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PurposE

1. Summarize & discuss big ideas, current events, & future considerations related to SCTG/MTSS/PBIS.

2. Review & discuss themes that ground SCTG/MTSS/PBIS practice & systems implementation.

3. Shape & discuss “outcomes” related to student benefit, implementation fidelity, sustainability, & scaling.
Why Invest in Schools?
Keeps me up at night!

- Events & images of VIOLENT & DISRESPECTFUL behavior
- Degradation of SCIENTIFIC knowledge, methods, & decision making
- IMPLEMENTATION IN-FIDELITY of evidence-based practices
- Prioritization of INEFFECTIVE PRACTICES
- NEGATIVE classroom & school CLIMATE & CULTURE
- Subjective non-data-based decision making
- Increasing economic, social, & political GAPS & POLARIZATION
- Harassment, discrimination, & BULLYING behavior
Schools are one of our most structured, predictable, continuous social support systems

- Academic success
- Social, emotional, & behavioral success
- Positive adults modeling
- Neighborhood availability
- Specialized supports
- Caring, professional adults
- Positive classroom & school climate

12+ yrs., 180 days/yr., 6 hrs./day
Schools, LEAs, SEAs as Effective Organizations

“Organizations are groups of individuals whose collective behaviors are directed toward a common goal & maintained by a common outcome”

(Skinner, 1953, Science of Human Behavior)

Systems Outcomes

Common VISION & objectives
Common LANGUAGE
Common EXPERIENCES & ROUTINES
Quality LEADERSHIP & coaching
Updated Ruminations on Challenge
Students’ Relationships in School and Feelings About Personal Safety at School

2015 Nationally Representative Sample Survey

Perceptions of school safety & neighborhood crime of 12-18 year olds.

USDoE NCES March 2018

Analysis for this report is restricted to the SCS respondents who were enrolled in grades 6 through 12 and who did not receive any part of their education through homeschooling during the school year.
Regardless of perceptions of crime, 95% students reported feeling safe at school.

Post 2016??
More likely to report feeling safe at school if access to adult or student

Post 2016??

Among students who agreed there was a lot of crime in their home neighborhoods, those who agreed that they felt safe at school also agreed that there was a teacher or adult at school who really cared about them (93.5 percent) and really listened when they had something to say (96.4 percent) at higher rates than students who did not feel safe at school (73.8 percent and 76.5 percent, respectively).

Among students who agreed there was a lot of crime in their school neighborhoods, those who also agreed that they felt safe at school more often agreed that there was a teacher or adult at school who really cared about them (94.0 percent) than students who did not feel safe at school (81.1 percent).

Among students who agreed there was a lot of crime in their school neighborhoods, those who also agreed that they felt safe at school more often agreed that there was a student school who really cared about them (93.6 percent) than students who did not feel safe at school.
2015 Nationally Representative Sample Survey

Perceptions of bullying victimization & hate-related words of 12-18 year olds.

USDoE NCES March 2018
2007-2015
Decreases in rates of reported bullying & hate-related words

Post 2016??

NOTE: "Bullied" includes students being made fun of, called names, or insulted; being the subject of rumors; being threatened with harm; being pushed, shoved, tripped, or spit on; being pressured into doing things they did not want to do; being excluded from activities on purpose; and having property destroyed on purpose. "At school" includes the school building, school property, school bus, or going to and from school. Tabular data for percentages are available in table 11.5 at [https://nces.ed.gov/pubs2017/2017004.pdf](https://nces.ed.gov/pubs2017/2017004.pdf).
2007-2015
Decreases in rates of reported frequent bullying & increases in telling adult

Post 2016??
5850 to 6,121 increase (4.6%) total hate crime incidents (6.4% 2014)

19% rise anti-Muslim hate crimes

5% increase (3,310 to 3,489) race/ethnic hate crimes

- 58% race (1/2 black)
- 1/5 religious bias
- 1/6 sexual orientation bias

4.6% increase in hate crime incidents: anti-Muslim, race/ethnicity, religion, sexual orientation

Offenders: 46% white, 25% black
Revisiting Violence Prevention Logic: Risk & Protective Factors
Implementation Challenge: Risk & Protective Factors

Risk Factors

Vs

Protective Factors
Implementation Challenge

Risk Factors vs Protective Factors

- Mental illness
- Disability
- Substance Use
- Antisocial behavior

Examples

Risk Factors
- Protective Factors
Risk Factors vs Protective Factors

Examples:

- Mental illness
- Disability
- Substance Use
- Antisocial behavior

- Academic competence
- Healthy habits
- Interpersonal skills
- Self-management skills

Implementation Challenge
Risk Factors

- Trauma
- Negative modelling
- Family, school, community disruption
- Discrimination

Protective Factors

- Academic competence
- Healthy habits
- Interpersonal skills
- Self-management skills

Implementation Challenge

Examples

Risk Enhancers

Vs
Risk Factors
- Protective Factors

Self-management skills
- Interpersonal skills
- Healthy habits
- Academic competence
- Interpersonal skills
- Self-management skills

Risk Enhancers
- Trauma
- Negative modelling
- Family, school, community disruption
- Discrimination

Implementation Challenge

INEFFECTIVE RESPONSE
- Reactive management
- Exclusion, segregation, isolation
- Train & hope
- Non-evidence-based practices
- Subjective decision making
- Low quality implementation of evidence-based practices

Examples
- INEFFECTIVE RESPONSE
  - Reactive management
  - Exclusion, segregation, isolation
  - Train & hope
  - Non-evidence-based practices
  - Subjective decision making
  - Low quality implementation of evidence-based practices

Vs
- Protective Factors
- Academic competence
- Healthy habits
- Interpersonal skills
- Self-management skills
**Implementation Challenge**

**INEFFECTIVE RESPONSE**
- Reactive management
- Exclusion, segregation, isolation
- Train & hope
- Non-evidence-based practices
- Subjective decision making
- Low quality implementation of evidence-based practices

**Risk Enhancers**
- Trauma
- Negative modelling
- Family, school, community disruption
- Discrimination

**EFFECTIVE RESPONSE**
- Prevention-based behavioral sciences
- Tiered support systems
- Data-based decision making teaming
- Continuous coached professional development
- High fidelity implementation

**Protective Factors**
- Academic competence
- Healthy habits
- Interpersonal skills
- Self-management skills
Decision-Driven Data Systems
26,424 schools identified as using PBIS across 50 states, DC, & Guam (>14 million students)
Number of Schools Implementing PBIS by Year
June 2018

26,424 schools identified as using PBIS across 50 states, DC, & Guam (>14 million students)
21 States >500 Schools
Proportion of Schools Implementing PBIS by State
August 3, 2017

14 States >40% Schools
Schools Reporting PBIS Tier I Fidelity
August 3, 2017

14,324 Schools Reporting Tier I Fidelity
9,564 (65%) Schools Meeting PBIS Tier I Fidelity Criterion
9,407 Schools Reporting Tier II Fidelity

3,114 (33%) Schools Meeting PBIS Tier II Fidelity Criteria
Schools Reporting PBIS Tier III Fidelity
August 3, 2017

9,407 Schools Reporting Tier III Fidelity
1,837 (19%) Schools Meeting PBIS Tier III Fidelity Criterion
Major ODR per Grade Level (triangle): 2016-17
Horner et al.

13.4 - Mean Percentage Students (2016-17 Reg Ed) (Majors Only)

Most students respond T1

~8-15% T2/3 (excl. “Other”)

12.6%
## Major ODR per Grade Level (triangle): 2016-17

**Horner et al.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Grade Level</th>
<th>Mean Percentage ODRs (2016-17 Reg Ed)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PreK-K</td>
<td>~75-85% T2/3 (excl. “Other”)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elementary</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Middle</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PreK-8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PreK-12</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Others</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

12.6% students = 84% major ODR

Few % students occasion much attention
“Bet your next month’s salary!!”

- Reduced major disciplinary infractions & antisocial behavior.
- Improvement in aggressive behavior, concentration, prosocial behavior, & emotional regulation
- Improvements in academic achievement
- Enhanced perception of organizational health & safety
- Reductions in teacher & student reported bullying behavior, peer rejection, & substance abuse
- Improved school climate
“Fix These, NOW!

Not Equal!

- Aggression
- Bullying behavior
- Non-compliance
- Insubordination
- Social withdrawal
- Truancy
- Harassment
- Non-compliance
- Mental illness
- Unemployment
- Deviant sexual behavior

- Restraint & seclusion
- Dropping out
- Out of school suspension
- Negative climate
- Bullying behavior
- Probation & parole
- Hate crime
- Self-injury
- Disproportionality
- Gun possession
- Weapon possession
- Probation & parole
- In school detention
- Out of school suspension
- Probation & parole
- Arrests & incarceration
- Probation & parole
- Mental health referral
- Disproportionality
- Mental illness
- School failure
- Harming animals
- Substance use
- Law/norm violations
- Office referral

- Achievement gap
- Unemployment
- School-to-prison pipeline
- Trauma
- Self-injury
- Negative climate
- Hate crime
- Deviant sexual behavior
- Fix These, NOW!
- Harming animals
- Fix These, NOW!
- Fix These, NOW!
- Fix These, NOW!
- Fix These, NOW!
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>STUDENT BEHAVIOR</th>
<th>ADULT BEHAVIOR</th>
<th>OUTCOMES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Aggression</td>
<td>Office referral</td>
<td>Disproportionality</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bullying behavior</td>
<td></td>
<td>Dropping out</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-compliance</td>
<td>In school detention</td>
<td>School failure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Insubordination</td>
<td>Out of school suspension</td>
<td>Mental illness</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social w/withdrawal</td>
<td>Probation &amp; parole</td>
<td>School-to-prison pipeline</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Truancy</td>
<td>Arrests &amp; incarceration</td>
<td>Achievement gap</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Law/norm violations</td>
<td>Restraint &amp; seclusion</td>
<td>Unemployment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Substance use</td>
<td>Mental health referral</td>
<td>Delinquency</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weapon possession</td>
<td></td>
<td>Negative climate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harassment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-injury</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Apply Behavior Analytic Logic
General

- Evidence-based
- Data Driven
- Trauma-informed
- Preventive & constructive
- Culturally, developmentally reflective
- Aligned & integrated
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tier</th>
<th>Outcomes</th>
<th>Data</th>
<th>Practices</th>
<th>Systems</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Tier 3</td>
<td>•</td>
<td></td>
<td>•</td>
<td>•</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tier 2</td>
<td>•</td>
<td>•</td>
<td>•</td>
<td>•</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tier 1</td>
<td>•</td>
<td>•</td>
<td>•</td>
<td>•</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
McIntosh et al., 3 October 2018 SCTG Preconference

Research-based Sustainability Drivers

School
• Team
• Data collection use
• Data collection sharing with staff
• Classroom PBIS

District

State
• State team
• Centralized training curriculum
• Implementation Blueprint
• Self-Assessment

“Precorrectable” Misrules
• One-person initiative
• One funding source
• Contextualized data
• Standalone initiative

Improve environment to promote desirable behavior in predictable problem situation (Colvin)
PBIS/MTSS State Leadership Meeting
“Lessons & Big Ideas”
8 August 2018 Denver
Don Kincaid et al.
APBS State PBIS Leaders Network Meeting

- Over 100 members in the Network
- 82 leaders from 36 states met in Denver in August for two days
- Mission: To connect, collaborate, and grow to implement PBIS wider and deeper by matching support to state needs
- Results: 6 workgroups were formed:
  - Integration of initiatives
  - Scale-up
  - Political support
  - Funding
  - Extension of PBIS into new areas
  - Policy
- Meeting again Thursday from 2:30-5:00
15 minute SEA Table Discussion

“What are you doing to enhance SEA implementation capacity?”

1. Name & describe implementation driver.
2. Describe 1 precorrection strategy (error prevention).
3. Describe 1 sustainability strategy.
Results revealed that the PGD strategy produced significant improvements in academic engaged time and reductions in disruptive behavior. Moreover, results from a social validity questionnaire indicated that teachers found the PGD strategy to be feasible, reasonable, and acceptable.


https://doi-org.ezproxy.lib.uconn.edu/10.1177/1098300717753831

**PGD = INCREASE in academic engagement upon entering classroom**

**PGD = DECREASE in disruptive behavior upon entering classroom**
1. Personal Greeting & Interaction
   - Name, fistbump, high-5, etc.

2. Precorrective Task
   - Tell me, show me, do for me, etc.

3. Positive Reinforcement
   - Specific verbal praise, gesture, authentic social, etc.

**WHEN & WHERE:** Every major transition….throughout year, especially, beginning of year, grading period, return from breaks, Mondays, etc.

**EXAMPLES:** Entering/exiting building, classroom, lunchroom, sporting event, assembly, library, office, bus,
Schools = excellent **PREVENTION** opportunity (6 hrs/day, 180 days/yr) that can be safe, predictable, positive for ALL students

**BEHAVIORAL SCIENCES** serve as useful theory of action/change

Positive, doable, effective **PRACTICES** exist to maximize academic/behavioral success

Implementation **SYSTEMS** needed for students to experience & benefit from effective practices

**DECISION**-based **DATA** systems to inform actions

Consideration of **CULTURE & STUDENT BENEFIT** needed to guide decisions & actions