisions. School principals report that it is helpful to know what behavior occurs, where and when the behavior occurs, and the responses to that behavior in order to develop strategic lesson plans to reduce problem behaviors. The data support from the PBIS Data Specialist for the utilization of the SSD PBIS data system has been reported as essential and enhances the sustained practice of collecting and analyzing data.
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Without that support, their school would have abandoned the PBIS data system. One specific building principal reported that a year after initiating PBIS, the building did not “feel” any different although the data indicated changes were occurring. Based on the data, this principal continued implementation of PBIS for another year and saw dramatic and evident changes in year two.

Data from the seventy-eight active schools that reported ODR data for the 2006-07 school year were analyzed further. Of the 78 schools, 71 schools had one to three years of prior ODR data on record. For these 71 schools, a baseline ODR count was computed based on the average of pre 2006-07 ODR data reported. The 2006-07 ODR figures were compared to the baseline ODR count for each school to assess the degree of increase or decrease in 2006-07 ODRs compared to previous years. The number of active schools demonstrating an increase or decrease in 2006-07 ODRs is reported in Table 3 and illustrated in Figure 4.

Table 3. 2006-07 ODR Status Compared to Baseline ODR Data

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Percentage Change</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Decrease in 2006-07 ODRs</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Decrease 1-20%</td>
<td></td>
<td>16</td>
<td>22.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Decrease 21-40%</td>
<td></td>
<td>14</td>
<td>19.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Decrease 41-60%</td>
<td></td>
<td>14</td>
<td>19.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Decrease 61-80%</td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Decrease &gt; 80%</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>48</td>
<td>67.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Increase in 2006-07 ODRs</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increase 1-20%</td>
<td></td>
<td>10</td>
<td>14.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increase 21-40%</td>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increase 41-60%</td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increase 61-80%</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increase &gt; 80%</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>23</td>
<td>32.4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
As indicated in Table 3 and Figure 4, forty-eight schools (67.6%) demonstrated a decrease in 2006-07 ODRs in comparison to previous years, whereas 23 schools (32.4%) showed an increase in 2006-07 ODRs. Additional analysis of the aforementioned ODR data in conjunction with 2006-07 SET scores indicated that schools who met the “80/80” SET criteria demonstrated greater success in reducing 2006-07 ODRs (average decrease = 16%) compared to those schools who did not meet the “80/80” SET criteria (average decrease = 3%).

Although the difference in 2006-07 ODR reduction was not statistically significant \( t(55) = 1.24, p > .05 \) between schools which did or did not meet the “80/80” SET criteria, the results do mirror state-wide findings recently reported in Illinois. This research indicated that schools fully implementing PBIS (i.e., “80/80” SET criteria met) reported far fewer ODRs compared to schools demonstrating only partial implementation of PBIS as indicated by failure to meet the “80/80” SET criteria (Illinois PBIS Network, 2007). As the average office discipline referral (ODR) is estimated at 30 minutes, the ability to reduce the number of ODRs translates directly into increased time for academic instruction. Disaggregated ODR results based on type of school (i.e., elementary, secondary, SSD/Court) are presented in Table 4.
Table 4. 2006-07 ODR Status Compared to Baseline ODR Data: Disaggregate

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Percentage Change</th>
<th>Elementary (n=51)</th>
<th>Secondary (n=14)</th>
<th>SSD/Courts (n=6)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Decrease in 2006-07 ODRs</td>
<td>Decrease 1-20%</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Decrease 21-40%</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Decrease 41-60%</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Decrease 61-80%</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Decrease &gt; 80%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increase in 2006-07 ODRs</td>
<td>Increase 1-20%</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Increase 21-40%</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Increase 41-60%</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Increase 61-80%</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Increase &gt; 80%</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As indicated in Table 4, secondary schools demonstrated the greatest success in reducing 2006-07 ODRs compared to elementary and SSD/Court schools. Approximately 92.9% of the active secondary schools included in the analysis demonstrated a decrease in 2006-07 ODRs compared to 64.8% of elementary schools and 33.3% of SSD schools and Court programs.

District commitment more than individual school commitment is a major indicator for success. Schools receiving district support for PBIS achieve greater success in implementing PBIS and reducing ODRs than those schools that do not receive district support. For example, supplementary data analysis of the 71 schools reported above indicated that 75-100% of schools characterized as receiving district level support (e.g., schools trained in 2003-04, 2004-05) demonstrated a decrease in 2006-07 ODRs compared to baseline ODR data. However, only 40% of schools characterized as lacking district support (e.g., schools trained in 2005-06) showed a decrease in ODRs.

During the first two years of implementation many schools may see a dramatic decrease in ODRs as the building staff posts and directly teaches expectations, reinforces appropriate behavior, uses consistent language and uses data to make decisions. In subsequent years, the number of schools showing a decrease in ODRs may decline because their ODRs have stabilized or leveled off. Schools will then begin working on secondary (i.e., classroom/targeted group) and tertiary (i.e., individual) levels of interventions for those students not responding as well to universal/tier I levels of support.
Support Logs Database
The support log database is in a developmental stage. The log has been designed to capture professional development and follow-up support provided to schools and districts following the annual 2-day summer symposium. It also tracks the collaboration and support of schools and districts that have not yet attended training but are considering PBIS and are involved in activities to prepare their school or district.

The support log data includes: type of professional development (i.e., coaching, consulting, and/or training), amount of facilitator time spent on professional development per school or district, number of participants impacted and level of support (i.e., building, district, state or national). Baseline data from the support logs assist the facilitators in developing strategic follow-up to schools. The data, although not student data, is being used in conjunction with SETs and ODR data to guide the facilitators about the type and intensity of on-site support and the content of professional development needed to meet the needs of the students and faculty in county districts and individual schools.

V. Discussion
The compilation and analysis of the above data was used to develop a summary of strengths, concerns, and recommendations for the PBIS professional development program. These areas have been organized by three main areas that are also in the SSD PBIS Leadership Team Action Plan (referenced on page 4) in an effort to streamline our work.

Strengths Evaluation

1. The number of schools actively implementing PBIS has increased steadily during the past ten years with a current total of ninety-nine. Most school teams are implementing the PBIS program within a year of attending initial training. During this time schools have revised their current data-keeping system to align their PBIS and building goals to their student data and begin to use student data to make decisions about the social skills that need to be taught. Schools report that the support from the data specialist is critical for increasing the implementation levels in active PBIS schools. This support for developing and aligning data systems allows for data export and disaggregation.

2. Active school teams are using data for decision making which include determining: skills that need to be taught or re-taught, areas of focus, students who need additional support in the form of targeted groups or individual support, and how resources might be consolidated to meet current needs.
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3. The evolution and refinement of the PBIS program during the past ten years has resulted in county-wide growth in the quantity of schools implementing PBIS, quality of PBIS implementation, and sustainability of school-wide PBIS systems in schools.

4. The number of active schools participating in the SET evaluation has increased dramatically during the past three years. In addition, the percentage of active schools meeting the “80/80” SET criteria has also increased significantly indicating enhanced implementation integrity.

5. The number of active PBIS schools submitting ODR data has increased during the past three years. The reporting of ODR data allows PBIS facilitators to look at data more frequently and systematically in order to examine trends both at district and county-wide levels. During the 2006-07 school year, 88.64% of active PBIS schools submitted ODR data.

6. The majority of active PBIS schools (67.6%) who submitted ODR data demonstrated a decrease in 2006-07 ODRs in comparison to previous years. In addition, schools meeting the “80/80” SET criteria demonstrated greater ODR reductions on average compared to schools not meeting the “80/80” SET criteria.

Coaching and Training

1. PBIS Facilitators use research to guide professional development.

2. New school teams receive regular and frequent follow-up support during their first year of implementation in the form of team meetings, coaches meetings, and possible staff development.

3. Competence of leaders at the school level has increased resulting in some active schools requiring only 1-2 facilitator contacts per year and/or additional facilitator support to the district-level leadership team.

Coordination/Collaboration

1. SSD PBIS District Leadership Team has developed a 3-year action plan for PBIS following the guidelines from OSEP National Center for PBIS (PBIS Implementers Blueprint).

2. PBIS Facilitators have developed collaborative working structures with partner districts and local universities.

3. District level support increases the level of implementation as determined by active schools.

4. Strong school administrator support increases level of implementation as measured by SET data (i.e., administrator interview). This includes administrators (a) regularly attending PBIS meetings, (b) providing funding for PBIS activities, (c) designating
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time on staff agenda for PBIS updates, and (d) actively promoting PBIS as a priority and integrating it with other initiatives/improvement activities.

Concerns

Evaluation

1. PBIS has not established a procedure/structure for collecting and correlating school performance data (e.g., attendance, MAP data) with ODR, SET, and support log data.
2. PBIS has not systematically collected data on secondary (i.e., classroom/targeted group) and tertiary (i.e., individual) levels of interventions due to lack of time, tools and resources.

Coaching and Training

1. Schools with new administration experience a dip in implementation.
2. New school teams need varying degrees of one-on-one coaching to develop a functional data system. Time and amount of coaching needed are dependent upon the level of technology that exists in the school, the level of expertise in technology, whether or not they are exporting from an existing database and how complex that existing system may be.
3. Some schools continue to struggle with implementation of PBIS. Of the 68 schools for which we have 2006-07 SET scores, 46% did not meet the “80/80” SET criteria.

Coordination /Collaboration

1. As SSD PBIS networks with state and national stakeholders, opportunities have been informally available to participate in research projects and benefit from research related resources.
2. Special education teachers and students in classrooms who have limited contact with general education were less able to define school-wide PBIS expectations.

Recommendations

Evaluation

1. Expand the PBIS evaluation data system to include suspension, attendance and MAP data and referrals to special education and a means to correlate that data with ODR, SET, and support log data.
2. Develop data collection methods for secondary (i.e., classroom/targeted group) and tertiary (i.e., individual) levels of intervention.
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Coaching and Training
1. Data specialist will continue to work with schools and districts to build compatible data export systems.
2. Develop systems to support and train new school administrators so they can support ongoing implementation of PBIS.
3. Develop the role of the PBIS coaches to provide additional resources and support to new and struggling PBIS school-based teams to create safe and orderly schools as measured by SET and social validity surveys.
4. Develop standardized training at the universal level so SSD and partner districts can access and present “modules” with more independence using web-based technology. This will allow more time to create on-going professional development for secondary and tertiary levels of intervention.

Coordination/Collaboration
1. Continue to build collaborative and formal working structures with the state, universities and national organizations to partnership in research and teacher preparation.
2. Provide structures to ensure the special education teacher is a part of the PBIS School-based Leadership Team. Develop a procedure to be sure all of the special education teachers in a school are aware of and incorporate PBIS principles into their instruction and environments.
3. Develop and improve working structures of partner district leadership teams to support continuous regeneration of PBIS as new administrators and faculty join the staff.

Person responsible to champion action plan:
Ros VanHecke, Director
PBIS Evaluation Committee Members

Timeframe for reporting updates to Board of Education: May 2008

Signature of Administrator Responsible for Chairing Evaluation
Professional Development:
Positive Behavioral Interventions and Supports
Standard Program Evaluation
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Appendix 1: School-Wide Evaluation Tool
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 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.

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

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 (SET)
### Implementation Guide

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School</th>
<th>__________________________</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>________</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>District</td>
<td>__________________________</td>
<td>State</td>
<td>________</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Step 1: Make Initial Contact

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.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>__________________________</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Phone</td>
<td>__________________________</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| 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 timeline
5. _______ Behavioral incident summaries or reports (e.g., office referrals, suspensions, expulsions)
6. _______ Office discipline referral form(s)
7. _______ Other related information

### Step 2: Confirm the Date to Conduct the SET

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 (SET) Scoring Guide

### Feature

#### A. Expectations Defined

1. **Evaluation Question:** 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)
   - **Data Source:** Discipline handbook, Instructional materials
   - **Score:** 0-2

2. **Evaluation Question:** 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)
   - **Data Source:** Wall posters
   - **Score:** 0-2

#### B. Behavioral Expectations Taught

1. **Evaluation Question:** 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)
   - **Data Source:** Lesson plan books, Instructional materials
   - **Score:** 0-2

2. **Evaluation Question:** 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%)
   - **Data Source:** Interviews
   - **Score:** 0-2

3. **Evaluation Question:** 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%)
   - **Data Source:** Interviews
   - **Score:** 0-2

4. **Evaluation Question:** Can at least 70% of 15 or more students state 67% of the school rules? (0= 0-50%; 1= 51-69%; 2= 70-100%)
   - **Data Source:** Interviews
   - **Score:** 0-2

5. **Evaluation Question:** Can 90% or more of the staff asked list 67% of the school rules? (0= 0-50%; 1= 51-89%; 2=90%-100%)
   - **Data Source:** Interviews
   - **Score:** 0-2

#### C. On-going System for Rewarding Behavioral Expectations

1. **Evaluation Question:** Is there a documented system for rewarding student behavior? (0=no; 1= states to acknowledge, but not how; 2= yes)
   - **Data Source:** Instructional materials, Lesson Plans, Interviews
   - **Score:** 0-2

2. **Evaluation Question:** 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%)
   - **Data Source:** Interviews
   - **Score:** 0-2

3. **Evaluation Question:** 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%)
   - **Data Source:** Interviews
   - **Score:** 0-2

#### D. System for Responding to Behavioral Violations

1. **Evaluation Question:** Is there a documented system for dealing with and reporting specific behavioral violations? (0=no; 1= states to document; but not how; 2 = yes)
   - **Data Source:** Discipline handbook, Instructional materials
   - **Score:** 0-2

2. **Evaluation Question:** 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%)
   - **Data Source:** Interviews
   - **Score:** 0-2

3. **Evaluation Question:** 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)
   - **Data Source:** Walls
   - **Score:** 0-2

4. **Evaluation Question:** 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%)
   - **Data Source:** Interviews
   - **Score:** 0-2
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Feature</th>
<th>Evaluation Question</th>
<th>Data Source (circle sources used)</th>
<th>Score: 0-2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>E.  Monitoring &amp; Decision-Making</td>
<td>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, &amp; (i) administrative decision? (0=0-3 items; 1= 4-6 items; 2= 7-9 items)</td>
<td>Referral form (circle items present on the referral form)</td>
<td>P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2. Can the administrator clearly define a system for collecting &amp; summarizing discipline referrals (computer software, data entry time)? (0=no; 1= referrals are collected; 2= yes)</td>
<td>Interview Other ______________</td>
<td>I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>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)</td>
<td>Interview Other ______________</td>
<td>I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>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%)</td>
<td>Interviews Other ______________</td>
<td>I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F.  Management</td>
<td>1. Does the school improvement plan list improving behavior support systems as one of the top 3 school improvement plan goals? (0= no; 1= 4th or lower priority; 2= 1st-3rd priority)</td>
<td>School Improvement Plan, Interview Other ______________</td>
<td>P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>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%)</td>
<td>Interviews Other ______________</td>
<td>I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3. Does the administrator report that team membership includes representation of all staff? (0= no; 2= yes)</td>
<td>Interview Other ______________</td>
<td>I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4. Can 90% of team members asked identify the team leader? (0= 0-50%; 1= 51-89%; 2= 90-100%)</td>
<td>Interviews Other ______________</td>
<td>I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5. Is the administrator an active member of the school-wide behavior support team? (0=no; 1= yes, but not consistently; 2= yes)</td>
<td>Interview Other ______________</td>
<td>I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>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)</td>
<td>Interview Other ______________</td>
<td>I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>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)</td>
<td>Interview Other ______________</td>
<td>I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>8. Does the team have an action plan with specific goals that is less than one year old? (0=no; 2= yes)</td>
<td>Annual Plan, calendar Other ______________</td>
<td>P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G.  District-Level Support</td>
<td>1. Does the school budget contain an allocated amount of money for building and maintaining school-wide behavioral support? (0= no; 2= yes)</td>
<td>Interview Other ______________</td>
<td>I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2. Can the administrator identify an out-of-school liaison in the district or state? (0=no; 2= yes)</td>
<td>Interview Other ______________</td>
<td>I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Summary</td>
<td>A = /4</td>
<td>B = /10</td>
<td>C = /6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scores</td>
<td>F = /16</td>
<td>G = /4</td>
<td>Mean = /7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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)

10) Do you acknowledge students for doing well socially? Yes  No  If no, skip to # 12.
11) What are the social acknowledgements/activities/routines called (student of month, positive referral, letter home, stickers, high 5’s)? (C2, C3)

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

12) Has the team taught/reviewed the school-wide program with staff this year? (B3) Yes  No
13) Is your school-wide team representative of your school staff? (F3) Yes  No
14) Are you on the team? (F5) Yes  No
15) How often does the team meet? (F6) ______________
16) Do you attend team meetings consistently? (F5) Yes  No
17) Who is your team leader/facilitator? (F4) ______________
18) Does the team provide updates to faculty on activities & data summaries? (E3, F7) Yes  No
   If yes, how often? ______________
19) Do you have an out-of-school liaison in the state or district to support you on positive behavior support systems development? (G2) Yes  No
   If yes, who? ______________
20) What are your top 3 school improvement goals? (F1)

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

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

**Staff Interview Questions**

*Interview a minimum of 10 staff*

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

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**

*Interview a minimum of 15 students*

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

2. Have you received a _______________________ since ______________? (C2)
   (reward for appropriate behavior) (2 months ago)
# Interview and Observation Form

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Front hall/office</th>
<th>Class 1</th>
<th>Class 2</th>
<th>Class 3</th>
<th>Cafeteria</th>
<th>Library</th>
<th>Other setting (gym, lab)</th>
<th>Hall 1</th>
<th>Hall 2</th>
<th>Hall 3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Are rules &amp; expectations posted?</td>
<td>Y N</td>
<td>Y N</td>
<td>Y N</td>
<td>Y N</td>
<td>Y N</td>
<td>Y N</td>
<td>Y N</td>
<td>Y N</td>
<td>Y N</td>
<td>Y N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is the documented crisis plan readily available?</td>
<td>Y N</td>
<td>Y N</td>
<td>Y N</td>
<td>Y N</td>
<td>Y N</td>
<td>Y N</td>
<td>Y N</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---
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Appendix 2: Support Log Database
PBIS Support Log: Example

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Facilitator</th>
<th>Level of Support</th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Kels Bell</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School</th>
<th>District</th>
<th>Range</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Activity: [ ] PBS [ ] FA/BIP [ ] Other

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>System</th>
<th>DW</th>
<th>U/SW</th>
<th>NC</th>
<th>C</th>
<th>TG</th>
<th>IS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Start Time</th>
<th>Activity Duration</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>End Time</th>
<th>Activity + Prep/Follow-up Time</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Prep/Follow-up HOURS: [ ]

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>#Participants</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Enter Workshop Title, IS name, if multi-District training enter School names and Districts

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Workshop Title</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>IS Name(s)</th>
<th>Schools Attending</th>
<th>Districts Attending</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Comments

- TOTAL # of Participants: 1438
- GRAND TOTAL ACTIVITY TIME: 121
- GRAND TOTAL ACTIVITY WITH PREP TIME: 196
Appendix 3: History of Changes in the PBIS Program
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Program Changes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1998-1999</td>
<td>• Contracted with outside experts to conduct the PBIS School-Wide Summer Symposium.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1999-2000</td>
<td>• PBIS Facilitators assumed PBIS School-wide Summer Symposium and added follow-up training for existing PBIS teams. Schools were provided</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>professional development in functional behavioral assessment and behavior intervention plans based on student support/consultation referral data.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Hired a part-time data expert to design and build a data-base system.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• An Excel data-base designed for schools’ use to organize and disaggregate their system-wide office discipline referral data (on-going revisions were</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>made based on current research and needs of our school districts) was also established.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2000-2001</td>
<td>• To respond to the individual needs of districts and school, on-site staff development was created and provided.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• PBIS Facilitators focused support at the partner district level to design and implement district-level plans.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• An SSD PBIS District Leadership Team was initiated to create a sustainable system. This team met quarterly and included stakeholders across St.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Louis County.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• These changes were in response to data regarding implementation levels.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2001-2002</td>
<td>• Office discipline referral (ODR) data indicated a need for internal coaches and additional resources to support teams with Functional Behavior</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Assessments and Behavior Intervention plans, a Tier 3 intervention.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• As a result, professional development was created to support the use of building level PBIS coaches.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• An additional training component, Active Supervision was provided to schools based on data indicating a need for non-teaching staff to be involved</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>in PBIS.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2002-2003</td>
<td>• Added Acting Out Cycle to on-site training.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Coaches training format was changed to team-based training.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• PBIS Facilitators were certified through a training process supported by the National Center for PBIS to conduct the School-wide Evaluation Tool</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(SET).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2003-2004</td>
<td>• PBIS Facilitators conducted SETs to collect implementation data.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• An evaluation database was developed to triangulate multiple data sources (SET, ODR, Team Implementation Checklist (TIC), Effective Behavior</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Support surveys, and support logs) to support PBIS Facilitators in using data to guide their work in professional development.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2004-2005</td>
<td>• Training in Facilitating School-Wide PBIS (SW PBIS) was added to professional development.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Visibility and political support for PBIS was increased by developing the PBIS Compendium website (which also served to support schools to share</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>information with each other).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Partnership with the stakeholders responsible for the state of Missouri PBIS Initiative was established.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005-2006</td>
<td>• An additional facilitator was added to respond to increasing numbers and needs of active schools.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• PBIS Facilitators started to systematically work with internal school-wide PBIS coaches (at the district level).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• An outside expert was contracted to provide professional development for a Tier 3 level intervention, Intensive Level PBIS: Integrating</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Wraparound Approaches in PBIS Schools. PBIS Facilitators participated and coached school wraparound teams.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• A specialized administrator training was added as part of the initial 2-day Summer Symposium.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• The PBIS Award of Excellence Program for those schools demonstrating high fidelity of implementation on critical features of PBIS as determined by</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SET scores, change in student behavior and an application process was initiated. The state of Missouri modeled their PBIS Award of Excellence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Program on our system.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• A full-time PBIS data specialist was hired.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006-2007</td>
<td>• PBIS coaches were requested based on the number of active PBIS schools’ and districts’ need.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• A process to assess all schools in St. Louis County at the school-wide level using the SET was developed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007-2008</td>
<td>• Professional development for external PBIS coaches has begun.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix 4: Active Schools List
PBIS Schools 2007-08

**Affton**
- Rogers Middle

**Bayless**
- Bayless Elementary
- Bayless Intermediate
- Bayless Jr. High
- Bayless High

**Brentwood**
- Collaborative School

**Clayton**
- Meramec Elementary

**Ferguson/Florissant**
- Airport Elementary
- Berkeley Middle
- Bermuda Elementary
- Central Elementary
- Combs Elementary
- Commons Lane Elementary
- Cool Valley Elementary
- Cross Keys Middle
- Duchesne Elementary
- Ferguson Middle
- Griffith Elementary
- Halls Ferry Elementary
- Holman Elementary
- Johnson-Wabash Elementary
- Lee Hamilton Elementary
- Parker Road Elementary
- Robinwood Elementary
- Vogt Elementary
- Walnut Grove Elementary
- Wedgewood Elementary

**Hancock**
- Hancock Place Middle

**Hazelwood**
- Armstrong Elementary
- Arrowpoint Elementary
- Granneman Elementary
- Hazelwood Central Middle
- Hazelwood East Middle
- Hazelwood North Middle
- Hazelwood Northwest Middle
- Hazelwood Southeast Middle
- Hazelwood West Middle
- Jury Elementary
- Keeven Elementary
- Lusher Elementary
- Russell Elementary
- Townsend Elementary
- Walker Elementary

**Kirkwood**
- Early Childhood Center
- Keysor Elementary
- Robinson Elementary
- Tillman Elementary
- Westchester Elementary

**Ladue**
- Conway Elementary
- Spoede Elementary

---

**LEADERSHIP TEAM**

**SCHOOL-WIDE**

1. Build Data System
2. Establish measurable outcomes
3. Select evidence-based practice
4. Collect, analyze, & prioritize data
5. Monitor implementation & progress
6. Implement
7. Ensure efficient, accurate, & durable implementation

---

Enhanced PBS Implementation Logic

---
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School District</th>
<th>Elementary Schools</th>
<th>Middle Schools</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Maplewood Richmond Heights | MRH Elementary  
MRH Middle |                                                      |
| Mehlville             | Beasley Elementary  
Bernard Middle  
Blades Elementary  
Buerkle Middle  
Early Childhood Center  
Oakville Middle  
Oakville Sr. High  
Point Elementary  
SCOPE  
Wohlwend Elementary |                                                      |
| Normandy              | Garfield Elementary                                      |                                                      |
| Parkway               | Mason Ridge Elementary  
Oak Brook Elementary  
Parkway Central Middle  
Shenandoah Valley Elementary |                                                      |
| Pattonville           | Briar Crest Elementary  
Parkwood Elementary  
Willow Brook Elementary |                                                      |
| Ritenour              | Buder Elementary  
Hoech Middle  
Iveland Elementary  
Kratz Elementary  
Marion Elementary  
Marvin Elementary  
Ritenour Middle  
Ritenour High  
Wyland Elementary |                                                      |
| Riverview Gardens     | Glasgow Elementary  
Koch Elementary |                                                      |
| Rockwood              | Ballwin Elementary  
Eureka Elementary  
Uthoff Valley Elementary  
Westridge Elementary |                                                      |
| SSD                   | Ackerman  
Bridges  
JDC  
Lakeside  
Litzsinger  
Neuwoehner  
Northview  
Southview |                                                      |
| University City       | Jackson Park Elementary |                                                      |
| Webster               | Computer Elementary  
Stegar 6th Grade Center  
Hixson Middle School  
Webster Groves High School |                                                      |
| Wellston              | Central Elementary |                                                      |

**CONTINUUM OF SCHOOL-WIDE INSTRUCTIONAL & POSITIVE BEHAVIOR SUPPORT**

- **Primary Prevention:** School-/Classroom-Wide Systems for All Students, Staff, & Settings
- **Secondary Prevention:** Specialized Group Systems for Students with At-Risk Behavior
- **Tertiary Prevention:** Specialized Individualized Systems for Students with High-Risk Behavior

**PBS Organizational Logic**

- Funding
- Visibility
- Political Support
- Leadership Team
  - Active Coordination
  - Training
  - Coaching
  - Evaluation
- Local School Teams/Demonstrations