

CHAPTER 12: REFERENCES AND RESOURCES

Chapter 1

- Baer, D. M., Wolf, M. M., & Risley, T. R. (1968). Some current dimensions of applied behavior analysis. *Journal of applied behavior analysis*, 1(1), 91-97.
- Bijou, S., & Baer, D., (1961). *Child development I: A systematic and theory*. Englewood Cliffs, JG: Prentice-Hall.
- Cook, C. R., Mayer, G. R., Browning-Wright, D., Kraemer, B., Wallace, M. D., Dart, E., Collins, T., & Restori, A. (2012). Exploring the link among Behavior Intervention Plans, treatment integrity, and student outcomes under natural educational conditions. *Journal of Special Education*, 46 (1), 3-16.
- Crone, D. & Horner, R. H. (2003). *Building positive behavior support systems in schools*. New York: Guilford Press.
- Crone, D., Hawkin, L. S., & Horner, R. H. (2015). *Building positive behavior support systems in schools*. 2nd Ed. New York: Guilford Press.
- Dowdy, E., Furlong, M., Raines, T.C., Boverly, B., Kauffman, K., Kamphaus, R., Dever, B., Price, M., & Murdock, J. (2015). Enhancing school-based mental health services with a preventative and promotive approach to universal screening for complete mental health. *Journal of Educational and Psychological Consultation*, 25(2/ 3), 178-197.
- Elliott, S. N., & Gresham, F. M. (2007). *Social skills improvement system: Classwide intervention program*. Minneapolis, MN: Pearson Assessments.
- Ervin, R. A., Radford . P. M., Berisch, K., Piper, A. L., Ehrhardt. K. E., & Poling. A. (2001). A descriptive analysis and critique of the empirical literature on school-based functional assessment. *School Psychology Review*, 30, 193-210.
- Gage, N. A., Lewis, T. J., & Stichter, J. P. (2012). Functional behavioral assessment-based interventions for students with or at risk for emotional and/or behavioral disorders in school: A hierarchical linear modeling meta-analysis. *Behavioral Disorders*, 37(2), 55-77.
- Gall, G., Pagano, M. E., Desmond, M. S., Perrin, J. M., & Murphy, J. M. (2000). Utility of psychosocial screening at a school-based health center. *The Journal of School Health*, 70(7), 292-298.
- Hoff, K. E., Ervin, R. A., & Friman, P. C. (2005). Refining functional behavioral assessment: Analyzing the separate and combined effects of hypothesized controlling variables during ongoing classroom routines. *School Psychology Review*, 34, 45-57.
- Humensky, J., Kuwabara, S. A., Fogel, J., Wells, C., Goodwin, B., & Van Voorhees, B. W. (2010). Adolescents with depressive symptoms and their challenges with learning in school. *Journal of School Nursing*, 26(5), 377-392.

- Kilgus, S. P., & Eklund, K. R. (2016). Consideration of base rates within universal screening for behavioral and emotional risk: A novel procedural framework. *School Psychology Forum*, 10(1), 120-130.
- Loman, S. L., & Horner, R. H. (2013). Examining the efficacy of a basic functional behavioral assessment training package for school personnel. *Journal of Positive Behavior Interventions*, 1098300712470724.
- Loman, S., Strickland-Cohen, M. K., Borgmeier, C., & Horner, R. (2013). Basic FBA to BSP Trainer's Manual.
- March, R., Horner, R.H., Lewis-Palmer, L., Brown, D., Crone, D., Todd, A.W., & Carr, E. (1999). *Functional assessment checklist for teachers and Staff (FACTS)*. Eugene,OR: Department of Educational and Community Supports, University of Oregon.
- McIntosh, K., Brown, J. A., & Borgmeier, C. J. (2008). Validity of Functional Behavior Assessment within an RTI framework: Evidence and future directions. *Assessment for Effective Intervention*, 34, 6-14.
- Nelson, J. R., Benner, G. J., Lane, K., & Smith, B. W. (2004). Academic achievement of k-12 students with emotional and behavior disorders. *Exceptional Children*, 71(1), 59-73.
- Newcomer, L., & Lewis, T. J. (2004). Functional behavioral assessment: An investigation of assessment reliability and effectiveness. *Journal of Emotional and Behavioral Disorders*, 12, 168-181.
- Payne, L. D., Scott, T. M., & Conroy, M. (2007). A school-based examination of the efficacy of function-based intervention. *Behavioral Disorders*, 32 (3), 158-174.
- Schalock, R. L. (1996). Reconsidering the conceptualization and measurement of quality of life. In R. L. Schalock (Ed.), *Quality of life: Vol. I. Conceptualization and measurement*. Washington, DC: American Association on Mental Retardation.
- Scott, T.M., Anderson, C., Mancil, R., & Alter, P. (2009). Implementing function-based support within schoolwide positive behavior support. In Sailor, D., Dunlap, G., Sugai, G., & Horner, R. (Ed.) *Handbook of positive behavior support*. New York: Springer Science+Business Media.
- Scott, T.M., & Kamps, D.M. (2007). The future of functional behavioral assessment in school settings. *Behavioral Disorders*, 32(3), 146-157. May 2007. Retrieved August 14, 2012, from <http://www.ccbd.net/sites/default/files/BD%2032-03-146.pdf>.
- Skinner, B. F. (1953). *Science and human behavior*. Simon and Schuster.
- Strickland-Cohen, M. K., & Horner, R. H. (2015). Typical School Personnel Developing and Implementing Basic Behavior Support Plans. *Journal of Positive Behavior Interventions*, 1098300714554714.
- Tilly, W. D., Reschly, D. J., & Grimes, J. P. (1998). Disability determination in problem solving systems: Conceptual foundations and critical components. In D. J. Reschly, W. D. Tilly & J. P. Grimes (Eds.), *Functional and noncategorical identification and intervention in special education* (pp. 285-300). Des Moines, IA: State of Iowa Department of Education.
- Wehmeyer, M. L. (1996). Self-determination as an educational outcome: Why is it important to children, youth and adults with disabilities? In D. J. Sands & M. L. Wehmeyer (Eds.), *Self-determination across the life span: Independence and choice for people with disabilities* (pp. 15-34). Baltimore: Paul H. Brookes.
- Wehmeyer, M.L., & Schalock, R.L., (2001). Self-determination and quality of life: Implications for special education services and supports. Focus on Exceptional Children.

Wheeler, J. J., & Mayton, M. R. (2010). Other innovative techniques: Positive behavior supports and response to intervention. *Current issues and trends in special education: Identification, assessment and instruction*, 19, 175-195.

Wills, H. P., Kamps, D., Hansen, B., Conklin, C., Bellinger, S., Neaderhiser, J., & Nsubuga, B. (2009). The classwide function-based intervention team program. *Preventing School Failure: Alternative Education for Children and Youth*, 54(3), 164-171.

Chapter 2

Lewis, T.J. (2009). Increasing family participation through SW-PBS. In Sailor, D., Dunlap, G., Sugai, G., & Horner, R. (Ed.) *Handbook of positive behavior support*. New York: Springer Science+Business Media.

Chapter 3

Crone, D., Hawken, L.S. & Horner, R.H. (2010). *Responding to problem behavior in schools: The behavior education program* (2nd ed.). New York: The Guilford Press.

Crone, D., Hawkin, L. S., & Horner, R. H. (2015). *Building positive behavior support systems in schools*. (2nd ed.). New York: Guilford Press.

Crone, D. & Horner, R. H. (2003). *Building positive behavior support systems in schools*. New York: Guilford Press.

Goh, A. E., & Bambara, L. M. (2012). Individualized positive behavior support in school settings: A meta-analysis. *Remedial and Special Education*, 33(5), 271-286.

Newton, J. S., Todd, A., Horner, R., Algozzine, B., & Algozzine, K. M. (2009). Direct observation, recording and analysis. *Eugene, OR: University of Oregon, Educational and Community Supports*.

Scott, T.M., Anderson, C., Mancil, R., & Alter, P. (2009). Implementing function-based support within schoolwide positive behavior support. In Sailor, D., Dunlap, G., Sugai, G., & Horner, R. (Ed.) *Handbook of positive behavior support*. New York: Springer Science+Business Media.

Chapter 4

Anderson, C. & Scott, T. (2009). Implementing function-based support within schoolwide positive behavior support. In Sailor, D., Dunlap, G., Sugai, G., & Horner, R. (Ed.) *Handbook of positive behavior support*. New York: Springer Science+Business Media.

Center for Effective Collaboration and Practice. (1998). *An IEP team's introduction to functional behavioral assessment and Behavior Intervention Plans*. Washington, DC: American Institutes for Research. Retrieved June 11, 2011 from <http://cecp.air.org/fba/problembehavior2/text2.htm#direct1>.

Colvin, G. (2009). *Managing noncompliance and defiance in the classroom*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Corwin.

- Crone, D. & Horner, R. H. (2003). *Building positive behavior support systems in schools*. New York: Guilford Press.
- Elliott, S.N., Gresham, F.M., Frank, J.L., & Beddow, P.A. (2008). Intervention validity of social behavior rating scales. *Assessment for Effective Intervention*, 34(1), 15 -24.
- Goodman, R. (1997). The strengths and difficulties questionnaire: A research note. *Journal of Child Psychology and Psychiatry*, 38(5), 581-586.
- Goodman, S. (2011, September). *Ask the experts response from Steve Goodman*. Washington, D.C.: RTI Action Network. Retrieved September 20, 2011, from <http://rtinetwork.org/connect/479-behavior-supports-q7>
- Kamphaus, R. W. & Reynolds, C. R. (2007). *Behavioral and emotional screening system manual*. Minneapolis, MN: Pearson.
- LeBuffe, P. & Naglieri, J. (2003). *The Devereux Early Childhood Assessment Clinical Form (DECA-C): A measure of behaviors related to risk and resilience in preschool children*. Lewisville, NC: Kaplan.
- Lembke, E. (2010). *Ask the experts response from Erica Lembke*. Washington, D.C.: National Center on Response to Intervention. Retrieved May 19, 2011, from <http://www.rti4success.org/resources/ask-expert>
- McIntosh, K. (August 25, 2011) personal communication.
- Merrell, K. W. (2003). *Preschool and Kindergarten Behavior Scales - Second Edition*. Austin, TX: Pro-Ed.
- Neisworth, J. T., Bagnato, S. J., Salvia, J., & Hunt, F. M. (1999). *TABS Manual for the Temperament and Atypical Behavior Scale: Early Childhood Indicators of Developmental Dysfunction*. Paul H. Brookes Publishing Co., PO Box 10624, Baltimore, MD 21285-0624
- Radford, P. (2008). Determining the response in RTI: Response to Hintze: Conceptual & empirical issues related to Developing a Response-to-Intervention Framework. [Audio Podcast]. National Center on Student Progress Monitoring. Retrieved June 10, 2011, from <http://www.studentprogress.org/weblibrary.asp#tools>
- Sprague, J., Cook, C., Wright, D., & Sadler, C. (2008). *RTI and behavior: A guide to integrating behavioral and academic supports*. Horsham, Pennsylvania: LRP Publications.
- Squires, J., & Bricker, D., (2009). *Age and stages questionnaire: Third Ed*. Baltimore, MD: Brookes.
- Todd, A. W., Horner, R. H., Sugai, G., & Colvin, G. (1999). Individualizing school-wide discipline for students with chronic problem behaviors: A team approach. *Effective School Practices*, 17(4), 72-82.
- University of Oregon PBIS Workgroup. (July 2010). *Growth in the cumulative number of ODRs in elementary school settings. Evaluation brief*. Eugene, OR: Educational and Community Supports, University of Oregon.
- Walker, H. M. & Severson, H. H. (1992). *Systematic screening for behavior disorders (SSBD). Second edition*. Longmont, CO: Sopris West.

Chapter 5

- Alberto, P. A., & Troutman, A. C. (2012). *Applied behavior analysis for teachers* (8th ed.). Upper Saddle River, NJ: Pearson.
- Baer, D. M., Wolf, M. M., & Risley, T. R. (1968). Some current dimensions of applied behavior analysis. *Journal of applied behavior analysis*, 1(1), 91-97.
- Crone, D., Hawken, L.S. & Horner, R.H. (2010). *Responding to problem behavior in schools: The behavior education program* (2nd ed.). New York: The Guilford Press.
- Crone, D., Hawken, L.S. & Horner, R.H. (2015). *Building positive support systems in schools, second edition: Functional behavioral assessment* (2nd ed.). New York: The Guilford Press.
- Crone, D. & Horner, R. H. (2003). *Building positive behavior support systems in schools*. New York: Guilford Press.
- Derby, K. M., Wacker D. P., Sasso G., Steege M., Northup J., Cigrand K., & Asmus, J. (1992). Brief functional assessments techniques to evaluate aberrant behavior in an outpatient setting: A summary of 79 cases. *Journal of Applied Behavior Analysis*, 25, 713–721.
- Hanley G. P., Iwata B. A., & McCord B. E. (2003). Functional analysis of problem behavior: A review. *Journal of Applied Behavior Analysis*, 36, 147–185.
- Lane, K.L., Rogers, L.A., Parks, R.J., Weisenbach, J.L., Mau, A.C., Merwin, M.T. & Bergman, W.A. (2007). Function-based interventions for students who are nonresponsive to primary and secondary prevention efforts: Illustrations at the elementary and middle school levels. *Journal of Emotional and Behavioral Disorders*, 3, 169-184.
- Lane, K. L., Weisenbach, J. L., Little, M. A., Phillips, A., & Wehby, J. (2006). Illustrations of function-based interventions implemented by general education teachers: Building capacity at the school site. *Education and Treatment of Children*, 29, 549-671.
- Loman, S.L. (2009). *ABC Recording Form*. In *Practical FBA: Participants guidebook to the practical functional behavioral assessment training manual for school-based personnel*. www.pbis.org.
- Loman, S. & Borgmeier, C. (2010). *Practical functional behavioral assessment training manual for school-based personnel*. Portland, OR: Portland State University.
- March, R. E., Horner, R. H., Lewis-Palmer, T., Brown, D., Crone, D. A., Todd, A. W., & Carr, E. G. (2000). *Functional assessment checklist for teachers and staff (FACTS)*. Eugene: University of Oregon.
- Sugai, G., & Horner, R. (2009). *Behavior function: Staying close to what we know*. Retrieved May 12, 2011 from www.pbis.org/pbis_newsletter/volume_1/issue1.aspx
- Sugai, G., Horner, R., Dunlap, G., Hieneman, M., Lewis, T, Nelson, M., Scott, T., Liaupsin, C, Sailor, W., Turnbull, A., Rutherford, H., Wickham, D., Ruef, M., & Wikox, B. (1999). Applying positive behavioral support and Functional Behavior Assessment in schools. *Journal of Positive Behavior Interventions & Supports*, 2(3), 131-143.

- Sugai G., Horner, R. H., Lewis, T. J., Dunlap, G., Hieneman, M., Nelson, C. M., Scott, T, Liaupsin, C., Sailor, W., Turnbull A. P., Turnbull, H. R., Wickham, D., Ruef, M. & Wilcox, B. (1999). *Applying positive behavioral support and functional behavioral assessment in schools*. OSEP Center on Positive Behavioral Interventions and Support Technical Assistance Guide 1 (Version 1.4.4).
- Sugai, G., Sprague, J.R., Horner, R.H., & Walker, H.M. (2000). Preventing school violence. The use of office discipline referrals to assess and monitor schoolwide discipline interventions. *Journal of Emotional and Behavioral Disorders*, 9(2), 94-101.
- Sulzer-Azaroff, B. & Mayer, R. (1991). *Behavior analysis for lasting change*. Fort Worth, TX: Holt, Reinhart & Winston, Inc.
- Van Norman, R. (2008). ABC recording form. Eds. JO Cooper, TE Heron, & WL Heward. *Applied Behavior Analysis: Second Edition*. Pearson: Upper Saddle River, NJ.

Chapter 6

- Anderson, C., & Horner, R.H. (2008, October). *Developing feasible and effective interventions based on functional behavioral assessment*. PBIS Leadership Forum, Chicago, IL.
- Bowers, F.E., Woods, D.W., Carlyon, W.D., & Friman, P.C. (2000). Using positive peer reporting to improve the social interactions and acceptance of socially isolated adolescents in residential care: A systematic replication. *Journal of Applied Behavior Analysis*, 33, 239-242.
- Chandler, C. L., & Connell, J. P. (1987). Children's intrinsic, extrinsic and internalized motivation: A developmental study of children's reason for liked and disliked behaviours. *British Journal of Developmental Psychology*, 5(4), 357-365.
- Colvin, G., (2004). *Managing the cycle of acting out behavior in the classroom*. Eugene, OR: Behavior Associates.
- Crone, D., Hawken, L.S. & Horner, R.H. (2010). *Responding to problem behavior in schools: The behavior education program* (2nd ed.). New York: The Guilford Press.
- Crone, D. & Horner, R. H. (2003). *Building positive behavior support systems in schools*. New York: Guilford Press.
- Deci, E. L., & Ryan, R. (1985). *Intrinsic motivation and self-determination in human behavior*. New York: Plenum.
- Ervin, R.A., Miller, P.M., & Friman, P.C. (1996). Feed the hungry bee: Using positive peer reports to improve the social interactions and acceptance of a socially rejected girl in a residential placement. *Journal of Applied Behavior Analysis*, 29, 251-253.
- George, M.P. (2000). Establishing and promoting disciplinary practices at the building level that ensure safe, effective, and nurturing school environments. In L.M. Bullock & R.A. Gable (Eds.), *Positive academic and behavioral supports: Creating safe, effective, and nurturing schools for all students*. Reston, VA: Council for Exceptional Children.
- Grieger, T., Kaufman, J.M., & Grieger, R. (1976). Effects of peer reporting on cooperative play and aggression of kindergarten children. *Journal of School Psychology*, 14, 307-313.

- Iwaszuk, W. M., Lupo, J., & Wills, H. (under review). Classroom-based intervention at the high school level: A modification of the Class-Wide Function-related Intervention Teams (CW-FIT). *Behavior Modification*.
- Jones, K.M., Young, M.M., & Friman, P.C. (2000). Increasing peer praise of socially rejected delinquent youth: Effects on cooperation and acceptance. *School Psychology Quarterly*, 15, 30-39.
- Kamps, D., Wills, H., Heitzman-Powell, L., Laylin, J., Szoke, C., Hobohm, T., & Culey, A. (2011). Class-Wide Function-Related Intervention Teams: Effects of group contingency programs in urban classrooms. *Journal of Positive Behavior Interventions*, 13, 154-167.
- Loman, S. & Borgmeier, C. (2010). *Practical functional behavioral assessment training manual for school-based personnel*. Portland, OR: Portland State University.
- O'Neill, R.E., Horner, R.H., Albin, R. W., Sprague, J.R., Storey, K. & Newton, J.S. (1997). *Functional assessment and program development for problem behavior*. Belmont, CA: Brooks/Cole Cengage Learning.
- Robinson, S.L. (1998). Effects of positive statements made by peers on peer interactions and social status of children in a residential treatment setting. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Mississippi State University, Starkville.
- Ryan, R. M. (1995). Psychological needs and the facilitation of integrative processes. *Journal of personality*, 63(3), 397-427.
- Ryan, R. M., & Deci, E. L. (2000). Intrinsic and extrinsic motivations: Classic definitions and new directions. *Contemporary educational psychology*, 25(1), 54-67.
- Schwartz, I.S. & Baer, D.M. (1991). Social validity assessments: Is current practice state of the art? *Journal of Applied Behavior Analysis*, 24(2), 189-204.
- Scott, T.M. (2012). *Social skills instructional groups*. Presentation at the 9th Annual National PBIS Leadership Forum for Implementers of SW-PBS, Chicago, IL.
- Scott, T.M., Anderson, C. & Alter, P. (2012). *Managing classroom behavior using positive behavior supports*. Upper Saddle River, NJ: Pearson Education, Inc.
- Skinner, C.H., Cashwell, T.H., & Skinner, A.L. (2000). Increasing tootling: The effects of a peer monitored group contingency program on students' reports of peers' prosocial behaviors. *Psychology in the Schools*, 37, 263-270.
- Skinner, C. H., Neddneriep, C. E., Robinson, S. L., Ervin, R., & Jones, K. (2002). Altering educational environments through positive peer reporting: Prevention and remediation of social problems associated with behavior disorders. *Psychology in the Schools*, 39(2), 191-202.
- Sugai G., Horner, R. H., Lewis, T. J., Dunlap, G., Hieneman, M., Nelson, C. M., Scott, T, Liaupsin, C., Sailor, W., Turnbull A. P., Turnbull, H. R., Wickham, D., Ruef, M. & Wilcox, B. (1999). *Applying positive behavioral support and functional behavioral assessment in schools*. OSEP Center on Positive Behavioral Interventions and Support Technical Assistance Guide 1 (Version 1.4.4).
- Todd, A. W., Horner, R. H., Sugai, G., & Colvin, G. (1999). Individualizing school-wide discipline for students with chronic problem behaviors: A team approach. *Effective School Practices*, 17(4), 72-82.

University of Kansas Center for Research, Inc. (2017). A multi-site efficacy trial of the class-wide function-related intervention teams “CW-FIT”: A research to practice agency for students with and at risk for EBD. Retrieved from <https://cwfit.ku.edu/research>.

Wills, H. P., Kamps, D., Hansen, B. D., Conklin, C., Bellinger, S., Neaderhiser, J. & Nsubuga, B. (2010). The class-wide function-based intervention team (CW-FIT) program. *Preventing School Failure*, 54, 164-171.

Chapter 7

Alberto, P.A. & Troutman, A.C. (2013). *Applied behavior analysis for teachers*. Upper Saddle River, NJ: Pearson.

Iovannone, R. (March, 2012). *Evaluating the technical adequacy of FBAs and BIPs: How are schools doing?* [PowerPoint slides]. Retrieved August 14, 2012, from http://www.tbsconference.net/handouts/2012_handouts/Wednesday_Session/8-1040/Iovannone%20-%20FBA%20Technical%20Adequacy.pdf
Association for Positive Behavior Support (APBS) Conference, Atlanta, GA.

Kansas Institute for Positive Behavior Support. (2012). *Direct observation tools in functional assessment*. Retrieved March 25, 2017 from http://www.kipbs.org/new_kipbs/fsi/behavassess.html

Kazdin, A. E. (2011). *Single-case research designs: Methods for clinical and applied settings*. Oxford University Press.

Lembke, E. (2010). *Ask the experts response from Erica Lembke*. Washington, D.C.: National Center on Response to Intervention. Retrieved May 19, 2011, from <http://www.rti4success.org/resources/ask-expert>.

Tieghi-Benet, M. C., Miller, K., Reiners, J., Robinett, B. E., Freeman, R. L., Smith, C. L., Baer, D., & Palmer, A. (2003). *Encouraging student progress (ESP), Student/ team book*. Lawrence, KS: University of Kansas.

Chapter 8

Blood, E., & Neel, R.S. (2007). From FBA to implementation: A look at what is actually being delivered. *Education and Treatment of Children*, 30, 67-80.

Borgmeier, C. (2010). *Behavior support plan critical features checklist*; Portland, OR: Portland State University.

Iovannone, R., & Christiansen, K. “Prevent-teach-reinforce model (PTR): A tier 3 behavior intervention accepted by teachers.” Annual meeting of the Association for Positive Behavior Supports, Atlanta, GA. March 2012. Invited Workshop Presentation.

Maryland Coalition for Inclusive Education (2009), *Functional Behavior Assessments & behavior intervention plans rubric for quality components*. Hanover, MD: Maryland Coalition for Inclusive Education, Inc.

- Sasso, G.M., Conroy, M.A., Peck-Stichter, J., & Fox, J.J. (2001). Slowing down the bandwagon: The misapplication of functional assessment for students with emotional or behavioral disorders. *Behavioral Disorders*, 26, 282-296.
- Scott, T.M., Anderson, C., & Spaulding, S. (2008). Strategies for developing and carrying out functional assessment and Behavior Intervention Planning in the general classroom. *Preventing School Failure*, 52(3), 39-49.
- Scott, T.M., & Kamps, D.M. (2007). The future of functional behavioral assessment in school settings. *Behavioral Disorders*, 32(3), 146-157. May 2007. Retrieved August 14, 2012, from <http://www.ccbd.net/sites/default/files/BD%2032-03-146.pdf>.
- Scott, T.M., Meers, D.T., & Nelson, C.M. (2000). Toward a consensus of functional behavioral assessment for students with mild disabilities in public schools: A national survey. *Education and Treatment of Children*, 23, 265-285.
- Sugai, G. & Horner, R.H. (2003). Overview of the functional behavioral assessment process. *Exceptionality*, 8, 149-160.
- Sugai, G., Lewis-Palmer, T., & Hagan-Burke, S. (1999—2000). Overview of the functional behavioral assessment process. *Exceptionality*, 8, 149—160.
- Van Acker, R., Boreson, L., Gable, R.A., & Potterton, T. (2005). Are we on the right course? Lessons learned about current FBA/BIP practices in schools. *Journal of Behavioral Education*, 14, 35-56.

Chapter 9

- Alexander, G. (2010). Behavioural coaching – the GROW model. In J. Passmore (ed.), *Excellence in coaching: The industry guide* (pp. 83-93). London: Kogan Page.
- Blase, K. A., & Fixsen, D. L. (2005, Summer). The National Implementation Research Network: Improving the science and practice of implementation. *CYF News*, pp. 8-12.
- Hiralall, A. S., & Martens, B. K. (1998). Teaching classroom management skills to preschool staff: The effects of scripted instructional sequences on teacher and student behavior. *School Psychology Quarterly*, 13(2), 94.
- Harn, B., Parisi, D., & Stoolmiller, M. (2013). Balancing fidelity with flexibility and fit: What do we really know about fidelity of implementation in schools? *Exceptional Children*, 79(2), 181-193.
- Ismat, A. (1996). *Making time for teacher professional development*. Eric Clearinghouse on Teaching and Teacher Education. Retrieved April 13, 2012 from <http://www.ericdigests.org/1997-2/time.htm>
- Johnson, N. W. (2007). *Peer coaching: A collegial support for bridging the research to practice gap* (Doctoral dissertation, University of Missouri-Columbia).
- Joyce, B., & Showers, B. (2002). *Student achievement through staff development*. Alexandria, VA: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development.
- MO DESE SPDG (2015). School Based Implementation Fidelity Checklist.

- MO Department of Elementary and Secondary Education (DESE) (2013). *Professional Learning Guidelines for Student Success*.
- Nobori, M. (2011). *How principals can grow teacher excellence*. Edutopia. Retrieved March 7, 2012 from <http://www.edutopia.org/stw-school-turnaround-principal-teacher-developments-tips>
- Noonan, P., Langham, A., & Gaumer Erickson, A. (2013). *Observation Checklist for High-Quality Professional Development Training*.
- Simonsen, B., MacSuga-Gage, A.S., Briere III, D.E., Freeman, J., Myers, D., Scott, T.M., & Sugai, G. (2014). Multitiered support framework for teachers' classroom-management practices: Overview and case study of building the trainable for teachers. *Journal of Positive Behavior Interventions*, 16, 179-190.
- Simonsen, B., MacSuga, A. S., Fallon, L. M., & Sugai, G. (2013). Teacher self-monitoring to increase specific praise rates. *Journal of Positive Behavior Interventions*, 15(1), 5-15.
- Sugai, G. (2016, September). *Sustaining high fidelity practice implementation with local resources: Musings on implementation capacity development*. Abstract retrieved September 2016, from <https://www.pbis.org/Common/Cms/files/pbisresources/28%20Sep%202016%20SMH%20Research%20Summit%20HAND.pdf>
- Whitmore, J., (1992). *Coaching for performance*. London: Nicholas Brealy.

Chapter 10

- Algozzine, B., Barrett, S., Eber, L., George, H., Horner, R., Lewis, T., Putnam, B., Swain-Bradway, J., McIntosh, K., & Sugai, G (2014). *Schoolwide PBIS Tiered Fidelity Inventory*. OSEP Technical Assistance Center on Positive Behavioral Interventions and Supports. www.pbis.org.
- Anderson, C., Childs, K., Kincaid, D., Horner, R.H., George, H. P., Todd, A., Sampson, N. & Spaulding, J. (2010). *Benchmarks for advanced tiers*. Eugene, OR: Educational and Community Supports, University of Oregon & University of South Florida.
- Mercer, S. H., McIntosh, K., & Hoselton, R. (2016). Comparability of fidelity measures for assessing tier 1 schoolwide positive behavioral interventions and supports. *Manuscript submitted for publication*.

Chapter 11

- McIntosh, K. & Goodman, S., (2016). *Integrated multi-tiered systems of support: Blending rti and pbis*. New York: Guilford Press
- Technical Assistance Center on Positive Behavior Interventions and Support, U.S. Department of Education, Office of Special Education Programs (2010). Implementation blueprint and self-assessment: positive behavioral interventions and support. Retrieved from www.pbis.org.

MO SW-PBS Terms/Abbreviation/Acronym Glossary

Schoolwide Positive Behavior Support (SW-PBS) includes specialized vocabulary following implementation of an intervention. Ensuring all stakeholders in your school community are communicating clearly is an important component of maintaining a common philosophy and purpose. Frequently used terms, abbreviations and acronyms are included here for your reference. Your team may consider including this list in your staff handbook, or otherwise communicating the information to the members of your school community.

MO SW-PBS GLOSSARY OF TERMS—TIER 1-2-3

A

Acquisition: First phase of learning when a student is learning a new skill. This phase is followed by fluency, maintenance and generalization.

Action Plan: A framework for thinking about how to complete a task or project efficiently.

Action Team: Formed for each student in order to conduct the FBA, develop the BIP, and monitor progress for data-based decision making.

Active Supervision: Strategy for monitoring a large area (i.e., classroom, hallway, playground) that involves scanning, moving, and interacting.

Adapted FACTS: Adapted Functional Assessment Checklist for Teachers and Staff (FACTS – Part A). Used in referring students to Tier 2 or Tier 3 Teams for consideration.

Advanced Tier Spreadsheet: A MO SW-PBS developed tool for collecting and graphing student outcome data for students participating in Tier 2 and Tier 3 Interventions.

Aggregate: To collect and summarize all data together, undifferentiated by subgroups.

Alterable Indicators of Risk: Actions, conditions, or behaviors that can be changed to improve the student outcomes (tardiness, task difficulty, disengagement, etc).

Alternate Replacement Behavior: A short term replacement behavior which serves the same function as a student's problem behavior, but is more consistent with expectations until the student can perform the desired behavior consistently.

Always Applicable: Defining schoolwide and classroom rules that can be used every day.

Amotivation: A complete lack of motivation for or value of the activity or knowledge in consideration, or perceived lack of competence with the activity.

Antecedent: Events that happen immediately before and trigger a behavior.

Applied Behavior Analysis (ABA): The design, implementation, and evaluation of environmental modifications to produce socially significant improvement in behavior.

At Risk: Students whose behaviors have been documented as unresponsive to Tier 1 practices and systems. Usually exhibit low intensity, frequent difficulty performing expectations, but not to the point of chronic problem behavior.

Autonomy: Being in control of one's life, self-determination.

Aversive Stimulus: A (negative) stimulus or event that can increase (when it is an antecedent) or decrease (when a consequence) a behavior.

Avoid: A function of behavior in which the student exhibits problem behavior in order to disengage from people or tasks/situations.

B

Baseline Data: The current level of functioning that is compared to the phase immediately following an intervention.

Base Rate: The proportion of students in the school who exhibit emotional or behavioral risk (Kilgus & Eklund, 2016).

Behavior: Any observable and measurable act of an individual.

Behaviors/Rules: Specific tasks students are to do to achieve the schoolwide expectations.

Behavior Education Program (BEP): A Check-In, Check-Out Intervention for students at risk (Tier 2 Practice)

Behavior Intervention Plan (BIP): A written description that defines how an educational setting will be changed to improve the behavioral success of the student.

Behavior Pathway: A component of the Behavior Intervention Plan (BIP) in which the student behavior is described in observable, measurable terms, and setting events, antecedent events, consequences, and function are identified.

Behavior Support Plan (BSP): Also referred to as the Behavior Intervention Plan (BIP).

Beliefs: Underlying sentiments, assertions, or assumptions that inform the customs or practices of a group.

Big 5 ODR Report: The compilation of a school's office discipline referral (ODR) data, which includes: 1) average referrals per day per month, 2) behavior, 3) location, 4) time, and 5) students involved. Used for problem identification and action planning and to monitor progress on efforts.

Big 5 Generator: A MO SW-PBS developed electronic data management system that collects and charts office discipline referral frequencies by incident, behavior, location and time of day.

C

Check & Connect: A Tier 2 intervention developed by University of Minnesota used with K-12 students who shows warning signs of disengagement with school and who are at risk of dropping out.

Check-In, Check-Out: A Tier 2 intervention, sometimes referred to as the Behavior Education Program (BEP). Students are presented with daily/weekly goals and then receive frequent feedback on meeting the goals throughout the day.

Chronic Behaviors: Persistent behaviors that are repeated or reoccurring over a period of time; the behavior has persisted for a while.

Class-Wide Function-Related Intervention Teams (CW-FIT): Group contingency classroom management program consisting of teaching and reinforcing appropriate behaviors (i.e., getting the teacher’s attention, following directions, and ignoring inappropriate behaviors of peers), improving students’ on-task behavior and increasing teacher recognition of appropriate behavior.

Coaching: Job embedded professional learning provided to support implementation of new skills and practices. Frequently involves modeling, observing, providing feedback.

Common Formative Assessments: Assessments developed collaboratively by teams of teachers that are given to students across the grade or content level, and are used to monitor student progress and inform midcourse correction.

Communication Plan: A document describing how the PBIS team will share information with members of the team, staff, school community, and general public.

Competence: Succeeding in what is to be done, belief in one’s ability to succeed, self-efficacy.

Competing Behavior Pathway: A component of the Behavior Intervention Plan (BIP) in which the student behavior is described in observable, measurable terms, and setting events, antecedent events, consequences, and function are identified and which also lists an appropriate alternate replacement behavior, as well as the desired replacement behavior.

Composition Metrics: This metric shows the percentage of total outcomes experienced by subgroup relative to the percentage of the total enrollment made up by that subgroup.

$$\frac{\text{Total Number of Outcomes by the Subgroup}}{\text{Total Number of Outcomes by all Students}} \quad \text{Compared to} \quad \frac{\text{Number of students enrolled in subgroup}}{\text{Number of Students Enrolled in School}}$$

Comprehensive System of Identification: Student identification system which uses at least two of the following systems – existing school data, teacher/parent nomination, and Universal Screening.

Consequence: The resulting event or outcome that occurs immediately following the behavior. May increase, maintain or decrease the likelihood of future behavior.

Consistently Implemented: Practice or intervention is in place across all settings and by all persons who are involved, and used with fidelity.

Context Analysis: Data gathered to give information about the environment and/or conditions that exist which are associated with when a behavior is more or less likely to occur.

Continuously Available: As related to Tier 2 interventions, flexible grouping with multiple, fluid entry points throughout the school year.

Coordinator: Person who coordinates schoolwide implementation of the overall Tier 2 practices and systems.

Core Team: A stable group consisting of administrator, person with behavioral expertise, and a person with academic expertise that is responsible for developing the Tier 3 system as well as being the intake team for student referrals.

Culturally Responsive: Behaviors, attitudes and policies that come together in a system to work effectively in cross-cultural situations.

D

Daily Progress Report (DPR): A tool used to record data related to student performance of targeted expected behaviors identified as part of a Tier 2 intervention. The student receives ratings and feedback from teachers throughout the day about their level of performance of each of the expected behaviors, usually on a point rating scale.

Data: Information used to make decisions, including records of behavioral incidents, attendance, tardies, achievement, staff and student perceptions and others.

Data-Based Decision Making: A systematic process for analysis of information that leads to action steps.

Data Collection Tool: A MO SW-PBS developed electronic data management system that collects and summarizes office discipline referral frequencies by incident, behavior, location, time of day, student, possible motivation, others involved, staff, race and ethnicity, and others.

Data Decision Rules: The school-determined data points describing student performance as proficient, at-risk, or high risk. Data decision rules are typically developed for quantitative school data like number of office discipline referrals, minor behavior referrals, attendance, grades, assessment scores, etc.

Desired Behavior: In Tier 3, the desired behavior is the long-term behavior the team has identified as a replacement for the current problem behavior.

Didactic Training: Also known as direct training, is training which includes content, rationale, demonstration, practice, and feedback components.

Discipline: Instruction that corrects, molds or perfects character and develops self-control.

Disaggregate: To separate and present data by subgroups.

Disproportionality: To treat categories inequitably, as when categories of students experience different disciplinary consequences for similar offenses.

Duration: A measurement of how long a behavior occurs, or how long an individual engages in a behavior.

E

End of Year Reports (EOY): Reports available from MO SW-PBS that aggregates data from a variety of sources, to provide a complete assessment of the state of the school.

Engaged Time: The amount of instructional time where students are actively engaged in learning.

Environment: The physical, social, academic, and emotional conditions that exist for the student. This can refer to the classroom environment, the school environment, the home environment, etc.

Environmentally Mediated: Manipulation of the full set of stimulus conditions in an environment which controls a target behavior.

Equity: The quality of being fair and impartial.

Existing School Data Inventory: Template used by teams when developing their data decision rules.

Expectations: 3-5 words that define the kind of people you want your students to be.

Explicit Bias: Disproportionality that is consistently high across all settings. Also called systematic bias.

Externalizing Behaviors: Behavior problems that are observable and overt, often directed toward people and/or objects in the social environment.

Extinction: Withholding reinforcement for a previously reinforced behavior to reduce the occurrence of the behavior.

Extrinsic Motivation: When an individual engages in an activity to attain a separable outcome (e.g., to receive an external item or activity of preference, to fit into a group, to master a skill or gain knowledge needed for later).

Evidence-based Practice: A process intended to link evidence with ethical and practical/application issues when making decisions about practices and interventions.

F

Facilitator: The Intervention Facilitators deliver the Tier 2 interventions to the students. The CICO Facilitators would do the morning check in and afternoon check out. SSIG Facilitators would lead the social skills groups. Facilitators deliver the intervention and collect the student data from the DPRs on a regular basis to be reported to the Intervention Coordinator.

Fading: The process by which a student who has shown positive response for an adequate time will transition from participation in an intervention to self-monitoring independence.

Feedback: The information provided to students by adults and other students about how well they are performing the expected behaviors. Feedback can be categorized as positive (reinforcing the expected behavior), corrective (telling the student what the expected behavior is for the situation), and negative (giving the student a message to stop their current behavior with no information about a replacement behavior).

Fidelity: Delivery of the intervention in the way in which it was designed to be delivered.

FIRST STEP Next: Evidence-based early intervention program designed for young children, preschool through second grade, who exhibit challenging behaviors such as defiance, conflicts with peers, and disruptive behaviors.

Fluency: Second phase of learning. When a task/skill is performed without error or interruption in a change of behaviors.

Formative Data: Data used to monitor progress; used to make mid-course corrections during a cycle, lesson, unit, program, or intervention.

Frequency or rate (of behavior): The number of times a behavior occurs during a set period of time.

Function of Behavior: The need fulfilled through the performance of a specific behavior. The function of behavior can be categorized as behavior to obtain (attention, tangible item) or avoid (attention, task, stimulus).

Function-based: Refers to a consequence that increases the likelihood that a behavior will be performed.

Function Based Intervention: A specific practice intended to reduce the performance of problem behavior by addressing the student need (function of behavior) through performance of expected or desired behaviors.

Functional Analysis (FA): A strategy of manipulating a student's environment to test the hypothesis statement.

Functional Behavior Assessment (FBA): A process for identifying the events that predict the occurrence and maintenance of a behavior.

G

General case (programming): The design of instruction for students to perform a task with any member of a class of stimuli.

Generalization: Fourth phase of learning where behavior occurs under different conditions other than those taught (people, settings, etc.).

Graduating: Successfully completing an intervention, and maintaining the expected or desired behavior through independent self-monitoring.

H

High Risk: Typically describes students who have excessive rates of problem behavior, or especially intense problem behaviors, and will likely require intensive, rather than targeted, intervention.

I

Identification Process: The plan created by the school's Tier 2 and Tier 3 Teams communicating how students can be considered for additional support. The identification process should include at least two of the following methods of identification: meeting school data decision rules, teacher/parent nomination, and universal screening.

Implicit Bias: An unconscious association regarding some groups based on stereotypes which are activated involuntarily and without an individual's awareness or intentional control (Staats, 2014).

Individualized Education Plan (IEP): A document that details the goals and objectives for a student's yearly educational plan.

Input Data: Data to monitor or evaluate adult actions; fidelity of implementation data; cause data.

Instructional Time: The amount of the allocated time that actually results in teaching.

Intervention: In SW-PBS, an intervention is a research-based universal (primary), targeted small group (secondary) or intensive individual (tertiary) support implemented for students who are experiencing difficulties meeting the universal expectations.

Intense Behavior: The force or magnitude of the behaviors impact on the classroom environment.

Intensive (Tertiary) Interventions: Interventions that provide support to students with the most severe risk factors and who display chronic/repetitive patterns of behavior.

Internalizing Behaviors: Behavior problems that the students directs inwardly toward him or herself.

Intrinsic Motivation: Participating in an activity simply for the enjoyment of the activity itself.

In-vivo support: In-vivo or in a real life situation support can include the coach providing modeling, coaching and/or feedback while instruction is occurring during a teacher's classroom instruction.

J

Job Embedded Professional Development (JEPD): Professional learning opportunities that occur in an authentic context (i.e., with students).

L

Lawful Behavior: Relationships between events that occur naturally that predict behavior and identify associated environmental antecedents and consequences.

Learning: A durable change in behavior associated with environmental conditions.

Levels of Learning: Hierarchies of learning in cognitive, affective, and psychomotor areas that classify possible learning outcomes in terms of increasingly abstract levels and include acquisition, fluency, maintenance, generalization, and adaptation.

Locus of Causality: The extent to which individuals perceive their actions as caused by internal or external reasons.

M

Maintenance: The third phase of learning. The ability to perform a behavior over time.

Measureable: Defining schoolwide or classroom behaviors that could be counted.

Menu of Function Based Interventions: A MO SW-PBS document containing setting strategies, antecedent strategies, teaching strategies, and consequence strategies to help teams plan for behavior intervention planning.

Mission: Defines a school or district purpose. They are practicable, a blueprint for current practice or what we do. Missions answer the questions, "Why do we exist? What do we do?"

Modeling: The demonstration of behavior. May be used to prompt or teach a behavior.

MO Student Support Model: A graphic representation of the required elements for intensifying supports for students who continue to demonstrate difficulties after Tier 1 components are delivered. See reference in Chapter 1 of the Tier 2 Workbook.

MO SW-PBS Data-Based Decision Making (DBDM) Process: A decision making process that can guide teams in making data based decisions.

MO SW-PBS Universal Tier 1 Checklist: A Checklist developed by MO SW-PBS to assist teams in determining fidelity of implementation of Tier 1 universal systems and practices, and to identify needs for action planning.

MO SW-PBS School Outcomes Data: Provides information on outcomes for students, especially for students with disabilities, or who are referred for additional academic or behavioral supports. Supplements data collected throughout the year, and is a critical source of information for the MO SW-PBS End of Year Reports that are provided to school. Submitted to MOSWPBS@Missouri.edu in June of each school year.

Multi-User Survey: A survey which includes many respondents. Such surveys include the SAS and SSS.

N

Natural Reinforcement: Reinforcement that is the direct result of that behavior.

Negative Punishment: Removal of a stimulus immediately following a behavior that decreases the likelihood of behavior occurring in the future.

Negative Reinforcement: Removal of a stimulus preceding a behavior that increases the likelihood of behavior occurring in the future.

Neutralizing Routines: Replacement behaviors for teachers to implement at those vulnerable decision points when disproportional consequences are more likely to occur.

Nomination: A process that allows teachers, parents, and/or students themselves to submit candidate names to be considered for Tier 2 supports.

Norms: Protocols and commitments developed by each team to guide members in working together. Norms help team members clarify expectations regarding how they will work together to achieve their shared goals.

O

Observable: Defining schoolwide and classroom rules that are behaviors that can be seen.

Observation: Formative or summative assessment of a teacher or student, can be formal or informal. Typically longer in duration than a walkthrough.

ODR (Office Discipline Referral): Usually the result of a “major” discipline violation, the ODR refers to the paperwork associated with sending a student to the office to receive a consequence as the result of problem behavior.

Operational Definition: A descriptive statement that specifically identifies commonly agreed upon behavior that is directly observable and measurable.

Opportunity Costs: Resources spent on one activity are not available for other activities.

Outcome Data: Data gathered to monitor or evaluate progress toward desired outcomes or goals; effect data.

P

Performance Deficit: A failure to perform the expected behavior at acceptable levels or in the correct circumstance.

Permanent Products: Items to be reviewed as evidence of meeting a goal. Permanent products can include writing samples, completed assignments, drawings, etc. When using permanent products as consideration for goal achievement, quality of the item should be considered.

Person Centered Planning: A team-based planning process for an individual's future goals that focuses on strengths and abilities of the individual and his or her inclusion within community life.

PBIS APPS: A web based survey and data collection site operated by the University of Oregon's Educational and Community Supports (ECS). Applications include The SWIS Suite, PBIS Assessments, PBIS Evaluation. <https://www.pbisapps.org/Pages/Default.aspx>

PBIS Assessments: An application within PBIS Apps that allows users to take a number of SW-PBS surveys.

Phases of Learning: Sequential stages in gaining skill mastery that include: a) acquisition, b) fluency, c) maintenance, and d) generalization.

Poor Response to Intervention: A review of data shows there is a gap between the trend line and the student's goal line that continues to widen.

Positive Behavior Support (PBS): A broad range of systematic and individualized strategies to achieve important social and learning outcomes while preventing problem behavior among all students.

Positive Peer Reporting (PPR): Simple procedure that is used to promote positive peer interactions, improves peer perceptions of students who tend to be socially rejected or neglected and encourages all children to focus on and report prosocial behaviors of their peers.

Positive Reinforcement: Presentation of a stimulus immediately following a behavior that increases the likelihood of behavior occurring in the future.

Positive Response to Interventions: Data indicates the student is making progress toward his/her goal and will reach the goal within a reasonable amount of time.

Positively Stated: Creating rules that tell students what to do to be successful.

Practices: Strategies and interventions schools put in place to support students.

Praise: An expression of admiration for performance that serves to reinforce the behavior; verbal recognition. Often used interchangeably with specific positive feedback.

Pre-correction: Reminders before entering a setting or performing a task to promote successful demonstration of expected behaviors.

Primary (Universal) Interventions: Preventative, universal supports implemented with all students that promote safety, positive school culture, and an effective learning environment at the whole school level.

Problem Behavior: Behavior which is inconsistent with the expectations for the environment. For example, yelling is a problem behavior in a library, but not necessarily on a playground. Some problem behavior can be undesirable across settings, such as hitting or hurting others.

Problem Solving Process: The process that groups can use in order to engage in meaningful dialogue in order to reach a resolution to a problem.

Procedures: Methods or process for how things are done in non-classroom settings and in each classroom.

Professional Development: Support services for educators; often describing a single event such as face-to-face training only.

Professional Learning: A systematic process of support for all school staff that can include face-to-face training, observation, coaching, resource banks of materials, communication plans, virtual supports, etc.

Progress Monitoring: The ongoing collection and review of data to determine the performance of a student participating in an intervention.

Prompt: A stimulus (reminder, hint, or cue) that increases the probability the correct response will be emitted.

Punishment: A consequence that decreases the likelihood that the problem behavior will recur (Skinner, 1938).

Q

Quality of Life (QoL): A construct that attempts to conceptualize what “living the good life” means (Wehmeyer and Schlack, 2001).

Questionable Response to Interventions: A review of data shows there is a gap between the trend line and the student’s goal line that may not be widening but closure may not occur in an acceptable amount of time.

R

Read Only (PBIS Assessments): Refers to a level of access in a PBIS Assessments account. Individuals with read only access can log into PBIS Assessments, and pull reports for surveys associated with their organization.

Readiness: The degree to which a team is meeting the established criteria for adding to their SW-PBS system. There are specific readiness checklists for moving to Tier 2 and to Tier 3.

Reinforcement: An overarching term for a contingently delivered consequence associated with an increased likelihood of future behavior.

Relatedness: Connecting with others, belonging.

Reliability: The degree of accuracy or consistency in measurement procedures.

ReNew: A structured school-to-career transition planning and individualized wraparound process for youth with emotional and behavioral challenges.

Response to Intervention: “The practice of providing high-quality instruction and interventions matched to student need, monitoring progress frequently to make decisions about changes in instruction or goals, and applying child response data to important educational decisions” (Batsche et al., 2005).

Reward: Something that reinforces a desired behavior, most often a preferred tangible/object or activity; often used interchangeably with “reinforcement,” but has acquired a controversial tone and misconstrued as bribery.

Risk Index: “A risk index is the percent of a group that receives a particular outcome (most commonly an ODR or suspension), which is equivalent to the likelihood of someone from that group receiving that outcome,” (p. 5, McIntosh, K., Barnes, A., Eliason, B., & Morris, K. (2014). The risk index is calculated by dividing the number of students in a group who have experienced the outcome at least once by the number of students in the group, then multiplying by 100.

Risk Ratio: A measure of the likelihood of an outcome occurring for a target group relative to a comparison group. Calculated by dividing the risk index of the target group by the risk index of the comparison group. The risk ratio is considered to be a more stable metric for monitoring disproportionality than is the risk index.

$$\frac{\text{Risk Index of Target Group}}{\text{Risk Index of Comparison Group}} = \text{Risk Ratio}$$

S

Screening Instrument: A short questionnaire, rating scale, or other brief instrument for gathering information about emotional and behavioral characteristics of students.

Secondary Support: Targeted, group-based interventions for students who present risk factors and who require repeated practice and environmental modifications to increase their likelihood of academic and social success.

Self Determination: “Acting as the primary causal agent in one’s life and making choices and decisions regarding one’s quality of life free from undue external influence or interference” (Wehmeyer, 1996).

Self-Monitoring: Having an individual monitor, record and/or report his or her own behavior.

Serviceable Base Rate: The amount of students identified as at risk who could reasonably be served in a small group or individual intervention with the current resources available in the school (Kilgus & Eklund, 2016).

Setting Event: Conditions or events that influence behavior by temporarily changing the value or effectiveness of reinforcers.

Short Term Replacement Behavior: In a competing behavior pathway, the short term replacement behavior is an alternate behavior to the problem behavior which serves the same function, but is an agreeable step toward the desired behavior which is consistent with the universal expectations. For example, if a student argues and uses bad language to try to avoid tasks he or she finds aversive, a short term replacement might be to ask for a break from the tasks instead of arguing. This still allows for a degree of task avoidance, but is less problematic than the former behavior. Eventually, the desired behavior will be for the student to complete tasks independently, even if the task is aversive, but this is too far removed from the current reality without the temporary replacement behavior.

Single User Survey: A survey for which only one response is entered into the survey site, such as the TFI and SET.

Skill Deficit: Absence of knowledge or insufficient understanding of when to use the expected behavior.

Social Competence: The ability to use the appropriate social skills for a situation or environment.

Social Reinforcement: Social behaviors (i.e., smiles, praise) that increase the frequency or rate of behavior occurrence.

Social Skills: Learned behaviors which can be verbal and non-verbal, requiring both initiations and responses (interactive), and are highly contextual. The five broad dimensions of social skills include: Peer Relations Skills, Self-Management Skills, Cooperation or Compliance Skills, Assertion Skills, and Academic Skills.

Social Skills Intervention Groups (SSIG): Specific secondary (targeted Tier 2) intervention for teaching social skills to students who demonstrate deficits in acquisition, performance and fluency, or who have competing problem behaviors which interfere with the performance of a learned skill.

Social Validity: the acceptability or relevance of a program or procedures to its consumers.

Specific Positive Feedback: Verbal reinforcement; a form of social reinforcement that provides information on successful behavior while reinforcing or increasing the likelihood that behavior will be repeated; combines social attention, instruction, and reinforcement.

Stability: The consistency of performance measured, sometimes referred to as overlap when performance is compared between research study phases.

Standardized: Following a specifically prescribed protocol, frequently a process or instrument that has been 'normed' on a specific population to be reliable to a specific degree when used as instructed.

Stimulus: An object or event that may occasion a response.

Student Identification: The process by which students are brought to the attention of the Tier 2 or Tier 3 Team for consideration for further support or intervention.

Summary Statement: The summary statement narrows down all the assessment information gathered into one or two succinct statements that allow the team to develop strategies based on the summary. A summary statement usually includes a) problem behavior, b) triggering antecedent, c) maintaining consequences, and d) setting events.

Summative Data: Data that is collected and reviewed in order to evaluate the effects of the steps that were taken to determine whether the desired outcomes were achieved.

Sustainability: The process of maintaining fidelity, through inevitable changes, so a practice continues to be effective in the long term.

Systems: Strategies and interventions schools put in place to support adults in the school setting.

T

Target Behavior: The focus behavior to change.

Targeted (Secondary) Interventions: Targeted, group-based interventions for students who present risk factors and who require repeated practice and environmental modifications to increase their likelihood of academic and social success.

Task Analysis: Breaking complex behavior into its component parts to teach individuals to perform complex behavior and sequences/chains of behaviors.

Teacher Approval: Used in research to assess the relationship of teacher behavior to student learning; generally verbal praise and encouragement, but may also include non-verbal attention (e.g., smiles, facial attention, touch, etc.).

Teaching: Systematic manipulations of instructional and social variables that create a change in behavior.

Teacher Mediated: Teacher manipulation of stimuli to control a target behavior.

Teacher Nomination: One way students are identified for consideration for Tier 2 or Tier 3 support. The team develops a form and a process for teachers that is clear, quick, and simple.

Team Member (PBIS Assessments): Refers to a level of access in a PBIS Assessments account. Individuals with Team Member access can log in, copy multi-user survey links to send to stakeholders, enter responses for single user surveys, and pull survey reports for their organization.

Tertiary (Intensive) Interventions: Interventions that require support to students with the most severe risk factors and who display chronic/repetitive patterns of violent, disruptive, or destructive behavior.

Three-tiered Model: A mental health approach to identify and address the needs of all student populations at three levels of interventions (primary, secondary and tertiary).

Tier 2 (Targeted): More specialized and intensive practices and systems for supporting students whose behaviors have been documented as unresponsive to Tier 1 practices and systems. Sometimes called secondary supports or system, or small-group targeted intervention.

Tier 3 (Intensive): Highly specialized and individualized practices and systems for supporting students whose behaviors have been documented as unresponsive to Tiers 1 and 2 practices and systems. Sometimes called tertiary supports or system, or intensive individual intervention.

Time-out from Positive Reinforcement: A procedure that serves as a punishment by denying a student, for a fixed period of time, the opportunity to receive reinforcement.

Tootling: A positive intervention that can be added to existing classroom systems to enhance students' awareness of positive behavior of other students. It encourages students to notice pro-social behaviors displayed by their classmates throughout the day, and report them on a written note. It is particularly effective in classrooms that experience high rates of student turnover and classrooms with students who are at risk for isolation or peer rejection due to persistent negative behaviors.

Trend (in data): An indication of a distinctive direction in the performance of a behavior.

Triangulation: In social sciences, the process of checking results or conclusions from one data set against the results or conclusions from two or more other data sets.

U

Understandable: Defining schoolwide and classroom rules using student-friendly language.

Universal Interventions: Preventative, universal supports implemented with all students that promote safety, positive school culture, and an effective learning environment at the whole school level.

Universal Screening: A method for systematically identifying students who may require additional support. Typically screening instruments require a response to short statements about emotional or behavioral characteristics of a student. These instruments can be used to generate risk scores for all students in a grade level, building or district.

V

Validity: The extent to which an instrument or procedures demonstrates soundness. Internal validity is the extent to which the instrument or procedures assesses behavior in the domain of interest. External validity is the extent to which the outcomes of the FBA/FA predict future occurrences of behavior and result in support plans that work.

Variability: Visual description of data. The range of highest to lowest performance measured.

Vision: A clearly articulated, results-oriented picture of the future you intend to create. A vision focuses on the end-results and values, not on specific means of getting there.

Vulnerable Decision Point: When a problem behavior occurs, the point when a teacher realizes they may be vulnerable to a biased response.

W

Wait Time: The time lapse between delivering a question and calling on a student or cueing a group response.

Walkthrough: Brief (three to ten minute) classroom visits in which the visitor records observations of the use of predetermined evidence-based practices.

Wrap-around: A process for planning the delivery of services that is provided by agencies and professionals in collaboration with families for students with intensive/tertiary support needs.

MO SW-PBS ABBREVIATION/ACRONYM GLOSSARY

Abbreviation / Acronym	Meaning	Tier
ABA	Applied Behavior Analysis	all
ABC	Antecedent -> Behavior -> Consequence	all
APBS	Association for Positive Behavior Support	n/a
ASQ-3	Ages and Stages Questionnaire: Third Ed. (Universal Screener)	all
BASC-2 BESS	Behavioral and Emotional Screening System (Universal Screener)	all
BAT	Benchmarks of Advanced Tiers (PBIS Assessments)	2,3
BEP	Behavior Education Program (a book/dvd resource for Check-In, Check-Out Intervention)	2
BIP	Behavior Intervention Plan	3
BoQ	Benchmarks of Quality (advanced teams use in place of SET - Schoolwide Evaluation Tool)	1
CICO	Check-In, Check-Out Intervention	2
CW-FIT	Class-Wide Function-Related Intervention Teams	2,3
DECA	Devereux Early Childhood Assessment Program (Universal Screener)	all
DESE	Department of Elementary and Secondary Education	n/a
DPR	Daily Progress Report	2,3
EBS	Effective Behavioral Supports	all
EBS	Effective Behavior Support Survey	1
ESP	Early Screening Project (Universal Screener)	all
FACTS	The Adapted Functional Assessment Checklist for Teachers and Staff	2,3
FBA	Functional Behavioral Assessment	3
IEP	Individualized Education Program	n/a
ISS	In-School Suspension	n/a
MAP	Missouri Assessment Program	n/a
MO SW-PBS	Missouri Schoolwide Positive Behavior Support	all
MU	University of Missouri	n/a
ODR	Office Discipline Referral	all
OMPUA	Observable, Measureable, Positively Stated, Understandable, Always Applicable	1
OSS	Out-of-School Suspension	n/a
OTR	Opportunities to Respond	1
PBIS	Positive Behavior Interventions and Supports	all

Abbreviation / Acronym	Meaning	Tier
PL	Professional learning	all
PKBS-2	Preschool and Kindergarten Behavior Scales, Second Ed. (Universal Screener)	all
PM	Progress Monitoring	all
PPR	Positive Peer Reporting	all
RtI	Response to Intervention	n/a
SAEBERS	Social, Academic, Emotional Behavior Risk Screener (Universal Screener)	all
SAS	Self-Assessment Survey (PBIS Assessments)	all
SDP	School Data Profile	all
SDQ	Strengths and Difficulties Questionnaire (Universal Screener)	all
SET	Schoolwide Evaluation Tool (external observation tool PBIS Assessments)	1
SGSS	Small Group Social Skills Intervention	2
SPED	Special Education	n/a
SPP	State Performance Plan	n/a
Ss	Represents the word Students on Twitter chat	n/a
SSBD	Systematic Screening for Behavior Disorders (Universal Screener)	all
SSIG	Social Skills Intervention Group	2
SSIS	Social Skills Improvement System (Universal Screener and Small Group Intervention Resource)	all
SSS	School Safety Survey (PBIS Assessments)	all
SWIS	School Wide Information Systems (PBIS Apps)	all
T1	Tier 1 (Universal Support)	1
T2	Tier 2 (Targeted Group Support)	2
T3	Tier 3 (Intensive Individual Support)	3
TABS	Temperament and Atypical Behavior Scale	all
TIC	Team Implementation Checklist	1
TFI	Tiered Fidelity Inventory	all
Ts	Represents the word Teachers on Twitter chat	n/a
WPR	Weekly Progress Report	2,3

APPENDIX