

Peabody College

VANDERBILT UNIVERSITY

NASHVILLE, TENNESSEE 37203



The Alliance Project

Headquarters

Peabody College, Box 160
Hill Student Center, Rm. 101
(615) 343-5610
1-800-831-6134
Fax (615) 343-5611
alliance@vanderbilt.edu

Washington, DC Metropolitan Office

10860 Hampton Road
Fairfax Station, VA 22039
(703) 239-1557
Fax (703) 503-8627
Email: judysd@gte.net

February 2001

Applying Positive Behavioral Support in Schools _____

This is the full text of the paper cited below. One figure has been changed to a table and is modified graphically but not in content.

Office of Special Education Programs. (2000). Applying positive behavioral support in schools. *Twenty-second annual report to Congress on the implementation of the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act* (pp. III-7 through III-31). Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Education.

The contents of this module reflect the work of George Sugai and Robert H. Horner and have been adapted from *Technical Assistance Guide #1, Applying Positive Behavioral Support and Functional Behavioral Assessment in Schools*, which was prepared by the Office of Special Education Programs' Center on Positive Behavioral Interventions and Supports and approved by the U.S. Department of Education. For a complete copy of *Technical Assistance Guide #1*, go to <http://www.pbis.org>

The OSEP Center on Positive Behavioral Interventions and Supports is supported by a grant from OSEP, with additional funding from the Safe and Drug Free Schools Program, U.S. Department of Education.

INTRODUCTION

On June 4, 1997, amendments to the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA) became law (P.L. 105-17). These amendments introduced a number of concepts that were new to the statute, two of which are particularly important to the education of children whose behaviors violate school codes of conduct and/or are outside personal or interpersonal norms of acceptable social behavior: (a) positive behavioral support (PBS) and (b) functional behavioral assessment (FBA).

PBS and FBA are not new. However, in the context of IDEA, they represent an important effort to improve the quality of behavioral interventions and behavioral support planning. As schools organize to meet these requirements and to build their capacity to meet the behavioral needs of all students, especially students with disabilities, attention must be given to the definition, features, and uses of PBS and FBA. The purpose of this paper is to describe what is meant by PBS and FBA.

CONTEXT

Schools are important environments in which children, families, educators, and community members have opportunities to learn, teach, and grow. For nearly 180 days each year and 6 hours each day, educators strive to provide students learning environments that are stable, positive, and predictable. These environments have the potential to provide positive adult and peer role models, multiple and regular opportunities to experience academic and social success, and social exchanges that foster enduring peer and adult relationships.

Despite these positive attributes, teachers, students, families, and community members face significant contemporary challenges in schools (e.g., acts of school violence, drug abuse, emotional and behavioral disorders, excessively high rates of rule- and code-violating behavior, expulsions, dropping out). Every year, schools are being asked to do more with fewer resources. New initiatives to improve literacy, enhance character, accommodate rapidly advancing technologies, make schools violence-free, and facilitate school-to-work transitions are added to the educator's workday. Schools are being asked to achieve new and more results, yet seldom are allowed to cease work on the growing list of initiatives.

Educators also are being asked to educate an increasingly heterogeneous population of students. An increasing number of students in our schools have English as a second language, limited family supports, significant learning and/or behavioral problems, families who face major financial barriers, and a great need for mental health, social welfare, medical, and vocational assistance (Knitzer, 1993; Knitzer, Steinberg, & Fleisch, 1990; Stevens & Price, 1992). Although most attention has focused on students with externalizing problem behavior (e.g., aggressive, antisocial, destructive), students with internalizing behavior problems (e.g., social withdrawal, depression) also represent an important concern of families, schools, and communities (Kauffman, 1997).

In addition, challenges associated with educating students with severe problem behavior are increasing (Biglan, 1995; Kauffman, 1997; Sprague, Sugai, & Walker, 1998; Sugai & Horner, 1994; Walker, Colvin, & Ramsey, 1995). Although these students represent only 1 percent to 5 percent of a school's enrollment, often they can account for more than 50 percent of the behavioral incidents handled by office personnel and consume significant amounts of educator and administrator time (Sugai, Sprague, Horner, & Walker, in press; Taylor-Greene et al., 1997). Many of these students require comprehensive behavioral supports that involve family, school, and community participation (Eber, 1996; Eber & Nelson, 1997; Epstein et al., 1993; Walker et al., 1995; Walker, et al., 1996).

Many schools lack the capacity to identify, adopt, and sustain policies, practices, and systems that effectively and efficiently meet the needs of all students (Mayer, 1995; Sugai & Horner, 1994, 1999; Taylor-Greene et al., 1997; Walker et al., 1996). Schools often rely on outside behavioral expertise because local personnel lack specialized skills to educate students with significant problem behaviors. School morale is often low because ongoing staff support is limited. Although many students have significant social skills needs, social skill instruction is not a conspicuous and systemic component of the school-wide curriculum. Behavioral interventions are not based on information obtained from assessments. In general, systems for the identification, adoption, and sustained use of research-validated practices are lacking (Kotter, 1995; Latham, 1998; Sugai & Horner, 1999; Todd, Horner, Sugai, & Sprague, 1999).

In sum, the challenges facing educators are significant and persistent. If not addressed, their impact on students, school personnel, families, and community members can be dramatic. However, the problem is not that schools lack procedures and practices to address these challenges. Procedures and practices have been defined and growing over the past 30 years (Mayer, 1995; Peacock Hill Working Group, 1992; Sugai, 1998; Walker et al., 1998). The greater problem has been that researchers have been unable to create and sustain the "contextual fit" between what the procedures and practices are and the features of the environments (e.g., classroom, workplace, home, neighborhood, playground) in which the student displays problem behavior (Albin, Lucyshyn, Horner, & Flannery, 1996; Walker et al., 1996). The systemic solution is to create effective "host environments" that support the use of preferred and effective practices (Sugai & Horner, 1994, 1999; Zins & Ponti, 1990). Effective host environments have policies (e.g., proactive discipline handbooks, procedural handbooks), structures (e.g., behavioral support teams), and routines (e.g., opportunities for students to learn expected behavior, staff development, data-based decision making) that promote the identification, adoption, implementation, and monitoring of research-validated practices.

As a society, we look to our schools to be or become settings where our children can learn the skills for successful adulthood (e.g., IDEA, Goals 2000: Improving America's Schools Act). This expectation occurs in the context of an increasingly heterogeneous student body and students with intense patterns of chronic problem behavior. The growing expectation is that schools will deliver socially acceptable, effective, and efficient interventions to ensure safe, productive environments where norm-violating behavior is minimized and prosocial behavior is promoted. PBS and FBA represent important efforts toward achieving these goals.

Increasingly, efforts to establish school-linked service arrangements for children and families are appearing around the country (Sailor, 1996). These models have been tested and described in numerous schools (Adelman & Taylor, 1997; Dryfoos, 1997; Illback, Nelson, & Sanders, 1998; Kagan, Goffin, Golub, & Pritchard, 1995; Kearns, Kleinhert, Farmer, & Warlick, in press; Kleinert, Kearns, & Kennedy, in press).

More recently, these school, family, and community partnerships have been described under the "community schools" rubric (Benson & Harkavy, 1997; Lawson & Briar-Lawson, 1997). These comprehensive systems-change initiatives are designed to create a seamless web of supports and services that "wrap around" children and families, and to bring an end to the current fragmentation and categorical separation of school agency-directed programs. These systems-change efforts create a gateway through which to integrate PBS methods into the culture of the school and to extend effective and coordinated participation in the behavioral support plan to family members and community agency personnel (Sailor, 1996).

POSITIVE BEHAVIORAL SUPPORT

Optimizing the capacity of schools to address schoolwide, classroom, and individual problem behavior is possible in the face of current challenges but only if working policies, structures, and routines emphasize the identification, adoption, and sustained use of research-validated practices. In recent years, PBS has been emerging as an approach to enable schools to define and operationalize these structures and procedures. New journals (e.g., the *Journal of Positive Behavioral Intervention*), technical assistance centers (e.g., Beach Center, Center on Positive Behavioral Interventions and Supports), and personnel preparation programs have established PBS as the focus of their purpose and activities.

Definition

PBS is a general term that refers to the culturally appropriate application of positive behavioral interventions and systems to achieve socially important behavior change. PBS was developed initially as an alternative to aversive interventions used with students with significant disabilities who engaged in extreme forms of self-injury and aggression (Durand & Carr, 1985; Myer & Evans, 1989). More recently, the technology has been applied successfully with students both with and without disabilities, in a wide range of contexts (Carr et al., 1999); Horner, Albin, Sprague, & Todd, 1999), and extended from an intervention approach for individual students to an intervention approach for entire schools (Colvin, Kame'enui, & Sugai, 1993; Colvin, Sugai, Good, & Lee, 1997; Lewis, Sugai, & Colvin, 1998; Taylor-Greene, et al, 1997; Todd, Horner, Sugai, & Sprague, 1999).

PBS is not a new intervention package, nor a new theory of behavior, but an application of a behaviorally-based systems approach to enhancing the capacity of schools, families, and communities to design effective environments that improve the fit or link between research-validated practices and the environments in which teaching and learning occur. Attention is focused on creating and sustaining school environments that improve lifestyle results (personal, health, social, family, work, recreation, etc) for all children and youth by making problem behavior less effective, efficient, and relevant -- and desired behavior more functional.

The use of culturally appropriate interventions also is emphasized in the PBS approach. "Culturally appropriate" describes interventions that consider the unique and individualized learning histories (social, community, historical, familial, racial, gender, etc) of all individuals (children with problem behaviors, families, teachers, community agents, etc) who participate in the PBS process and approach. Data-based problem solving and individualized planning processes can help to establish culturally appropriate interventions; however, individual learning histories ultimately can affect how data are summarized, analyzed, and used.

Haring and De Vault (1996) indicate that PBS comprises (a) "interventions that consider the contexts within which the behavior occurs," (b) "interventions that address the functionality of the problem behavior," (c) "interventions that can be justified by the outcomes," and (d) "outcomes that are acceptable to the individual, the family, and the supportive community" (p. 116).

Features

At the core, PBS is the integration of behavioral science, practical interventions, social values, and a systems perspective (table 1).

Behavioral science. An existing science of human behavior links the behavioral, cognitive, biophysical, developmental, and physical-environmental factors that influence how a person behaves (Baer, Wolf, & Risley, 1968; Bijou & Baer, 1987; Schwartz, 1989; Wolery, Bailey, & Sugai, 1988). Of particular interest are factors that affect the development and durability of disruptive and dangerous behaviors (Biglan, 1995; Kauffman, 1997; Mayer, 1995; Patterson, Reid, & Dishion, 1992; Walker et al., 1995). To a great extent, when these behaviors are observed in our schools, they can be traced to unintentional student, peer, and/or teacher behavioral exchanges (Gunter, Denny, Jack, Shores, & Nelson, 1993; Sasso, Peck, & Garrison-Harrell, 1998; Shores, Gunter, & Jack, 1993; Shores, Jack, Gunter, Ellis, DeBriere, & Wehby, 1993).

Although learning and teaching processes are complex and continuous, and some behavior initially is not learned (e.g., biobehavioral), key issues from this science are that much of human behavior is learned, comes under the control of environmental factors, and can be changed. The strength of the science is that problem behaviors become more understandable and, as our understanding grows, so does our ability to teach more socially appropriate and functional behavior. The PBS approach is founded on this science of human behavior. Different procedures and strategies are applied at different levels, but the fundamental principles of behavior are the same.

Table 1. Foundations and Features of Positive Behavior Support

Behavioral Science	Practical Interventions	Social Values	Systems Perspective
Human behavior is affected by behavioral, biobehavioral, social, and physical environmental factors.	Functional behavioral assessments are used to develop behavior support plans.	Behavior change must be socially significant, comprehensive, durable, and relevant.	The quality and durability of supports are related directly to the level of support provided by the host environment.
Much of human behavior is associated with unintentional learning opportunities.	Interventions emphasize environmental redesign, curriculum redesign, and removing rewards that inadvertently maintain problem behavior.	The goal of PBS is enhancement of living and learning options.	The implementation of practices and decisions is policy-driven.
Human behavior is learned and can be changed.	Teaching is a central behavior change tool.	PBS procedures are socially and culturally appropriate. Applications occur in least restrictive natural settings.	Emphasis is placed on prevention and the sustained use of effective practices.
	Research-validated practices are emphasized.	The fit between procedures and values of students, families, and educators must be contextually appropriate.	A team-based approach to problem-solving is used.
	Intervention decisions are data-based.	Nonaversive interventions (no pain, tissue damage, or humiliation) are used.	Active administrative involvement is emphasized.
			Multi-systems (district, schoolwide, non-classroom, individual student, family, community) are considered.
			A continuum of behavior supports is emphasized.

Practical interventions. The science of human behavior has led to the development of practical strategies for preventing and reducing problem behavior (e.g., Alberto & Troutman, 1999; Cooper, Heron, & Heward, 1987; Kerr & Nelson, 1998; Koegel, Koegel, & Dunlap, 1996; Reichle & Wacker, 1993; Wolery et al., 1988). "Practical" describes strategies that emphasize the contextual fit among problem behaviors, environments in which problem behaviors are occurring, and interventions that are developed and implemented (Albin et al., 1996). Priority is given to interventions that improve implementation efficiency, intervention effectiveness, and relevance of outcomes by (a) involving recipients of PBS in the design of behavior support plans, (b) considering the values of recipients and implementers of PBS, (c) considering the skills of implementers of PBS, (d) securing the approvals and endorsements of recipients and implementers of PBS, (e) considering the resources and administrative supports needed to implement strategies, and (f) providing the supports needed to sustain the use of effective strategies over time.

Although implementation details vary across age groups, contexts, and behavior, PBS interventions have common features. Foremost among these features is the application of FBA, but equally important are emphases on environmental redesign (changing aspects of the setting), curriculum redesign (teaching new skills), modification of behavior (teaching and changing student and adult behavior), and removing rewards that maintain problem behaviors (Carr et al., 1994; Luiselli & Cameron, 1998; O'Neill et al., 1997).

PBS procedures emphasize assessment prior to intervention, manipulation of antecedent conditions to reduce or prevent the likelihood that a problem behavior will occur, development of new social and communication skills that make problem behaviors irrelevant, and careful redesign of consequences to eliminate factors that maintain problem behaviors and encourage more acceptable replacement social skills and behaviors. PBS is an approach that emphasizes teaching as a central behavior change tool and focuses on replacing coercion with environmental redesign to achieve durable and meaningful change in the behavior of students. As such, attention is focused on adjusting adult behavior (e.g., routines, responses, instructional routines) and improving learning environments (e.g., curricular accommodations, social networks).

Educators, parents, and community agents must "work smarter" (Kame'enui & Carnine, 1998) by using time more efficiently and strategically selecting instructional and behavioral strategies for which clear evidence of their effectiveness exists. Working smarter means using what works for all students, not just those with learning and behavioral difficulties (Delpit, 1995). The PBS approach emphasizes the identification, adoption, and sustained use of practices that have been research validated. For students with serious anti-social behaviors, a number of recent meta-analyses and descriptive literature reviews support the use of strategies that can be applied by educators in school environments, especially (a) contextually targeted social skills instruction, (b) academic and curricular restructuring, and (c) behaviorally based interventions (Gottfredson & Gottfredson, 1996; Lipsey, 1991, 1992; Lipsey & Wilson, 1993; Tolan & Guerra, 1994). Other more specific research-validated practices include FBAs, direct instruction, and other applied behavior analytic strategies (Carr et al., 1999).

Finally, the PBS approach emphasizes the use of data collection and analysis to inform decision making (e.g., direct behavioral observations, curriculum-based measurement). A variety of data sources (e.g., office discipline, referrals, attendance and tardy reports, and academic progress) are collected through a range of methods (e.g., archival review, interviews, direct observations) and from multiple sources (i.e., students, family members, educators, community members). In addition to behavioral factors, assessments consider cognitive, biophysical, developmental, and physical-environmental factors to assist in understanding problem behavior and in guiding the development of comprehensive behavioral support plans.

Collectively, these data can be used to determine the student's current level of functioning, the impact of the intervention on problem behavior, and/or improvements in other lifestyle results (e.g., family, work, recreation). With ongoing data collection, intervention and instructional modifications can be made in a timely manner.

Social values. PBS emphasizes consideration of social values in both the results expected from behavioral interventions and the strategies employed in delivering the interventions. A central PBS tenet is that behavior change needs to be socially significant. Behavior change should be (a) *comprehensive* in that all relevant parts of a student's day (before, during, and after school) and important social contexts (home, school, neighborhood, and community) are affected, (b) *durable* in that the change lasts for long time periods, and (c) *relevant* in that the reduction of problem behaviors and increases in pro-social behaviors affect living and learning opportunities (academic, family, social, work). The goal of PBS is more than the control of problem behavior; it also includes the enhancement of the living and learning options available to the student and to his or her peers and family (Risley, 1996; Turnbull & Turnbull, 1996).

Social values are also important in defining acceptable types of intervention procedures. PBS emphasizes the importance of procedures that are socially and culturally appropriate. The contextual fit between intervention strategies and the values of families, teachers, schools, support personnel, and community agency personnel may affect the quality and durability of support efforts (Sailor, 1996). No intervention should cause pain, tissue damage, or humiliation to children and their families. Finally, careful consideration is given to lifestyle outcomes that go beyond simple behavior reduction and enhancement. The development of behavioral support plans and the evaluation of their effects consider the student's current and future quality of life in all settings and circumstances. Koegel, Koegel, and Dunlap (1996, p. xiv) add that "interventions should strive to enhance a person's competencies and access to desirable environments, social circumstances, and activities" and "all people should be treated with respect and dignity, and that interventions must therefore refrain from interactions that are degrading, humiliating, or pain-inducing."

Systems impact. PBS is of particular importance for schools, given the emphasis on behavioral "systems" as well as individual children. A systems perspective provides support for the adoption and sustained use of effective school practices (Sugai & Horner, 1994, 1999). Without a systems approach, identification of practices is limited, adoptions are incomplete, and attention to school initiatives to address discipline is episodic and short term (e.g., 18-24 months) (Latham, 1988; Sugai & Horner, 1999; Zins & Ponti, 1990).

PBS implementations consider multiple contexts: family, district, school, classroom, non-classroom (e.g., cafeteria, hallways, bus, playground, parking lot), and individual. Efforts are policy-driven to ensure accountability, maximum positive results, participation in and progress through the general curriculum, and effective and efficient communications. In addition, a proactive (positive and preventive) perspective is maintained along three levels: (a) *primary* -- reducing the number of new cases of problem behavior, (b) *secondary* -- reducing the number of current cases of problem behavior, and (c) *tertiary* -- reducing the intensity and complexity of current cases (Walker et al., 1996). A team-based approach is applied to program assessment, development, and problem-solving (Adelman & Taylor, 1997; Lawson & Briar-Lawson, 1997). This approach enables input from multiple sources, a broader expert knowledge base, and improved sustainability over time.

At all levels in the system, active administrator support and participation are required. Without strong leadership from school administrators, program efforts often are inefficient, incomplete, and ineffective (Colvin & Sprick, 1999). Similarly, when problem behavior is chronic and intense, comprehensive linkages with other human service agencies (e.g., juvenile justice and corrections, mental/public health, child and family services) are considered (Eber, 1996; Eber & Nelson, 1997; Epstein et al., 1993; Walker et al., 1995; Walker et al., 1996).

Taken as a whole, a systems perspective to PBS provides a continuum of behavioral support (table 2) in which prevention is emphasized, and intensity of problem behavior and context is considered. As a continuum, four change elements characterize PBS: (a) change of systems (policies, structures, routines), (b) change of environments, (c) change of student and adult (parent, teacher, staff), and (d) change in appreciation of appropriate behavior in all involved individuals (student, staff, family, etc).

Table 2. Continuum of Positive Behavior Support

All Students in School

Students with-----> chronic/intense problem behavior (1 - 7 percent) ----->	Tertiary Prevention	Specialized individual interventions (Individual Student System)
Students at risk-----> for problem behavior (5-15 percent)----->	Secondary Prevention	Specialized group interventions (At-Risk System)
Students without-----> serious problem behaviors (80-90 percent)----->	Primary Prevention	Universal interventions (Schoolwide System, Classroom System)

FUNCTIONAL BEHAVIOR ASSESSMENT-BASED
BEHAVIOR SUPPORT PLANNING

Among the most important changes in applied behavioral analysis in the past 20 years has been the development of FBA (Special Issue, 1994). The development of positive behavioral interventions and plans that are guided by FBA is the foundation on which the PBS approach is delivered. A central message from this advancement is that the design of successful behavioral change interventions requires identification of the events that reliably predict and maintain problem behaviors (Carr, 1994; Horner, 1994; O'Neill et al., 1997; Repp, 1994; Sugai, Lewis-Palmer, & Hagan, 1998). Historically, problem behaviors have been viewed as residing within a child, and the diagnostic emphasis has been on the type of problem behavior or the link with disability type (i.e., within the individual). Although all types of information may be useful in the design of effective support, the current emphasis is on careful documentation of the predicting and maintaining events associated with problem behaviors.

Although useful in guiding decision-making at all levels, the FBA approach is the cornerstone of systems that address the educational programming for students who display the most significant and challenging problem behavior. These students require behavior support plans that are specialized, individualized, and high intensity. Such plans must be based on information about the nature of the problem behavior and the environmental context in which the problem behavior is observed. The FBA approach provides a systematic and informed means by which targeted interventions can be developed and monitored.

Functional assessment is not new, for it can be found in a variety of disciplines (e.g., vocational education, physical therapy, chemistry, physics). However, in education (in particular special education), functional assessment had its beginnings in the 1960s in applied behavior analysis (Bijou & Baer, 1961, 1978; Bijou, Peterson, & Ault, 1968; Bijou, Peterson, Harris, Allen, & Johnston, 1969). Initially, research studies and applied applications of the functional assessment technology demonstrated the value of defining variables maintaining a problem behavior prior to constructing an intervention (Carr, 1977; Carr & Durand, 1985; Iwata, Dorsey, Slifer, Bauman, & Richman, 1982; Repp & Horner, 1999; Touchette, MacDonald, & Langer, 1985). Although most of this work has been conducted with individuals with severe developmental and intellectual disabilities (Blakeslee, Sugai, & Gruba, 1994; Lohrman-O'Rourke, Knoster, & Llewellyn, 1999), a growing body of research and applications focuses on individuals with normal intellectual functioning (e.g., emotional and behavioral disorders, learning disabilities) (e.g., Broussard & Northup, 1995; Dunlap, Kern-Dunlap, Clarke, & Robbins, 1991; Dunlap et al., 1993; Dunlap, White, Vera, Wilson, & Panacek, 1996; Kern, Childs, Dunlap, Clarke, & Falk, 1994; Lewis & Sugai, 1993, 1996a, 1996b; Umbreit, 1995; Vollmer & Northup, 1996).

Definition

We define FBA as a systematic process of identifying problem behaviors and the events that reliably predict occurrence and non-occurrence of those behaviors and maintain the behaviors across time. The purpose of gathering this information is to improve the effectiveness, relevance, and efficiency of behavior support plans (Carr et al., 1994; Foster-Johnson & Dunlap, 1993; Horner, 1994; O'Neill et al., 1997; Sugai, Horner, & Sprague, 1999; Sugai, Lewis-Palmer, & Hagan, 1998; Tilly et al., 1998). Specifically, if we can identify the conditions under which problem behavior is likely to occur (triggering antecedents and maintaining consequences), we can arrange environments in ways that occurrences of problem behavior can be reduced, and teach and encourage behaviors that can replace problem behavior.

A number of procedures exist for conducting an FBA (Center for Effective Collaboration and Practice, 1998), but any professionally appropriate assessment should, at minimum, conclude with three main results. The first is hypothesis statements that include three key features: (a) operational definitions of the problem behavior(s), (b) descriptions of the antecedent events that reliably predict occurrence and non-occurrence of the problem behavior(s), and (c) descriptions of the consequence events that maintain the problem behavior(s). The second is direct observation data supporting these hypotheses. The third FBA result is a behavior support plan. The importance of the link between hypotheses that are derived from FBAs and the development of comprehensive behavior support plans must be emphasized. Behavior support plans provide a summary of intervention manipulations in four areas: setting event strategies, antecedent strategies, behavior teaching strategies, and consequence strategies. In addition, a comprehensive behavior support plan provides implementation scripts that detail who does what strategies, when, where, how often, and why; how emergency or crisis situations will be handled; and how implementation and effectiveness will be monitored.

In sum, FBA is not a set of forms or static products. It is a process of understanding behavior in the context in which it is observed and of guiding the development of positive behavioral interventions that are relevant, effective, and efficient. FBA is a best and preferred practice for all challenging behavior, not just for behavioral events that result in suspensions or other disciplinary actions.

Steps of the Functional Behavioral Assessment and Behavior Support Planning Process

In this section, an overview of the six main steps involved in conducting an FBA and developing behavior support plans is provided (table 3). Additional and specific guidelines for implementing the process are available in O'Neill et al. (1997); Sugai, Lewis-Palmer, and Hagan (1998); and Tilly et al. (1998).

Step One. Using archival review, analysis of routines, interviews, and/or direct observations, information is gathered regarding the conditions under which the problem behavior is and is not observed and more appropriate behavior is required. Attention is focused on four primary factors: setting events/establishing operations that make the problem behavior worse (e.g., diet, medical conditions/illness, sleep, fatigue, social conflicts), antecedent events that predictably precede and trigger or occasion problem behavior (e.g., task demands, instruction, peer/adult requests), problem behaviors that as a response class or set are maintained by a common function or outcome (e.g., attention, escape/avoidance), and consequence events that predictably follow and maintain problem behavior (positive or negative reinforcement).

Table 3. Overview of Functional Behavioral Assessment and Behavior Support Planning

<u>Step</u>	<u>Tools/Procedures</u>	<u>Outcome</u>
1. Collect information regarding conditions under which problem behavior is and is not observed and more appropriate behavior is required.	Archival review, analysis of routines, interviews, direct observation.	Descriptions of possible setting events, triggering antecedents, problem behavior response classes, maintaining consequences.
2. Develop testable (manipulable) hypotheses.	Team analysis of information from Step 1.	Testable hypotheses.
3. Collect direct observation information.	Direct observation.	Verified summary statements.
4. Design behavior support plans.	Team development.	Specification of (a) desired and acceptable alternative behavior, (b) antecedent strategies and manipulations, (c) consequence strategies and manipulations, (d) strategies for teaching desired and acceptable alternative behavior, and (e) setting event/ establishing operating strategies and manipulations.
5. Develop implementation scripts.	Team development.	Scripts that specify how, when, where, etc behavior support plan is to be implemented and by whom.
6. Collect information on effectiveness and efficiency of behavior support plan and redesign based on evaluation information.	Team development	Data on student progress and plan implementation, and redesign/ update plan.

Step Two. The information collected in the first step is used to develop testable hypotheses which best describe the conditions under which the problem behavior is most likely to occur. A complete testable hypothesis indicates problem behavior, triggering antecedent events, maintaining consequence events, and influential setting events/ establishing operations (O'Neill et al., 1997).

Step Three. After testable hypotheses are developed, direct observation information is collected to verify the accuracy or predictability of these statements. Usually, multiple observations are conducted across multiple settings and situations to determine whether problem behavior patterns occur under hypothesized conditions and contexts. These observations involve the careful documentation of antecedent and consequence variables that are present or absent when problem behaviors are and are not observed.

In cases where hypotheses are difficult to establish or where problem behavior is particularly resistant to interventions, functional "analysis" may be recommended. A functional analysis involves a systematic manipulation (i.e., removal and addition) of factors that are hypothesized as triggering or occasioning problem behavior. These manipulations are designed to trigger problem behavior under one set of conditions and not under others. However, in educational and clinical applications, researchers do not recommend functional analysis without the direct involvement of an experienced behavior analyst, consent and collaboration by families and caregivers, and structures for maintaining appropriate accountability (e.g., data collection, monitoring of implementation fidelity).

Step Four. Based on information from verified hypotheses, behavior support plans are developed that specify possible teaching strategies or manipulations for desired and acceptable alternative behaviors, antecedent events, consequence events, and setting events/establishing operations. This plan serves as the basis for defining the actual implementation of the behavioral intervention. Unlike more typical single-dimension interventions that focus on reactive, consequence manipulations (e.g., time-out, behavioral contracts), behavior support plans are based on FBA's considerable intervention components that are instructionally focused (i.e., teaching acceptable and desired replacement behaviors), prevention focused (e.g., neutralizing or eliminating the conditions that trigger problem behaviors or make them worse or more likely), and environmentally based (e.g., rearrangement of the problem context).

Step Five. Implementation scripts are developed to specify how, when, and where the behavior support plan will be implemented and by whom. Contingency plans for responding to emergencies, training staff, and collecting data also are indicated. If necessary, resources and assistance from other support individuals or agencies (e.g., mental health, medical, vocational) are indicated.

Step Six. Information on the effectiveness and efficiency of the behavior support plan is collected regularly, and the plan is redesigned based on an evaluation of this information. A formative (direct, frequent, regular) approach is emphasized.

CONCLUSION

Schools can be great places for students, teachers, related services personnel, families, human service practitioners, and community members to work collaboratively to achieve meaningful results for all children and youth. However, the efficiency and effectiveness of many schools have decreased because of limited resources; diverse students, families, and neighborhoods; increases in school violence; and increased social responsibilities. Although the solution is multifaceted, schools can make a significant contribution by "working smarter." This approach requires the establishment of proactive school environments (i.e., "host environments") that have the capacities to identify, adopt, and sustain the use of effective policies, systems, and practices.

PBS represents an important approach to identifying and organizing effective school practices, especially for students who present significant problem behavior. However, many systems-level challenges remain to be addressed. First, schools need guidelines for making the adoption and sustained use of PBS practices efficient and relevant. Attention must be focused on the policies, environments, structures, and practices of PBS. For example, addressing the needs of students who present significant problem behavior requires personnel with time, highly specialized skills, access to resources, and administrative supports.

Second, balancing efforts and attention between schoolwide and individual student systems is a challenge for many schools. For example, a schoolwide discipline system that operates efficiently and effectively for the majority of students in a school can ease the high costs

associated with addressing the intense needs of the relatively small proportion of students who present the most significant problem behavior (Sugai, Sprague, Horner, & Walker, in press). However, many schools lack the capacity to maintain the efficient and ongoing operation of both schoolwide and individual student systems. Increasingly, partnerships that include schools, community agencies, businesses, and family members offer new pathways for using PBS to change systems (Illback & Nelson, 1996; Sailor, 1996, in press).

Third, as the specialized nature of interventions increases with the increasing intensity of problem behavior, so does the complexity of the implementation. Schools need user-friendly ways to use PBS and FBA based behavior support planning. Consideration must be given to the unique features (e.g., cultural, geographic, demographic, physical) of a school and its students, families, teachers, and community members.

Finally, Carr et al. (1999) noted that lifestyle results were measured in less than 3 percent of PBS studies. Schools must develop mechanisms for determining if their efforts at the schoolwide, classroom, non-classroom, and individual student levels actually are associated with meaningful outcome improvements for students, their families, and the school. Attention to the reduction of problem behavior is understandable; however, the impact of PBS efforts on larger lifestyle results (e.g., peer relations, family functioning, community mobility) also must be considered.

The PBS approach offers students, teachers, and family and community members a process that begins to address these systems-level challenges. The process is based on an established science of human behavior, pays attention to important lifestyle results, works from a systems perspective, and gives priority to research-validated practices. The goal of PBS is to use information from FBAs to guide the design of learning and teaching environments that support and encourage adaptive behavior and lessen the usefulness of problem behavior.

References

- Alberto, P. A., & Troutman, A. C. (1999). *Applied behavior analysis for teachers* (5th ed). Columbus, OH: Merrill.
- Adelman, H., & Taylor, L. (1997). Addressing barriers to learning: Beyond school-linked services and full service schools. *American Journal of Orthopsychiatry*, 67, 408-421.
- Albin, R. W., Lucyshyn, L. M., Horner, R. H., & Flannery, K. B. (1996). Contextual fit for behavioral support plans: A model for a goodness-of-fit. In L. K. Koegel, R. L. Koegel, & G. Dunlap (Eds.), *Positive behavior support: Including people with difficult behavior in the community* (pp. 81-89). Baltimore: Paul H. Brookes.
- Baer, D. M., Wolf, M. M., & Risley, T. R. (1968). Some current dimensions of applied behavior analysis. *Journal of Applied Behavior Analysis*, 1, 91-97.
- Benson, L., & Harkavy, I. (1997). School and community in the global society: A neo-Deweyian theory of community problem-solving schools and cosmopolitan neighborly communities in a neo-Deweyian "manifesto" to dynamically connect school and community. *Universities and Community Schools*, 5, 11-69.
- Biglan, A. (1995). Translating what we know about the context of antisocial behavior into a lower prevalence of such behavior. *Journal of Applied Behavior Analysis*, 28, 479-492.

- Bijou, S. W., & Baer, D. M. (1961). *Child development I: A systematic and empirical theory*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall.
- Bijou, S. W., Peterson, R. F., & Ault, M. H. (1968). A method to integrate descriptive and experimental field studies at the level of data and empirical concepts. *Journal of Applied Behavior Analysis, 1*, 175-191.
- Bijou, S. W., Peterson, R. F., Harris, F. R., Allen, E., & Johnson, M. S. (1969). Methodology for experimental studies of young children in natural settings. *Psychological Record, 19*, 177-210.
- Blakeslee, T., Sugai, G., & Gruba, J. (1994). A review of functional assessment use in data-based intervention studies. *Journal of Behavioral Education, 4*, 397-414.
- Broussard, C. D., & Northup, J. (1995). An approach to functional assessment and analysis of disruptive behavior in regular education classrooms. *School Psychology Quarterly, 10*, 151-164.
- Carr, E. G. (1977). The motivation of self-injurious behavior: A review of some hypotheses. *Psychological Bulletin, 84*, 800-816.
- Carr, E. G. (1994). Emerging themes in the functional analysis of problem behavior. *Journal of Applied Behavior Analysis, 27*, 393-400.
- Carr, E. G., & Durand, V. M. (1985). Reducing behavior problems through functional communication training. *Journal of Applied Behavior Analysis, 18*, 111-126.
- Carr, E. G., Horner, R. H., Marquis, J. G., Turnbull, A. P., Magito-McLaughlin, D., McAtee, M. A., et al. (1999). *Positive behavior support for people with developmental disabilities: A research synthesis*. Washington, DC: American Association on Mental Retardation.
- Carr, E. G., Levin, L., McConnachie, G., Carlson, J. I., Kemp, D. C., & Smith, C. E. (1994). *Communication-based intervention for problem behavior: A user's guide for producing positive change*. Baltimore: Paul H. Brookes.
- Center for Effective Collaboration and Practice. (1998). *Addressing student problem behavior: An IEP team's introduction to functional behavioral assessment and behavior intervention plans*. Washington, DC: American Institutes for Research.
- Colvin, G., & Sprick, R. (1999). Providing administrative leadership for effective behavior support: Ten strategies for principals. *Effective School Practices, 17*, 65-71.
- Colvin, G., Kame'enui, E. J., & Sugai, G. (1993). Schoolwide and classroom management: Reconceptualizing the integration and management of students with behavior problems in general education. *Education and Treatment of Children, 16*, 361-381.
- Colvin, G., Sugai, G., Good, R. H., III, & Lee, Y. (1997). Using active supervision and precorrection to improve transition behaviors in an elementary school. *School Psychology Quarterly, 12*, 344-363.

- Cooper, J. O., Heron, T. E., & Heward, W. L. (1987). *Applied behavior analysis*. Columbus, OH: Merrill.
- Delpit, L. (1995). *Other people's children: Cultural conflict in the classroom*. New York: New Press.
- Dryfoos, J. G. (1997). The prevalence of problem behaviors: Implications for programs. In R. P. Weissberg, T. P. Gullotta, R. L. Hampton, B. A. Ryan, & G. R. Adams (Eds.), *Enhancing children's wellness. Healthy children 2010: Issues in children's and families lives* (Vol. 8). London: Sage Publications.
- Dunlap, G., Kern-Dunlap, L., Clarke, S., & Robbins, F. R. (1991). Functional assessment, curricular revision, and severe problem behaviors. *Journal of Applied Behavior Analysis, 24*, 387-397.
- Dunlap, G., Kern, L., DePerczel, M., Clarke, S., Wilson, D., Childs, K. E., et al. (1993). Functional analysis of classroom variables for students with emotional and behavioral disorders. *Behavioral Disorders, 18*, 275-291.
- Dunlap, G., White, R., Vera, A., Wilson, D., & Panacek, L. (1996). The effects of multi-component, assessment-based curricular modifications on the classroom behavior of children with emotional and behavioral disorders. *Journal of Behavioral Education, 6*, 481-500.
- Durand, M. V., & Carr, E. G. (1985). Self-injurious behavior: Motivating conditions and guidelines for treatment. *School Psychology Review, 14*, 171-176.
- Eber, L. (1996). Restructuring schools through wraparound planning: The LADSE experience. In R. J. Illback & C. M. Nelson (Eds.), *School-based services for students with emotional and behavioral disorders* (pp. 139-154). Binghamton, NY: Haworth Press.
- Eber, L., & Nelson, C. M. (1997). School-based wraparound planning: Integrating services for students with emotional and behavioral needs. *American Journal of Orthopsychiatry, 67*, 385-395.
- Epstein, M. H., Nelson, C. M., Polsgrove, L., Coutinho, M., Cumblad, C., & Quinn, K. P. (1993). A comprehensive community-based approach to serving students with emotional and behavioral disorders. *Journal of Emotional and Behavioral Disorders, 1*, 127-133.
- Foster-Johnson, L., & Dunlap, G. (1993). Using functional assessment to develop effective, individualized interventions for challenging behaviors. *Teaching Exceptional Children, 25*, 44-50.
- Gottfredson, G. D., & Gottfredson, D. C. (1996). *A national study of delinquency prevention in schools: Rationale for a study to describe the extensiveness and implementation of programs to prevent adolescent problem behavior in schools*. Ellicott City, MD: Gottfredson Associates, Inc.
- Gunter, P. L., Denny, R. K., Jack, S. L., Shores, R. E., & Nelson, C. M. (1993). Aversive stimuli in academic interactions between students with serious emotional disturbance and their teachers. *Behavioral Disorders, 18*, 265-274.
- Haring, N. G., & De Vault, G. (1996). Family issues and family support: Discussion. In L. K. Koegel, R. L. Koegel, & G. Dunlap (Eds.), *Positive behavioral support: Including people with difficult behavior in the community* (pp. 116-120). Baltimore: Paul H. Brookes.
- Horner, R. H. (1994). Functional assessment: Contributions and future directions. *Journal of Applied Behavior Analysis, 27*, 401-404.

- Horner, R. H., Albin, R. W., Sprague, J. R., & Todd, A. W. (1999). Positive behavior support. In M. E. Snell & F. Brown (Eds.), *Instruction of students with severe disabilities* (5th ed) (pp. 207-243). Upper Saddle River, NJ: Merrill-Prentice-Hall.
- Illback, R. J., & Nelson, C. M. (1996). *Emerging school-based approaches for children and youth with emotional and behavioral disorders: Research for practice and service integration*. New York: Haworth Press.
- Illback, R. J., Nelson, C. M., & Sanders, D. (1998). Community-based services in Kentucky: Description and 5-year evaluation of Kentucky IMPACT. in M. J. Epstein, K. Kutash, & A. Duchnowski (Eds.), *Outcomes for children and youth with emotional and behavioral disorders and their families: Programs and evaluation best practices*. Austin, TX: PRO-ED.
- Itawa, B. A., Dorsey, M., Slifer, K. J., Bauman, K. E., & Richman, G. S. (1982). Toward a functional analysis of self-injury. *Analysis and Intervention in Developmental Disabilities*, 2, 1-20.
- Kagan, S. L., Goffin, S. G., Golub, S. A., & Pritchard, E. (1995). *Toward systemic reform: Service integration for young children and their families*. Falls Church, VA: National Center for Service Integration.
- Kame'enui, E. J., & Carnine, D. W. (1998). *Effective teaching strategies that accommodate diverse learners*. Upper Saddle River, NJ: Prentice Hall.
- Kearns, J. F., Kleinert, H. L., Farmer, R., & Warlick, K. (in press). The implications of Kentucky's education reform for students with disabilities. In W. Sailor (Ed.), *Inclusive education and school/community partnerships*. New York: Teachers College Press.
- Kern, L., Childs, K. E., Dunlap, G., Clarke, S., & Falk, G. D. (1994). Using assessment-based curricular interventions to improve the classroom behavior of a student with emotional and behavioral challenges. *Journal of Applied Behavior Analysis*, 27, 7-19.
- Kleinert, J. L., Kearns, J. F., & Kennedy, S. (in press). Including all students in educational assessment and accountability. In W. Sailor (Ed.), *Inclusive education and school/community partnerships*. New York: Teachers College Press.
- Knitzer, J. (1993). Children's mental health policy: Challenging the future. *Journal of Emotional and Behavioral Disorders*, 1, 8-16.
- Koegel, L. K., Koegel, R. L., & Dunlap, G. (Eds.). (1996). *Positive behavioral support: Including people with difficult behavior in the community*. Baltimore: Paul H. Brookes.
- Kotter, J. P. (1995). Leading change: Why transformation efforts fail. *Harvard Business Review*, 73, 59-67.
- Latham, G. (1988). The birth and death cycles of educational innovations. *Principal*, 68, 41-43.
- Lawson, H. A., & Briar-Lawson, K. (1997). *Connecting the dots: Progress toward the integration of school reform, school-linked services, parent involvement and community schools*. Oxford, OH: Institutes for Educational Renewal.
- Lewis, T. J., Colvin, G., & Sugai, G. (in press). The effects of pre-correction and active supervision on the recess behavior of elementary school students. *School Psychology Quarterly*.

- Lewis, T. J., & Sugai, G. (1993). Teaching communicative alternatives to socially withdrawn behavior: An investigation in maintaining treatment effects. *Journal of Behavioral Education, 3*, 61-75.
- Lewis, T. J., & Sugai, G. (1996a). Descriptive and experimental analysis of teacher and peer attention and the use of assessment-based intervention to improve the pro-social behavior of a student in a general education setting. *Journal of Behavioral Education, 6*, 7-24.
- Lewis, T. J., & Sugai, G. (1996b). Functional assessment of problem behavior: A pilot investigation of the comparative and interactive effects of teacher and peer social attention on students in general education settings. *School Psychology Quarterly, 11*, 1-19.
- Lewis, T. J., Sugai, G., & Colvin, G. (1998). Reducing problem behavior through a schoolwide system of effective behavioral support: Investigation of a schoolwide social skills training program and contextual interventions. *School Psychology Review, 27*, 446-459.
- Lipsey, M. W. (1991). The effects of treatment on juvenile delinquents: Results from meta-analysis. In F. Losel, D. Bender, & T. Bliesener (Eds.), *Psychology and law*. New York: Walter de Gruyter.
- Lipsey, M. W. (1992). Juvenile delinquency treatment: A meta-analytic inquiry into the variability of effects. In T. D. Cook, H. Cooper, D. S. Cordray, H. Hartman, L. V. Hedges, R. V. Light, T. A. Louis, & F. Mostellar (Eds.), *Meta-analysis for explanation*. Beverly Hills, CA: Sage.
- Lipsey, M. W., & Wilson, D. B. (1993). The efficacy of psychological, educational, and behavioral treatment: Confirmation from meta-analysis. *American Psychologist, 48*, 1181-1209.
- Lohrman-O'Rourke, S., Knoster, T., & Llewellyn, G. (1999). Screening for understanding: An initial line of inquiry for school-based settings. *Journal of Positive Behavioral Interventions, 1*, 35-42.
- Luiselli, J. K., & Cameron, M. J. (Eds.). (1998). *Antecedent control: Innovative approaches to behavioral support*. Baltimore: Paul H. Brookes.
- Mayer, G. (1995). Preventing antisocial behavior in the schools. *Journal of Applied Behavior Analysis, 28*, 467-478.
- Meyer, L. H., & Evans, I. M. (1989). *Nonaversive intervention for behavior problems: A manual for home and community*. Baltimore: Paul H. Brookes.
- 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: A practical handbook*. Pacific Grove, CA: Brooks/Cole.
- Patterson, G. R., Reid, J. B., & Dishion, T. J. (1992). *Antisocial boys*. Eugene, OR: Castalia Press.
- Peacock Hill Working Group. (1992). Problems and promises in special education and related services for children and youth with emotional or behavioral disorders. *Behavioral Disorders, 16*, 299-313.
- Reichle, J., & Wacker, D. P. (Eds.). (1993). *Communication alternatives to challenging behavior: Integrating functional assessment and instructional strategies* (Vol. 3). Baltimore: Paul H. Brookes.

- Repp, A. (1994). Comments on functional analysis procedures for school-based behavior problems. *Journal of Applied Behavior Analysis, 27*, 409-411.
- Repp, A., & Horner, R. H. (Eds.). (1999). *Functional analysis of problem behavior: From effective assessment to effective support*. Belmont, CA: Wadsworth.
- Risley, T. (1996). Get a life: Positive behavioral intervention for challenging behavior through life arrangement and life coaching. In L. K. Koegel, R. L. Koegel, & G. Dunlap (Eds.), *Positive behavioral support: Including people with difficult behavior in the community* (pp. 403-424). Baltimore: Paul H. Brookes.
- Sailor, W. (in press). Devolution, school/community/family partnerships, and inclusive education. In W. Sailor (Ed.), *Inclusive education and school/community partnerships*. New York: Teachers College Press.
- Sailor, W. (1996). New structures and systems change for comprehensive positive behavioral support. In L. K. Koegel, R. L. Koegel, & G. Dunlap (Eds.), *Positive behavioral support: Including people with difficult behavior in the community* (pp. 163-206). Baltimore: Paul H. Brookes.
- Sasso, G. M., Peck, J., & Garrison-Harrell, L. (1998). Social interaction setting events: Experimental analysis of contextual variables. *Behavioral Disorders, 24*, 34-43.
- Schwartz, B. (1989). *Psychology of learning and behavior* (3rd ed). New York: Norton.
- Shores, R. E., Gunter, P. L., & Jack, S. L. (1993). Classroom management strategies: Are they setting events for coercion? *Behavioral Disorders, 18*, 92-102.
- Shores, R. E., Jack, S. L., Gunter, P. L., Ellis, D. N., DeBriere, T. J., & Wehby, J. H. (1993). Classroom interactions of children with behavior disorders. *Journal of Emotional and Behavioral Disorders, 1*, 27-39.
- Special issue: Integrating basic and applied research. (1994, Winter). *Journal of Applied Behavior Analysis, 27*.
- Sprague, J., Sugai, G., & Walker, H. (1998). Antisocial behavior in schools. In S. Watson & F. Gresham (Eds.), *Child behavior therapy: Ecological considerations in assessment, treatment, and evaluation* (pp. 451-474). New York: Plenum Press.
- Stevens, L. J., & Price, M. (1992). Meeting the challenge of educating children at risk. *Phi Delta Kappan, 74*, 18-23.
- Sugai, G. (1998). Postmodernism and emotional and behavioral disorders: Distraction or advancement. *Behavior Disorders, 23*, 171-177.
- Sugai, G., & Horner, R. (1994). Including students with severe behavior problems in general education settings: Assumptions, challenges, and solutions. In J. Marr, G. Sugai, & G. Tindal (Eds.), *The Oregon conference monograph* (Vol. 6) (pp. 102-120). Eugene, OR: University of Oregon.
- Sugai, G., & Horner, R. H. (1999). Discipline and behavioral support: Preferred processes and practices. *Effective School Practices, 17*, 10-22.

- Sugai, G., Horner, R. H., & Sprague, J. (1999). Functional assessment-based behavior support planning: Research-to-practice-to-research. *Behavioral Disorders, 24*, 223-227.
- Sugai, G., Lewis-Palmer, T., & Hagan, S. (1998). Using functional assessments to develop behavior support plans. *Preventing School Failure, 43*, 6-13.
- Taylor-Greene, S., Brown, D., Nelson, L., Longton, J., Gassman, T., Cohen, J., et al. (1997). Schoolwide behavioral support: Starting the year off right. *Journal of Behavioral Education, 7*, 99-112.
- Tilly, W. D., III, Knoster, T. P., Kovalski, J., Bambara, L., Dunlap, G., & Kincaid, D. (1998). *Functional behavioral assessment: Policy development in light of emerging research and practice*. Alexandria, VA: National Association of State Directors of Special Education.
- Todd, A. W., Horner, R. H., Sugai, G., & Sprague, J. R. (1999). Effective behavior support: Strengthening schoolwide systems through a team-based approach. *Effective School Practices, 17*, 23-37.
- Tolan, P., & Guerra, N. (1994). *What works in reducing adolescent violence: An empirical review of the field*. Boulder: University of Colorado, Center for the Study of Prevention of Violence.
- Touchette, P. E., MacDonald, R. F., & Langer, S. N. (1985). A scatter plot for identifying stimulus control of problem behavior. *Journal of Applied Behavior Analysis, 18*, 343-351.
- Turnbull, A. P., & Turnbull, H. R. (1996). Group action planning as a strategy for providing comprehensive family support. In L. K. Koegel, R. L. Koegel, & G. Dunlap (Eds.), *Positive behavioral support: Including people with difficult behavior in the community* (pp. 99-114). Baltimore: Paul H. Brookes.
- Umbreit, J. (1995). Functional assessment and intervention in a regular classroom setting for the disruptive behavior of a student with attention deficit hyperactivity disorder. *Behavioral Disorders, 20*, 267-278.
- Vollmer, T. R., & Northup, J. (1996). Some implications of functional analysis for school psychology. *School Psychology Quarterly, 11*, 76-92.
- Walker, H. M., Colvin, G., & Ramsey, E. (1995). *Antisocial behavior in school: Strategies and best practices*. Pacific Grove, CA: Brooks/Cole.
- Walker, H. M., Forness, S. R., Kauffman, J., Epstein, M. H., Gresham, F. M., Nelson, C. M., & Strain, P. S. (1998). Macro-social validation: Referencing outcomes in behavioral disorders to societal issues and problems. *Behavioral Disorders, 24*, 1-18.
- Walker, H. M., Horner, R. H., Sugai, G., Bullis, M., Sprague, J. R., Bricker, D., & Kaufman, M. J. (1996). Integrated approaches to preventing antisocial behavior patterns among school-age children and youth. *Journal of Emotional and Behavioral Disorders, 4*, 193-256.

- Wolery, M. R., Bailey, D. B., & Sugai, G. M. (1988). *Effective teaching: Principles and procedures of applied behavior analysis with exceptional students*. Boston: Allyn & Bacon.
- Zins, J. E., & Ponti, C. R. (1990). Best practices in school-based consultation. In A. Thomas & J. Grimes (Eds.), *Best practices in school psychology – II* (pp. 673-694). Washington, DC: National Association of School Psychologist.

The Alliance Project (#8029K4085) is supported by the U.S. Department of Education, Office of Special Education Programs (OSEP). Opinions expressed herein are those of the sources and do not necessarily represent the position of the U.S. Department of Education.