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Managing disruptive behaviors in schools is a high-ranking concern in communities across the country (Rose & Gallup, 2006). Unfortunately, the practice of instituting tougher and more severe consequences for increased discipline problems has not resulted in a decrease of disruptive behavior (Lewis & Garrison-Harrell, 1999; Safran & Oswald, 2003; Turnbell et al., 2002). Instead, schools and communities are now turning to alternative proactive strategies emphasizing positive behavior supports (PBS) and prevention. The leadership for changing a school-wide approach away from a punitive-style of discipline to a proactive, pro-social approach is not simply implementing a new idea; rather it is creating a cultural change.

The purpose of this study was to gain an in-depth understanding of the patterns of implementation of PBS and patterns of student behavior when PBS was implemented by a principal-led planning team and a coach-led planning team. The following overarching questions guided this study: (1) What does the implementation of PBS look like in buildings with principal-led planning teams and coach-led planning teams, and (2) What are the patterns of student behavior when PBS is implemented with a coach-led team, a principal-led team, and in buildings where PBS is not implemented?
A descriptive case study approach was used to enable an in-depth description of archived documents detailing the implementation of PBS in four elementary schools in a large urban district in the Midwest.

The analysis of the data revealed findings in three areas: (a) Principal-led and coach-led PBS teams implemented the key components of PBS in a similar sequence, although some of the components were implemented with greater quality by the coach-led teams; (b) patterns of student behavior were similar between the coach-led PBS schools and the principal-led PBS schools, except in the area of tardies; and (c) differences in patterns of student behavior were revealed between PBS schools and non-PBS schools.
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CHAPTER I
INTRODUCTION

Managing disruptive behaviors in schools is a high ranking concern in communities across the country (Rose & Gallup, 2006), resulting in teaching and learning time being cut short by staff mitigating disruptive behaviors (Walker, Ramsey, & Gresham, 2005). In the most recent Phi Delta Kappa/Gallup poll (Rose & Gallup, 2006), the public ranked the lack of discipline as the third biggest problem facing public schools behind lack of funding and overcrowding. Schools have addressed the problem of disruptive behavior by instituting zero tolerance policies and focusing strategies on punishment for misbehavior (Skiba & Peterson, 2000). Unfortunately, the practice of instituting tougher and more severe consequences for increased discipline problems has not resulted in a decrease of disruptive behavior (Lewis & Garrison-Harrell, 1999; Safran & Oswald, 2003; Turnbell et al., 2002). In fact, implementing such consequences may have the opposite effect and can increase the incidence of disruptive behavior (McCord, 1995).

Schools and communities are turning to alternative strategies emphasizing positive behavior supports (PBS) and prevention. PBS is a proactive approach to providing supports and interventions to promote positive socially acceptable behaviors. PBS is a systems change process which challenges staff to reflect upon their belief systems about behavior and instruction (Sugai & Horner, 2006). Although the empirical support for implementing PBS in schools is encouraging in relation to student, teacher, and staff, and school climate outcomes, the leadership for changing a school-wide deeply
embedded practice, such as changing a punitive-style of discipline to a proactive, pro-social approach requires deliberate leading for long-term adaptive changes, not quick technical fixes (Heifetz & Linsky, 2002). It is not simply implementing a new idea; rather, it is creating a cultural change in how staff members learn a new practice by owning their own data, increasing their own knowledge and skill, practicing and reflecting on their practice in collaborative teams, and engaging students to take responsibility for their learning (City, Elmore, Fiarman, & Teitel, 2009). Michael Fullan (2000) developed a theory regarding leading a reculturing process in schools. He introduced the concept of dependency in leadership where leaders become dependent on external forces for school improvement. This dependency can interfere with the reculturing process in schools and can create significant barrier to the implementation and sustainability of PBS. Fullan argued that the role of principals has increasingly become complex and constrained. They tend to “receive” innovations from externally initiated changes rather than getting involved as learners in reform situations. The end result of the dependent leader is innovations come and go without a full integration into the context and culture of the school (Fullan, 2000).

Breaking the bonds of dependency and moving to positive reculturing of a school, argued Fullan (2000), “involves changing the norms, values, incentives, skills, and relationships in the organization to foster a different way of working together. Reculturing makes a difference in teaching and learning” (p. 161). Fullan argued that student achievement will increase with work cultures that are collaborative, that create
professional learning communities among staff, and foster an environment of continuous improvement of their instructional practices based on student data.

One way that schools can provide opportunities for staff to work collaboratively and increase their knowledge and skill is outlined in the text, “Instructional Rounds in Education: A Network Approach to Teaching and Learning,” co-authored by City et al. (2009). The authors emphasized the need for staff to become reflective practitioners with their colleagues. They stated that we learn to do the work by doing the work, not by instructing others to conduct the work or hiring expert consultants to serve as the knowledge-holders of how to do the work. Change occurs by focusing the work around enhancing instructional practice with the staff directly involved with the performance of the students.

John Hattie (2009) and Robert Marzano (2003) separately reinforced City et al.’s (2009) conclusions after reviewing large bodies of research on effecting change within schools. They concluded that one of the best ways to sustain improvement is to examine professional practice through creating collaborative teams to enable teachers to be reflective practitioners around their own belief systems, student outcomes, and teaching practices. In fact, Marzano (2003) emphasized the importance of educators working collaboratively to hone their instructional practices. He stated, “Leadership for change is most effective when carried out by a small group of educators with the principal functioning as a strong cohesive force” (p. 174).

Using collaborative teams to work through a plan-do-study-act cycle of improvement provides a systematic way for staff to improve their practices through
analyzing their data, establishing needs, identifying and implementing common strategies and goals, to reflect on their effectiveness, and making adjustments and beginning the cycle again (Learning Points Associates, 2004). One process of improvement that deploys this type of continuous improvement cycle is the Ohio Integrated Systems Model (OISM) developed by the participating district’s state department of education. It is a tool to close the achievement gap among lower performing students and the rest of the student population in both academic and behavioral areas of need. The Ohio Integrated Systems Model has three tiers which represent increasingly intensive academic and behavioral interventions for students. The universal tier provides strong front-line core instructional supports and preventative measures to meet the needs of the vast majority of students. The targeted tier provides interventions and explicit, specific supports for at-risk students who need additional support beyond the core universal curricula. The intensive tier provides individualized, concentrated supports for students who need services beyond what can be found at the universal and targeted tiers (Sugai & Horner, 2006).

The Ohio Integrated Systems Model is a systems change model built on the same foundation as PBS. PBS focuses exclusively on the behavioral needs of students. PBS uses school-based collaborative teams including teachers, administrators, and support personnel (e.g., school counselors) to collect and analyze behavior data to plan, implement, and monitor strategies to reduce disruptive behavior (Todd, Horner, Sugai, & Colvin, 1999). Teams develop strategies across a three-tiered system of support: universal/school-wide prevention strategies, targeted interventions in specific classrooms,
and intensive individual interventions for students with the most significant needs (Lewis, Sugai, & Colvin, 1998). Teams monitor progress by tracking student data, such as, office referrals, suspensions, expulsions, attendance, and tardies (Lewis et al., 1998; Todd et al., 1999). Measures of school climate can also provide data on staff satisfaction as PBS is implemented.

The leadership of the PBS planning teams typically is shared between the chairperson of the team and the principal. The principal generally attends all meetings and serves in a leadership/facilitator role to ensure that the outlined process is being followed. There is a new trend, though, to hire or contract with PBS coaches to assist teams with the implementation of PBS (Safran & Safran, 1996).

Districts across the country have looked toward PBS coaches as a means to enhance the knowledge and skills of teachers; to provide support in the development of the reinforcement system and the lessons to teach the expected behaviors; to assist the teams in ensuring students are engaged in the PBS system through components, such as reinforcement activities; and to also provide the on-going support as teachers implement new strategies (Borman & Feger, 2006; Knight, 2006; Neufeld & Roper, 2003; Swinnerton, 2007). The overall role of the PBS coach is to use a variety of professional development strategies to enhance the instructional core (i.e., increasing teacher’s knowledge and skill, introducing new rigorous content, or enhancing student engagement). Despite this role to enhance the instructional core, using external coaches to support the implementation of PBS may support Fullan’s (2000) theory of schools and leaders becoming dependent on external initiatives that, in the end, fall flat in improving
student achievement. It is an increasing trend, though, to use external coaches for PBS, but this principle of dependency has not been examined within the framework of PBS implementation.

Rationale

Studies on PBS have focused primarily on whether disruptive behavior declined after implementing PBS (Christensen, Young, & Marchant, 2004; Irvin, Tobin, Sprague, Sugai, & Vincent, 2004; Lemoine, 2004; Lewis, Colvin, & Sugai, 2000; Sprague et al., 2001; Sugai, Sprague, Horner, & Walker, 2000). No published studies examine the leadership roles within this reculturing process and the patterns of implementation and student behavior across different teams. Because districts are increasingly securing instructional coaching services to assist with PBS, it is critical to provide rich descriptions of the patterns of implementation and student outcomes when teams are led by coaches or by principals.

Purpose of Study

The purpose of this study is to gain an in-depth understanding of the patterns of implementation of PBS and patterns of student behavior when PBS is implemented by a principal-led planning team and a coach-led planning team. The following overarching questions guided this study:

1. What does the implementation of PBS look like in buildings with principal-led planning teams and coach-led planning teams?
2. What are the patterns of student behavior when PBS is implemented with a coach-led team, a principal-led team, and in buildings where PBS is not implemented?

3. What are the patterns of staff’s perceptions of school climate when PBS is implemented with coach-led teams and principal-led teams?
CHAPTER II
REVIEW OF LITERATURE

Problem Behavior

Communities across the country rank disruptive behaviors in schools as one of their top concerns (Rose & Gallup, 2006). As staff turn their attention to mitigating disruptive behavior, teaching and learning time is cut short (Walker et al., 2005). The Surgeon General reported in the 2008 Youth Violence report that 36% of high school students across the country reported being in a physical fight in the past 12 months. An estimated 30% of students in 6th through 10th grade reported being involved in bullying (Centers for Disease Control and Prevention, 2008). These student reports are reinforced by public perception regarding discipline. In a recent Phi Delta Kappa/Gallup poll (Rose & Gallup, 2006), the public ranked the lack of discipline as the third biggest problem facing public schools behind lack of funding and overcrowding.

Studies consistently find a direct positive link between student behavioral difficulties and poor academic performance (McEvoy & Welker, 2000). The link appears to start early. Breslau et al. (2009) found that children at the age of 6 with behavior problems, particularly children with attention problems, have diminished student achievement in high school. In addition to the persistence of problem behavior over time, researchers have found that the relationship between behavior and poor reading skills increases as students get older (Fleming, Harachi, Cortes, Abbot, & Catalono, 2004; Morrison, Anthony, Storino, & Dillon, 2001; Nelson, Benner, Lane, & Smith, 2004; Roeser & Eccles, 2000). For example, McIntosh, Flannery, Sugai, Braun, and Cochrane
(2008) conducted an analysis of students’ problem behavior in Grade 8 and academic performance in Grade 9, and conversely their academic skills in Grade 8 and problem behavior in Grade 9. They found statistically significant links between both, reinforcing the crossover effects from behavior to academics.

In Ohio, disruptive behavior in the schools appears to be increasing rather than decreasing. There has been a steady increase in the number of out-of-school suspensions across the state according to discipline data reported on the state department of education’s website. Figure 1 shows the number of out-of-school suspension occurrences growing from 212,042 occurrences in 2004-2005 to 230,764 occurrences in 2006-2007. While suspensions increased, during that same time period, enrollment in the state dropped from 1,781,143 in 2004-2005 to 1,755,588 in 2006-2007 (Ohio Department of Education, 2010).

Across the US, school districts in urban settings with larger numbers of students from ethnic minorities and students from low socio-economic backgrounds have greater challenges with student discipline. Blacks, Latinos, and low socio-economic students receive disproportionate amounts of discipline and more severe punishment than other students (Raffaele Mendez & Knoff, 2003).

Schools have addressed the problem of disruptive behavior by instituting zero tolerance policies and focusing strategies on punishment for misbehavior (Skiba & Peterson, 2000). Unfortunately, the practice of instituting tougher and more severe consequences for increased discipline problems has not proven to decrease disruptive behavior (Lewis & Garrison-Harrell, 1999; Safran & Oswald, 2003; Turnbell et al.,
Figure 1. Three year trends in out of school suspension occurrences in state (2003-2004 to 2005-2006; Ohio Department of Education, 2010)

2002). In fact, it can have the opposite effect and can increase the incidence of disruptive behavior (McCord, 1995; Sugai & Horner, 1999; Sulzer-Azaroff & Mayer, 1994).

Increasingly, school districts are using processes such as Positive Behavior Supports (PBS) to make systemic changes in their discipline procedures (Sugai & Horner, 2006). Leadership teams are used to analyze behavior data, establish and teach behavioral expectations, and create universal, targeted, and intensive supports to proactively address students’ needs. Rather than focusing on technical solutions of discipline (e.g., code of student behavior, stricter consequences), the leadership teams focus on adaptive changes in students and staff to increase instructional time and to improve the overall school climate.
Leadership for Change

Ronald Heifetz and Marty Linsky (2002) made a distinction between technical solutions and adaptive changes. Technical problems already have the solutions known to those involved; it is just a matter of applying the known solution to resolve the issue. Adaptive challenges cannot be solved by simply applying an available procedure. Adaptive challenges require changing attitudes, values, and behaviors. Heifetz and Linsky argued that leaders often jump to technical solutions rather than work through a process of discovery and discontent to get to a sustained adaptive change. The leadership exhibited by principals and building teams to address disruptive behavior requires some technical solutions, but the majority of the work involves changing people’s belief systems and creating a sustainable long-term process of decision making. Leaders must have a keen understanding of the change process to move people’s belief system from a punishment-based system to a proactive, preventative system.

In Leading in a Culture of Change, Michael Fullan (2001b) outlined key guidelines for pushing change to an adaptive level. These guidelines enable more in-depth and sustained implementation. The suggested six guidelines for understanding the process of change are:

(1) the goal is not to innovate the most, but rather to innovate selectively with coherence; (2) it is not enough to have the best ideas, you must work through a process where others assess and come to find collective meaning and commitment to new ways; (3) appreciate early difficulties of trying something new—what I call the implementation dip; (4) redefine resistance as a potential positive
force—naysayers sometimes have good points, and they are crucial concerning the politics of implementation; (5) reculturing is the name of the game—much change is structural, and superficial—the change required is in the culture of what people value and how they work together to accomplish it; (6) never a checklist, always complexity—there is no step-by-step shortcut to transformation; it involves the hard day-to-day work of reculturing. (p. 34)

Richard Elmore (2003) took the broader change process and applied it directly to schools and classrooms through the concept of the “Instructional Core:” rigorous content, teacher knowledge and skill, and student engagement. He argued you cannot fully effect educational change without impacting the culture of the school across all three areas. Elmore believed the dynamic relationship between content, teacher knowledge and skill, and student engagement requires teacher leaders and administrators to make a cultural shift to one of examining their professional practice. Change occurs not by simply implementing a new program or new idea, but instead by creating a cultural shift in how we buy in to the practice, examine data to increase our knowledge, practice the strategies to enhance our skill, reflect on our practice, and engage students in their own growth and development (City et al., 2009).

Sergiovanni (1996) called this internal moral change process as an inside rather than outside theory of schooling. Having a system of professional socialization, purposing and shared values, and collegiality and natural interdependence versus a rules-based theory encourages teachers to practice in more complex ways resulting in better learning conditions for students. Within professional socialization are the concepts
of a strong knowledge base for teaching. Virtue speaks to the professional obligations of a teacher to be dedicated to lifelong inquiry and reflection, committed to the larger practice of all school staff not only themselves. Purposing and shared values serve as the glue that bonds people together in their schoolhouse. Benchmarks for knowing what is to be done are important markers in the change process. Lastly, collegiality and natural interdependence refers to how teachers support each other and share common values about teaching and learning (Sergiovanni, 1996). These group values and collegiality encourage people to manage themselves and push each other for continuous improvement. The fundamental difference between a norms-based system of change versus a rules-based system is the ownership of the participants in the change process and the shared moral conviction to work with each other toward common goals.

**Improvement Process**

Fundamental to trying to move towards a norms-based system of change in a school is paying attention to the current belief systems and identifying where new programs or initiatives fit into that belief system. Making changes in belief systems about discipline and school climate can occur through a change process where staff can work through their own inquiry-based needs process, establish goals, develop and implement strategies, have time for reflection around those strategies, evaluate progress, and make any necessary adjustments in strategies (Fullan, 2001a). Using collaborative teams to do this work is central to reflective practice.

John Hattie (2009) concluded that the best way to effectively change processes in schools for sustained improvement is to create collaborative teams for teachers to identify
what students must learn, the benchmarks to track the learning, to gather evidence of the learning, and to analyze the results to determine which instructional strategies were working. This conclusion was drawn after reviewing and synthesizing over 800 meta-analyses on the factors that impact student achievement. Robert Marzano (2003) supported this conclusion when he described collaborative teams as one of the most powerful initiatives for school improvement he had seen in the last decade.

One process for collaborative teams to use in implementing a systemic change into their school culture is the Plan-Do-Study-Act cycle of school improvement. It is commonly used in schools and businesses (Learning Points Associates, 2004). Walter Shewhart (1939) originally introduced the model of improvement, which was later modified for corporations by W. Edwards Deming (1986). Educators also viewed the model as appropriate for school improvement efforts (Rinehart, 1993). Figure 2 depicts the improvement cycle which contains the following stages:

- Plan: Develop a plan for improvement.
- Do: Implement the plan.
- Study: Evaluate the impact according to specific criteria.
- Act: Adjust strategies to better meet criteria.

Data are the key to this continuous improvement cycle. During the planning stage, teams must use data to identify needs and focus their goals. Data patterns reveal strengths and weaknesses in the system and provide excellent direction. When teams “do,” they collect progress monitoring data that will tell them whether they are on track to meet their goals. Through collaborative reflection, staff members review the data, or study, and begin to
Figure 2. Plan-Do-Study-Act Cycle of Improvement

decide next steps. The final stage is to adjust their strategies and act. Eventually, the whole cycle begins again. Each stage in the Plan-Do-Study-Act cycle enables team members to reflect on their practice and reinforce the moral imperative of supporting each other through the change process (Rinehart, 1993).

The planning stage of the cycle, in essence, starts with conducting a needs assessment. The assessment is firmly rooted in data analysis, resulting in two important products: (a) evidence as to why a change is needed in a particular area, and (b) baseline data which can be used as a starting place for new change. Staff members need to be able to handle the data, work through processes to analyze it, and collaboratively draw their own implications. When staff can clearly outline their students’ needs, moving to the goal-setting step emerges as the next logical stage (Rinehart, 1993).

A second component of planning is establishing goals. There is robust literature on the importance of establishing strategic goals prior to implementing a change in a business, organization, or school (Conzemius & O’Neill, 2001; DuFour, DuFour, &
Eaker, 2008; Rinehart, 1993). There is also consensus that goals need to be clear, measurable, and challenging. SMART goals have emerged as a valuable tool for schools to formalize their goal-setting process (Conzemius & O’Neill, 2001). SMART is an acronym for specific, measurable, achievable, research-based, and time sensitive. If goals are written using these guidelines, it guides the implementation process and clearly outlines how to measure success.

The third step in the planning stage is developing evidence-based strategies to meet the goals (Rinehart, 1993). The term evidence-based means “strategies, processes, and curricula for which information exists to support adoption and sustained use” (OSEP Center on PBIS; Sugai et al., 2010, p. 26). It refers to the use of research and other relevant scientific studies as the foundation for determining the best practices in our field. Teams examine available or new instructional strategies and prioritize the practices shown by research to result in meaningful improvements in student outcomes (Cook, Tankersley, & Landrum, 2009).

The second stage of continuous improvement is the actual implementation of the strategies. That is, educators “do” the strategies outlined in their plan. Teams need to have clear guidance on implementation, including professional development to ensure proper execution of the strategies, and methods for staff to support the fidelity of the implementation. Continuing to have collaborative teams meet as implementation moves into the “do” stage is a critical component to ensure reflective practice (DuFour et al., 2008; Rinehart, 1993). As teams implement their strategies, educators need to be able to meet with their colleagues and discuss their implementation.
The third stage is to “study” the impact of the strategies. Collaborative teams reflect on their implementation and review data to measure their effectiveness and to make adjustments in their strategies based on the outcome data. The importance of establishing measurable goals becomes clear during this stage. Analyzing the progress monitoring data and other outcome data against the measurable goals results in evidence for the team to make decisions on next steps (Rinehart, 1993). This stage mirrors the first stage of reviewing data to identify needs and establish a baseline, resulting in a complete cycle of improvement.

Lastly, the teams “act.” They adjust their strategies based on their results, make modifications to their plan, and start the cycle over again. This is a critical step in fine-tuning strategies and identifying how to take strategies to a higher level of implementation (Rinehart, 1993).

**Ohio Integrated Systems Model**

The Ohio Department of Education developed a systems change model for staff to address both the academic and behavioral needs of their students. The foundation of the model is a three-tiered system of prevention and intervention called the Ohio Integrated Systems Model for Academic and Behavior Supports (OISM). The state department provided support for state-wide implementation of OISM starting in the 2005-2006 school year and expanding state-wide during the 2006-2007 school year through a federally funded State Improvement Grant. Technical assistance to districts, such as professional development and instructional coaching, was provided through the state department of education’s regional staff (Ohio Department of Education, 2007).
Districts across the state implemented OISM as a tool to close the achievement gap among lower performing students (e.g., students with disabilities, at-risk learners) and the rest of the student body. By using the model to address the academic and behavioral needs of the entire student body, districts and principal-led building teams focused on reducing the number of children who needed targeted or intensive intervention.

Like the PBS model previously described, the OISM model has three tiers, which represent increasingly intensive academic and behavioral intervention for students who need it (Figure 3). The model is designed to provide strong school-wide instruction and supports that would meet the needs of most students. The targeted tier is for students at some risk for school failure and provides more explicit targeted instruction for groups of students in addition to the core curricula. When effective

*Figure 3. Ohio Integrated Systems Model*
school-wide instruction and targeted interventions are in place, a small percentage of students may still require intensive supports that are designed for their individual needs. The students in the intensive tier are at high risk for failure (Ohio Department of Education, 2007).

The percentages listed in each tier on the Ohio Integrated Systems Model represent the expected percentages of students in each segment of the cone if appropriate prevention and intervention services are provided (Sugai & Horner, 1999). In any given student body,

- 80-90% of students are in the green zone and need universal school-wide interventions. This zone includes core instruction, is used in all settings with all students, and is preventative and proactive.
- 5-10% of students are in the yellow zone and need core instruction and targeted interventions. This zone includes the at-risk students, should be highly efficient, and have rapid response.
- 1-5% of students are in the red zone and need core instruction and intensive intervention. This zone includes individual students, is assessment-based, and should include intense, durable procedures.

In addition to the three tiers of prevention and intervention, the OISM model also has five components that are embedded within the tiers. District and building-level teams must engage in a collaborative problem solving process to guide school improvement efforts across the three tiers. Decisions must be based on specific and relevant data impacting both the academic and behavioral needs of
students. Instructional strategies must be research-validated practices, which include methods to explicitly teach both academic skills as well as appropriate social and behavioral skills. Lastly, the data analysis, instructional strategies, teaming processes, and curricula content must be culturally responsive to address the historically underachieving culturally diverse students within each district (Ohio Department of Education, 2007). The state supported process of implementing OISM in a district includes establishing a commitment and then creating a district-level leadership team. This team, typically chaired by the superintendent or assistant superintendent, includes, but is not limited to, representation from the leadership of curriculum and instruction, pupil personnel/student services, building level administration, and other key stakeholder group leaders. Regional representatives from the department of education work collaboratively with these teams to implement systems change at the district level to support building level implementation and, in turn, improve achievement for all groups of students. The work of the district team involves reviewing and potentially revising district policies and practices, and engaging in professional learning to build skills and information related to the key content of OISM.

The OISM model is designed to step building leadership teams through a collaborative strategic planning process. Teams use their student academic and behavior performance data to define the problem, analyze the problem, establish goals, develop and implement a plan, and evaluate the plan.

In order to sustain OISM, the department of education worked with districts to develop internal capacity to support training and technical assistance at the building level.
District personnel were identified to serve as district coaches supported by the district leadership team and the regional department of education representatives to provide training and coaching support to principal-led building leadership teams. The building leadership teams include staff from both general and special education as well as parents and community.

**Positive Behavior Supports (PBS)**

For the state department of education in this study, OISM amalgamates behavior and academic prevention and intervention efforts into the one model. The behavioral component of OISM is the three-tiered PBS system of delivery (Sugai & Horner, 1999). According to the School-Wide Positive Behavior Support Implementers’ Blueprint and Self-Assessment from the Center on Positive Behavioral Interventions and Supports (Sugai et al., 2010), school-wide positive behavior support is a “framework or approach comprised of intervention practices and organizational systems for establishing the social culture, learning and teaching environment, and individual behavior supports needed to achieve academic and social success for all students” (p. 13). The Center does not describe PBS as a “model;” rather it states that PBS is a set of systems change strategies, effective prevention-oriented practices, and interventions that have a strong history of effectiveness. PBS includes a wide range of systemic and individualized strategies to teach appropriate behavior and prevent problem behaviors (Carr et al., 1999; Warren et al., 2003).

PBS requires implementation across all three change components identified by Richard Elmore (City et al., 2009) in the Instructional Core. Teacher knowledge and skill
must be developed around topics, such as explicitly teaching behavioral expectations and rewarding students when they are demonstrating appropriate behaviors. Building teams must rigorously implement the new content through, for example, publishing behavioral expectations, designing lesson plans to teach them, and consistently reinforcing their use. Lastly, PBS focuses strongly on student engagement. Structures are established to engage students in their own learning and to take responsibility for their actions. Using teacher’s knowledge and skill, delivering content through explicitly teaching behavioral expectations, and engaging students in their own learning process, serves as the backdrop for PBS (Nelson & Colvin, 1996). These PBS systems change strategies are grounded in key characteristics including three tiers of support, evidenced based practices, and a systems perspective.

**Three Tiers of Support**

PBS interventions are planned and implemented across three levels of support as depicted in Figure 4. Universal interventions are school-wide and focus on designing environments that reinforce appropriate behaviors. Targeted interventions are designed specifically for an at risk group of students requiring more support, and individualized intensive interventions are used for students with chronic problem behaviors (Warren et al., 2003).

Universal interventions shift the behavior focus to prevention and creating a positive school climate rather than a punitive disciplinary approach (Sugai & Horner, 1999). A PBS planning team establishes behavioral expectations for both staff and students and designs strategies to explicitly teach and reinforce them (Todd et al., 1999).
The strategies and supports designed are unique to each school and build on their particular strengths and weaknesses. As a system-wide primary prevention effort in schools, positive behavior support consists of rules, routines, and physical arrangements that are developed and taught by school staff to prevent initial occurrences of problem behavior (Lewis & Sugai, 1999; Sugai, 2009; Warren et al., 2003). Sugai and Horner (2006) explained universal interventions as “directed toward all students across all school settings, and involves school, family, and community members” (p. 247). The strategies create a common language and focus for staff, families, and students. The strategies are implemented consistently across all school settings and all staff (Sugai & Horner, 2006).
The second tier of behavior support includes targeted interventions—interventions designed to specifically address a group of students who are at risk for problem behavior (Sugai & Horner, 1999). The interventions may include grouping students based on their behavioral deficits, specific skills training for appropriate behavior, and group contingencies (Lewis & Sugai, 1999; Warren et al., 2003). Typically, the interventions involve an increased amount of adult attention and monitoring of the students (Sugai & Horner, 2006).

Students who are still exhibiting problem behavior after receiving both universal and targeted interventions may be referred for intensive, individualized support (the third tier). Individualized plans are developed for the students who need the most support based on an analysis of the function of their problem behavior. This approach allows educational teams to address the multiple issues that may be impacting the chronic behavioral concerns that students with the most intensive needs typically display (Lewis & Sugai, 1999; Warner et al., 2003).

**Evidence Based Practices**

One of the basic principles of PBS is that interventions selected must be based on clear research indicating their effectiveness, and the interventions chosen must be associated with the identified need, as evidenced through the school discipline data (Sugai & Horner, 2006). The School-Wide Positive Behavior Support Implementers’ Blueprint and Self-Assessment (Sugai et al., 2010) recommends asking the following questions to determine if there is sufficient research to deem a practice as being evidence-based:
(a) Has a convincing functional relationship been documented experimentally between the practice and the desired outcome? (b) Has the effectiveness of the practice been replicated across similar populations and contexts? (c) Has the practice been implemented effectively, accurately, efficiently, and durably by real or local users? and (d) Does the practice have sufficient scope to affect multiple educational outcomes? (p. 38)

**Systems Perspective**

The school-wide PBS process emphasizes the creation of systems that support the implementation and sustainability of evidence-based practices and procedures, and fit within on-going school improvement efforts (Sugai et al., 2010). George Sugai (2009) outlined the following systemic features of PBS, depicted in Figure 5, that must be evident to have sustained and embedded reform:

(a) Outcomes—academic and behavior targets that are endorsed and emphasized by students, families, and educators; (b) Practices—interventions and strategies that are evidence based; (c) Data—information that is used to identify status, need for change, and effects of interventions; (d) Systems—supports that are needed to enable the accurate and durable implementation of the practices of PBS. (p. 1)

Carr et al. (2002) emphasized the importance of PBS requiring a systems perspective.

One of the central messages of PBS is that, in providing support, we should focus our efforts on fixing problem contexts and not problem behavior. Behavior change is not simply the result of applying specific techniques that address
specific challenges. The best technology will fail if it is applied in an uncooperative or disorganized context. This thinking, which underlies all of PBS, has made efforts at systems change one of the defining features of the approach. (p. 9)

**PBS Process**

The PBS process follows the same sequence as the Plan-Do-Study-Act cycle of improvement. When implementing PBS, there are seven essential processes that provide the framework for the tasks conducted by PBS teams and principals (Sprague et al., 2001).
1. A planning team analyzes behavioral data to identify areas needing improvement;

2. Appropriate behaviors are identified for students and staff;

3. Students are taught these behaviors and given opportunities to practice and integrate the behaviors into their daily routines;

4. Student incentives are created to reinforce the appropriate use of the new behaviors;

5. Staff make a commitment to monitor, support, coach, debrief, and provide necessary adjustments to sustain the achieved gains;

6. Staff receive professional development and feedback regarding effective implementation of the intervention; and

7. Data are analyzed to determine the effectiveness of the intervention.

**Effectiveness of PBS**

The number of rigorous studies on the effectiveness of PBS has increased over the past five years as the implementation of PBS has grown. Studies consistently find decreases in disruptive behavior, particularly with high quality implementation of PBS (Barrett, Bradshaw, & Lewis-Palmer, 2008; Bohanon et al., 2006; Bradshaw, Reinke, Brown, Bevans, & Leaf, 2008; Duda, Dunlap, Fox, Lentini, & Clarke, 2004; Lassen, Steele, & Sailor, 2006; Lewis, Hudson, Richter, & Johnson, 2004; Luiselli, Putnam, & Sunderland, 2002). A key aspect of ensuring fidelity is providing systematic training in PBS to implementers. Bradshaw et al. (2008) conducted a group randomized trial examining the impact of training in PBS on the implementation within the schools.
Randomly selected schools received training while other schools received no training. After three years of implementation, trained schools received higher implementation fidelity ratings in PBS compared to non-trained schools.

There are also studies that link PBS to improved academic performance. Horner et al. (2009) conducted a randomized controlled trial of the effectiveness of PBS after three years of implementation in elementary schools in Illinois and Hawaii. They reported an improved perception of safety in the schools and an increase in third grade reading scores. In another study of effectiveness, Carr et al. (1999) conducted a comprehensive meta-analysis of PBS research with people with developmental disabilities. They reviewed studies conducted from 1985 to 1996 and found that two-thirds of the interventions were effective across a variety of settings. In fact, studies in the meta-analysis indicated as much as an 80% reduction in problem behavior.

It is important to note that these early studies focused on the implementation of PBS with students with significant behavior problems. Although PBS is a systems-change process which takes three to five years to fully integrate into the culture of the school (Lewis, 2006), additional research has focused on the effectiveness of PBS even after only one year of implementation (Blueprint for PBS Implementation, Sugai et al., 2010).

For example, Netzel and Eber (2003) studied the implementation of PBS in an urban elementary school. After one year of implementation, they found a 22% reduction in suspensions. The first year of implementation solely focused on strategies within the universal tier (e.g., teaching school-wide rules and recognizing appropriate student
behavior). Similarly, Warren et al. (2003) studied student discipline outcomes after one year of PBS implementation and reported a 20% decrease in office discipline referrals, 23% decrease in time-outs, and 57% decrease in short-term suspensions.

The results of several studies have indicated the importance of the universal tier when implementing PBS. In discussing the implementation of the different tiers of support, Newcomer, Lewis, and Powers (2002) indicated that research has shown that intensive individualized supports are effective and an important component of PBS, but universal school-wide supports must be the first step in an effective school discipline program. In fact, Horner, Freeman, Nelson, and Sugai (2003) concluded that “preliminary results suggest that when schools implement primary level prevention efforts they (a) identify fewer students as needing intensive behavior plans, and (b) are more successful in their support of these students” (p. 4).

PBS Planning Team

In addition to the importance of implementing a universal, primary tier of support, another important component of the PBS process is the establishment of a collaborative planning team (Lewis, Powers, Kely, & Newcomer, 2002). PBS teams typically consist of representatives from general education, special education, the principal, support staff, and sometimes parents (Sugai et al., 2010). PBS teams generally meet bimonthly after school and plan, assist in the delivery, and monitor all components of PBS including assessing the behavioral needs of the students, identifying expected behaviors, developing school-wide prevention strategies, developing ways to teach expected behaviors, and regularly monitoring the student outcomes (Oswald, Safran, & Johanson,
Lewis et al. (2002) recommended that PBS planning teams have the authority to determine if there are any changes necessary in current discipline procedures, including routines and environmental factors.

The leadership of the PBS planning teams typically is shared between the chairperson of the team and the principal. The principal generally attends all meetings and serves in a leadership/facilitator role to ensure that the outlined process is being followed. Although most research has identified such leadership at the building level for PBS teams, there is a new trend noticed in the literature to hire or contract with instructional coaches to assist teams with the implementation of PBS (Safran & Safran, 1996) rather than or in addition to principals leading the process.

**Instructional Coaching**

Implementing a change in instructional processes and impacting people’s belief systems requires on-going sustained professional development and support. Recently, districts across the country have begun to look toward instructional coaches as a means to enhance the knowledge and skills of teachers, and to also provide the on-going support as teachers implement new strategies (Borman & Feger, 2006; Knight, 2006; Neufeld & Roper, 2003; Swinnerton, 2007). The instructional coach is typically a full- or part-time member of the staff. The role of the instructional coach is to use a variety of professional development strategies to foster high quality implementation of chosen strategies. Wood and McQuarrie (1999) have described instructional coaching as “on the job learning” (p. 12). Coaches use techniques such as guiding teachers through instructional materials, collaborative planning of lessons and interventions, modeling instructional practices, and
working individually or in small reflective teams to review strategies (Knight, 2004) to enhance the knowledge and skills of the team, as well as to facilitate the implementation of the chosen practice.

The research on the effectiveness of instructional coaches is not as robust as the prevalence of the use of coaches in districts (Cornett & Knight, 2008). Cornett and Knight reviewed over 250 publications regarding instructional coaching and found few rigorous studies. Most of the literature focused on sharing best practices and did not provide actual evidence of effectiveness. In one study that did include sufficient evidence (Knight, 2004), the researcher found that instructional coaches can achieve a high-degree of implementation in a relatively short amount of time when two specific conditions are present: principal support and highly qualified coaches (Knight, 2004). Cornett and Knight (2008) later studied the difference in implementation between teachers who attended professional development to learn a new strategy and teachers who attended the same training, but also received support from an instructional coach. They found the teachers who were coached were significantly more likely to implement the new strategy within the classroom and the teachers expressed more likelihood to continue to use the strategy in the future. Cornett and Knight concluded that the results suggest that instructional coaching will increase the likelihood that teachers adopt new teaching practices.

In addition to the use of internal instructional coaches, external consultants have also become more and more prevalent to assist with the change process in the schools (Fullan, 2001a). External consultants, or coaches, are not on staff and come in to the
school to work specifically on a targeted initiative. Large-scale reform movements across the country through state level Departments of Education or through national profit and not-for-profit reform groups allocate their personnel to work directly with schools (Fullan, 2001a). Peter Block (1999) outlined three sets of skills for coaches not on staff at an organization: technical, interpersonal, and consultancy skills. Technical skills are related to the coaches’ depth of understanding of the content. Listening, giving support, and maintaining a relationship necessary to create a safe environment for honest dialogue are the interpersonal skills necessary for effective coaching. Block argued that coaches are often strong in the technical and interpersonal areas, but may not pay enough attention to actual implementation strategies, which is a key to the last skill set: consultancy. Consultancy skills include specific roles at different points during the initiative execution: entry, problem identification, feedback, implementation, extension, and termination.

When and how to employ external coaches during the implementation of an initiative are important considerations. Michael Fullan (2001a) argued that using external consultants and coaches can be effective if framed accurately:

Every time a school district has been working diligently on a problem and they ask us to help them go further, it almost always helps. Every time a district is experiencing a problem and they want us to provide the solution, it never works. (p. 185)
To be successful, consultants must carefully assess the local context and ensure that internal staff members integrate the model into their current system. Fullan noted several considerations when using consultants:

1. Ensure that there is a match between the practice and the needs, perspectives, and resources of the unit and its staff. Buildings may take on a new initiative without carefully assessing whether it is a good fit with their current status and the result would be less than effective.

2. Second, make certain that the staff can fully engage in the process before implementing it. Too often, the new practice is one of many initiatives introduced in succession, resulting in overload and fragmentation.

3. Third, understand that one model may work in one setting, but not in others. Identify similarities and differences in the current building to elements within past buildings where the imitative was implemented so that modifications can be made as necessary.

Fullan (2001a) stated that

All successful schools and districts are proactively plugged into an external network of resources, professional development, and other forms of assistance. So, it is not whether you should be in the game that is at issue, but how you should play it. (p. 195)

Principals should ensure that the theory of action of the external consultant or the district coach fits into their schools. They cannot let multiple initiatives collide; instead, they must integrate and focus on building capacity so implementation can be sustained over
time. As Hatch (2001) stated, “it takes capacity to build capacity” (p. 1). Staff must have an internal commitment to a continuous improvement process to sustain change over time.

To support a school’s implementation of PBS, an instructional coach or consultant can be used to link the training with actual implementation. Districts sometimes reorganize current staff’s responsibility to serve as a building- or district-level PBS coach, hire new part- or full-time staff, or contract for the service (Sugai et al., 2010). Other districts use school psychologists to support the implementation of PBS due to their specialized role in supporting both academic and behavioral needs of students. The function and quality of the coach is more important than how he or she was initially hired or assigned (Sugai et al., 2010). As Block (1999) identified, coaches need technical, interpersonal, and consultancy skills; specific areas within those skills for PBS coaches are related to team dynamics, systems change, problem solving, communication skills, and the PBS process (Sugai et al., 2010).

The time dedicated by the coach to each team may be more frequent during the initial phases of the implementation (e.g., monthly) and more direct (e.g., attend every meeting) and then decrease and disperse later as implementation becomes more integrated into the culture of the school (Sugai et al., 2010). For example, the coach should attend training sessions with their teams to ensure consistency in knowledge and skill related to PBS. When implementation moves into an advanced phase, the coaches’ role shifts to assisting the teams with self-assessment, fidelity of implementation across
all staff members and all settings, maximizing outcomes, and communicating progress (Horner et al., 2004; Sugai, Lewis-Palmer, Todd, & Horner, 2001).

**Literature Review Summary**

This chapter explored the current stressors facing school systems across the country regarding disruptive behavior and the historical perspective of how districts have tried to address these problems through instituting ineffective zero tolerance measures. Through an examination of the literature on change processes, improvement cycles, leadership teams, and coaching, PBS emerged as an effective systemic change process to reduce disruptive behavior. The information obtained through this literature review was extensive; however, the literature on the leadership of PBS teams is minimal. As districts continue to expend financial resources to assign PBS coaches to support the implementation of PBS, research is needed to determine the patterns of implementation and student outcomes when PBS leadership teams are led by PBS coaches versus teams.

**Purpose of Study**

The purpose of this study is to gain an in-depth understanding of the patterns of implementation of PBS and patterns of student behavior when PBS is implemented by a principal-led planning team and a coach-led planning team. The following overarching questions guided this study:

1. What does the implementation of PBS look like in buildings with principal-led planning teams and coach-led planning teams?
2. What are the patterns of student behavior when PBS is implemented with a coach-led team, a principal-led team, and in buildings where PBS is not implemented?

3. What are the patterns of staff’s perceptions of school climate when PBS is implemented with coach-led teams and principal-led teams?
CHAPTER III

METHODOLOGY

Research Design

A descriptive case study approach was used as the research design due to its ability to allow the researcher to describe the complexity of implementation of change initiatives in education (Stake, 1995; Yin, 1994). A case study approach enables in-depth analysis of implementation and descriptions of “episodes of nuance, the sequentiality of happenings in context, [and] the wholeness of the individual” (Stake, 1995, p. xii). This study provides in-depth descriptions of archived documents detailing the implementation of PBS when leadership teams were led by principals and external coaches, and describes the patterns of student behavior across buildings implementing PBS and buildings that did not implement PBS.

Robert Stake (1995) argued that some people have the idea that qualitative researchers should not have guiding questions as they conduct their research. He stated, “The design of all research requires conceptual organization, ideas to express needed understanding, conceptual bridges from what is already known, cognitive structures to guide data gathering, and outlines for presenting interpretations to others” (p. 15). In qualitative case study, researchers seek greater understanding of the case, expressing appreciation for the uniqueness and complexity of the case.

In line with Stake’s (1995) assertions, the overarching goal of this study was to seek a better understanding of the implementation process of PBS in specific cases. Because the cases (school buildings) were different in their leadership organization, I
sought to understand PBS in both contexts, as well as how student outcomes might differ in buildings where PBS was not implemented. Although I did seek understanding in general, I did have three overarching questions to guide this study:

1. What does the implementation of PBS look like in buildings with principal-led planning teams and coach-led planning teams?

2. What are the patterns of student behavior when PBS is implemented with a coach-led team, a principal-led team, and in buildings where PBS is not implemented?

3. What are the patterns of staff’s perceptions of school climate when PBS is implemented with coach-led teams and principal-led teams?

**Setting and Participants**

**Setting**

The archival documents were collected from four participating elementary schools in an urban district in Ohio. The time period studied was October 2006 to June 2007. Student behavior data were collected from fall 2006 and spring 2007. The PBS implementation data were collected from January 2007 to June 2007 which reflects the time period when the PBS training and implementation occurred in the four elementary schools.

The participating district has over 50 schools serving approximately 23,000 students and over 3,000 staff, including 1,700 teachers. It routinely has been ranked as one of the highest academically performing large urban districts in the state. As it receives accolades for its high performance academically, it also receives recognition for...
having the highest rates of out-of-school suspensions. In 2004-2005, the district was reviewed by the state for its compliance with federal and state special education requirements. The review resulted in a citation in the area of discipline incidents for students with disabilities. Interestingly, the district did not receive the citation due to having a disproportionate number of out-of-school suspensions for students with disabilities compared to non-disabled peers; instead, the citation came strictly because all students, including students with disabilities, were being suspended at a rate considerably higher than the state average and averages for other comparable districts. Table 1 depicts the number of out-of-school suspensions per 100 students for the 2004-2005 school year and the subsequent two years. For example, in 2004-2005 there were 75 incidents of out-of-school suspension for every 100 students. One incident can equal one or more days out of school. Additionally, the 75 incidents can include one student with multiple incidents.

Table 1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>District Average</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Similar Large Urban Districts Average</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ohio Average</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The student population is primarily African American (48.5%) and Caucasian (44.8%), and 40% of the student population moves in or out of the school during the course of a school year. Moreover, the total percentage of students on free or reduced lunch is 66%. Table 2 provides the demographics for the district by race, gender, and mobility rate.

Table 2

Demographics for the District

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Race</th>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Mobility Rate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Asian/Pacific Islander</td>
<td>1.8%</td>
<td>50.76%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American Indian/Alaska Native</td>
<td>0.1%</td>
<td>49.24%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black/African American</td>
<td>48.5%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic</td>
<td>1.0%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caucasian</td>
<td>44.8%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multi-Race</td>
<td>3.8%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The district was selected for participation because it had multiple buildings that implemented PBS during the 2006-2007 school year. The district hired coaches to support both the implementation of the Ohio Integrated Systems Model (OISM) developed by the state department of education, and the implementation of PBS. As such, these coaches were also charged to support PBS implementation. The district was only able to hire three coaches, so there were not enough staff members to support all of the elementary buildings. This financial dynamic resulted in two elementary buildings
being assigned a coach to lead their PBS planning and two buildings not being assigned a coach and having the principal lead the PBS planning team.

The schools that implemented PBS did so voluntarily, responding to a request by the district to serve as an “early adopter” of PBS. PBS was identified as a district-wide strategy to reduce the number of incidents of disruptive student behavior and to reduce the overall suspension rate. The district’s goal was to identify four elementary schools to begin the roll-out of PBS district-wide and eventually, over a five year time period, expand PBS to all elementary schools.

The senior level administrator responsible for supervising the elementary schools in the district scheduled a presentation at a regularly scheduled elementary principal meeting in November 2006 regarding the district’s desire to identify four elementary schools to implement PBS beginning January 2007. This was the third formal presentation principals had received regarding PBS. During the 2004-2005 school year, two elementary schools implemented PBS as part of a state-funded grant program. All principals in the district were provided information regarding the PBS initiative at that time, including testimonials regarding the significant drop in discipline incidents the two state-funded buildings experienced after one year of implementation. By November 2006, both schools were no longer implementing PBS due to changes in leadership. At the conclusion of the one-hour presentation in November 2006, principals were asked to fill out an interest card listing the following three statements to choose from describing their readiness for PBS.

1. My building is ready to implement PBS now.
2. My building is interested in the future, but the timing is not right for us this school year.

3. My building’s readiness is low. We will need further information for all staff prior to participation.

Building level principals also had the opportunity to schedule a similar presentation for their entire staff before they made their decision. None of the four participating buildings opted for a school-based presentation before filling out the card.

**Participants**

The participants included all faculty and administrators in each of the four schools implementing PBS. A total of 4 building-level administrators and 92 classroom teachers (i.e., general education and intervention specialists) participated in the PBS initiative. The full staff participated through analyzing their own student discipline data, planning school-wide strategies to address the behavioral concerns, implementing the strategies, and evaluating their effectiveness at the end of the school year.

**PBS planning teams.** An important component of the PBS planning process is the establishment of a planning team (Lewis et al., 2002). PBS teams typically consist of representatives from general education, special education, the principal, support staff, and sometimes parents. They generally meet bimonthly after school and assess the behavioral needs of the students, identify expected behaviors, develop school-wide prevention strategies, and develop ways to teach expected behaviors (Oswald et al., 2005). In this study’s participating district, all elementary schools had intervention assistance teams (IAT) in place since the early 1990s. The IAT teams analyzed student
achievement data, implemented intervention strategies, and monitored students’ progress, primarily focusing on academic needs. These pre-existing IAT teams were used as the PBS planning teams because the process they used for academic strategies was similar to the process for PBS. Most of the schools, though, supplemented their IAT teams with additional members during the PBS planning process.

**Principal-led PBS teams.** In two of the buildings, the PBS teams were led by principals. The principals’ role in the PBS process was to facilitate the team in (a) analyzing the student discipline data; (b) creating a plan to implement universal prevention strategies; and (c) monitoring the progress of the plan (Lewis et al., 2000.) The principals did not serve as the chairperson of the planning team, but served in a leadership process-oriented role. Instead, the chairperson was typically a teacher or support staff member selected from the planning team, whose role was to set the agenda and facilitate the discussion at each meeting.

**Coach-led PBS teams.** In the other two buildings, the PBS teams had principals in attendance, but they had the addition of an external coach who provided leadership in the PBS process. The coaches were assigned to the building on a part-time basis and were employees of the district, serving in non-administrative positions. In the coach-led teams, the role of the coaches was to facilitate the team in (a) analyzing the student discipline data; (b) creating a plan to implement universal prevention strategies; and (c) monitoring the progress of the plan.

**PBS coaches.** The two female coaches who led two school buildings’ implementation of PBS had similar, extensive backgrounds in instructional coaching,
behavior management, applied behavior analysis, and PBS. One coach had been with the district for 12 years, including 6 years as a middle school special education teacher of students with emotional disturbances. The second coach had 10 years of experience with the district and, prior to her instructional coaching role, had taught high school students with multiple disabilities. The first coach additionally had six years of experience as an instructional coach for special education teachers and for the Interventional Assistance Team process for the district. The second coach had five years of experience providing similar services. The coaches were both working on their master’s degree in administration at a local university during the 2006-2007 school year.

**Lead behavior specialist.** The district had on their staff three behavior specialists to support students with disabilities with social/emotional difficulties and non-disabled students served in alternative settings. One of the behavior specialists was identified as the “lead behavior specialist.” Her responsibilities included establishing a district-wide full continuum of behavioral supports for students identified with the greatest social/emotional needs, providing classroom level supervision of the program, guiding the work of the other two behavior specialists, and leading the implementation of positive behavior supports for the district. The lead behavior specialist had 15 years of experience with the district. Prior to her role as lead behavior specialist, she was a teacher of middle school students with severe emotional disorders who were educated in a therapeutic separate facility. Prior to her employment in the participating district, she worked in another state for five years as a special education teacher for students with emotional disturbances. Over her career, she participated in advanced training in numerous aspects
of positive behavior supports, crisis prevention, classroom management, applied behavior analysis, functional behavioral assessments, and writing behavior intervention plans. Moreover, she served as an adjunct faculty member at a local university teaching courses on behavior management. She is also a nationally certified trainer for (a) Crisis Prevention Institute (CPI), a de-escalation and crisis prevention training; (b) Life Space Crisis Intervention (LSCI), which is an advanced therapeutic strategy for staff who work with troubled students; and (c) CHAMPS, a social skills curricula to design a proactive and positive classroom management plan that will overtly teach students how to behave responsibly.

**External PBS consultant and trainer.** The district contracted with a university professor who is nationally renowned for her work in PBS, applied behavior analysis, and evidence-based practices. She was contracted to provide training for the building PBS planning teams, provide building-level consultation to the PBS planning teams if requested by the team, and provide consultation to the PBS coaches and lead behavior specialist to assist with their leadership of the PBS implementation. The external trainer had worked at the university for 12 years and had achieved the rank of full professor. She was the co-director of the Ohio Integrated Systems Model (OISM) project, which served as the foundation work for the participating district’s PBS work. She also designed and directed a licensure endorsement program for behavior specialists at her university. She is extensively published and provides training and consultation to districts across the country in the areas of PBS, positive parenting, applied behavior analysis, single-subject research, and evidence-based practices.
**Non-PBS buildings.** Student discipline and attendance data from two elementary buildings that did not implement PBS were also collected and analyzed to identify patterns of behavior from fall 2006 and spring 2007. The two buildings were selected due to their similarity in students across the following criteria: (a) out-of-school suspension, (b) office referrals, (c) attendance, (d) tardies, (e) poverty rate, and (f) academic achievement.

**Researcher’s role.** The researcher examined archived documents from the implementation of PBS that had occurred one year prior to the initiation of this study. The researcher gathered documents primarily from the Lead Behavior Specialist, Principals, and PBS Coaches. Once the study commenced, direct contact with participants occurred only to clarify documents (e.g., no source listed on a document, explanation of text listed on the PBS matrix) and to conduct member checking with the principals.

**Research Permission**

The researcher submitted and received Kent State University Institutional Review Board approval of the study. The researcher also submitted and received approval from the district’s Research Review Team to conduct research in the participating school district. The process included submitting an application, an abstract, an approved University Institutional Review Board letter, a researcher responsibility sign-off form, and an identification of the state Academic Content Standards that the research supported. These documents were submitted and the researcher was granted approval to conduct the study.
**Procedures**

This case study contained three components:

1. collection of archival student behavioral and attendance records of the two schools not implementing PBS and the four schools implementing PBS during a one-month time period (10/9/06—11/14/06); this time period represents a month of data prior to implementation of PBS;

2. collection and analysis of artifacts detailing the PBS training and implementation for the four PBS schools; and

3. collection of archival student behavioral and attendance records of the two schools not implementing PBS and the four schools implementing PBS during a one-month time period (4/2/07—5/14/07).

This time period represents a month of data collection after the implementation of PBS. Collecting data prior to the implementation of PBS and after provides a rich comparative description between the context of the school prior to and after PBS began.

**Data Collection**

The primary source of data was both official documents and personal documents. Increasingly, researchers using qualitative methods are using documents as their primary source of data (Bogdan & Biklen, 1998). Official documents are those that are produced by employees for record-keeping or dissemination. For this study, multiple official documents were collected and analyzed, including state-generated school report cards, student discipline and attendance data, staff climate data, PBS training materials, training evaluations, and PBS implementation artifacts (e.g., PBS matrix, reward tickets).
Personal documents are produced by individuals for limited use (Bogdan & Biklen, 1998). The personal documents were collected primarily from the trainers and coaches and included personal e-mail correspondence and implementation notes from the participants.

Data collection also centered on archival student behavioral records and artifacts, because these materials left a trail of actual implementation. Ian Hodder (as cited in Denzin & Lincoln, 2003) emphasized that material traces of behavior provide a unique perspective of a case compared to interviews and questionnaires. She argued, “What people say is often very different from what people do” (p. 158).

**Data Sources**

Three sources of data were used in this study: school-level, district-level, and state-level data. The primary source for the archived discipline, attendance, and tardy data was from the district. All schools in the district used a student information system that collected and stored relevant discipline and attendance data on their students. The archived data already existed and was not being collected specifically for this study. The four PBS schools also submitted their individual student discipline cards to a central location in the district to be entered into a PBS-related electronic data tool titled School-Wide Information System (May et al., 2000). State level data from the state’s student information system were also obtained to validate the district and school level data. The implementation artifacts originated at the school level, but copies of all artifacts were also stored and retrieved from the district level.
Data Elements

District student code of behavior. The district has a uniform code of behavior across all schools, and a supporting Code of Behavior Question and Answer document to answer the most common questions from students and parents. The Student Code of Behavior document states, “Clearly stated rules and regulations ensure that all students know what is expected of them. The Code of Student Behavior outlines such rules and regulations and the range of potential consequences for a student’s failure to comply.” Code violations range from the most severe; “Bringing or possessing a firearm (as defined in the federal Gun-Free Schools Act of 1994) on school property, in a school vehicle or to/at any school-sponsored event is a mandatory expulsion for not less than one calendar year” to the least severe, violation of classroom rule.

Office discipline referrals. Sugai et al. (2000) defined an office referral as An event in which (a) a student engaged in a behavior that violated a rule or social norm in the school, (b) the problem behavior was observed or identified by a member of the school staff, and (c) the event resulted in a consequence delivered by administrative staff who produced a permanent (written) product defining the whole event. (p. 3)

The advantage of using office referrals in this study is that the referrals were already collected in an electronic format, they are sensitive enough to reflect changes in behaviors due to reform efforts, and in this participating district, there is consistency across schools in the violations written due to a district-wide Code of Student Behavior. The categories of events captured as an office discipline referral in the district were
out-of-school suspensions, in-school suspensions, detentions, student conferences, parent conferences, home visits, and referrals to the school board for a hearing.

**Suspensions.** Suspensions are defined as the temporary exclusion of a student by the superintendent, principal, assistant principal, or any other administrator from the District’s instructional program for a period not to exceed 10 school days.

**Expulsions.** Expulsions are the exclusion of a student from the district for a period not to exceed the greater of 80 school days remaining in a semester or term in which the incident that gives rise to the expulsion takes place.

**Absences.** A student marked absent for a full day or a half day. A student is marked absent for half a day, in this participating district, if he or she signs in after 10:00 a.m. and a whole day if he or she signs in after 12:00.

**Tardies.** A tardy is assigned if a student reports to school late, but before 10:00.

**State-Generated Local Report Cards.** Annually, each school receives a Local Report Card summarizing student testing information, attendance data, school demographics, and staff demographics.

**School Climate.** Staff perceptions of school climate were measured by the *School Climate Survey, Staff Version* (Haynes, Emmons, & Comer, 1994). The surveys were confidential and were logged only by a number, which was used to match the pre-test survey with the post-test survey. The survey was developed by the School Development Program at the Yale Child Study Center and consists of 80 items with 5-point Likert scale responses ranging from Strongly Agree to Strongly Disagree. Each
item on the survey is categorized into 10 components of school climate. A sample of the survey can be found in Appendix A.

The 10 components of climate captured in the survey include (a) “achievement motivation” which is defined as the extent to which students at the school believe they can learn and are willing to learn; (b) “collaborative decision making” has 8 items that measure the extent of involvement of parents, students, and staff in decision making; (c) “equity and fairness” has 7 items and is defined as the extent to which students are treated equally regardless of their diverse backgrounds; (d) “leadership” has 8 items and measures the principal’s role in guiding the direction of the school and facilitating a positive school climate; (e) “order and discipline” consists of 12 items which reflect the appropriateness of student behavior in school; (f) “parent involvement” asks about the frequency of parent participation in school activities through 5 items; (g) “school building” relates to the physical appearance of the school in 6 items; (h) “school-community relations” has 6 items which covers the support and involvement from the community in the school; (i) “staff dedication to student learning” has 8 items and measures the effort of teachers to get students to learn; and the 10th component (j) “general school climate” includes all of the items on the survey except question #3 and measures the quality of interactions feelings of trust, and respect within the school community.

Survey development procedures included assessing inter-rater agreement with 20 raters scoring school climates using a three-point Likert scale. Items with an inter-rater agreement of 79% or higher were selected for continuing. A principal factor analysis was
used to determine construct validity and the analysis yielded 10 variables which were later named the components reviewed previously. Reliability coefficients have been reported and range from .80 to .97 and are all deemed satisfactory for use in studies to measure components of school climates.

In this study, the *School Climate Survey, Staff Version* (Haynes et al., 1994) was scored using a 5-point Likert scale. The inclusion criterion for calculating a subscale score was based on at least 80% of the items being answered. Subscale scores were computed by dividing the sum of all subscale items when a response was made by the number of items that make up the subscale. The total score was computed in a similar manner and required at least 80% of the items being answered to be reported as data for this study.

**Implementation artifacts.** Documents that delineated the processes they used to implement PBS in their schools were collected and analyzed from each of the PBS planning teams. Artifacts included training materials, training evaluations, implementation matrix, meeting dates, agendas, process notes from coaches, behavioral expectation charts, and student training schedules. Where necessary to describe existing documents, or the absence of documents, explanations were provided by the principals, coaches, or district-level lead behavior specialist.

**Data Management**

Standard conventions of data management were used for preserving and organizing the data (Bogdan & Biklen, 1998). As archival personal and official documents were collected from the district representing personal and official documents
from PBS coaches, principals, the lead behavior specialist, the trainer, or district and state sources, the documents were carefully managed by the researcher. The documents were reviewed; labeled with the date, title of document, source, and significance; and stored (Bogdan & Biklen, 1998). A total of 137 documents were collected from the school, district, and state regarding the four PBS schools and the two schools that did not implement PBS.

**Data Analysis**

A review of the PBS literature identified key program components for effective implementation of PBS (Horner et al., 2004; Kincaid, Childs, & George, 2005; Metzler, Biglan, & Rusby, 2001; Sugai et al., 2000). Horner et al., Kincaid et al., and Sugai et al. have taken these components and developed implementation measures to enable researchers and school staff to assess the fidelity of PBS implementation. The resulting and refined School-Wide Evaluation Tool (SET; Horner et al., 2004) has 28 items containing seven subscales: Expectations Defined, Behavioral Expectations Taught, Ongoing System for Rewarding Behavioral Expectations, System for Responding to Behavioral Violations, Monitoring and Decision Making, Management, and District Level Support. The SET has been widely used, but has limitations due to its lengthy administration process by external evaluators (Cohen, Kincaid, & Childs, 2007).

Another approach to evaluating the execution of PBS is through the School-Wide Benchmarks of Quality (BoQ: Kincaid et al., 2005), a 53-item rating scale that was developed to focus on key implementation process indicators, but is designed to be administered by internal staff and is built around quality benchmarks. The BoQ has a
detailed scoring guide that assigns quality points to achieving each benchmark (see Appendix B). Table 3 provides an example of the scoring guide for one of the key components in an effective PBS program: data analyzed monthly.

Table 3

Sample Scoring Guide From the BoQ

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2 points</th>
<th>1 point</th>
<th>0 points</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Data is printed, analyzed, and put into graph format or other easy to understand format by a member of the team monthly (minimum).</td>
<td>Data is printed, analyzed, and put into graph format or other easy to understand format by a team member less than once a month.</td>
<td>Data is not analyzed.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The 53 items in the BoQ correspond to 10 PBS benchmarks or subscales of the instrument: PBS Team, Faculty Commitment, Effective Discipline Procedures, Data Entry, Expectations and Rules, Reward System, Lesson Plans, Implementation Plans, Crisis Plans, and Evaluation. Three documents were used to rate a school’s implementation: the Coach Scoring Form, the Scoring Guide, and the Team Member Rating Form. Independent researchers tested the usefulness of the BoQ for School-wide Positive Behavior Support and found it to be a reliable and valid tool for assessing the implementation of the universal tier of PBS (Cohen et al., 2007). For the current study, 9 out of the 10 benchmarks found within the BoQ were used as a priori categories for PBS implementation data analysis. The Crisis Plan benchmark was not used because crisis planning was not a part of the PBS planning and implementation process for the district. The district has crisis planning requirements outlined by the department of education, but
it was not a part of this PBS implementation, therefore, the subscale was not used as a category.

Personal and official documents collected from each school team were coded according to the remaining nine benchmarks of the BoQ. The researcher grouped the documents by the benchmark category and then coded each document with the name of the benchmark category (e.g., faculty commitment). The grouped documents for each school were then rated based on the exemplars listed under each benchmark (e.g., faculty involved in establishing and reviewing goals). In the text of the case studies in Chapter 4, the benchmark from the BoQ and the exemplar item are listed after each description of evidence using parenthesis and bold print.

Robert Stake (1995) argued that case studies rely on two ways to reach new meanings about cases: “through direct interpretation of the individual instance and through aggregation of instances until something can be said about them as a class” (p. 74). Some important features of a case may only appear once in the data, but others will have an aggregate of features to interpret. Both direct and aggregate of these approaches were used to analyze the archival documents for this study. When clarification was required on a document or the lack of a document, the researcher spoke with the PBS coach, the principal, or the lead behavior specialist and subsequently coded the document to assist with the interpretation. Student discipline and attendance data were also analyzed and coded for patterns across the four PBS buildings and two non-PBS buildings.
Issues of Reliability and Validity

In the qualitative paradigm, researchers often view reliability and validity as trustworthiness, rigor, and quality (Golafshani, 2003). In case studies, researchers try to provide a “substantial body of uncontestable description” (Stake, 2003, p. 110). Triangulation is one method of enhancing the trustworthiness, rigor, and quality of a study and is defined to be “a validity procedure where researchers search for convergence among multiple and different sources of information to form themes or categories in a study” (Creswell & Miller, 2000, p. 126). In this study, triangulation was used across both the implementation data and the student outcome data.

The implementation data were triangulated by coding each school’s completed PBS implementation matrix and PBS action plan tracking their implementation. These data were first directly coded in relation to which BoQ subscale the information would fall (e.g., Effective Discipline Procedures, Data Entry, Expectations and Rules, Reward System). The researcher then completed the BoQ rating scale using the aggregate evidence available. Taking the direct data interpretation results, items were clustered together to form classes of results. Lastly, the researcher used member checking to aide in triangulating the data conclusions by having each principal review the completed case study for their school to provide feedback on the accuracy of the content, including any missing aspects of their implementation.

The student discipline data were analyzed and coded for patterns across the fall 2006 data and the spring 2007 data for each building. The data were also analyzed and coded for patterns across principal-led buildings, coach-led buildings, and non-PBS
buildings. Triangulation was achieved by using and coding multiple sources of discipline data including (a) the district’s internal student information system that stored daily incidents of discipline infractions and consequences, (b) School-Wide Information System (SWIS) data entered by the lead behavior specialist for each PBS building, and (c) discipline data from the Department of Education.
CHAPTER IV
DESCRIPTION OF SITES

A descriptive case study enables a rich description of a natural school setting to answer the questions: (a) What does the implementation of PBS look like in buildings with principal-led planning teams and coach-led planning teams? (b) What are the patterns of student behavior when PBS is implemented with a coach-led team, a principal-led team, and in buildings where PBS is not implemented? (c) What are the patterns in staff’s perceptions of school climate when PBS is implemented with coach-led teams and principal-led teams? Descriptive case studies create a picture so that readers take a journey of discovery as they read the rich text (Mertler, 2006).

I begin with a description of the PBS training provided to the four PBS schools and the data warehouse tools, based on their district-wide Code of Student Behavior, for all of the schools. I conclude with a description of each elementary site organized in the following manner: (a) a description of the school including its context within the city, (b) data from the documents and artifacts describing the PBS implementation, and (c) a comparison of the archival student behavioral records from before PBS implementation to after implementation.

PBS Training for School Staff

Two one-hour meetings were held with the four principals of the PBS schools on December 14, 2006, and January 11, 2007, to map out the timeline for training, review expectations for implementation, and explain the support the buildings would receive through the remainder of the year.
The four PBS schools participated in five training sessions conducted between January 1, 2007, and June 1, 2007. Non-administrative participants were paid a workshop stipend of $12.50 per hour for their attendance at each session. Team members were also fed dinner during each training session. Table 4 depicts the training frequency and duration of each training session. The training was conducted by an external PBS trainer who was a university professor with a national reputation as an expert in the field of PBS.

Table 4

*PBS Training Schedule*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Time Frame</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>January 9, 2010</td>
<td>3:30 pm—6:30 pm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>January 17, 2010</td>
<td>3:30 pm—6:30 pm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>February 27, 2010</td>
<td>3:30 pm—6:30 pm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>April 4, 2007</td>
<td>3:30 pm—6:30 pm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>June 1, 2007</td>
<td>3:30 pm—6:30 pm</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The initial three-hour training was conducted on January 9, 2007, with members of each school’s PBS planning team, including the principals from each of the four PBS schools. The training focused on (a) the theoretical background of PBS; (b) an introduction to understanding the three tiers of PBS; (c) establishing whole-school behavioral expectations; (d) implementing a system for rewarding whole-school and individual student use of behavioral expectations; (d) teaching students to understand and
meet whole school expectations through consistent teaching at targeted times throughout
the year; and (e) monitoring student progress. A PBS Team Training pre-survey was
distributed to the participants prior to the training asking them their level of
understanding regarding the seven components of PBS. The participants completed the
survey again at the end of the training session identifying their level of understanding on
a three point scale: 1 = Not sure if I have it yet; 2 = Yes, I understand it, but am not
fluent; 3 = Yes, I’ve got it and understand it, and am fluent. The results of the pre- and
post-survey are found in Table 5.

Table 5

Results of Pre- and Post-PBS Survey

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Prior to Training</th>
<th>Item</th>
<th>After Training</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>I can describe and promote the purpose and rationale for using a school-wide PBS approach.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36</td>
<td></td>
<td>0  18  42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41</td>
<td></td>
<td>1  20  39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48</td>
<td></td>
<td>2  26  32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38</td>
<td></td>
<td>0  21  39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>I can describe and promote the practices of a universal, school-wide PBS approach, such as:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Small set of positively stated school-wide behavioral expectations</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42</td>
<td>• Procedures for teaching school-wide behavioral expectations</td>
<td>0  22  38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td>• Continuum of procedures for encouraging school-wide behavioral expectations</td>
<td>0  26  34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td>• Procedures for monitoring, adapting, enhancing implementation</td>
<td>1  29  30</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Additionally, at the initial training session, the PBS planning teams were provided 2005-2006 data reports and the fall of 2006 data reports outlining their (a) student discipline data (i.e., office discipline referrals) by type, grade level, and gender; (b) attendance data by grade level and gender; and (c) tardies by grade level and gender. Teams were provided time to review the data and identify priority needs.

Lastly, the PBS planning teams were provided a timeline of meetings and a list of resources that were available to them during the course of designing their positive behavior support system. The resources included purchasing incentives to use for their reward systems, printing of posters for behavioral expectations, release time for their PBS planning team members, attendance at relevant conferences or trainings, and one building-level consultation time with the external PBS trainer. Each team was asked to log the resources or additional training they took advantage of to assist them in their planning, implementation, and monitoring of their school-wide prevention strategies. Teams were also asked to hold at least one school-based planning meeting between each district training session.

After the initial training session, each school conducted an introductory training session on PBS to their own staff at a staff meeting during the month of January. Representatives from each school’s PBS planning team, the principal, and the PBS coach, if the school had one assigned, shared the major tenets of PBS and the process for creating a school-wide system of prevention. The staff was also asked to provide feedback to the PBS team regarding what they perceived to be the most problematic areas of the school in terms of disruptive behavior (e.g., cafeteria, hallways) and the time of
day problems were most likely to occur. The teams used this feedback to begin targeting their strategies to specific areas within the school.

The follow-up three hour meetings in January, February, April, and June were held with the PBS planning teams, facilitated by the same external PBS trainer who conducted the initial training. The four sessions focused solely on the implementation within the universal tier of PBS. The external PBS trainer emphasized the importance of having high quality universal tier strategies prior to putting into place targeted and intensive strategies. She cautioned that if teams did not focus their time and energy on the universal tier, they would end up having more and more students needing targeted and intensive supports because their needs were not being met at the universal tier. The purpose of the monthly touch-base trainings was to hear updates from each team on their PBS progress, share best practices across school teams, troubleshoot any problem areas, and gain a deeper understanding of the process for creating school-wide system of prevention.

The training on January 17, 2007, included a review of the major components of PBS introduced at the initial training two weeks earlier, focusing on the universal tier. The external PBS trainer distributed and introduced the *Universal PBS Program Matrix* which she designed to help PBS planning teams step through a systematic process of implementation in the universal tier (Appendix C). Table 6 outlines the five objectives on the matrix and an example of one of the tasks under each objective.

The matrix became the foundation for each school’s planning process. Principals received the tool electronically from the lead behavior specialist and continued to add,
edit, and delete strategies as they worked through the planning process throughout the rest of the school year. The teams brought the matrix and used it to guide their decision-making during each training session and school-based planning meeting.

In addition to introducing the matrix during the January meeting, the remaining part of the agenda included team-planning time to work through Objectives #1 and #2. The external PBS trainer and lead behavior specialist moved around the room answering questions from the teams and provided support. Likewise, the two building PBS coaches sat with their building teams and participated as a team member, but also ensured the team stayed focused on the task at hand and moved through the matrix effectively.
The agenda for the third PBS training session, held on February 27, 2007, was evenly divided between three major topics: feedback on progress, data analysis, and team planning time. The meeting started with a facilitated sharing session by the external PBS trainer where each team shared their progress on the *Universal PBS Program matrix*. The trainer then highlighted sections of the matrix to further reinforce the importance of Objectives #1 and #2. She then moved on to Objectives #3, #4, and #5 providing a richer explanation of each, including explicit examples from other districts’ PBS plans.

On April 3, 2007, the teams had an opportunity to share their practices with the other schools. The external PBS trainer and lead behavior specialist planned a gallery walk. Each team had 10 minutes to record on chart paper their progress on achieving the benchmarks on the *Universal PBS Program matrix*. The expectation was that the planning teams had fully implemented their strategies under Objective #1 and #2, so the gallery walk highlighted these objectives, although the teams could share across all five objectives if they wanted. After the teams charted their progress, team members circulated around the room and spent 5 to 7 minutes at each other teams’ charts. As teams moved about the room, members were encouraged to ask questions regarding each school’s implementation. One member of each team stayed back with their chart to explain their team’s progress to others during the gallery walk.

After the gallery walk, the external PBS trainer facilitated a feedback session regarding each team’s progress. The teams then moved back to their school teams and received their monthly attendance and tardy reports, and their monthly SWIS discipline reports. The teams discussed their data and identified implications for their next phase of
implementation. The last part of the meeting focused on the external PBS trainer reviewing and reinforcing Objective #3 (acknowledging appropriate behavior), Objective #4 (teaching behavioral expectations), and Objective #5 (advertising behavioral expectations). She shared explicit examples of each from previous districts with which she worked and had teams share their progress, ideas, and questions or concerns regarding these objectives.

The final training session held on June 1, 2007, was a wrap-up and celebration event. The external PBS trainer focused the training on final updates and progress reports from the PBS teams and team planning time to identify strategies to start the next school year off with introducing and teaching the behavioral expectations right away in September. The teams answered the following questions: (a) How will you start the year teaching building/classroom behavioral expectations? and (b) What are your staff development needs? The PBS trainer also spent time talking through how to sustain PBS through the entire school year, including how to monitor staff fidelity of implementation, and how to monitor progress of student outcomes. The second part of the session included staff celebrations. The lead behavior specialist provided final discipline, attendance, and tardy monthly reports and year-end reports with which teams could compare their results with the previous school year. The lead behavior specialist highlighted major celebrations found within each school’s data reports. The session ended with announcements regarding the types of supports that were planned for the subsequent school year, including the assignment of a PBS coach to each participating school, continued funds for PBS incentives for students and staff, continued data entry of
their discipline data into SWIS, and funds for extended time for their PBS planning team to continue to meet regularly.

**District-Wide Data Collection Tools for Discipline and Attendance**

A key component of PBS is collecting and analyzing student discipline infractions to identify areas of concern and to prioritize strategies. The district has an extensive electronic data collection system based on office referrals documented on pink cards and the code violations outlined in the district-wide Code of Student Behavior. The document details 37 violations of the Code of Student Behavior along with the range of penalties and consequences for the violations. The violations range from the most severe expellable offenses, such as, bringing or possessing a firearm, to minor offenses, such as, violating a classroom rule (*Effective Discipline Procedures—8, 9, 10*). The Code and a question and answer document that accompanies the code provides further procedural information and some definitions of the violations, but there are not clear definitions for each violation. Additionally, there is not a clear distinction made between major and minor infractions. Instead, there are three categories within the code: (a) violations resulting in a mandatory recommendation for expulsion (e.g., firearms, setting fires); (b) offenses resulting in mandatory suspensions (e.g., setting off fire alarm, theft); and (c) consequences for offenses that are discretionary as determined by the principal (e.g., dress code violations, insubordination; *Effective Discipline Procedures—9, 11, 12*).

The principal or school secretary enters every office referral into the data warehouse including the date, the code violation, a narrative description of the incident, and the outcome. The pre-existing demographic data in the data warehouse for every
student merges with the discipline data to enable robust data analysis. Numerous pre-set reports are available for staff to analyze the data by gender, race, grade level, type of violation, monthly trends, annual trends, referring staff member, or by a specific date span. Similar reports are also available for student attendance and tardies (Effective Discipline Procedures—10; Data Entry & Analysis—15-17).

The district provides training on the Code of Student Behavior, including descriptions of each code violation and examples. The training is conducted by staff in the Office of Student Services and occurs every two years. Staff members travel to each school to conduct the training. The training only focuses on understanding the application of the code; they do not focus on specific data trends within each building (Implementation Plan—39).

Although there was a robust data collection and reporting system, there were some data points missing from this district-wide system that hindered drilling down further into the data. The district’s current data warehouse also did not provide graphical reports for ease of analysis. The regional offices of the State Department of Education provided training and support for districts to use the School-Wide Information System (May et al., 2000) as a rich data collection and analysis tool, particularly for schools using PBS. The lead behavior specialist and PBS coaches were trained on PBS and discussed using SWIS with the four PBS principals. Consensus was reached to use SWIS to enhance the data analysis component of their PBS implementation. The lead behavior specialist collected all office referral cards (i.e., “pink cards”) on a weekly basis and had
secretaries enter them into SWIS. The pink cards were still entered into the district-wide data warehouse at each building.

SWIS is a web-based information system designed to support schools in developing and sustaining positive school climate. SWIS provides summaries of referrals in a graph format for use in the design of positive behavior support for individual students, groups of students, or the entire student population. Reports enable teams to analyze by day of the week or month, types of violations, locations within the school, time of day, student, referring staff member, or by ethnicity and gender (May et al., 2000). Samples of the types of reports are found in Appendix D (Effective Discipline Procedures—9, 10, 12; Data Entry & Analysis—15-17).

During each PBS training session for the planning teams, data reports were provided from both the district-wide data warehouse and from SWIS. Time was provided during the training to have teams analyze the data and identify patterns of behavior needing attention through their PBS strategies (Data Entry & Analysis—18 & 19).

School A: Brown Elementary School

Description of the School and its Context Within the City

Brown Elementary School was built in the early 1900s. The large three-story building looks prominent in its location in the neighborhood, but appears worn due to its age. It is tucked into a residential neighborhood with sidewalks, tree-lined streets, and two-story houses. Most of the homes were built in the 1920s primarily to house employees from major manufacturers who have long since left the city. The average price of a home in the immediate surroundings of the school is $40,000 as of summer
2010. The larger area around the school, which shares the same zip code, has a higher median home price of $73,000. Nearly half of the residents in the area rent apartments versus own their own homes. The residents are primarily Caucasian with 35% living in poverty, although the closer you get to Brown Elementary School, the greater the percentage of African Americans and families living in poverty.

Brown Elementary School has an enrollment of approximately 450 students. The student body represents a diverse racial/ethnic background: 51.9% African American, 30.2% Caucasian, 11.4% Multi-Racial, 1.1% Hispanic, and 5% Asian. Of the 450 students, 4.8% are identified students for English as a Second Language (ESL) services, and 10% receive special education services. Brown has a poverty rate of 83%, as measured by the percentage of students on free and reduced lunch. Their mobility rate is 43%, which means 43% of the students enrolled or withdrew some time after the first month of school. In other words, only 57% of the students maintained enrollment at Brown from the first month of school through the last day of school. From a teacher’s perspective, this means almost half of the students sitting in class change either in or out through the course of the year.

Student achievement, as reported on the state Local Report Card, demonstrates a two or three year trend of increased performance in all three tested grades (see Figures 6, 7, and 8).
Figure 6. Brown Elementary School, 3rd Grade Ohio Achievement Test Results, 2005-2006

Figure 7. Brown Elementary School, 4th Grade Ohio Achievement Test Results, 2005-2006

Figure 8. Brown Elementary School, 5th Grade Ohio Achievement Test Results, 2005-2006
Brown’s performance index score also improved dramatically over the last 3 years from 70 in 2003-2004 to 85.9 in 2005-2006. The performance index score reflects the overall achievement of every student tested through the state testing system. The score is a weighted average based on the actual performance level of each test with the most weight given to the advanced students. The highest possible score is 120, with 100 being the goal (State Local Report Card, 2005-2006). The state has five overall ratings for schools on their Local Report Card starting with the lowest: Academic Emergency, Academic Watch, Continuous Improvement, Effective, and Excellent. Brown’s rating was Continuous Improvement in 2005-2006.

Staff members at Brown have a high degree of educational attainment. One hundred percent are designated “highly qualified” to teach their grade and content area, and 82.8% have a master’s degree or higher which is significantly higher than the district rate of 70%. Brown teachers have an average of 17 years of experience designating them as a veteran staff. The gender breakdown of the staff is heavily weighted toward females: 90% female and 10% male. Similarly, the staff is 87% Caucasian and 13% African American (Ohio Department of Education, 2007)

Data From the Documents and Artifacts Describing the PBS Implementation

Brown was a coach-led building. The PBS team met monthly to map out the strategies for school-wide implementation (PBS Team—3). The team, chaired by one of the general education teachers (PBS Team—1), consisted of seven staff members including the principal, four general education teachers representing different grade levels, and two intervention specialists. The principal at Brown was actively involved in
every meeting and every training session, and she encouraged all of the staff to fully embrace PBS during staff meetings (PBS Team—2). The coaches’ role was to facilitate the team in (a) analyzing the student discipline data; (b) creating a plan to implement universal prevention strategies; and (c) monitoring the progress of the plan (PBS Team—1).

The Brown PBS planning team carefully worked through the Universal PBS Program Matrix, introduced by the external training during the initial trainings, which takes teams through a step-by-step approach to implementation of the universal tier of PBS. The Brown team meticulously used this matrix as their tool for planning each objective listed on the matrix, as documented primarily by their artifacts, not necessarily the amount of text they typed into the matrix for planning (Implementation Plan—39-43).

Brown’s PBS team also asked for a personal consultation with the external PBS trainer to assist in clarifying strategies of how to teach the behavioral expectations with the students and how to build consistency across all staff in catching students performing positive behaviors. The team adjusted their planning matrix and outlined a more direct approach to teaching the students behavioral expectations.

The PBS team started their planning process by reviewing student discipline trend data provided by the district’s lead behavior specialist. They analyzed three types of data: (a) discipline incidents by type of violation (i.e., by Student Code of Behavior violation) and by month; (b) discipline incidents by type of violation broken down by race and gender; and (c) staff feedback from an adapted EBS survey that helps teams identify areas of behavioral concern within the building (Faculty commitment—6 &
The PBS team posted a summary of the staff feedback in the office and asked for changes/additions. The team then used the summary and other data to focus their discussions around school-wide behavioral expectations and areas to target when teaching the expectations.

The Brown team developed three simple rules, or behavioral expectations (Appendix E). The team brought a summary of the discipline data and their ideas for the three expectations to the full staff at a staff meeting and received endorsement for the following:

1. Be respectful
2. Be responsible
3. Be ready to learn

The team gave staff the opportunity to offer suggestions for modifications, but none were received, so the expectations were adopted (Faculty Commitment—6; Expectations—20, 24).

The planning team worked together to define the behavioral expectations for numerous locations throughout the school (Expectations—24). They answered this question, “What would being respectful, responsible, and ready to learn look like in the key locations throughout the school?” The “locations” were identified by their time of use or activity, as well as physical space, and included: upon arrival to school, at dismissal, at breakfast, at lunch, in the restrooms, at recess, during assemblies, in common areas, and on the bus. The PBS team took the ideas and developed a chart of Brown’s expectations listing specific behaviors to look for in each setting. For example,
to be respectful upon arrival to school means students are dressed appropriately, walking, and entering school quietly. The behavioral expectations for being responsible are to arrive on time, stand in correct line, and follow school rules. The last expectation, “to be ready to learn,” means to have all materials for school (*Faculty Commitment—6; Expectations—22, 23, 24*). The team posted these expectations by location again in the office and put a copy in all staff members’ mailboxes for suggestions for changes. The team then presented the expectations chart to the staff at a staff meeting and discussed rolling the PBS program out throughout the building.

One key principle of PBS is staff modeling and holding themselves accountable for the same behavioral expectations as the students. The document review for Brown did not indicate any evidence that the team talked with staff about the expectations also applying to them as a faculty. This may have occurred, but it could not be identified from the document review (*Expectations—21*).

The team then turned their attention to meeting the goal of recognizing students for demonstrating the expected behaviors. The full staff voted for a ticket-system for student recognition. The planning team moved forward and developed pride tickets personalized with “I am: Respectful, Responsible, Ready to Learn” (Appendix F). The principal arranged through district administrative staff to have lanyards purchased for all of their staff members. Each personnel received tickets to keep in the lanyards with the expectation that they distribute them to students when they are caught displaying the positive behaviors listed for each behavioral expectation. The Brown staff also
emphasized the need for the lanyards to serve as a visual reminder of the expectations and the incentives (*Reward/Recognition—25-26*).

A large container was placed in the office for students to place their earned tickets in for daily drawings. Each day, six tickets were drawn from the container and names were announced during morning announcements. Students came to the office for a small reward (e.g., pencils, erasers, grippers, and notepads). Weekly, three tickets for grades Kindergarten through third and three tickets for grades fourth through sixth were drawn for incentives that were determined to be of “medium” value (e.g., stuffed animals, chains, water bottles, bracelets). Every 9 weeks, five tickets per grade level were drawn for a large-scale celebration (e.g., pizza luncheon with the principal, movies, karaoke, dance/music in the cafeteria; *Reward/Recognition—26-28*).

The PBS planning team also decided to build in a reward for their staff for distributing the tickets. For every fourth ticket drawn during the weekly drawing, the name of the staff member who distributed the ticket received an incentive (e.g., dry erase markers, dry erase board; *Reward/Recognition—32*).

The PBS team, along with other staff, decided to design a formal school-wide process of teaching the behavioral expectations to the students. They designed an assembly schedule during which each grade level had a time slot for the classes to be taken around to all of the training locations, based on the expectations chart. Staff and district PBS coaches served as trainers at each location and taught the students what behavior does and does not look like at the specific location. For example, staff and coaches were located in the cafeteria, the playground, the hallway, the entranceway, and
the bathroom and identified (through direct instruction, role-playing, question/answer) how it would look for students to be respectful, responsible, and ready to learn in each of those locations. Students then rotated throughout each of the teaching locations throughout the school. Posters were designed and hung within the classrooms and at each targeted location around the school. The signs listed the expectations and their mascot (Appendix G). They also demonstrated how the students would earn the tickets at each location. Lastly, they used certificates of accomplishments for larger celebrations.

PBS information was included in school newsletters and reminders of expectations were heard daily on the morning announcements.

Moreover, at the end of the school year, the staff decided to produce videotaped behavioral expectation lessons in all areas listed on the expectation chart. The peer mediator group took lead on producing and acting in the videos. The video was then stored in the LRC for all students and classes to check out and review (Lesson Plans—33, 34, 35, 37; Implementation—40).

As each stage of implementation progressed, staff buy-in was strong, although some staff began to limit the number of tickets per day and on occasion, staff forgot to wear their lanyards. The PBS team addressed these slippages by focusing on staff incentives to refresh the buy-in (Reward System—32).

At the end of the year, the planning team had the entire staff complete a self-assessment on the school-wide systems and non-classroom settings of PBS implementation (Effective Behavior Support Survey version 2.0; Sugai, Horner, & Todd, 2000; Evaluation—49, 53). The staff ranked the following three PBS features as the
highest for implementation, meaning the feature is “in place” in their school: (a) expected student behaviors are taught directly; (b) 3-5 student expectations are defined; and (c) principal is an active participant on PBS team. The three lowest ranked features deemed “not in place” or “partially in place” were: (a) options exist to allow classroom instruction to continue when problem behavior occurs, although the staff were evenly split on this item (i.e., 16 indicated this feature to be “in place,” 13 selected “partially in place,” and 3 checked “not in place”); (b) patterns of student problem behavior are reported to faculty for active decision-making on a regular basis (e.g., monthly); and (c) status of student behavior and management practices are evaluated quarterly from data. This feedback was used by the staff to make adjustments for future planning, particularly in the area of data sharing and analysis on a more regular basis. There was no evidence within the documentation or implementation plans of student surveys or other feedback mechanism for students (Faculty Commitment—5-7; Data Entry & Analysis—18 & 19; Evaluation—49, 53).

At their final wrap-up session with the external PBS trainer, the PBS planning team was able to review their end-of-year student discipline and attendance data from the district data warehouse and from SWIS. These data were used to make adjustments in their PBS implementation matrix for the following school year. The team focused on beginning the school year with explicitly teaching the behavioral expectations to all students and using a video for review through the year and for new students.
A Comparison of the Archival Student Discipline Records for Brown Elementary
Before PBS Implementation (Fall 2006) to After Implementation (Spring 2007)

Documentation record review of archived behavioral data was analyzed from multiple sources to augment findings with regard to implementation. The data were calculated by determining the number of incidents per 100 students: number of incidents divided by the enrollment, multiplied by 100. This calculation method enables readers to take into account enrollment differences across schools. For example, a school may have 60 incidents of suspension, which on its face may sound high. If the school’s enrollment is only 200 students, then the number of incidents per 100 students is 30. In other words, for every 100 students, there are 30 incidents of suspension. If a building with 60 suspensions has an enrollment of 500 students, then the number of incidents per 100 students drops significantly to 12.

Brown Elementary School had 50 Office Discipline Referrals (ODRs) for the one-month data collection period in the fall of 2006 (October 9, 2006, to November 14, 2006), which is a rate of 11.16 incidents of ODRs for every 100 students. Males were responsible for 41 of these incidents; females, 9. After implementation of PBS, the ODRs dropped to 40 for the one-month data collection in the spring of 2007 (April 2, 2007, to May 14, 2007), which is a rate of 8.93 per 100 students. The incidents from males dropped to 33 while incidents from females dropped to 7.

Drilling down into the types of discipline incidents, Brown saw the most serious type of discipline offense, a student services referral for potential expulsion or transfer to another building, drop from one incident in the fall to zero in the spring. Suspension
rates remained relatively flat from 6.25 incidents per 100 students in the fall to 6.92 in the spring. Four grade levels decreased the number of ODRs after implementation of PBS. Second grade showed a large increase, although in both the fall and spring data collection periods the vast majority of violations occurred by students in grades 3 through 5. Table 7 shows the difference in ODRs by grade level.

Table 7

*Brown Elementary School, Number of Office Discipline Referrals by Grade Level*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>GRADE LEVEL</th>
<th>FALL 10/9/06-11/14/07</th>
<th>SPRING 4/2/07-5/14/07</th>
<th>Difference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Kdg</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>+7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>-5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>-7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**A Comparison of the Archival Student Attendance and Tardy Records for Brown Elementary Before PBS Implementation (Fall 2006) to After Implementation (Spring 2007)**

In 2005-2006, Brown Elementary had an attendance rate of 93.9% reported on their state Local Report Card (Ohio Department of Education, 2010). The state standard is 93% and Brown exceeded the district average of 93.4% that same year. There were 115 absences recorded for every 100 students at Brown during the one-month fall data
collection period. After PBS implementation, the spring data collection period reported a considerable increase to 145 absences for every 100 students. Tardies, on the other hand, showed a dramatic drop from 72 tardies to 49 tardies per 100 students.

**School B: Jones Elementary School**

**Description of the School and its Context Within the City**

When approaching Jones Elementary School by car, it would be easy to miss it completely. It is tucked behind a popular eclectic shopping and arts district known for its economic, racial, and ethnic diversity. The average home price immediately surrounding the school is $69,000. When you broaden the scope of residences within the same zip code, the average home value is $156,000. There are many moderate to high-end apartments in the area which tend to attract young single and newly married couples. Homeowners represent 55% of the local residents whereas 45% are renters. The median household income is $40,000 with 13% of the residents living in poverty. Interestingly, the racial make-up of this broader zip code zone around the school is 80% White and 15% African American. This is in stark contrast to the racial make-up of the school indicating the resident zone for the school includes the more heavily populated streets with African American families and the reality that some Caucasian families choose to open enroll their students to other schools.

Jones has 380 students with a high percentage of African American students (81%). Multi-Racial students represent 9.4% of the student population and Caucasian students only 7.4%. The percentage of students eligible for special education is 11% with less than 10 students identified as English as a Second Language learners. Jones has 17%
of their students moving in or out during the school year and despite the higher level of household income in the region around the school, 87% of the students at Jones are eligible for free and reduced lunch due to their low income level.

Academically, Jones has been making steady progress although not enough to move up in the state rating system. Jones was rated in Academic Watch the year before PBS implementation which is the second lowest rating out of the five possible state ratings. Hidden within this low rating, though, are gains in most tested subjects and gains in the school’s performance index score which reflects the achievement of every tested student. In 2003-2004, their performance index score was 74.2 out of 120. The score increased to 75.3 in 2004-2005 and 77.4 in 2005-2006. Their three-year trend in reading and math on their state Local Report Card also shows increases in all grade levels except fifth grade reading (Figures 9, 10, and 11).

Staff members at Jones have an average of 16 years of experience which designates them as a veteran staff. All of the staff (100%) meet the licensure requirements to be highly qualified by the state to teach their grade levels; however, only 62% of the staff has at least a master’s degree which is below the district percentage of 70%. The staff racial make-up does not reflect the student population. Caucasian teachers make up 79% of the staff, whereas African Americans represent 13% and Asians, 8%. Jones more closely resembles the national average of male teachers in an elementary school than many other elementary schools in America, with 16% of their teachers being male.
Figure 9. Jones Elementary School, 3rd Grade Ohio Achievement Test Results, 2005-2006

Figure 10. Jones Elementary School, 4th Grade Ohio Achievement Test Results, 2005-2006

Figure 11. Jones Elementary School, 5th Grade Ohio Achievement Test Results, 2005-2006
Data From the Documents and Artifacts Describing the PBS Implementation

Jones was a coach-led building. The coach had worked with the school previously in two other instructional support roles, so she was familiar with the principal and the staff and was viewed as a knowledgeable resource. The PBS planning team had strong representation from the various constituents at the school (i.e., special education, general education, support staff; PBS Team—1) and the principal was highly supportive and a strong proponent of PBS in the building. The coach facilitated the PBS meetings, but the principal truly was a driving force at this building. She worked with her staff behind the scenes to build buy-in and support of PBS, particularly among key teacher leaders in the building (PBS Team—2).

The staff chose to use a pre-existing team as their PBS planning team; therefore, they had two roles at the building. The team served as the PBS planning team and as the building’s Intervention Assistance Team (IAT), which has the responsibility for progress monitoring at-risk students and potentially making referrals to special education for students not making adequate progress over time. The staff decided to use a pre-existing team because the IAT process used for the academic interventions and the PBS process were the same. They split the agenda of each meeting so that the first half would focus on IAT academic work and the second half would focus on PBS. The team met at least monthly with some months requiring two meetings. When the staff reflected at the end of the year whether this was a positive move to combine the two roles, they reported that it made sense because of the similar planning and implementation process, but that
ultimately it was difficult to dedicate enough time for both the behavior and academic needs of the students (PBS Team—3).

The planning team reviewed climate survey data previously distributed to students and feedback received from the staff during a staff meeting to help prioritize areas of need in the school. The team identified the following areas of concern: excessive talking in the hallways, disruptive behavior on the playground, and disruptions in the lunchroom. The staff also talked about what students would look like if they were Positive Jones’ students. The PBS planning team recommended to the full staff at a staff meeting an overarching theme of pride in their school using key action words. The staff gained consensus around three behavioral expectations:

- Follow directions
- Respect authority
- Come to school prepared and ready to learn

Members of the PBS planning team facilitated a session with the full staff to review discipline, attendance, and tardy data to glean the greatest areas of need at Jones (Data Entry—15-19). They also worked through a brainstorming session on the key “hot spots” in the school to address in the definitions of the expectation, and they reviewed their current four school rules (i.e., follow directions the first time given; keep hands, feet, and other objects to ourselves; walk quietly in the hallways and have a pass when not with an adult; respect our school community and family). The staff decided to hone in on the hallways, outside, the cafeteria, the office, restrooms, and departure time, and sought to define the behavioral expectations in the context of those places or times of the
day. For example, the staff filled out a survey seeking ideas of what it means to follow
directions, respect authority, and come to school prepared and ready to learn when
departing from school. Table 8 depicts an example of the expectation definitions.

Table 8

*Jones Elementary School, Sample Definitions for Behavioral Expectations*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Follow Directions</th>
<th>Respect Authority</th>
<th>Come to School Prepared &amp; Ready to Learn</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Departure</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Go to designated area</td>
<td>• Show consideration for neighbors’ property</td>
<td>• Take all supplies with you</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Walk quietly</td>
<td>• Go straight home</td>
<td>• Go straight home</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Use sidewalks</td>
<td>• Listen to crossing guard</td>
<td>• Cross the street with the crossing guard</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• No re-entering building</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The planning team gathered all of the ideas and brought back to the staff a draft
expectation list that was well defined and ready to be explicitly taught. The full staff
supported the list and the PBS team was ready to plan the strategies to teach the
expectations to the students (*Faculty Commitment—5, 6; Expectations—24*).

The team created charts for the six targeted areas in the building outlining the
behavioral expectations. The charts were displayed throughout the building along with
pictures of students following directions, acting respectfully, and being ready to learn.
The staff decided to introduce the behavioral expectations at a school assembly and the
expectations were taught to the students via teachers role playing situations that portrayed
both a positive demonstration of the expectation and negative behaviors (*Implementation
—39-44*).
The Jones staff decided to use a ticket system with their mascot proudly displayed on the front of each ticket. The back of the tickets included a place for the student’s name, name of staff member who awarded the ticket, and homeroom number. Staff wore lanyards around their necks with the tickets and passed them out to selected students who were displaying the appropriate behaviors in the targeted areas. The planning team intentionally made sure that all staff members were included, so bus drivers, child nutrition workers, and secretaries also received lanyards and tickets. The team emphasized the importance of everyone wearing the lanyards to visually remind students of the expectations and potential rewards.

Every teacher was given a plastic container for his or her room so that when students earned a ticket, the student placed it in the container. On Thursday afternoons, the teachers would draw one name from their containers. The name that was drawn was submitted to the office in the PBS reward box for the principal to announce on Friday morning during the televised announcements. The students whose names were drawn and announced were able to select prizes from the PBS basket. Prizes included trinkets, school supplies, water bottles, stuffed animals, bracelets, and/or dog tags. After students had a dog tag chain, they could add tags that focused on demonstrating positive character traits. Student winners also had their names displayed in the school newspaper as students who made the school proud with their positive behavior. The school’s parent liaison also maintained records for the tickets submitted because these students were eligible for a drawing that occurred every 9 weeks for a pizza luncheon (Rewards—25 to 28).
The planning team also decided to incorporate group rewards into this first year of implementation by providing rewards at the end of each 9-week session for the class with the most tickets earned (*PBS Team—25-26*). For example, classes with the most tickets during the time span earned pizza or ice cream parties. The Jones planning team also planned a culminating end-of-year drawing to receive a bike for any student who had received four or more tickets. This drawing occurred at a full-school assembly the last week of school.

One of the struggles described by the PBS planning team was keeping the staff motivated to continue to distribute the tickets, particularly toward the end of the year. The principal stepped in and provided excellent leadership refueling the teachers’ desire to continue the process with fidelity. At a subsequent staff meeting, the principal revisited the purpose of PBS and reminded the staff of the commitments they made regarding distributing tickets when students exhibited appropriate behaviors. She also shared summary discipline data that showed a decline in suspensions to motivate them to keep moving forward with implementation. The PBS planning team also decided to start giving rewards for teachers participating in the PBS program. The team gave small incentives (e.g., school supplies) to colleagues at staff meetings if they had distributed tickets during that month (*PBS Team—2*).

At the conclusion of the school year, the team had a facilitated training session with the other PBS teams to review their end-of-year data. They also reflected on their progress during the first year of implementation and identified opportunities for improvement for the following school year. The Jones planning team wrote into their...
planning matrix the need to increase the awareness and involvement of parents in PBS the following year (*Implementation—45*). They also had just learned that their principal was being moved to a different school within the city. The team expressed considerable concern regarding keeping PBS going when transitioning to a new principal. They asked for support from the PBS coach and the lead behavior specialist to train the new principal and ensure a smooth transition (*Evaluation—53*).

The coach’s role throughout the planning and implementation process at Jones was to facilitate their team meetings and continue to reinforce the necessary next steps. The coach also kept the principal and staff focused on the fidelity of implementation and provided encouragement when motivation began to wane as well as reassurance when the team did not initially see a reduction in disruptive behavior. She encouraged the staff to continue the process for pay-offs further down the road.

**A Comparison of the Archival Student Discipline Records for Jones Elementary Before PBS Implementation (Fall 2006) to After Implementation (Spring 2007)**

Jones Elementary School saw a small increase in the number of Office Discipline Referrals (ODRs) from 9.45 incidents per 100 students during the fall data collection period (October 9, 2006, to November 14, 2006), to 10.24 incidents during the spring (April 2, 2007, to May 14, 2007). Males in the school receive a disproportionate number of suspensions; although they represented nearly half of the student population, they received 85% of the ODRs during the fall data collection period. In contrast, a comparison of the spring ODRs with the fall ODRs showed the rate of ODRs dropping by 10 points for males to 79%. The ODR rate more closely matched school
demographics by race than by gender. African American students at Jones represented 81% of the student population and received 89% of the ODRs. There was no sizeable change from fall to spring data collection.

Although ODR showed an increase from fall to spring, an examination of the out-of-school suspensions found a small decrease in the school rate from 7.87 incidents per 100 students in the fall to 7.35 incidents in the spring. Digging deeper into the specific consequences provided for incidents, another trend emerged comparing the fall with the spring. During the fall data collection period, 83% of the consequences for discipline infractions were out-of-school suspensions totaling 50 days of lost instruction for the 30-day period of time. The remaining infractions (17%) resulted in some type of in-school consequence (e.g., in school suspension, parent/student conference, or detention). During the spring 30-day data collection period, the percentages shifted to more in-school consequences (26%) versus out-of-school suspensions (74%). One troubling data point, however, is the total number of suspension days increased from fall (50) to spring (88). This comparison indicates more days given per incident in the spring than in the fall. The district Code of Student Behavior provides directions on the number of suspension days per incident depending on the type of infraction, so the increase in suspension days may be an indication that students were exhibiting more severe code violations in the spring versus the fall.

Table 9 shows the difference in ODRs by grade level. Students in third grade overwhelmingly received the most ODRs across all grade levels. Despite typical district trends of the intermediate grades (i.e., third, fourth, and fifth) being responsible for the
Table 9

*Jones Elementary School, Number of Office Discipline Referrals by Grade Level*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>GRADE LEVEL</th>
<th>FALL 10/9/06-11/14/06</th>
<th>SPRING 4/2/07-5/14/07</th>
<th>Difference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Kdg</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>+4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>+2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>-3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>+1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>+3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Vast majority of discipline incidents, Jones’ fourth grade students only had one ODR incident during the two data collection periods. The one incident involved a female student receiving an out-of-school suspension for one day.

**A Comparison of the Archival Student Attendance and Tardy Records for Jones Elementary Before PBS Implementation (Fall 2006) to After Implementation (Spring 2007)**

Jones Elementary School repeatedly met the state requirement of over 93% attendance rate. The patterns of absence prior to PBS and after PBS for Jones show a substantial increase in the rate of absences per 100 students. There were 116 incidents of absence per 100 students in the fall compared to 190 incidents in the spring. The rate of tardies, on the other hand, dropped considerably from the fall to the spring. During the
fall data collection period, there were 130 incidents of tardies per 100 students. In the spring, the rate dropped to 98 incidents.

**School C: Smith Elementary School**

**Description of the School and its Context Within the City**

Smith Elementary is a small school with only 277 students situated on a major road in the city. The school is surrounded by residential streets, though, giving it more of an intimate neighborhood school feel. The immediate streets around the school are filled with small bungalow-style homes on tree-lined streets with a low average price range ($29,000) compared to some of the other streets within the school zone. There are streets within the residential zone of the school, however, with houses as high as $100,000. The average home value in the larger zip code region, which encompasses the school, is $80,475. The average household income of the zip code region is $33,000 with 17% of the residents living in poverty. Smith Elementary School families have mixed economic levels between low and middle income. A little more than half (57%) of the students meet the poverty level requirements to be eligible for free and reduced lunch.

Multiple generations of families have lived in the same neighborhoods around Smith for many years. Many of the parents, and even some grandparents of Smith students, also went there as children. This shared experience creates a family atmosphere at the school and also contributes to relatively stable enrollment patterns in terms of students moving in and out; Smith’s mobility rate is 25%.

The student body at Smith mirrors the racial make-up of its neighborhood. Students are primarily Caucasian (87%) with only small percentages of minority students
attending (i.e., 7.7% African American and 3.6% Multi-Racial). Although their student body is rather homogenous in terms of race, Jones has a high percentage of students with disabilities (18.6%) and they provide specialized services for the 4% of students who are identified as English as a Second Language (ESL) learners.

Smith is rated by the state department of education as Effective, which is the second highest rating possible. The state assesses student achievement in grades 3-5 at the elementary level and Smith exceeded the state requirement of at least 75% proficiency in fourth grade reading, writing, and mathematics, and in fifth grade reading. Moreover, Smith also exceeded the state requirement of 93% attendance with an attendance rate over 95%, an attendance rate that exceeded both the district average of 93.4% and the state average of 93.5%.

In the 3 years prior to PBS implementation, Smith made substantial gains in their performance index score which assigns weighted points to all state tests administered in the building. The highest score possible is 120. Smith’s performance index score was 70.7 in 2003-2004, then rose almost 8 points to 78.5 in 2004-2005. The following year, 2005-2006, the year before PBS implementation, their performance index score took a significant jump to 91.6.

Student achievement, as reported on the state Local Report Card, demonstrates a two or three year trend of increased performance in nearly all three tested grades (Figures 12, 13, and 14).
Figure 12. Smith Elementary School, 3rd Grade Ohio Achievement Test Results, 2005-2006

Figure 13. Smith Elementary School, 4th Grade Ohio Achievement Test Results, 2005-2006

Figure 14. Smith Elementary School, 5th Grade Ohio Achievement Test Results, 2005-2006
The staff members at Smith are overwhelmingly veteran educators with more than 23 years of experience. All of the staff (100%) meet the licensure requirements to teach their grade and subject areas. The staff also values continuing higher education with 74% of the staff with at least a master’s degree, which is higher than the district-wide rate of 70%.

**Data From the Documents and Artifacts Describing the PBS Implementation**

Smith was a principal-led PBS team. They participated in all of the training sessions with the other PBS teams, but they were not assigned a coach to work with their PBS planning team. Their principal was highly engaged in the team training and team meetings (*PBS Team—2*). In training sessions, she asked numerous clarifying questions and sought out consultation from the PBS trainer. The PBS team had broad representation including both general education and special education teachers. They also had representation from both primary and intermediate teachers (*PBS Team—1*). It was not clear whether there was a chair identified or whether by default the principal led each team meeting.

The Smith PBS planning team had regular monthly planning meetings. During the month of March, they met three times to analyze feedback from staff and compile a draft of behavioral expectations and definitions. They also requested and received an individual consultation session with the external PBS trainer at their school site in May. They used this consultation session to help analyze what they had achieved up to that date and how to plan for the start of the next school year (*PBS Team—3*).
The Smith team used the Universal PBS Program Matrix provided by the external trainer during the initial meeting to step through their implementation of the universal tier of PBS. The team’s first two months of planning focused on reviewing the student data provided by the district’s lead behavior specialist, from which they analyzed discipline incidents by type of violation aggregated by month, race, and gender. The Smith PBS team also reviewed attendance and tardy data (Data Analysis—15-19) and shared these results with staff to prioritize the needs in the building (Faculty Commitment—5 & 7). Analysis of the data led the team to focus their attention on the targeted and intensive tier of PBS rather than the universal tier. Interestingly, the PBS team’s professional development sessions with the other PBS planning teams from across the district focused solely on strategies for the universal tier. The external PBS trainer emphasized to the teams the need to have strong universal school-wide positive behavior supports first before organizing targeted and intensive interventions. The Smith team’s planning, however, honed in on an identified group of boys who had the highest number of office referrals, instead of developing and implementing a universal program. The team designed supports for the boys including setting goals and establishing sophisticated reward systems to reinforce improved behavior (e.g., sports equipment for meeting individual goals; Expectations & Rules—20; Rewards—25-27; Implementation Plan—39-43).

Perhaps the focus on the targeted and intensive interventions grew out of their struggle to establish their 3-5 behavior expectations in the beginning of the process. Instead of facilitating an emergence of a set of behavioral expectations, as the other teams
had done, the Smith team initially tried to merge existing school-wide belief statements with behavioral expectations. They established a crossword-type phrase using letters within the phrase to spell out their mascot’s name (Eagles): “Every day, all boys and girls will learn and achieve excellence.” As the team progressed through the training, they realized they jumped over the universal tier and immediately began planning for targeted and intensive interventions. They requested and received substitute teachers for their PBS planning team members in April to have a collegial planning day to review their progress and revamp their plan. During this planning day, the Smith team also realized they needed to create new behavioral expectations so they reviewed a sample large urban district’s resources regarding PBS to get ideas of how to recalibrate their work around the universal tier (*Expectations & Rules—20, 22*). The team decided to use a climate survey with their staff to gather feedback to date, and the feedback then led the team to creating the following three behavioral expectations (*Expectations & Rules—20, 22 & 24*):

1. Be respectful of self, others, and property
2. Be responsible and prepared at all times
3. Be ready to follow directions and procedures

From this list, the team decided to use three key words to summarize the building’s behavioral expectations: Responsible, Respectful, and Safe.

The Smith team brought these three expectations to the full staff and received their endorsement to move forward. The team brainstormed with full staff regarding what these expectations look like in settings across the school to begin defining each expectation. The PBS team documented the results of the brainstorming sessions with
the full staff and their own deliberations on the planning matrix, then streamlined the ideas into a behavioral expectation chart for each school-wide location in the school, including the restroom, playground, hallway, breakfast door, dismissal area, office, dining room, and gym from 8:00-8:15 (Expectations & Rules—20, 22, 23, 24; Faculty Commitment—6). For example:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Responsible</th>
<th>Respectful</th>
<th>Safe</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Restroom</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Towel in trash</td>
<td>• Stay in your own space</td>
<td>• Keep the restroom clean</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Use it, flush it, wash it</td>
<td>• Use quiet voices</td>
<td>• Keep hands and feet to self</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Turn off water</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Playground</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Use good listening</td>
<td>• Treat others kindly</td>
<td>• Use equipment carefully</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Use appropriate language</td>
<td>• Take turns</td>
<td>• Hands, feet and objects to yourself</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Because the planning team had to readjust their strategies in late spring 2007 to focus on the universal tier, they taught behavioral expectations through classroom discussions and presentations by the teachers in spring 2007, but decided to also plan more formal school-wide events for the beginning of the next school year. The staff planned a “Positive Behavior” assembly for the first day of school in August 2007 to formally reintroduce PBS and, in particular, to teach the behavioral expectations to the students (Lesson Plans—33, 34, 37; Implementation Plan—39-43).

The team also carefully mapped out strategies to engage parents in the PBS plan. They provided information to all parents regarding the targeted and intensive tier for all parents during Open House. They also planned informational sessions for the subsequent
school year and asked one of the PBS coaches serving other buildings to present to parents (*Lesson Plans—38; Implementation Plan—45*).

The staff used tickets to reward individual students demonstrating the behavioral expectations. All staff members were given tickets to use in their specific settings and in school-wide settings, including on busses. Tickets were drawn weekly and winning students received rewards including items donated by the community (e.g., movie coupons, food coupons). Monthly, Smith faculty held a special drawing of earned tickets to randomly identify students to receive a “Gold Card” which gave the students specific privileges. Gold Card students ate lunch, complete with a special dessert, at a table on the stage with the principal in the cafeteria. The art teacher made a special backdrop for the special eating area and the table had a gold colored tablecloth and centerpiece to make the event even more special. Also, the staff designated a “Gold Card Lane” in the cafeteria so that Gold Card students could bypass the regular long line to pick up their lunch (*Rewards—25, 26, 27, 28*).

In addition to individual rewards, the Smith team also created opportunities for groups of students to receive rewards. The staff decided to focus group rewards on attendance, which was not specifically addressed in their behavioral expectations, but was identified by the school staff as an area needing improvement. Each month, classes maintaining 93% attendance rates or better received extra recess and a class certificate. Other school-wide rewards also were established, but not necessarily linked directly to the PBS behavioral expectations. These rewards were in addition to the reinforcement of the behavioral expectations, although it did not appear clear how they were connected.
Every student recognized as a “Star Student” or “Good Citizen” received a dog tag and chain with the Smith mascot. The criteria for receiving these two acknowledgements were not found in the archival documents. Students also received rewards for perfect attendance and achieving academic success indicators, such as honor roll, merit roll, most improved, and meeting literacy benchmarks. Each week 3 K through second grade students and 3 third through fifth grade students were recognized for these achievements during lunch by the principal. These students received rewards, such as visors, wristbands, water bottles, and pencil boxes (Rewards—25, 26, 28).

Staff members were also recognized for their participation in distributing tickets to acknowledge positive behaviors. Teachers wrote their names on the tickets they distributed to students and the PBS planning team periodically pulled tickets from the box and the winning teacher received rewards, such as hall pass timers, electric pencil sharpeners, and paper. Once per month, three students identified as good citizens of the school could also select a teacher to receive a specific reward (Rewards, 32; Implementation—45).

Smith’s team focused on re-launching the introduction of the behavioral expectations, formally teaching the expectations to the students in each setting, and systematically implementing the reward system for students starting in September 2007 (Lesson Plans—33-37). They evaluated their end-of-year data at their last PBS training session and identified modifications in their PBS planning matrix to emphasize based on the data (Evaluation—53).
A Comparison of the Archival Student Discipline Records for Smith Elementary

Before PBS Implementation (Fall 2006) to After Implementation (Spring 2007)

An analysis of the office discipline referrals (ODRs) for Smith discovered a slight increase in the number of ODRs per 100 students from the fall 2006 (October 9, 2006, to November 14, 2006), to the spring of 2007 (April 2, 2007, to May 14, 2007). During the one-month time period in the fall, Smith reported 26 ODRs which equates to 9.96 ODRs per 100 students. A significant data point for the Smith planning team and entire staff was that all 26 ODRs were regarding male students. The racial/ethnic background of the male students included: 18 of the students were Caucasian, 6 were African American, 1 was Multi-Racial, and 1 was Asian. Female students had zero ODRs during the one-month fall data collection period. In the one-month time period in the spring, Smith had 29 total ODRs resulting in a rate of 11.11 ODRs per 100 students. A similar trend continued in the spring with 27 of the ODRs coming from male students and only two from females. The racial/ethnic background of the spring male students more heavily favored Caucasian students: 21 of the students were Caucasian, 4 were African American, 1 was Multi-Racial, and 1 was Hispanic.

At Smith Elementary School, the incidents of problem behavior overwhelmingly came from the older students in the school. The students in the intermediate grades (i.e., 3rd-5th grades) accounted for 76% of the ODRs in the school. Table 10 provides a breakdown by grade level during the two data collection periods.

The distribution of the actions taken in response to the ODRs shifted from the fall to the spring data collection period. In the fall, 54% of the ODRs resulted in an
Table 10

*Smith Elementary School, Number of Office Discipline Referrals by Grade Level*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>GRADE LEVEL</th>
<th>FALL 10/9/06-11/14/06</th>
<th>SPRING 4/2/07-5/14/07</th>
<th>Difference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Kdg</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>+1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>-1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>+8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>-4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>+3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

out-of-school suspension, whereas 46% resulted in some type of in-school consequence (i.e., in-school suspension, detention, or parent/student conference). After PBS implementation in the spring, only 41% of the ODRs resulted in an out-of-school suspension with 59% shifting to in-school actions.

**A Comparison of the Archival Student Attendance and Tardy Records for Smith Elementary Before PBS Implementation (Fall 2006) to After Implementation (Spring 2007)**

In 2005-2006, Smith Elementary had an attendance rate of 95.2% reported on their state Local Report Card (Ohio Department of Education, 2010). This rate exceeds the state standard of 93% and both the district average (93.4%) and the state average (93.5%). There were 108 absences recorded for every 100 students at Smith during the
one-month fall data collection period and after PBS implementation, the spring data
collection period reported a considerable increase to 178 absences for every 100 students.
Tardies also showed a significant increase from 47 tardies to 67 tardies per 100 students.

School D: Carter Elementary School

Description of the School and its Context Within the City

Carter Elementary School is a large stoic building prominently displayed on a
frequently traveled road in the city. As you approach the building, you get a sense that
the school has placed an important role in the history of the city and its industry. The
school is embedded within a neighborhood of blue and white collar workers who worked
for one of the cities’ largest employers who still has a national and international presence.
In its prime, the neighborhood had homes for middle- to high-income residents.
Although the average value of a home in the zip code region of the school is $84,000 and
the average household income is $36,171, the children in the area are experiencing an
increase in eligibility for free and reduced lunch based on their parent’s household
income within the school residential zone. The current rate of free and reduced lunch rate
is 70%. Yet, despite the higher rate of free and reduced lunch, the mobility rate is still
relatively stable compared to other schools in the city with similar poverty, with a
mobility rate of 19% (i.e., 19% of the students moved in or out of Carter during the
school year).

Carter Elementary School is a large elementary school relative to the other
elementary schools in the city, and with an enrollment of 583 placed it as one of the three
largest elementary schools within the district. In fact, Carter is even larger than two of
the middle schools in the city. The school is a diverse school with 53% of the students self-identified as Caucasian, 36% African American, and 10.8% Multi-Racial. Almost 14% of the student population is identified as a student with a disability and receiving services via an Individualized Education Program (IEP).

Carter is ranked in Continuous Improvement by the state. They met 2 out of 8 state indicators (i.e., 75% proficient or higher in tested subjects), fourth grade writing and attendance, on the state’s Local Report Card. Overall, Carter has been experiencing a decline in student achievement over the past three years and in 2003-2004, their performance index rating, which is a weighted average of all tested subjects and grades, was 91.5 (out of a possible 120). In 2004-2005, the index dropped to 87.7 and the following year, the year prior to PBS implementation, the rating dropped again to 82.2. Third grade mathematics is the only subject that experienced an increase over the two or three year trend data reported on the state’s Local Report Card (Figures 15, 16, and 17).

The Carter staff is a veteran staff with 19 years average teaching experience and 100% of the teachers meet the state’s highly qualified requirements for licensure and 78% hold a master’s degree or higher. The rate of advanced degree attainment is higher than the district rate of 70%. The racial make-up of the teachers is 89% Caucasian and 11% African-American. Although the rate of male teachers in elementary schools in the United States is around 25% (National Education Association, 2010), Carter’s staff is far below this national average with only 4% male teachers.
Figure 15. Carter Elementary School, 3rd Grade Ohio Achievement Test Results, 2005-2006

Figure 16. Carter Elementary School, 4th Grade Ohio Achievement Test Results, 2005-2006

Figure 17. Carter Elementary School, 5th Grade Ohio Achievement Test Results, 2005-2006
Data From the Documents and Artifacts Describing the PBS Implementation:

Carter had a large PBS planning team with an exceptionally broad representation from their staff. Their team included the principal, music teacher, gym teacher, secretary, librarian, five grade-level teachers, a special education teacher, and an art teacher. Carter was not assigned a PBS coach, so the team was classified as “principal-led.” The team met monthly, except two months in the spring required meetings every two weeks. The principal was an active participant, although she worked to establish an atmosphere of shared leadership on the team (PBS Team—1-3). The team identified three overarching goals for PBS: (a) reduce suspensions, (b) promote a positive learning community, and (c) celebrate school successes (PBS Team—4).

A staff survey was used to gather input into areas of need within the school setting that could be addressed through PBS. Staff readily participated in the survey and the results were tabulated and scheduled to be shared with staff during a regularly scheduled staff meeting. Unfortunately, due to a calamity day, the staff meeting was cancelled which delayed sharing of the information. Despite this timeline setback, the team decided to summarize the survey and begin drafting the behavioral expectations to share with the staff at their next meeting (Faculty Commitment—5-6; Expectations—20; Evaluation—49). The team also decided to introduce the draft behavioral expectations to students over the morning announcements and then reinforce them through the classroom teachers. Students were asked to provide feedback about the behavioral expectations to their teachers who then provided the information to the PBS planning team (Expectations—20, 24; Evaluation—49).
The Carter PBS team also had opportunities through the PBS training sessions and through their monthly meetings to analyze the discipline, attendance, and tardy reports provided to them by the lead behavior specialist for the district. The team summarized these results and shared them with their whole staff at their monthly staff meetings. The student data, the staff survey, and student feedback were all used as the basis for the three behavioral expectations established (Data Analysis—18, 19).

- Respect Ourselves
- Respect Others
- Respect Property

The staff also decided to create an overall theme for their positive behavior efforts. They developed the following slogan: Outstanding Character Leads to Success. Using the school-wide slogan and the three expectations, the PBS planning team began to define the expectations by answering the question: What do these expectations “look like” across our major school-wide setting? The Carter team shared the draft definitions with their full staff at a staff meeting and received agreement to proceed. Teacher volunteers made posters that depicted the behavioral expectations and their application in key areas of the school and the team developed plans to teach the actual expectations to the students. Examples of the definitions are included in Table 11 (Expectations—20, 22, 23, 24).

The staff worked collaboratively to create multi-tiered systems of rewards for both individual students and for groups. There were previous reward systems in place, so the planning team worked to determine what was needed for rewarding the new
behavioral expectations and then carefully typed up and taught the directions for implementing the reward system to the staff.

Tickets were used to recognize students caught displaying the behavioral expectations. All staff received tickets to distribute to the students, and the tickets included a place for the staff to check-off which behavioral expectation was displayed by the student (i.e., respect ourselves, respect others, respect property), the PBS slogan, the student’s name, staff signature, and a place for staff to write comments. After earning a ticket, students would take it to the office to be placed in their respective lunch period box. The principal brought the two boxes to the lunchroom each Friday and recognized each student earning a ticket whose name was called with a small prize (e.g., food treats, school supplies). Each month, one ticket was also drawn from each lunch period to receive a Grand Prize. In addition to the weekly and monthly recognition systems, the Carter team also planned to purchase medals for the subsequent year to have students wear all week showing they were role models in their behavior.
In addition to the rewards associated specifically with the PBS behavioral expectations, the school also had a Good Citizenship weekly award for students displaying honesty and respect to teachers or peers. This reward was overseen by the counselor and presented by the principal. Each classroom also had a goal to produce 100 acts of kindness during the year and a “Random Acts of Kindness” calendar or board on which teachers were to document every time they caught a student in his or her classroom doing something kind or thoughtful.

Rewards for other academic or academic-related achievements were also present at Carter Elementary for perfect attendance, and honor or merit roll. Students were identified and received their reward after each grading period. For example, in February, the students were able to attend a “Good Guy” dance at the school and recipients of the Principal’s Award for Highest Honor Roll Grade Point Average for each homeroom received their names in the school newspaper, a certificate, and lunch with the principal.

In the end, there were multiple reward systems that seemed to overlap in some areas. The staff identified the large number of programs as an area to address prior to the next school year and listed it as one of the discussion areas for their summer meetings. Their goal was to identify all of the reward programs available to students at Carter Elementary School by developing a chart listing all of the ways students can be rewarded and to then discuss areas to eliminate due to duplication or confusion from staff and students (Rewards—26-29).

In addition to the student recognition programs, the Carter staff also decided to include a reward system for staff in an effort to recognize those who participated in the
PBS program—that is, those staff who provided tickets to students exhibiting positive behaviors. After discussion, the PBS team decided to provide monthly gifts to the entire staff for their participation (e.g., cards, pens, flowers), instead of targeting specific staff members. The team deliberately decided to reward all staff, but there was no evidence of whether the team determined if each staff member actually participated in the reward system prior to delivering the items (*Reward—32*).

The Carter PBS planning team, in cooperation with the whole staff, decided to teach the behavioral expectations by having each classroom teacher review the definitions individually and to demonstrate the expectations in the various school settings on their own. There were no group assembly or school-wide stations for teaching the expectations. Moreover, there is no evidence that lesson plans were developed and provided. The behavioral expectation chart was the primary tool provided to each teacher to use for the instruction (*Lesson Plans—33-38*).

In terms of publicizing the PBS program, signs were created by the art teacher for the behavioral expectations and these were posted throughout the school (*Expectations—20*). Information about the PBS program was also included in the school newsletter for parents to gain an understanding of the implementation of PBS in the school and the information was posted on the school website, as well (*Implementation Plan—45*).

The Carter PBS planning team also recognized the importance of professional development for themselves and the entire staff. They worked with the district lead behavior specialist to schedule training at their school and to send teams to regional and state conferences regarding behavioral supports. Teams of staff received the following
training during the initial year’s implementation of PBS: PBS training from an expert in the field from a local university, Mean Girls conference, and Pyramid of Learning training.

At the end of the first year of implementation, the planning team was able to analyze their data and identify next steps. They immediately requested summer hours to work together to improve their plan and time to streamline their reward system, establish a more structured system of teaching the behavioral expectations, and find ways to provide booster training sessions through the year to keep students and staff engaged in the process (Evaluation—49, 53).

**A Comparison of the Archival Student Discipline Records for Carter Elementary Before PBS Implementation (Fall, 2006) to After Implementation (Spring, 2007)**

A review of the Office Discipline Referrals (ODRs) at Carter revealed the highest rate of ODRs per 100 students for the four PBS schools in this study. There were 18.01 incidents of ODRs for every 100 students during the fall data collection period (October 9, 2006, to November 14, 2006). Carter’s incident rate dropped to 15.95 after PBS implementation when data were collected in the spring (April 2, 2007, to May 14, 2007). Even though this rate dropped from fall to spring, it was still the highest of the four PBS schools in the spring.

Male students overwhelmingly represented the greatest percentage of total ODRs in the fall data collection period (81%), but dropped to 76% of the ODRs during the spring data collection period. Although African American students only represent 36% of the student body, 48% of the fall ODRs and 61% of the spring ODRs were for African
American students. Table 12 depicts the differences in ODRs by grade level. The intermediate grades (grades 3-5) represent 77% of the ODRs in the fall, but dropped significantly to only 66% of the ODRs after PBS implementation.

Table 12

*Carter Elementary School, Number of Office Discipline Referrals by Grade Level*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>GRADE LEVEL</th>
<th>FALL 10/9/06-11/14/07</th>
<th>SPRING 4/2/07-5/14/07</th>
<th>Difference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Kdg</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>+3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>-2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>+7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>+6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>-26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>105</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>-12</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A Comparison of the Archival Student Attendance and Tardy Records for Carter Elementary Before PBS Implementation (Fall 2006) to After Implementation (Spring 2007)

In 2005-2006, Carter Elementary had an attendance rate of 94.6% reported on their state Local Report Card (Ohio Department of Education, 2010). This rate exceeds the state standard of 93% and both the district average (93.4%) and the state average (93.5%). There were 135 absences recorded for every 100 students at Carter during the one-month fall data collection period. After PBS implementation, the spring data
collection period reported a considerable increase to 189 absences for every 100 students. Tardies also showed a significant increase from 56 tardies to 84 tardies per 100 students.

**A Comparison of the Archival Student Behavioral Records Across All Schools Before PBS Implementation (October 9, 2006) and After Implementation (November 14, 2006)**

Documentation record review of archived behavioral data was analyzed from multiple sources to augment findings with regard to implementation. The descriptive data are found illustrated in charts and tables embedded within this text include office referrals, out of school suspensions, tardies, and attendance. The data were collected during 30 days in the fall of 2006 prior to PBS implementation (October 9, 2006, to November 14, 2006) and during a second 30-day time period in the spring of 2007 (April 2, 2007, to May 14, 2007) after PBS was implemented. Rich descriptions of the data analysis are included regarding the two schools with coach-led PBS teams, the two schools with principal-led PBS teams, and two similar schools that did not implement PBS.

Two non-PBS schools were selected for discipline, attendance, and tardy review to enable a descriptive analysis of the patterns of student data in the PBS schools compared to the patterns of student data in the non-PBS schools. The two schools selected are Bradley Elementary School and Miller Elementary School. They were selected due to their students’ similar demographic background to the targeted four schools’ students, as well as their discipline, attendance, and tardy history.
Bradley Elementary School is a high poverty school located in a mixed residential and business neighborhood. Bradley has 375 students with a poverty rate of 90% and a mobility rate of 20%. They have a highly diverse population with 73% African American, 13% Caucasian, 6.4% Multi-Racial, 4.1% Asian, and 3.8% Hispanic students. Bradley also has a high percentage of students with disabilities (15%) and a moderately sized population of English as Second Language students (5%). The veteran staff has high levels of professional attainment with 80% having a master’s degree or higher. Bradley’s incidents of ODRs are at the higher end compared with the other schools in the study, with 19.8 incidents of ODRs per 100 students during the fall data collection period. Academically, Bradley is rated in Continuous Improvement showing strong increases in their Performance Index score over the past three years.

Miller Elementary School, the other non-PBS school, is rated in Academic Watch academically, but has experienced a small increase in their Performance Index score from 2004-2005 to 2005-2006. Miller’s student body is 57% African American, 30% White, 8% Multi-Racial, and 5% Asian. They have a high percentage of students with disabilities (18.5%) and less than 10 students eligible for English as a Second Language services. Moreover, they have a veteran staff with 78% receiving a master’s degree or higher. Miller’s discipline records are on the low-end compared to the other schools in the study showing 6.06 incidents of ODRs per 100 students in the fall.

Office Discipline Referrals (ODRs) include all types of discipline infractions that result in a referral to the office. Figure 18 shows a comparison of ODRs between the two coach-led PBS teams, the two principal-led PBS teams, and the two similar schools that
Figure 18. Number of incidents of office discipline referrals per 100 students in coach-led versus principal-led teams

did not implement PBS. The coach-led PBS buildings and the principal-led PBS buildings both showed a similar decline in ODRs from the fall to the spring: a 0.84 decrease and 1.07 respectively. In contrast, the non-PBS schools showed a dramatic increase of 5.76 points from the fall to the spring. The non-PBS buildings mirrored the more traditional trend in discipline data for the district, which annually reports a higher rate of discipline incidents in the spring compared to the fall.

A similar pattern exists for out-of-school suspensions with the PBS buildings mirroring each other in terms of fall and spring data, but the non-PBS schools showing a dramatic increase in incidents. The principal-led PBS schools showed a slight increase of
0.12 from the fall to the spring in out-of-school suspensions. Coach-led PBS schools showed the exact same increase of 0.12 from fall to spring. The non-PBS schools, however, recorded a large increase of out-of-school suspensions from 8.03 per 100 students in the fall to 12.74 in the spring (Figure 19). This is an increase of 4.71 points. Although the PBS schools did not decrease their out-of-school suspensions, remaining the same from fall to spring could, in fact, be a mark of great success in comparison to other buildings where the number of suspensions typically increases in the spring.
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*Figure 19.* Number of incidents of out-of-school suspensions per 100 students in coach-led versus principal-led teams

Attendance Office Referrals (AORs) represent the most severe violations of the Code of Student Behavior. Referrals require a formal hearing from a designated hearing officer and could result in an expulsion, building transfer, or multiple suspensions.
Typically, AORs occur as a result of physical or verbal assaults on staff or peers, weapons, drugs, or other dangerous behavior. Although uncommon in the elementary grades, they can occur. The coach-led PBS buildings had one AOR in the fall and zero in the spring. The principal-led PBS buildings had two in the fall and two again in the spring. The result is the four PBS buildings had three AORs in the fall and only two in the spring. The non-PBS buildings had one AOR in the fall and experienced an increase to three in the spring (Figure 20).

Absences across the three different groups of schools all recorded an increase in the rate of absences per 100 students. The coach-led buildings recorded an increase of 50.3 incidents of absence per 100 students from the fall to the spring. Principal-led PBS buildings posted an increase of 59.18 and the non-PBS buildings recorded an increase of 44.07. Figure 21 plots these changes.

The rate of tardies showed the most dramatic differences across the three types of buildings. The coach-led buildings showed a significant decline in tardies from 98.67 per 100 students to 71.53, a drop of 27.14 points. The principal-led PBS buildings recorded a dramatic increase in the rate of tardies from 53.55 in the fall to 78.91 in the spring, an increase of 25.36 points. The two non-PBS schools also recorded an increase, but not quite as large as the principal-led buildings. Their rate changed from 57.94 per 100 students in the fall to 74.35 in the spring, an increase of 16.4 points. Figure 22 visually depicts these changes.
Figure 20. Number of incidents of attendance office referrals per 100 students in coach-led versus principal-led teams
Figure 21. Number of incidents of absences per 100 students in coach-led versus principal-led teams
Figure 22. Number of incidents of tardies per 100 students in coach-led versus principal-led teams

Results of the Staff Climate Surveys Across the Four PBS Schools

The School Climate Survey, Staff Version (Haynes et al., 1994), was distributed by the principals to staff in all four PBS schools. The survey results were to be used to determine the patterns of staff’s perceptions of school climate when PBS is implemented with coach-led teams and principal-led teams. The surveys were confidential and were logged only by a number which was used to match the pre-test survey with the post-test survey of individual participants.
Only one of the four schools returned surveys from the vast majority of their staff even after repeated requests from the lead behavior specialist in the district. One school returned too few surveys to have them accurately reflect the perceptions of their staff, and two schools did not return any surveys. When the behavior specialist questioned the principals and staff why there was resistance to completing the survey, the primary concern revolved around the use and actual intent of the survey. Staff indicated concern with the number of questions about the administrator’s treatment of staff, particularly in relation to the first question, “Administrators here respect the teachers.” The behavior specialist was also told that staff had a concern about the reputation of the school if the results were shared publicly or compared with other schools. Because only one school completed the surveys, the data could not be analyzed to answer the third research question: What are the patterns of staff’s perceptions of school climate when PBS is implemented with coach-led teams and principal-led teams?
CHAPTER V
DISCUSSION

Changing long-held beliefs and practices around instructional improvement requires impacting the instructional core through enhancing teacher knowledge and skill, enhancing student engagement, or providing more rigorous content (City et al., 2009). A key consideration in this study was to understand how the role of an instructional coach impacted this reculturing process. The implementation of PBS was used as the unit of analysis to gain an in-depth understanding of the patterns of implementation of PBS and patterns of student behavior when PBS was implemented by a principal-led planning team and a coach-led planning team. The following overarching questions guided this study:

1. What does the implementation of PBS look like in buildings with principal-led planning teams and coach-led planning teams?
2. What are the patterns of student behavior when PBS is implemented with a coach-led team, a principal-led team, and in buildings where PBS is not implemented?
3. What are the patterns of staff’s perceptions of school climate when PBS is implemented with coach-led teams and principal-led teams?

Because there was resistance among the staff regarding completing the school climate survey, the third research question was not able to be addressed through this study.

A descriptive case study approach was used to enable an in-depth analysis of implementation and descriptions of “episodes of nuance, the sequentiality of happenings
in context, [and] the wholeness of the individual” (Stake, 1995, p. xii). This study provided in-depth descriptions of archived documents detailing the implementation of PBS when leadership teams were led by principals and external coaches, and describes the patterns of student behavior across buildings implementing PBS and buildings that did not implement PBS.

The archival documents were collected from four participating elementary schools in a large urban district in the Midwest. Student behavior data were collected from fall 2006 and spring 2007. The PBS implementation data were collected from January 2007 to June 2007 which reflects the time period when the PBS training and implementation occurred in the four elementary schools.

In two of the buildings, the PBS teams were led by principals. The principals did not serve as the chairperson of the PBS planning team, but served in a leadership process-oriented role. In the other two buildings, the PBS teams had principals in attendance, but they had the addition of an external coach who provided leadership in the PBS process. The coaches were not members of the school staff, but were employees of the district. The two coaches had extensive backgrounds in behavior management, applied behavior analysis, PBS, and had previous experience coaching the IAT process within the district. Two similar schools that were not implementing PBS were used as comparisons during the data analysis phase of this study.
Summary of Findings

The analysis of the data revealed findings in three areas: (a) Principal-led and coach-led PBS teams implemented the key components of PBS in a similar sequence, although some of the components were implemented with greater quality by the coach-led teams; (b) patterns of student behavior were similar between the coach-led PBS schools and the principal-led PBS schools, except in the area of tardies; and (c) differences in patterns of student behavior were revealed between PBS schools and non-PBS schools.

Most of the implementation patterns, based on the analysis of the documents, appeared to be similar across the Benchmarks of Quality (BoQ) scoring system. The coach-led schools received scores of 57 (74%) and 55 (71%) out of 77 total points. The principal-led schools received scores of 53 (69%) and 52 (68%). There was no variance between the coach-led buildings and principal-led buildings in the components of establishing the planning team, effective discipline procedures, data entry and analysis, establishing expectations and rules, and evaluation procedures. There was a 1-point variance (i.e., coach-led received 1 point higher score) on faculty commitment and implementation plans. There was a 2-point variance on lesson plans, and the largest variance (i.e., 3 points) arose in the category of reward systems. Overall, these variances appear small when 77 total points were possible; however, with a rating scale ranging only from 0 to a maximum of 3, these differences point to variances in quality of implementation. One of the principal-led schools, for example, started PBS implementation in the targeted and intensive tiers rather than the universal tier. This
delay resulted in a loss of time for teaching behavioral expectations to students in the school-wide settings where the behaviors were to be reinforced. Instead, the teachers taught the behavioral expectations in the classroom, resulting in a BoQ rating of 4 out of 8 on the lesson plan component. Conversely, a coach-led school received a higher rating of 6 out of 8 because they taught the expectations in the natural settings where the behaviors were to be reinforced using more sophisticated lessons at each station. Since the BoQ measures the degree of fidelity with which a school is implementing PBS, the seemingly small variances across the two types of planning teams indicate that coach-led schools had a higher degree of fidelity of implementation across some of the components, particularly in the areas of lesson plans and reward systems. The presence of a PBS coach appeared to serve as a quality control measure and as a compass for the planning teams across most of the key components of PBS; they kept the teams heading in the right direction in terms of logical, sequential implementation, and achieved higher quality overall implementation.

The patterns of student behavior were similar across all four PBS schools, except in the area of tardies (Table 13). Office discipline referrals, attendance office referrals, out-of-school suspensions, and attendance rates followed similar patterns from the fall to the spring data collection period. The only student data element that was not similar was the rate of tardies. The coach-led buildings showed a marked decline in tardies from 98.67 per 100 students to 71.53, a drop of 27.14 points. The principal-led PBS buildings recorded a dramatic increase in the rate of tardies from 53.55 in the fall to 78.91 in the spring, an increase of 25.36 points. Through the member checking process, the principals
of the coach-led buildings remarked that they did not believe the dramatic decline in tardies was linked to having a coach-led planning team nor the implementation of PBS.

In one building, this was the first full year of attendance in a temporary building where all of the students were bused to school. The principal believes the parents were still adjusting to getting their children to the bus stop in time during the fall data collection period and they had settled into the schedule of busing by the spring data collection time period, resulting in a decline. In the second building, a local church who partnered with the school provided alarm clocks to every kindergartener in the school because the kindergarten students had the highest number of tardies out of all of the grades. Additionally, the school improvement team also put into place an incentive chart in every first and second grade classroom due to their high numbers of tardies. Students earned a sticker next to their name every day they arrived to school on time. The class with the lowest number of tardies was announced over the speaker on Friday mornings. The students in that class with no tardies were able to go to the office and select a prize out of

Table 13

Summary of Behavior Incidents in Schools With Coach-Led PBS Teams and Principal-Led PBS Teams

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Incidents</th>
<th>Coach-Led</th>
<th>Principal-Led</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Office Referrals</td>
<td>Small</td>
<td>Small</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Out-of-School Suspensions</td>
<td>Small</td>
<td>Small</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Service Referrals</td>
<td>Minor</td>
<td>(same)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Absences</td>
<td>Large</td>
<td>Large</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tardies</td>
<td>Large</td>
<td>Large</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
the prize box. Both of these strategies were put into place prior to PBS and apart from any type of influence from the coach assisting with the PBS planning teams.

When analyzing the data across the four PBS schools and the two non-PBS schools, there were little difference for absences and tardies (Table 14). The patterns of absences from fall to spring were nearly identical across the PBS schools and non-PBS schools. The patterns of tardies varied across all three types of schools. The coach-led schools decreased their number of tardies, the principal-led schools had a very large increase in their number of tardies, and the non-PBS schools had a modest increase. In the schools studied, PBS did not appear to be a factor in the patterns of attendance or tardies.

Table 14

*Summary of Behavior Incidents in PBS Schools (Coach-Led and Principal-Led) and Non-PBS Schools*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Incidents</th>
<th>Coach-Led</th>
<th>Principal-Led</th>
<th>Non-PBS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Office Referrals</td>
<td>Small</td>
<td>Small</td>
<td>Large</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Out-of-School Suspensions</td>
<td>Small</td>
<td>Small</td>
<td>Large</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Service Referrals</td>
<td>Minor</td>
<td>(same)</td>
<td>Large</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Absences</td>
<td>Large</td>
<td>Large</td>
<td>Large</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tardies</td>
<td>Large</td>
<td>Large</td>
<td>Mod</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Contrasting absences and tardies, the patterns of student discipline were starkly different between the four PBS schools and the two non-PBS schools. The two non-PBS schools showed substantial increases from fall to spring in office discipline referrals, out-of-school suspensions, and attendance office referrals in comparison to the four
PBS schools. The PBS schools posted a decline in office discipline referrals from fall to spring, whereas the non-PBS schools posted a dramatic increase. The four PBS schools had a slight increase in out-of-school suspensions from fall to spring, but the non-PBS schools had a large increase. The PBS schools either had the same number of the most severe incidents of behavior violations (attendance office referrals) or had a decline. The non-PBS schools had an increase from fall to spring. These changes in student behavior in PBS buildings echo what is found in the literature regarding the effectiveness of universal PBS. Studies consistently find decreases in disruptive behavior, particularly with high quality implementation of PBS (Barrett et al., 2008; Bohanon et al., 2006; Bradshaw et al., 2008; Duda et al., 2004; Lassen et al., 2006; Lewis et al., 2004; Luiselli et al., 2002).

**Implications**

The results of this study hold important implications for district decisions regarding PBS implementation. Districts must evaluate whether the presence or absence of a PBS coach enhances or hinders the reculturation process. In this study, the descriptions of coach-led and principal-led PBS initiatives showed that both types of leadership teams promoted the implementation of PBS and the improvements in student behavior. Perhaps the process of using collaborative teams, creating a common vision of behavioral supports, and creating processes to review data and reflect on instructional practices, resulted in similar implementation patterns across the principal-led teams and coach-led teams. The collaborative nature of the teams may be more important than the existence or non-existence of a coach.
Regardless of the path the PBS implementation took, it is important to note that each component was realized in this descriptive study. However, it is also important to note that although Fullan (2000) and City et al. (2009) cautioned against using external agents of change, the external coaches in this study were influential in their schools, particularly in the quality of implementation. One potential important factor is although the coaches were not full-time members of the building staff, they were known to the building and were full-time staff members of the district, so they had a greater understanding of the culture and context of each school. The end result was small differences among the coach-led and principal-led schools in relation to the processes of implementation and the outcomes associated with PBS. The leadership provided (coach or principal) exacted notable changes for each school.

The conceptual framework of breaking the bonds of dependency to reculture schools put forth by Fullan (2000) provided an important context for considering the implications for this study. In this section, specific implications across four areas related to the reculturing process of PBS examined in this study will be revealed: (a) When distributing a staff climate survey, district staff need to take into consideration the unique contexts within each building, (b) The presence of PBS coaches may have some impact on the quality of the implementation patterns in PBS schools, (c) The presence of PBS coaches may not have had any impact on student outcomes, and (d) The implementation of PBS in both the coach-led buildings and principal-led buildings resulted in reductions in disruptive behaviors.
Context Matters

Because three of the four school teams resisted completing the staff climate survey, it may be that the district-level staff who selected the survey may not have carefully thought through the context of each building when selecting the survey instrument. The staff expressed concerns about how the results would be used and concerns about the negative questions about their principals. In retrospect, the district staff indicated they should have thought more about the implication of distributing such a detailed survey at the same time as introducing a new systems change process, such as PBS. Additionally, the district staff reported they would do more preparation and explanation to the staff regarding the purpose of the survey and how it will be used versus simply distributing it through the principals to pass out to teachers with little explanation. This confirms Michael Fullan’s (2001a) research regarding moving towards a norms-based system of change in a school versus a rules-based system. He indicated that you must start by paying attention to the current belief systems and identifying where new programs or initiatives fit into that belief system. Sergiovanni (1996) also emphasized the need for staff to feel ownership of the participation in the change process. Having the staff receive a climate survey deemed to have sensitive questions without an adequate explanation and process to fit its purpose into the work of the school resulted in the rejection of the survey and suspicion of its true purpose.

Implementation Matters

The process of implementation appeared to be similar across the two coach-led PBS schools and the two principal-led PBS schools, except for quality variances in the
area of designing lesson plans and reward systems. The coach-led buildings also kept very true to the sequence within the *Universal PBS Program* matrix, while principal-led teams both had one incident of straying from the matrix. Specifically, in one principal-led school the PBS planning team spent the first two months of implementation focused on the targeted and intensive tiers, rather than the starting place for PBS, the universal tier. Once they came to the realization during a PBS training session that they were approaching the system differently and that may not result in achieving the goals they had established, the team made adjustments and refocused their efforts on the universal tier. They were ultimately able to speed up their implementation to match the other three schools’ accomplishments in the PBS implementation matrix. In another case, a principal-led team worked diligently trying to fit a pre-existing school motto into the behavioral expectations. After struggling with making this fit, they abandoned the idea and created new behavioral expectations using the data available to them from students and staff. Again, the team was able to rebound and make adjustments to get back on track with the other PBS schools in the project, although some degree of quality was sacrificed.

What appeared to keep the teams basically on the same path of implementation was attending the same professional development and planning sessions; using the same planning matrix to design their implementation strategies; hearing a common vision from district staff regarding PBS, receiving similar district-level support for financial resources and data entry and analysis support; and ultimately receiving feedback from seasoned PBS implementers and their colleagues as they reached implementation milestones.
Although each school had its own unique strategies, the overall process of implementation was markedly similar. This implication fits the guidance found in Sugai et al.’s (2001) *School-Wide Positive Behavior Support: Implementers’ Blueprint and Self-Assessment* guidebook. They indicated that the effectiveness of PBS implementation is related to the extent that a common vision and a set of principles are used to guide decision-making and implementation efforts.

The small variances in implementation that occurred across principal-led schools and coach-led schools appeared to have little influence over the student outcomes. The improvements in student outcome data between the principal-led teams and coach-led teams were incredibly similar, except in the area of tardies. Indeed, the presence of a coach assisting with the leadership of the PBS planning process appeared to enhance the quality of implementation across some of the key PBS components, but it did not have a positive or negative influence over the patterns of student outcomes.

What appeared to be the glue that kept the coach-led teams and principal-led teams together through their implementation, resulting in similar student outcomes, was the monthly training sessions and district-wide collaborative planning sessions, regular building-level PBS planning team meetings, and becoming reflective practitioners through reviewing data and adjusting their instructional practices. The finding from this rich descriptive case study adds to the research of Bradshaw et al. (2008) who conducted a group randomized trial examining the impact of training in PBS on the implementation of the core features of the model. Randomly selected schools received training in PBS while other schools received no training. Over the three years, trained schools
outperformed non-trained schools in PBS program fidelity on all but one subscale of their measurement tool.

The district-wide sessions in this study served to calibrate the team’s work at the building level. Even when teams did not have a coach, the process of the collaborative teams coming together and sharing practices across the network of four buildings enabled them to stay on track and receive the support needed to keep the implementation moving forward and created a process of shared leadership where staff facilitated the training and reflective practices with the rest of the staff through the phases of implementation. While talking with one of the principals in a coach-led building after she read her school’s case study as part of the member checking exercise, the principal stated,

I don’t think the most important factor is whether you have a PBS coach or not. The most important factor is staff buy-in. The coach helped keep our attention on PBS and kept us focused, but if the staff didn’t buy in to PBS it wouldn’t have mattered if we had a coach or not.

The notion that it is not the technical restructuring processes that impact successful implementation of a new practice supports Fullan’s (2000) theory of dependency in leadership and the reculturing process. He challenged practitioners when thinking about scaling up initiatives and reculturing schools. “The main problem, I would say, is not the spread of good ideas. Making reform widespread is related to replicating the conditions of successful change, not to transferring products” (p. 163).
Suggestions for Future Research

Although a case study format was an excellent start to provide a rich description of the patterns of implementation and student outcomes across coach-led and principal-led PBS teams, a larger empirical study would be helpful to measure the differences between the groups on student outcomes. A descriptive case study approach could also be used in a similar fashion as this study, but using a longer view to capture the patterns of implementation and student outcomes for coach-led and principal-led teams over multiple years of implementation. For example, it would be helpful to the field to answer the question, “Does the coach become more important as the years pass to assist with actual implementation and sustainability in the building?”

The participating district had two schools participate in a state-wide roll-out of PBS prior to this project. The schools received coaching services for two years and realized dramatic declines in disruptive behavior. In one building, as soon as the PBS coach pulled out after the second year of the project, the implementation started to suffer and the disruptive behavior returned to its pre-PBS levels within one year. In the second building, both the PBS coach and the principal were re-assigned to different buildings within the district after the second year of the project and the PBS implementation immediately stopped, resulting in dramatic increases in disruptive behavior within a year’s time. The role of the coach in sustaining PBS may be more prominent in the later years than during the first initial six months of implementation.
The implications of the study must be tempered with the understanding that the implementation of PBS was at the very early stages since data were collected in April after training and implementation only began in January. When reviewing the implementation plans developed for the start of the next school year, two of the schools had more robust plans for teaching the behavioral expectations to the students and were repeatedly revisiting the instruction throughout the school year.

The study did not employ an experimental design. Therefore, the findings are descriptive in nature and readers cannot infer a cause and effect relationship between PBS and the student outcomes. Given that multiple sources of data demonstrated a similar pattern across the coach-led and principal-led PBS schools, it is unlikely that the observed patterns are the result of any systematic bias or error; however, this has not been demonstrated statistically. Additionally, the fidelity of PBS implementation was rated on the BoQ rating scale, but was not rated separately by a second evaluator.

Regardless of the limitations, the study adds to the literature base of PBS by describing the implementation procedures of four elementary schools in a large district that had two distinct forms of leadership programs in place. The results showed that both leadership programs were effective in implementation of PBS programming and reducing student behavioral difficulties. The changes in student behavior were greater in the PBS buildings than the two school buildings that did not use PBS programs. Moreover, the study showed that the two types of leadership programs did not vary distinctly in relation
to most results, thereby identifying both as effective means for initiating the processes of PBS in these elementary schools.
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School Climate Survey

School Climate Survey

TO: All school staff
FROM: 

This survey is designed to get the opinions of all school staff concerning the general climate of the school. Your input is very important in helping to better understand how we can improve the working environment at our school. All staff will receive a summary page of the responses. Your responses are strictly confidential and you will not be identified in any way. Thank you for taking the time to respond.

Please check your current position:

___ Teacher  ___ Instructional Support Staff (e.g., counselor, speech/language)
___ Administrator  ___ Non-Instructional Support Staff (e.g., custodian, secretary)

How many years have you worked in your present occupation? ____________

Circle the grade range you work with?  Pre-K  K-2  3-5  All Grades
II. We would like to know how you feel about your school. Please indicate how strongly you agree or disagree with each statement by filling in one of the five responses.

**SCALE: SA = Strongly Agree  A = Agree  NS = Not Sure  D = Disagree  SD = Strongly Disagree**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>SA</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>NS</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Administrators here respect the teachers</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Parents attend Parent-Teacher Association meetings</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. In academic subjects, students are given the same topics every year</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. At this school, parents frequently volunteer to help with special projects</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Students are taught new material every year in each subject</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Parents rarely attend school activities</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Students are given opportunities to express their views on important matters</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Community members are unsupportive of school activities</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Teachers are often disrespected by students</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Staff members at this school know the mission statement of the school</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. The principal has little contact with the teachers</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Teachers use a variety of teaching methods to help their students learn</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. Community members are unwelcome in the school</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. The principal visits teachers' classrooms regularly</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. At this school, parents frequently volunteer to help in the classrooms</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. Students are treated the same regardless of social class</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17. Most students here feel that they can learn</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18. The relationship between the school and community is good</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19. Non-teaching staff are asked to help with decisions on school matters</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20. It is easy to guide the behavior of the students at this school</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21. At this school, students are unfriendly</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22. The principal provides constructive feedback to teachers about their performance</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23. The school is usually too noisy</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24. The school reaches out to the community</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25. Students here are caring people</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26. At this school, students help one another</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27. Few teachers are willing to give students extra lessons after school</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28. Rules are obeyed by students</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29. The principal sets the direction for this school</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30. Students at this school have good self control</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scale: SA = Strongly Agree</td>
<td>A = Agree</td>
<td>NS = Not Sure</td>
<td>D = Disagree</td>
<td>SD = Strongly Disagree</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31. Students are treated the same regardless of race</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32. Staff at this school believe that very few of their students will</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>make it to college</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33. At this school, staff members agree that there is little hope of a</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>good future for their students</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34. Male and female students seem to benefit equally well from instruction</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35. Students at this school do not care about learning</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36. Students regardless of race seem to benefit equally well</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>from instruction</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37. Teachers are given opportunities to express their views</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>on important matters</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38. Male and female students are treated equally well</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39. There is good discipline at this school</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40. At this school, teachers find ways to motivate their students to learn</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41. It is clear that the principal facilitates and guides the</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>management process in the school</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42. The behavior of children at this school is good</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43. This school has a quiet atmosphere conducive to learning</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44. There is good community involvement in the life of the school</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45. Most staff at this school expect many of their students to go on to college</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46. Most staff here agree that many students at this school</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>will not complete high school</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47. Rules are frequently broken by students</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48. The school's administration is sensitive and responsive</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>to the needs of students</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49. Staff at this school see a bright future for their students</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50. Few opportunities are available for parents to give their opinions</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>on school matters</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51. Teachers at this school are committed to helping students learn</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>52. Professional non-teaching staff play an active role in decision-making groups</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>53. Students at this school are unwilling to learn</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>54. Members of the community work closely with school staff</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>to improve the school</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55. This school encourages parent involvement in the day-to-day activities of the school</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>56. The principal usually makes decisions concerning the school</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>without consulting teachers</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
SCALES:  SA = Strongly Agree  A = Agree  NS = Not Sure  D = Disagree  SD = Strongly Disagree

57. Non-teaching staff are given opportunities to express their views on important matters ..............................................  O  O  O  O
58. The same students get chosen every time to participate in after school or special activities ...........................................  O  O  O  O
59. This school is usually clean and tidy .....................................  O  O  O  O
60. Our students are willing and eager to learn .............................  O  O  O  O
61. Parents are given opportunities to express their views on important matters .............................................................  O  O  O  O
62. Parents visit the school on a regular basis .............................  O  O  O  O
63. Teachers at this school expect many of their students to pursue some kind of higher education beyond high school ......................  O  O  O  O
64. Sometimes the school roof leaks ...........................................  O  O  O  O
65. Students are orderly ..............................................................  O  O  O  O
66. Teachers here believe that their students will be among those who will help to solve problems of the future ..................................  O  O  O  O
67. This school has a bright and pleasant appearance ....................  O  O  O  O
68. Some students are treated unfairly by teachers ......................  O  O  O  O
69. This school is a safe place ......................................................  O  O  O  O
70. There are often broken windows or doors in this school ............  O  O  O  O
71. Students here fight a lot ..........................................................  O  O  O  O
72. Teachers at this school try to make school work exciting for students .................................................................  O  O  O  O
73. The walls of this school are usually in good condition ...............  O  O  O  O
74. At this school, staff pay close attention to students' feelings ........  O  O  O  O
75. This school is helping the students to develop into well-adjusted persons .............................................................  O  O  O  O
76. At this school, teachers help students feel good about themselves  O  O  O  O
77. Generally this school is well maintained ..................................  O  O  O  O
78. Teachers at this school generally try to accommodate the different learning styles of the children ...............................  O  O  O  O
79. The curriculum and materials used in this school reflect the ethnic and cultural diversity of students in this school .......................  O  O  O  O
80. Students of all races get along well together at this school ..........  O  O  O  O

Please add any additional comments you might wish in the space below.

We appreciate your taking the time to fill out this questionnaire. Thank you.
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SCORING GUIDE
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Scoring Guide

Completing the Benchmarks of Quality for School-wide Positive Behavior Support (SWPBS)

When & Why
Benchmarks of Quality for School-Wide Positive Behavior Support should be completed in the spring of each school year (Mar/Apr/May). The Benchmarks are used by teams to identify areas of success, areas for improvement, and by the PBS Project to identify model PBS schools.

Procedures for Completing

Step 1—Coaches Scoring
The Coach will use his or her best judgment based on personal experience with the school and the descriptions and exemplars in the Benchmarks of Quality “Scoring Guide” to score each of the 53 items on the Benchmarks of Quality “Scoring Form” (pp. 1 & 2). Do not leave any items blank.

Step 2—Team Member Rating
The coach will give the Benchmarks of Quality “Team Member Rating Form” to each SWPBS Team member to be completed independently and returned to the coach upon completion. Members should be instructed to rate each of the 53 items according to whether the component is “In Place,” “Needs Improvement,” or “Not in Place.” Some of the items relate to product and process development, others to action items; in order to be rated as “In Place;” the item must be developed and implemented (where applicable). Coaches will collect and tally responses and record on the Benchmarks of Quality “Scoring Form” the team’s most frequent response using ++ for “In Place,” + for “Needs Improvement,” and – for “Not In Place.”

Step 3 – Team Report
The coach will then complete the Team Summary on p. 3 of the Benchmarks of Quality “Scoring Form” recording areas of discrepancy, strength and weakness.
Discrepancies—If there were any items for which the team’s most frequent rating varied from the coaches’ rating based upon the Scoring Guide, the descriptions and exemplars from the guide should be shared with the team. This can happen at a team meeting or informally. If upon sharing areas of discrepancy, the coach realizes that there is new information that according to the “Scoring Guide” that would result in a different score, the item and the adjusted final score should be recorded on the “Scoring Form.”

Step 4—Reporting Back to Team
After completing the remainder of the Benchmarks of Quality: “Scoring Form,” the coach will report back to the team using the Team Report page of the Benchmarks of
Quality: “Scoring Form.” If needed, address items of discrepancy and adjust the score. The coach will then lead the team through a discussion of the identified areas of strength (high ratings) and weakness (low ratings). This information should be conveyed as “constructive feedback” to assist with action planning.

**Step 5—Reporting to District Coordinator**
The coach will forward a copies of the *Benchmarks of Quality: “Scoring Form”* and all of the “*Team Member Rating Forms*” to the district coordinator. Based upon the results of the Benchmarks, a PBS faculty member may contact the coach to determine if the school is interested in being considered for “model school” status. Potential “model schools” must agree to participate in on-site follow-up assessments.
### School-wide Benchmarks of Quality: SCORING FORM

**Coach's Name:**

**Date:**

**District:**

#### STEP 1: Coach uses the Scoring Guide to determine appropriate point value. Circle ONLY ONE response.

#### STEP 2: Indicate your team's most frequent response. Write the response in column 2. (in place +++, needs improvement ++, or not in place -). If there is a tie, report the higher score.

#### STEP 3: Place a check next to any item where there is a discrepancy between your rating and the team's rating. Document the discrepancies on page 3.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Critical Elements</th>
<th>STEP 1</th>
<th>STEP 2</th>
<th>STEP 3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PBS Team</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Team has broad representation</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Team has administrative support</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Team has regular meetings (at least monthly)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Team has established a clear mission/purpose</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty Commitment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Faculty are aware of behavior problems across campus (regular data sharing)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Faculty involved in establishing and reviewing goals</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Faculty feedback obtained throughout year</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Effective Procedures for Dealing with Discipline</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Discipline process described in narrative format or depicted in graphic format</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Process includes documentation procedures</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Discipline referral form includes information useful in decision making</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Behaviors defined</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Major/minor behaviors are clearly identified/understood</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. Suggested array of appropriate responses to minor (non office-managed) problem behaviors</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. Suggested array of appropriate responses to major (office-managed) problem behaviors</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Data Entry &amp; Analysis Plan Established</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. Data system to collect and analyze ODR data</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. Additional data collected (attendance, grades, faculty attendance, surveys)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17. Data entered weekly (minimum)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18. Data analyzed monthly (minimum)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19. Data shared with team and faculty monthly (minimum)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expectations &amp; Rules Developed</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20. 3-5 positively stated school-wide expectations posted around school</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21. Expectations apply to both students and staff</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22. Rules developed and posted for specific settings (where problems are prevalent)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23. Rules are linked to expectations</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24. Staff feedback/involvement in expectations/rule development</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Critical Elements</th>
<th>STEP 1</th>
<th>STEP 2</th>
<th>STEP 3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Reward/Recognition Program Established</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25. A system of rewards has elements that are implemented consistently across campus</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26. A variety of methods are used to reward students</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27. Rewards are linked to expectations</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28. Rewards are varied to maintain student interest</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29. System includes opportunities for naturally occurring reinforcement</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30. Ratios of reinforcement to corrections are high</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31. Students are involved in identifying/developing incentives</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32. The system includes incentives for staff/faculty</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Lesson Plans for Teaching Expectations/Rules</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33. A behavioral curriculum includes concept and skill level instruction</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34. Lessons include examples and non-examples</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35. Lessons use a variety of teaching strategies</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36. Lessons are embedded into subject area curriculum</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37. Faculty/staff and students are involved in development &amp; delivery of lesson plans</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38. Strategies to reinforce the lessons with families/community are developed and implemented</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Implementation Plan</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39. Develop, schedule and deliver plans to teach staff the discipline and data system</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40. Develop, schedule and deliver plans to teach staff the lesson plans for teaching students</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41. Develop, schedule and deliver plans for teaching students expectations/rules/rewards</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42. Booster sessions for students and staff are planned, scheduled, and delivered</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43. Schedule for rewards/incentives for the year is planned</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44. Plans for orienting incoming staff and students are developed and implemented</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45. Plans for involving families/community are developed &amp; implemented</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Crisis Plan</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46. Faculty/staff are taught how to respond to crisis situations</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47. Responding to crisis situations is rehearsed</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48. Procedures for crisis situations are readily accessible</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Evaluation</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49. Students and staff are surveyed about PBIS</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50. Students and staff can identify expectations and rules</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51. Staff use discipline system/documentation appropriately</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>52. Staff use reward system appropriately</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>53. Outcomes (behavior problems, attendance, morale) are documented and used to evaluate PBIS plan</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**TOTAL**

Benchmarks Scoring Form: 2005.doc 2/21/2005
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Universal PBS Program Matrix Distributed During Team Training

Objective 1: Creating Guiding Behavioral Expectations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Task</th>
<th>Product/Procedure</th>
<th>Begin Date</th>
<th>End Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Use existing codes of conduct, school rules, programs to create 4-5 Guiding behavioral expectations</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Present initial list to faculty and staff, highlighting areas of concern they identified in survey and ask for feedback</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Compile faculty and staff suggestions and modify list</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Present modified list to faculty and staff and ask for feedback</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Present modified list to key students/student groups and ask for feedback</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finalize guiding behavioral expectations</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Objective 2: Defining Behavioral Expectations**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Task</th>
<th>Product/Procedure</th>
<th>Begin Date</th>
<th>End Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Create global definitions for each behavioral expectation ~ what meeting the expectation would look like, what not meeting the expectation would look like</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Define behavioral expectations for different areas of school</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Present definitions to faculty, staff and students/student groups and ask for feedback</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finalize definitions</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Objective 3: Acknowledging Appropriate Behavior**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Task</th>
<th>Product/Procedure</th>
<th>Begin Date</th>
<th>End Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Individualized student system</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What will serve as the token?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Giving tokens</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Where are tokens given?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• By whom are tokens given?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• For what specific behaviors are tokens given?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Handing in tokens</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Who keeps the tokens?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• How are records maintained for tokens?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Rewards for students</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• How often are rewards provided?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• What are the rewards?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Can community resources be tapped?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Rewards for staff</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How are staff members recognized?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How are staff members rewarded?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Objective 3: Acknowledging Appropriate Behavior continued

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group systems</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>What groups can be rewarded?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How often should group rewards be presented?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What are group rewards?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School systems</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>What should earn school rewards?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How often should school rewards be presented?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What are school rewards?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Objective 4: Teaching Behavioral Expectations**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Task</th>
<th>Product/Procedure</th>
<th>Begin Date</th>
<th>End Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Identify where expectations will be taught to all students</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teach Expectations</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Teach specific types of behavior what are rewarded in relation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>to each expectation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Teach specific types of behavior that are punished in relation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>to each expectation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Objective 5: Advertising Behavioral Expectations**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Task</th>
<th>Product/Procedure</th>
<th>Begin Date</th>
<th>End Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Have school clubs, homerooms, grade levels compete for the best poster</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Post poster, signs throughout school</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Create and send flyer/newsletter home explaining the program</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Post behavioral expectations on school website</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX D

SAMPLE SWIS REPORTS
APPENDIX D

Sample SWIS Reports
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APPENDIX E

SAMPLE BEHAVIORAL EXPECTATIONS’ POSTER—BROWN

ELEMENTARY SCHOOL
APPENDIX E

Sample Behavioral Expectations’ Poster

Brown Elementary School

Brown Tiger Pride

Brown Tigers ARE:

Respectful
Responsible
Ready to learn
APPENDIX F

SAMPLE REWARD TICKET—BROWN ELEMENTARY SCHOOL
APPENDIX F

Sample Reward Ticket—Brown Elementary School

Brown Tiger Pride

_________________________  ________  _____
Student Name                             Room #     Grade

I AM:
RESPECTFUL
RESPONSIBLE
READY TO LEARN

____________________________
Teacher
APPENDIX G

SAMPLE CHART—DEFINITIONS OF BEHAVIORAL
EXPECTATIONS—BROWN ELEMENTARY SCHOOL
# APPENDIX G

Sample Chart—Definitions of Behavioral Expectations—Brown Elementary School

## BROWN TIGER PRIDE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>BROWN EXPECTATIONS</th>
<th>RESPECTFUL</th>
<th>RESPONSIBLE</th>
<th>READY TO LEARN</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>ARRIVAL</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stress appropriately</td>
<td>Arrive on time</td>
<td></td>
<td>Have all materials for school</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Walk</td>
<td>Stand in correct line</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enter school quietly</td>
<td>Follow school rules</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>DISMISSAL</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Listen for directions</td>
<td>Take material home</td>
<td></td>
<td>Follow directions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exit school quietly</td>
<td>Go to correct bus</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stay with your teacher</td>
<td>Students waiting to be picked</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Walk</td>
<td>Go to the office</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Follow school rules</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>BREAKFAST</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enter quietly</td>
<td>Enter in 2 lines</td>
<td></td>
<td>Take all materials with you</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pick up tray</td>
<td>Clean area when finished</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Set tables from back to front</td>
<td>Throw away trash</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Use manners</td>
<td>Follow school rules</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Follow directions</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exit quietly</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>LUNCH</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enter quietly</td>
<td>Enter in 2 lines</td>
<td></td>
<td>Take all materials with you</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pick up tray</td>
<td>Clean area when finished</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sit at class assigned table</td>
<td>Throw away trash</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Use manners</td>
<td>Follow school rules</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Follow directions</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exit quietly</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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