



*in*Forum

In Depth Policy Analysis

Statewide Behavior Initiatives

by
Eve Müller

February 2007

Project Forum
National Association of State Directors of Special Education
(NASDSE)
1800 Diagonal Road - Suite 320
Alexandria, VA 22314

Project Forum at National Association of State Directors of Special Education (NASDSE) is a cooperative agreement funded by the Office of Special Education Programs of the U.S. Department of Education. The project carries out a variety of activities that provide information needed for program improvement and promote the utilization of research data and other information for improving outcomes for students with disabilities. The project also provides technical assistance and information on emerging issues and convenes small work groups to gather expert input, obtain feedback and develop conceptual frameworks related to critical topics in special education.

This report was supported by the U.S. Department of Education (Cooperative Agreement No. H326F050001). However, the opinions expressed herein do not necessarily reflect the position of the U.S. Department of Education, and no official endorsement by the Department should be inferred.

Note: There are no copyright restrictions on this document; however, please credit the source and support of federal funds when copying all or part of this material.



This document, along with many other Forum publications, can be downloaded from the Project Forum at NASDSE web address:

<http://www.projectforum.org>

To order a hard copy of this document or any other Forum publications, please contact Nancy Tucker at NASDSE, 1800 Diagonal Road, Suite 320, Alexandria, VA 22314
Ph: 703-519-3800 ext. 312 or Email: nancy.tucker@nasdse.org

This document is available in alternative formats. For details please contact Project Forum staff at 703.519.3800

Table of Contents

STATEWIDE POSITIVE BEHAVIORAL INTERVENTIONS AND SUPPORTS	1
PREVIOUS RESEARCH ON SBIs	2
DATA COLLECTION AND ANALYSIS	2
FINDINGS	2
Survey Data	2
Interview Data	3
<i>Background History</i>	3
<i>Stakeholder Involvement</i>	4
<i>Eligibility Criteria</i>	5
<i>Scope and Focus</i>	6
<i>Components of SBIs</i>	7
<i>Fiscal and Human Resources</i>	8
<i>Professional Development</i>	9
<i>Evaluation</i>	11
<i>Policy Recommendations</i>	12
CONCLUDING REMARKS	12
REFERENCES	14
APPENDIX A—STATEWIDE BEHAVIOR INITIATIVES	15

Statewide Behavior Initiatives

In response to concerns of educators and parents regarding challenging classroom behaviors, the number of states implementing statewide behavior initiatives (SBIs) continues to grow. For the purpose of this document, an SBI is any formal, state education agency-level policy or plan intended to build the capacity of a state or non-state jurisdiction to provide behavioral support to schools.

Although at least two studies have been conducted of SBIs (Linehan, 2000; Boerman, Sugai, & Vincent, 2002), neither provides detailed information on the background and components of individual programs. The purpose of this document is to update past research on SBIs and to build on existing data by reporting on a brief survey of states as well as in-depth analyses of six SBIs. Project Forum conducted this study as part of its cooperative agreement with the U.S. Department of Education, Office of Special Education Programs (OSEP).

STATEWIDE POSITIVE BEHAVIORAL INTERVENTIONS AND SUPPORTS

Nearly all states with SBIs receive some sort of technical assistance from the OSEP-funded National Technical Assistance Center on Positive Behavioral Interventions and Supports (PBIS) Center at the University of Oregon. According to the center, PBIS is a behaviorally based systems approach designed to enhance the capacity of schools and communities to employ research-based practices in contexts where teaching and learning take place. Emphasis is placed on creating and sustaining primary (school-wide), secondary (classroom or small group) and tertiary (individual) systems of support that improve outcomes for all students by making problem behavior less effective and desired behavior more functional. The PBIS Center also describes the following components of successful statewide PBIS implementation:

- a leadership team that actively coordinates implementation efforts;
- an organizational umbrella with adequate funding, broad visibility and consistent political support;
- a foundation for sustained and broad-scale implementation established through (1) a cadre of individuals who can provide coaching support for local implementation, (2) a small group of individuals who can train teams on the practices and processes of school-wide PBIS, and (3) a system for ongoing evaluation; and
- a small group of demonstration schools that documents the viability of the approach within the local fiscal, political and social climate of the state.

Throughout this document, all references to states' use of a "PBIS approach" are based on the above descriptions.¹

¹ For more information on school and/or statewide PBIS, see the PBIS Center's website at www.pbis.org.

PREVIOUS RESEARCH ON SBIs

In 1999, Project Forum surveyed state education agencies (SEAs) to find out how many had an SBI in place (Linehan, 2000). Forty-three SEAs replied and responses indicated that 26 had an SBI at that time (10 of which had been implemented within the past year) and 13 had plans to develop one. Nearly three quarters (73%) of respondents with an SBI reported that the initiative included all students, whereas 27% reported that their SBI focused exclusively on students with disabilities. Fifteen of the 26 SEAs with active SBIs specifically included the birth to five age range and 23 of the 26 SEAs noted that funds had been earmarked to support implementation of their SBI.

The PBIS Center conducted a follow-up study in 2002 (Boerman, Sugai & Vincent, 2002). They surveyed the 26 SEAs that had reported having an SBI in place in 1999. Nineteen responded, with one-third reporting that the SBI had been implemented on a statewide basis and the remaining two-thirds reporting that the SBI was first being tested in select regions, districts or schools. Survey respondents reported that planning for, and development of, SBIs usually involved representatives from a wide range of stakeholder groups. Allocation of human resources for implementation of SBIs varied significantly from state to state—ranging from less than 1.0 full-time equivalency (FTE) to greater than 8.0 FTEs—as did sources of fiscal support. The majority of SBI behavioral objectives focused on classroom disruption and antisocial behavior, school violence, bullying, delinquency and harassment. The majority of respondents reported designating a training coordinator to support their SBI in addition to providing training of trainers across the state. A total of 12 respondents reported having procedures in place to evaluate their SBIs and of these, six reported that future funding was linked to outcomes.

DATA COLLECTION AND ANALYSIS

In July of 2006, Project Forum—in conjunction with the PBIS Center—developed an interview protocol and selected six states to be interviewed on the subject of their SBIs. Representatives from the following six states were interviewed during August of 2006: *Colorado, Iowa, Illinois, Maryland, New Mexico* and *Oregon*.² Data were analyzed using ATLAS.ti, a software program designed to aid with the analysis of qualitative data. Additionally, in order to update information on the total number of states with SBIs, all SEAs were surveyed during October of 2006. Survey and interview findings are reported in the following section.

FINDINGS

Survey Data

Forty-six SEAs responded to Project Forum's 2006 survey on SBIs (see Appendix A). Of these, 41 reported having an SBI currently in place. Four SEAs reported that their SBI was put into

² Websites for each SBI profiled in this document include Colorado's at www.cde.state.co.us/pbs; Iowa's at www.educ.drake.edu/rc/alliance.html; Illinois' at www.pbisillinois.org; Maryland's at www.pbismaryland.org; New Mexico's at www.nmpbs.org; and Oregon's at www.ode.state.or.us/initiatives/idea/pbs.aspx.

place within the last two years; 15 reported that it was put into place between 2000 and 2004; and 19 reported that it was put into place prior to 2000. Thirty-eight of the 41 SEAs reported that their SBI is based on an approach developed by the PBIS Center. Three SEAs reported using alternatives to the PBIS approach (i.e., *Arkansas* uses Project ACHIEVE,³ *California* uses Behavior Evaluation and Support Teams [BEST] and *Nevada* has implemented a Response to Intervention [RtI] model that integrates academic and behavioral supports). One additional SEA reported that although it does not currently have an SBI in place, it is in the process of developing one.

Interview Data

Background History

The histories of SBIs differ considerably. Some states have SBIs developed within the past few years and others have had them in place for more than a decade. Newer SBIs are more likely to have been based from the beginning on a PBIS model, whereas long-standing SBIs are more likely to have evolved over time, gradually adopting or incorporating a PBIS approach. Examples of long-standing SBIs include the following:

- *Colorado*—In place since the early 1990s, the state’s original SBI focused exclusively on students with significant emotional and behavioral challenges. Local education agencies (LEAs) and education service agencies selected and trained 43 Behavior Evaluation and Support Teams (BEST) to support these students. Since then, inspired by the PBIS model, *Colorado’s* SBI—while retaining the BEST teams—has evolved to include all students.
- *Iowa*—State money was made available in the early 1990s to a number of schools interested in implementing school-wide behavioral interventions. *Iowa* later participated in a multistate PBIS project and eventually became involved with the PBIS Center. Today, the Iowa Behavioral Alliance incorporates elements of a PBIS approach with school mental health and dropout prevention.
- *Illinois*—In the early 1990s, the state sponsored a project to reduce restrictive placements and facilitate interagency wraparound⁴ supports for students with emotional disturbance (ED) and their families. In 1998, with input from what is now the PBIS Center, *Illinois* shifted its focus to prevention and a school-wide approach serving all students.

Significantly, although most interviewees described SBIs that were developed in a “top-down” fashion (i.e., initiated at the state-level), *Oregon* described an SBI that began in 2003 as more “grass roots” in its orientation, having first been initiated at the local level and only recently merged into a collaborative state-level effort with the SEA in November of 2005.

³ For more information on Project ACHIEVE see its website at www.acc.k12.ar.us/sig/Overview%20Goals%20of%20the%20Grant.htm.

⁴ In regard to the issue of SBI, wraparound services typically focus on merging behavioral interventions with mental health and other services for individual students and their families.

The entity responsible for overseeing the SBI also varies from state to state. For example, *Colorado's* SBI is administered by the SEA; *Maryland's* is jointly administered by the SEA and a nonprofit behavioral health organization; *Oregon's* and *New Mexico's* SBIs are administered by regionally based educational service agencies; *Iowa's* SBI is administered by the Iowa Behavioral Alliance; and *Illinois's* SBI is administered by a grant project affiliated with a LEA.

All six interviewees described the initial exposure to work being done by the PBIS Center as a turning point and/or catalyst for change within their states. Interviewees reported having used trainers from the PBIS Center at some point during their SBI's history and/or receiving other types of technical assistance from the PBIS Center, and several noted that their states had met or were working to meet the criteria set forth by the PBIS Center for successful statewide PBIS initiatives. Most continue to access one or more types of support through the PBIS Center. Although all six SBIs currently incorporate a PBIS approach, most vary in one or more particulars. For more information on unique components of SBIs, see the section of this document titled "Components of SBIs" on page 7.

Stakeholder Involvement

Interviewees reported that most of the following groups were involved in the initial development of their SBIs: SEA representatives, representatives from institutions of higher education (IHEs), and LEA- and building-level administrators. *Iowa* and *Illinois* also reported initial involvement on the part of a broader range of stakeholders, including health and human services, mental health, juvenile justice, child welfare, early childhood and parent groups.

Most interviewees described involvement in the SBI by divisions of the SEA in addition to special education (e.g., Safe and Drug Free Schools, Title II, School to Work, Reading First, school health, preschool and programs serving at-risk and/or expelled youth). In some states like *Colorado*, the SBI is described as a "joint venture between special and general education." In other states, the SBI is still primarily a special education initiative, although all interviewees expressed a strong desire to involve general education in their initiatives.

All six interviewees reported having convened a state-level leadership team in accordance with PBIS Center recommendations. For some states, this team and the group that oversaw the initial development of the SBI were the same. For other states, establishment of a leadership team resulted in a broadening of the base of support for the SBI. According to several interviewees, stakeholder involvement in their states has grown significantly in the past few years. In the words of the interviewee from *Maryland*, participation by agencies other than the SEA has "expanded in leaps and bounds this past year." The interviewee from *Illinois* described a particularly dynamic leadership team—developed over the last two years with input from the PBIS Center—that includes a state judge, the head of the Illinois Parent Teacher Association (PTA), representatives of the state principals' association, representatives from major IHEs in the state and individuals overseeing related initiatives. *Illinois's* leadership team is currently working on securing funding and political support as well as increasing the visibility of its SBI. Similarly, *Colorado* recently added an advisory council to complement the more "nuts and bolts" work of

its leadership team. Like *Illinois'* leadership team, *Colorado's* advisory council handles issues relating to publicity and funding.

In addition to leadership teams and/or advisory councils, several interviewees described other types of interagency collaboration, including the following:

- *Iowa*—In addition to the Iowa Behavioral Alliance, the SEA is working to build capacity to provide community-based (as opposed to school-based) PBIS among private residential providers for adolescents and adults with mental health issues and/or developmental disabilities.
- *Maryland*—The Johns Hopkins Center for the Prevention of Youth Violence, with support from the National Institute of Mental Health and the Centers for Disease Control, began formal evaluation of Maryland's PBIS system in 2001 using randomized trials. In collaboration with the University of Maryland, the SEA will also establish a tertiary-level demonstration site using funds from a mental health integration grant.
- *New Mexico*—The SEA is working closely with IHEs throughout the state to offer both preservice and inservice PBIS training for teachers in the field.

Two interviewees also described state efforts to link SBI initiatives with other state-level initiatives:

- *Illinois*—The grant supporting the SBI is housed at the same statewide technical assistance center as two other grants/initiatives—one addressing the needs of students with autism spectrum disabilities and the other focusing on inclusive environments for students with severe disabilities. One of the outcomes of this approach has been the application of the evaluation and systems change components of PBIS to the other two initiatives.
- *New Mexico*—The state improvement grant (SIG) has not only funded its SBI, but has also funded initiatives relating to secondary transition and least restrictive environment (LRE) and representatives from both of these initiatives serve on the SBI's leadership team.

Eligibility Criteria

With the exception of *Maryland*, all interviewees noted that participation in the SBI had always been voluntary. The interviewee from *Maryland* noted that although the SEA had originally “nudged” its 15 pilot sites into participating, the SEA's current policy of asking LEAs to volunteer was much more effective for securing buy-in. Depending on the state, participation in the SBI may be initiated at the LEA level (*Colorado*) or at the school level, but with evidence of strong LEA support/commitment (*Iowa, Illinois, Maryland, New Mexico* and *Oregon*). Prior to November 2005, however, participation in *Oregon's* SBI was initiated exclusively at the school level.

Some states described more stringent eligibility criteria than others for schools and/or LEAs wishing to participate in the SBI. *Colorado*, for instance, described the application process as “competitive” and provided a lengthy list of eligibility criteria. On the other hand, *Iowa* and *Oregon* required schools and/or LEAs to complete applications, but set fewer eligibility requirements (although *Oregon’s* eligibility requirements have become more rigorous since transitioning from a grassroots effort to a more systematic statewide effort). Both *New Mexico* and *Illinois* described processes that had become more selective over time as the SBI had grown. In *New Mexico*, the success of the SBI has resulted in many more schools wishing to participate than the state can afford to support financially. *Illinois* also reports struggling to meet the demand and now requires more evidence of district commitment to provide coaching and other supports to schools before the SBI will work with them.

Common eligibility criteria include requiring schools and/or LEAs to complete an application process (e.g., *Colorado’s* “Partnership Proposal”); ensure allocation of sufficient coaching support based on the number of schools involved (e.g., no more than three schools per coach); guarantee that teachers will be given release time to attend necessary trainings; commit to collecting and reporting data; and/or develop a three-to-five year timeline. *Colorado’s* original guidelines also required that a small LEA wishing to participate in the SBI must secure involvement by 75% of its schools during the first year and a large LEA wishing to participate must secure involvement by at least 25% of its schools. *Colorado’s* guidelines have since been modified in recognition of the fact that large LEAs (e.g., those with more than 100 schools) can not realistically bring 25% of schools on in the first year of participation. Most interviewees described efforts to ensure that all schools and LEAs participating in the SBI create an infrastructure for sustainability.

Scope and Focus

In terms of scope, all six interviewees described SBIs that currently include all regions of their state. Some states—such as *Oregon* and *Colorado*—have built capacity incrementally by gradually expanding to include all regions. For example, education service agencies representing all parts of *Oregon* now receive state grants to support PBIS implementation. Several interviewees noted that the majority of participating schools are in metropolitan and/or suburban areas, with less participation by schools located in more rural areas.

All interviewees described SBIs that were growing exponentially to include many more LEAs and schools each year than originally planned. For instance, *Colorado’s* SBI expanded from two LEAs and 16 schools in 2002-2003 to 48 LEAs and 405 schools in 2006-2007. *Illinois* now has more than 600 schools in approximately 160 LEAs and *New Mexico* has 124 schools in 44 LEAs (including three schools that are part of the juvenile justice system). *Iowa* originally planned to work with just eight demonstration schools over a five year period, but—in response to LEA and school demand—more than 100 schools are now participating, albeit with LEA funding as opposed to state funding.

In *Maryland*, all LEAs are now participating in the SBI—with varying levels of implementation (i.e., some LEAs have committed significantly more resources and received

more in-depth training than others). In *New Mexico* and *Oregon*, on the other hand, only some of the LEAs are currently participating.

Although both *Colorado* and *Illinois* noted that in the past their SBIs focused exclusively on students with the most severe behavioral challenges, all six interviewees reported that their SBIs now focus on meeting the behavioral support needs of all students, not just those with disabilities. In spite of the stated purpose of serving all students, however, several interviewees noted that one of the weaknesses of their SBIs was the lack of staff training and resources to meet the needs of students requiring PBIS at the tertiary (or most intensive) level. One exception to this is *Iowa*, which provides extensive training in addressing the needs of the students with the most severe behavioral challenges, as well as mental health supports.

Components of SBIs

Because all interviewees reported adopting and/or adapting a PBIS approach as part of their SBI, interviewees were asked whether or not, and how, their approach differed from the model developed by the PBIS Center. Most described SBIs that have really taken the lead in developing and/or building on one or more components of a PBIS approach (e.g., family and community participation, tertiary interventions [including mental health services], early childhood and/or professional development). Examples of states' fine-tuning their SBIs to better accommodate their states' unique strengths and needs include the following:

- *Colorado*—Its SBI has a strong focus on family and community engagement as well as on early childhood. In developing its SIG application, which funds the SBI, the SEA collaborated with the state parent training and information center (PTIC) to ensure that the focus of the SBI was on families as well as students. The SEA and the PTIC jointly developed PBIS training modules for parents in order to encourage families to get involved in the school-wide PBIS initiative and to use PBIS principles at home. These trainings are offered at the LEA level and frequently draw between 20-80 participants. In terms of early childhood, four to five LEAs have adapted the PBIS approach for preschool settings (e.g., developed age-appropriate materials). The SEA plans to include three- to five-year-olds in the SBI in a more formalized way and to expand behavioral supports for this age group beyond the initial few LEAs involved.
- *Illinois*—The SBI is based on a strong interagency network and staff members have extensive training in a wraparound approach that merges behavioral interventions with mental health and other services for individual students and their families. The state has also launched an online system for integrating data-based decision making into the wraparound process to ensure more effective outcomes for these students. As part of its SBI, *Illinois* will also be funding several tertiary demonstration sites where a higher level of technical assistance will be provided to build LEA capacity to support students with emotional/behavioral and other severe disabilities.
- *Iowa*—Its SBI focuses on mental health and parent participation. The state sponsors staff wraparound training for personnel working with students with the most severe needs and

a state-level family team has been convened to identify how to increase family involvement in the SBI. Also, starting in 2006, 10-12 Head Start programs will receive training in the application of PBIS to early childhood settings.

- *Maryland*—The state has focused on building local capacity around PBIS training as well as passing legislation requiring PBIS in schools that have suspension rates of 18% or higher. Efforts are also underway to integrate the SBI with Systems of Care operated out of the governor’s Office of Children.
- *New Mexico*—Two components are unique to *New Mexico’s* SBI: embedding bully-proofing training into the PBIS model and providing culturally responsive PBIS training to staff. SBI representatives are also currently collaborating with the state’s PTIC to develop training modules for parents as well as for school staff on the “meaningful engagement” of parents in school-wide practices.

Fiscal and Human Resources

Sources of funding for SBIs vary considerably from state to state. For example:

- *Colorado* relies on a combination of SIG funds and IDEA discretionary funds earmarked for behavior. Approximately 50% of participating LEAs also receive expelled and at-risk dollars coming out of the state’s prevention initiative.
- *Illinois’* SBI is a grant-based project funded primarily by IDEA discretionary funds and money from the Children’s Mental Health Partnership (formed in response to legislation mandating social and emotional learning standards). The project has recently been awarded an OSEP grant in partnership with Kansas University to support several tertiary demonstration sites.
- *Iowa* receives funding through the SEA as part of a five year grant. Participating schools frequently use Safe and Drug Free Schools money to support building-level teams.
- *Maryland* funds its SBI through a combination of Title IV Safe and Drug Free Schools money, HIV Prevention money and Dropout Prevention money. The Division of Special Education and Early Intervention originally contributed 50% of the funds, but now the SBI is funded and overseen exclusively by the Division of Student, Family and School Support.
- *New Mexico* received funding for the last five years from the SIG and is currently applying for State Personnel Development Grant (SPDG) funds. SBI representatives are also engaged in preliminary discussions with Reading First.
- *Oregon*, prior to 2005, received no funding at the state level. The SEA now contributes some money via grant applications to LEAs throughout the state.

Amounts of money allocated to SBIs also vary. For example, *Illinois*' SBI is the most generously funded of the six states—with an operating budget of \$2.2 million per year; *Iowa*'s SBI receives \$2.3 million over a five year period and, since November of 2005, *Oregon*'s program has been operating on a budget of only \$290,000 per year.

In terms of human resources, some SBIs include numerous dedicated staff members, whereas other states operate their SBIs with minimal staff. For instance, *Illinois* has approximately 17 full-time equivalencies (FTEs) devoted to its SBI, including 20 field-based technical assistance coordinators, an evaluator and administrative staff; and *New Mexico* has a statewide coordinator, 14 trainers (who work as independent contractors) and will soon be adding five part-time regional coordinators. *Maryland*, on the other hand, has 3.0 FTE dedicated to its SBI and *Oregon* has 2.5 FTE.

As far as local resources, most interviewees reported that LEAs are expected to provide coaches (i.e., individuals who provide ongoing technical support to building-level teams) and several require a minimum number of coaching hours be made available. For example, *Colorado*, which follows PBIS Center recommendations for coaching limits, requires at least one half-time coach for every 5-8 school buildings. Larger LEAs in *Colorado* have as many as 3.5 FTE coaches and rural areas as little as .1 FTE coach. Most states expect LEAs to provide sufficient release time for building-level teams to meet together and receive training, although training itself is usually paid for by the SEA. Other local-level contributions to the SBI may include convening an LEA-level leadership team and covering travel expenses to and from training events. *Iowa* also reported that a number of LEAs have self-funded SBI sites beyond the original SEA-funded sites (i.e., covering the costs of training as well as providing coaches).

Professional Development

All six interviewees described offering SBI-related trainings at a number of levels (e.g., training for building-level teams, training for coaches and/or annual conferences or symposia for everyone involved in the SBI).

All interviewees reported offering specific training for building-level teams. Training is provided to both new and returning teams, with some states providing “differentiated” trainings (e.g., separate trainings for first, second and third year teams). Most interviewees described training sequences conducted over multiple years and reported offering trainings for building-level teams at the LEA level, regionally and/or at statewide training events. Several interviewees described unique approaches to training of building-level teams. For example:

- *Colorado* provides trainings for new teams that focus on PBIS at the universal (or primary) level and trainings for returning teams that focus on supports for students with more severe needs (secondary and tertiary levels).
- *New Mexico* offers separate trainings based on region as well as experience level, and reported offering almost 50 trainings during the 2005-2006 year. The state also hosts an

annual mini-conference for “graduating schools” that have completed their three years of required training.

The six interviewees also described offering specific trainings for coaches. For example: *Maryland* offers three trainings per year for all coaches; *Illinois* offers eight trainings per year for all coaches; *Colorado* offers five trainings per year for new coaches and three per year for more experienced coaches; and *New Mexico* offers an academy for new coaches in addition to three trainings per year for all coaches. The interviewee from *Colorado* noted that coaches are currently being trained to improve data-driven decision making skills and that content for next year’s trainings will be based on input from coaches regarding knowledge gaps.

In almost all states interviewed, annual statewide (often multi-day) conferences or symposia offer opportunities for all types of stakeholders to come together and learn from one another. Attendance at these events grows each year, with more than 400 attendees at *Illinois*’ most recent statewide leadership conference, 725 at *Colorado*’s summer symposium and more than 1,200 at *Oregon*’s PBIS conference. Due to the significant growth in numbers of attendees, *Maryland* now offers two annual regional conferences instead of a single, statewide conference.

Other SBI-related trainings include the following:

- *Illinois* offers PBIS courses at the state’s annual administrators’ academy as well as several trainings throughout the state for principals, superintendents and special education directors.
- *Maryland* offers opportunities for staff from participating high schools to meet twice per year as well as opportunities for staff from participating alternative education and special schools to meet twice per year. Maryland also hosts a spring forum for school administrators intended to recruit new schools.
- *New Mexico* and *Maryland* are partnering with IHEs to develop pre-service and in-service credits related to PBIS.
- *Oregon* offers three trainings per year for high schools participating in the SBI.

Although all six interviewees described initial reliance on the PBIS Center and other national-level trainers for state- and local-level training related to their SBIs, they also described efforts to build training capacity *within* their states. For instance, *Illinois* noted that establishing a state-level training network was an “explicit goal.” For the first two years of its SBI, *New Mexico* relied exclusively on national-level trainers, shifted during the third year to “co-training” (using both national-level trainers and a cadre of state-level trainers) and succeeded during the fourth year in using only state-level trainers. The interviewee from *New Mexico*, as well as those from most other states, expressed pride at having succeeded in developing effective state-level training teams, particularly for basic training in a universal, school-wide approach. States were more likely to depend on the PBIS Center for training of *trainers* (i.e., members of state-level training teams) and provision of content knowledge to coaches and building-level teams related to

secondary and tertiary supports. Members of state-level training teams come from a variety of backgrounds and include members of state-level leadership teams, PBIS coaches, volunteers affiliated with IHEs and/or other individuals with expertise in PBIS. In *Oregon's* case, prior to receiving state-level funding for its SBI, schools frequently paid private consultants to provide PBIS training.

Evaluation

All interviewees reported using evaluation materials developed by the PBIS Center, although some described adapting these materials to the needs of their states and/or developing additional state-specific evaluation materials. Most commonly, states described using the following PBIS Center tools:

- **Team Implementation Checklist (TIC)** designed to help building-level teams determine the level of PBIS implementation currently attained;
- **Effective Behavior Support (EBS) Self-assessment Survey** used by school staff for initial and annual assessment of effective behavior support systems in their school;
- **School-wide Evaluation Tool (SET)** designed to be used by an outside evaluator to assess and evaluate the critical features of school-wide effective behavior support across each academic year;
- **School-wide Information System (SWIS)** designed to indicate the frequency and proportion of office discipline referrals, suspensions and expulsions; and
- **School Safety Survey (SSS)** intended to serve as an index of the overall “safety” of the school by generating a perceived risk factors score and a perceived protective factors score.

State-specific approaches to evaluation include the following:

- *Illinois* developed and is currently piloting an online evaluation system for clinicians and social workers to integrate data-based decision making into wraparound teams at the tertiary level.
- *Maryland* has allowed schools to incorporate PBIS-related questions into their own staff surveys in lieu of using the EBS Self-assessment Survey.

All interviewees reported that they regularly evaluate professional development activities related to the SBI and assess fidelity of implementation at the individual building level using the TIC, SET or something similar, and most interviewees reported that participating LEAs make an effort to evaluate parent satisfaction.

All interviewees reported that they are now systematically gathering behavioral outcome data on students at participating schools (e.g., office discipline referrals and suspensions/expulsions). Interviewees from *Colorado*, *Iowa* and *Maryland* also reported gathering academic outcome data. Johns Hopkins University is conducting a formal evaluation of PBIS in *Maryland* using a randomized trial looking at data pertaining to 20,000 students.

All interviewees expressed confidence in the positive impact their SBI is having on students. Although not all states reported being able to measure clear outcomes at this time, all reported that their SBI had generated high levels of enthusiasm. In those states with well-established evaluation systems, interviewees reported there have been significant reductions in suspensions/expulsions as well as in office discipline referrals, which translate into gains in both instructional and administrative time.

Policy Recommendations

Interviewees provided a number of policy recommendations for implementing a successful SBI. Most commonly, interviewees made suggestions related to staffing. For example, most interviewees stressed that as the number of schools participating in their SBIs continues to grow, it is crucial that coaching capacity keeps up with this growth. Several suggested that states require that the number of schools assigned to a single coach not exceed a set figure. Others suggested offering fiscal incentives to LEAs that dedicate a portion of the workload of existing personnel (e.g., school psychologists) to school-wide PBIS coaching. Related to this, several interviewees recommended dedicating a full-time SEA-level staff person to the administration of the SBI because, in the words of one interviewee, “Otherwise it becomes one of 82,000 things they do.”

Another common recommendation was that of “blended” initiatives. For example, several interviewees suggested linking SBIs to other state-level initiatives including behavioral, mental health and/or response to intervention (RtI) initiatives that states are currently implementing or planning to implement. One interviewee stressed the importance of recognizing that PBIS is not so much a program as an organizational framework that states should consider applying to other initiatives as well as their SBIs. Other recommendations for successful SBIs included the following:

- Initiate a state-level leadership group with strong interagency, political and general education representatives to guide implementation.
- Build local and statewide training capacity.
- Develop staff skills for meeting the needs of students at the “tertiary” level (i.e., students with the most significant behavioral challenges).
- Ensure a five-to-ten year funding base through a variety of funding sources (not just special education).
- Focus behavioral resources on rural as well as urban/suburban areas of the state.
- Establish a system of collecting data at both state- and local-levels.
- Work with PTICs to examine how a PBIS approach can be extended beyond the school context to that of the family and/or the broader community.
- Provide continued federal funding for the PBIS Center.

CONCLUDING REMARKS

Almost all states surveyed reported either implementing an SBI or planning to implement an SBI in the near future, suggesting that states are aware that in order to educate students well, they

must also attend to social, emotional and behavioral issues. Significantly, many of these SBIs are quite new (i.e., implemented since 2000) and almost all have adopted/adapted a PBIS approach. In terms of the six states interviewed, the level and nature of SEA involvement in SBIs varies considerably. All have worked closely with the PBIS Center to develop and implement their SBIs, although most have made significant progress toward building state- and local-level capacity. A common theme across interviewees was the exponential growth of their SBIs due to the fact that LEAs and schools are eager to participate. Another theme was the success of the PBIS model due to its emphasis on the collection of outcome data and the importance of such data for securing state- and local-level buy-in to the SBI. Several interviewees also suggested that the SBI be linked to other initiatives and/or used as a model of how to “scale-up” other initiatives.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

Project Forum wishes to thank Rob Horner of the PBIS Center for helping identify the six states interviewed, as well as the following individuals for taking the time to be interviewed and/or for reviewing an earlier version of this document: Kiki McGough, PBS Coordinator and Cyndi Boezio, Director of the State Improvement Grant, Colorado Department of Education; Lucille Eber, Project Director, Illinois PBIS Network; Carl Smith, Co-Director, Iowa Behavioral Alliance; Susan Barrett, PBIS Maryland State Coordinator, Sheppard Pratt Health System; Cathy Jones, Statewide Coordinator for PBIS, New Mexico Region 9 Education Cooperative; and Chris Borgmeier, Co-Chair, Oregon Positive Behavior Support Network and Assistant Professor, Portland State University.

REFERENCES

- Boerman, T., Sugai, T., & Vincent, C. (2002). *Statewide behavioral interventions: Status and recommendations*. Eugene, OR: Center on Positive Behavioral Interventions and Supports, University of Oregon.
- Linehan, P. (2000). *Statewide behavior initiatives*. Alexandria, VA: Project Forum at the National Association of State Directors of Special Education.

APPENDIX A – STATEWIDE BEHAVIOR INITIATIVES (N=46)

State	SBI	Implemented	Model Used
Alabama	Yes	2000	PBIS
Alaska	Yes	2004	PBIS
Arizona	Yes	2002	PBIS
Arkansas	Yes	2003	Other
California	Yes	1998	Other
Colorado	Yes	Early 1990s	PBIS
Connecticut	No	N/A	N/A
Delaware	Yes	1998	PBIS
DODEA	No	N/A	N/A
Florida	Yes	1997	PBIS
Georgia	Yes	1999	PBIS
Hawaii	Yes	1997	PBIS
Idaho	Yes	1989	PBIS
Illinois	Yes	Early 1990s	PBIS
Iowa	Yes	Early 1990s	PBIS
Kentucky	Yes	1992	PBIS
Maryland	Yes	1998	PBIS
Massachusetts	Yes	2003	PBIS
Michigan	Yes	1998	PBIS
Micronesia	No	N/A	N/A
Minnesota	Yes	2005	PBIS
Mississippi	Yes	2006	PBIS
Missouri	Yes	2000	PBIS
Montana	Yes	Mid 1990s	PBIS
Nebraska	Yes	2000	PBIS
Nevada	Yes	1999	Other
New Hampshire	Yes	2002	PBIS
New Jersey	Yes	2004	PBIS
New Mexico	Yes	2001	PBIS
New York	Yes	2002	PBIS
North Carolina	Yes	2000	PBIS
North Dakota	Yes	2004	PBIS
Ohio	Yes	1999	PBIS
Oklahoma	No	N/A	N/A
Oregon	Yes	2001	PBIS
Palau	No	N/A	N/A
Pennsylvania	Yes	Mid 1990s	PBIS
South Carolina	Yes	2002	PBIS
South Dakota	No	Planned for 2007	PBIS
Tennessee	Yes	2006	PBIS
Texas	Yes	Late 1990s	PBIS
Utah	Yes	1991	PBIS
Virginia	Yes	2003	PBIS
West Virginia	Yes	Late 1990s	PBIS
Wisconsin	Yes	1999	PBIS
Wyoming	Yes	2005	PBIS
Total = 41 SBIs			