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</tr>
<tr>
<td>Creating a Data System</td>
<td>X</td>
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</tr>
<tr>
<td>Team Meetings to Evaluate Behavior</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TIER 1 ACADEMICS</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Step 1: Predicting Failure</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Step 2: Developing Prevention</td>
<td></td>
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History

Project ABRI (Academic and Behavior Response to Intervention) began in 2009 as a support to schools and districts for the implementation of a multi-tiered student response system. Initially, ABRI Liaisons worked directed with principal volunteers to establish a school team whose primary role including the analysis of school academic and behavioral data for decision-making. Now beginning our 5th year of implementation, Project ABRI is working with 60 plus schools throughout the commonwealth providing technical support.

Key features of the project include access to ABRI Liaisons, personalized support for implementation, technology support, data analysis with graphic summaries, and collaboration with regional cooperatives. Indicators of successful implementation are collected throughout Project ABRI participation indicating positive academic and behavioral outcomes for students.

Co-Principal Investigators
Terry Scott t.scott@louisville.edu
Amy Lingo amy.lingo@louisville.edu

ABRI website: www.louisville.edu/education/abri

What is Project ABRI?

- ABRI stands for Academic and Behavioral Response to Intervention and provides a framework for schools to improve student outcomes based on data based decision making.
- ABRI employs Response to Intervention (RtI) and Positive Behavior Intervention and Supports (PBIS).
- The framework for ABRI includes: Identification of predictable student failures, developing effective intervention strategies, systemic intervention with fidelity, and evaluation of fidelity and outcomes.

Links to HB 69 that discuss RtI importance of RtI in schools:


704 KAR 3:095: http://www.lrc.state.ky.us/kar/704/003/095.htm
ABRI Support

Project ABRI provides supports through group and individual school/district response.

Webinars
Webinars are presented and archived on the Project ABRI website. As implementers find similar topical requests, webinars are developed and recorded to meet those needs.

Website
The Project ABRI website is frequently updated with resources and information addressing systems of tiered intervention. One resource to consider is the matrix of videos representing sample tier one best practices. These vignettes are subdivided into grade levels, characteristics of learners and research-based intervention for viewers.

Liaison Support
Each school receives individualized services through the ABRI liaison. This support may include
- Attendance at monthly team meetings,
- Data extraction and analysis,
- Professional development activities for faculty or learning communities,
- Resources,
- Examples of practices found in other schools with similar goals,
- Feedback following team meetings, and
- General assessment of current response to intervention and positive behavior intervention supports

Individualized Support
Each school participating in Project ABRI has an individualized plan catered to their specific needs. Teams meet with the school liaison to identify areas of need and develop an annual plan broken into monthly activities. Liaisons work with the school to identify successful practices for continuation and areas to address with direct input from all stakeholders.

Intervention for learners is contingent upon the duration and frequency of previous success and failures. Liaisons work with schools to determine the level of student
need and the most powerful interventions available to address those needs. The ultimate goal is an increase in student achievement and decrease in discipline referrals.

**ACADEMIC AND BEHAVIOR RESPONSE TO INTERVENTION**

**What is the Idea Behind ABRI?**

The Academic and Behavior Response to Intervention Project (ABRI) is an example of multi-tiered systems of support (MTSS) for both academic and social behavior across all students. Historically, when this focus is applied to academics only it is referred to as Response to Intervention (RtI) and when it is applied to behavior only it is referred to as Positive Behavior Interventions and Support (PBIS). The blended MTSS approach that ABRI takes puts the focus on student success in the school – asking the question “what can we as a system do to increase the probability of student success tomorrow?

Project ABRI, as an example of MTSS has four key components – each of which is essential to the success of the system and based on the workings of the school as a system with all working together toward a common goal of student success. Given the development of a cohesive and comprehensive system, the four steps include
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(1) prediction of student failure, (2) development of prevention strategies, (3) consistent application of strategies, and (4) assessment of outcomes in relation to
pre-set objectives for success. For those students who do not experience success, the four steps repeat – with increased student individualization, intervention intensity, and involvement by those inside and outside the school.

The MTSS model typically conceives of 3 passes through this set of steps, one primary or universal pass involving every student in the school (Tier 1), a secondary or targeted pass with those students for whom the primary pass was insufficient to facilitate success (Tier 2), and a tertiary or intensive pass with individual students for whom the second pass was insufficient to facilitate success (Tier 3). The distinction between levels is not with the sequence of passes through the steps but with the focus. The focus of Tier 1 is on the entire school, the focus of Tier 2 is on small groups or sub-sets of students, and the focus of Tier 3 is on individual students (requiring a unique pass through the steps for each identified individual). In reality there may be multiple passes at each of these levels as data is used to fine-tune intervention and assessment. Only when data indicate that the best efforts are insufficient does the focus move up a tier. At Tier 3 every failure means another pass through the steps, each iteration being more intensive than the previous.

**ABRI IMPLEMENTATION**

**Developing an ABRI Team**

The ABRI Team is a group of stakeholders within the school who will take the lead in introducing ABRI and will facilitate school-wide implementation. While the administrator needn’t lead this team, it is essential that the principal be an active member – lending credibility to the team’s decisions. Ideally, this team is representative of the school. That is, the ideal team provides representation to all stakeholders. Each stakeholder should be able to look at the team and point to a member who understands his or her role in the school. For example, there should be at least one team member to represent non-certified employees (e.g., office staff, custodians, cafeteria staff, etc.). In addition, because instructional assistants (aka educational or teacher assistants) are generally larger in number and are heavily involved with direct student interaction, it is recommended that teams consider having at least one person on the team to represent this group. The remainder of the group should represent the instructional staff (teachers and specialists). This can be achieved across grade levels, content areas, hallway proximity, or any other method that produces broad representation.
Because an ABRI team represents a new committee in the school it is important that schools look at all committees to insure that each committee has distinct tasks that are in line with the school improvement plan (SIP). The Working Smarter grid is useful in aligning all committee tasks and assignments. Again, the role of the team is not to implement ABRI – but to facilitate implementation across stakeholders. If the team becomes responsible for all ABRI activities then there is no true systemic intervention and it will be difficult to establish systemic consistency for both prevention and intervention.

**this form is included in the Appendix**

### Develop ABRI Implementation Team

- **Big Idea**
  
  - *A team from within the school takes the lead in introducing school-wide support systems to their school.*

- **Essential Features**
  
  - Representative of stakeholders in school
  - Active support of an administrator
  - Meet and plan ABRI implementation
  - Set goals and timelines
ABRI Team Tasks

The initial tasks for the team include gathering of data from stakeholders to determine what they generally consider to be problematic for the school in terms of facilitating student success. This is done prior to introducing ABRI and is important because it serves an index of how accurate the stakeholders are in their perception of the school. The survey can be easily accomplished by asking stakeholders to list the issues that they see as the biggest problems (see example below). The brief survey can be placed in all stakeholder mailboxes, emailed, or otherwise distributed so that all are likely to respond.

These perceptions are then compared to actual data. When stakeholders do not have an accurate picture of what is occurring in the school the team must address this when introducing ABRI to the school. Such misperceptions will prevent the school from focusing on the actions that can make the biggest difference. For example, the stakeholders may report that low reading scores are mainly the result of a few students with major deficits. However, the data suggest that 40% of students are reading below grade level. Similarly, stakeholders may believe that behavior problems occur mainly in the hallway when data suggest the classroom is the largest source of problems. The team must make these misperceptions clear so that the stakeholders are willing to consider strategies across the school instead of only those focused on a few individuals or locations. [in the future I’d like to create a table with common misperceptions from academic and behavior]
School-Wide Commitment

A hallmark of ABRI and a staple of both RtI and PBIS is the systemic nature of intervention – all stakeholders are on the same page. The stakeholders are all those adults in the school who have an interest in the success of the students. Further, the breadth of stakeholders increases with higher tiers as persons outside the school are often necessary as interventions become more individualized. Thus, stakeholders include not just teachers and administrators but also office staff, instructional assistants, specialists, cafeteria staff, custodians, and any other affiliated personnel. Systemic interventions can only be successful when all those in the system are involved. If a student is misbehaving in the hallway and the custodian is the only one there then we would want that person to correct the student. Likewise, if a student is reading a flier in the office we would want office staff to acknowledge the student.

**This form is included in the Appendix**

### ABRI Student Failure Survey

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School Name:</th>
<th>Date:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Administrator _____ Teacher _____ Staff _____ Specialist _____ Other _____

Use your experience in the school to answer each of the following questions. Your responses will help us to determine priorities in the future in terms of creating a safe and effective school environment.

Consider if you had to wager on when students in your school would most likely fail, with what, when, where . . . and why?

List the most frequent problem behavior that you observe or respond to while at school

**Example:** Loud pushing in the entry hallway at 2:40 PM

1. _______________________
2. _______________________
3. _______________________
4. _______________________
5. _______________________

List the most predictable academic failures that you observe or respond to while at school

**Example:** 3 digit addition with regrouping at 2nd grade

1. _______________________
2. _______________________
3. _______________________
4. _______________________
5. _______________________
The effect of the systems approach is in the consistency of the message, instruction, and feedback across the school. Every time that a student behaves, correctly or incorrectly, and there is no adult feedback is a missed opportunity for instruction – we all must take that responsibility. As such, a first step in implementing ABRI will be to establish a school-wide commitment to working as a cohesive system.

Getting adults to buy into anything as large group is a tricky proposition and requires some finesse in presentation. What most are likely to be thinking when introduced to ABRI is that they will now be responsible for adhering to a new program of activities and standards. Right up front it needs to be made clear that ABRI is a framework for implementation – not a curriculum. Thinking back to the four steps, each school must engage in these same steps – but how they do that and what strategies they employ are dependent upon the unique issues and personalities in that school. A good first step is to introduce the concept of a framework using the four steps. At the same time, stakeholders need to realize that a systemic approach means that they will be making all the decisions. They need to hear the following:

A rule of thumb for moving forward is to garner an 80% positive vote from the stakeholders for moving forward with the ABRI systems approach. That is, when all stakeholders are asked to vote on whether they are willing to work from within an ABRI framework, at least 80% vote in favor. Of course this is just a guiding criterion. Some schools may be able to implement consistently with less than 80%

---

**ABRI Involvement**

ABRI is a systems approach and all of us run this as a school – it is not run by any individual or any outside entity – it is all us:

- we decide what our focus will be
- we decide the expectations
- we decide how we will monitor
- we decide what our goals are
- we decide what we’ll do to get there
- we evaluate our progress
- we decide whether to keep going or change
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consensus – simply because the stakeholders are generally willing to do what is asked. However, there are also schools where even better than 80% consensus will not be sufficient as there may be a vocal minority that can effectively sabotage what they don’t wish to do. Sabotage is easy – just don’t follow through with the school-wide agreements. Each team must determine what their own level of consensus must be in order to predict school-wide consistency with implementation. This may not happen in the first meeting – or even in the first year. But it is important to garner school-wide consensus before moving ahead. The school that attempts to implement ABRI while a significant portion of the stakeholders are not interested is a school that will likely not implement with fidelity.

The vote for ABRI involvement is simply a vote of agreement to engage in the four steps – at least at the school-wide level (Tier 1). These steps can be voiced as simple questions: (1) Do you agree to provide input in determining what our school’s problem areas are and what our goals should be? (2) Do you agree to provide input on what we should do to prevent predictable problems and make decisions about rules, routines, and arrangements to facilitate success? (3) Do you agree to abide by all or our school-wide decisions – regardless of your feelings about the decision? (4) Do you agree to collect data as agreed and allow that data to determine whether we continue with a strategy or change? Generally, stakeholders will be in favor of numbers 1, 2, and 4 – it is at number 3 where some are reluctant. We need to remind them that the administrator can simply direct them to engage in a practice and there is no choice. The ABRI process provide input and voting from all. But the bottom line is that at some point there will be a mandate – either from above or from within. When the mandates come from within they are more likely to be comfortable and sustainable.

Organizing ABRI Planning and Development

Once the team has introduced ABRI and garnered the requisite consensus to move forward, the role of the team changes from informational to support. The goal is to assist the stakeholders toward full implementation of both the academic and social behavior interventions. This involves organizing the stakeholders for discussions. While in the academic realm these meetings may be school-wide – more likely they will be specific to teachers of a given grade level or content. In the behavior realm, however, the meeting should include all stakeholders and focus on behavior across the school.
The following sections lay out a plan for leading the stakeholders through a process of planning and developing intervention and monitoring strategies. While the four steps are common across both the academic and behavioral realms, the strategies involved vary and are thus presented separately. It must be made clear to all stakeholders that ABRI involves both the academic and behavior components. The fact that they are separated at this point is simply to streamline the tasks and make the process most efficient.

At this point the ABRI team may wish to create roles for members to take the lead with the process in either the academic or behavior realm. Of course, taking the lead with any particular task does not preclude involvement in any other task. Rather, stakeholders need to see the team members involved in ABRI as a blended initiative.

The ABRI Readiness Self-Assessment and Action Plan provides a comprehensive view of all ABRI Team tasks. This form presents it as a checklist so that teams may formatively evaluate progress toward essential tasks and create action plans to meet goals within each area. It is recommended that teams use this form as a guiding document for insuring all implementation steps have been completed.

**This form is included in the Appendix**
This section summarizes activities within each of the four steps. While it is not essential that the steps be undertaken in order, doing so does present a logical process for achieving a completed universal plan.

**Step 1: Predicting Failure**

All tasks in Step 1 are focused on predicting student behavior problems. Because the data for student behavior is generated by stakeholder reports, it makes sense to ask the stakeholders what they know about those problems as a method of identifying predictable failures. It is recommended that a team member be assigned to lead the process during this step and the entire team be involved in facilitating discussion.

**Location Mapping for Predicting Problem Behavior**

Arguably, the most simple and direct manner of predicting problem behavior is to ask the adults who work with students around the school on a daily basis. The premise being that adult experiences in the school are the predictors for which we search. That is, we can offer the following to all individuals in a school:

> *I’m coming to your school tomorrow for 5 minutes. If when I’m there I see a problem behavior, you all get $10,000. Knowing this, when would you have me come, where would you have me stand to watch, and what do you predict that I would see?*

Under these circumstances, stakeholders would likely be very specific and would be thinking of the circumstances under which problem behaviors occur. This is exactly what we want, prediction of who, what, when, where, and eventually – why. We can strip out the monetary reward component of this offer and create a process by which all stakeholders become a part of a group prediction process.

First, either print or draw a large map of the school (or school and campus) with as much detail as possible. Many districts have blueprints of school layouts that can be blown up and used for this purpose. Second, bring all the stakeholders into one room with the map and provide all with 2 small sticker dots and a pen. Next, provide the following directions:
“Each of you has 2 sticky dots and a pen. You are to write on each dot the name of a problem student behavior that you personally see in the school most frequently. Also on each dot write down a time of day in which that problem most often occurs in your experience and any other predictor – such as certain students, conditions, or circumstances. Finally, go place your stickers on the map in the locations where you most often observe the behavior.

Prompt all that they are to be providing information on problems that they most often observe -- not on what they believe happens or what the worst problems are. The purpose of this activity is to predict the most likely times, locations, problems, and circumstances for a failure. Provide 10 minutes for stakeholders to consider the task and complete their dots and then 5 minutes for all dots to be placed on the map.

The completed map below is an example from an elementary school.

Note that, in this school, the most predictable problem areas are the cafeteria and the upper hallway. That’s not to say that problems cannot or have not occurred in other areas, only that these are the areas most predictive of failure and thus most in need of prevention strategies.
A quick look through the cafeteria dots reveals that the problems are overwhelmingly considered to be noise, messy, running, and poor manners—occurring mainly during arrival and dismissal from lunch. A look at the hallway reveals the problems to be loud, running, wandering, and safety issues.

The completed map below is an example from a high school. Because the school has 2 floors, there are 2 map areas.

![High School Map](image)

Note that in this school, the most predictable problem areas are the hallway, stairway, restroom, and outside porch area. Of course problems are noted in other areas too but these four areas represent the places in which misbehavior is most predictable. Thus, these are the areas in need of further prediction and eventually prevention.

**Summarizing Predictable Behavior Problems**

Once the map is completed and stakeholders have discussed the common predictors, a final discussion will revolve around reasons why those problems are predictable. A good way to think about this is to ask, why do those problems happen most in this location and at this time? Finally, a representative from the team will summarize the results in writing using a simple form. This will be used as the basis for a discussion of prevention strategies in Step 2.
**a blank version of this is included in the Appendix

As a final task in Step 1, the team should articulate 1-3 measurable goals for behavior – by location. These goals will serve as the benchmark for evaluation after data is collected and summarized for the first time. Because there is no true benchmark number the goal cannot simply be to reduce problems by a percentage. Rather, stakeholders must ask themselves, “what number of misbehaviors in the hallway would represent adequate progress after one month?” This number becomes the criterion by which success will be judged at the end of the first month.
Step 2: Developing Prevention: Rules, Routines, & Arrangements

The focus of Step 2 is to develop strategies that provide the best mix of logic (we believe it would work) and reality (we can consistently do this). We can introduce this to the stakeholders by amending the prior wager:

We’ve changed the bet. I’m coming to your school tomorrow and, based on your predictors, I will be in the hallway during transitions. If I do not see any loud, pushing, stalling, etc. you all get $10,000. What will you want to do differently before tomorrow?

Of course, if there was actually $10,000 per stakeholder involved then the strategies employed would be extremely intensive and time consuming. The reality, however, is that there is no money and the stakeholders already have a very full schedule of job related activities – so there’s no room for more intensity or time. The question is, what is the simplest thing we could do that we believe would be sufficient to provide a high probability for success?

Prevention Strategies

Rules – What do we want the students to do if they are successful?
- When, where, why
- Teach, encourage, remind, acknowledge

Routines and Arrangements – What will we do to increase likelihood of student success?
- Avoid problem contexts, times, groupings, etc.
- Consistent procedures and prompts
- Engage students
- Where should you and students be to predict success?
- Active supervision of all areas
- Consistent consequences

It is recommended that the team engage stakeholders in a discussion of what we want the students to do and what we currently do to facilitate this. That is, if the $10,000 bet were on now, what are we currently doing to win it? Obviously
whatever it is that we’re currently doing is insufficient – because we have determined that problems persist in a predictable manner. The question involves how we can change our behavior to create a higher probability of student success.

In general there are two broad categories of Prevention: things we ask the students to do (rules) and things we do to increase the probability of student success with those strategies (routines and arrangements). The goal here is to get the stakeholders to agree on what the rules are, how they’ll be taught to the students, and what strategies will be employed to facilitate success.

**Rules**

All curricular areas have rules and behavior is no different. In math the “+” sign is a rule – it says you must add in order to be successful. In reading the “ph” letter combination has a rule – it says you makes the “eff” sound in order to be successful. Teaching is simply a matter of getting students to understand, successfully demonstrate, remember, and then generalize these rules to the real world. But rules alone do not teach. Teaching includes presenting rules in engaging ways and also manipulating the environment to increase the probability that students will be successful in understanding, demonstrating, remembering, and using those skills in the real world.

It is recommended that all prevention strategies be **organized by location**. The number of locations in the school is limited compared to the number of identifiable problem behaviors or times. Thus, using location as the organizer will simplify the process.

Let’s start with rules. The first question to the stakeholders when considering rules is: *What do successful students do in this location, at these times, and under these conditions?* This will help to define a baseline for discussion of what all believe to be the most appropriate behaviors to be defined as rules for success. At times even behaviors of the successful students are not exactly what the stakeholders prefer and some fine-tuning is required. Caution is urged, however, in considering radical change across every student. First, consideration must be given to whether new behaviors are relevant to the student culture. For example, asking students to bow to one another may be a civilized manner of interacting in some cultures but in most US cultures that would be seen as aberrant and would be extremely unlikely to stick. Similarly, stakeholders are cautioned to “select their battles.” For example, demanding absolute silence in the hallway is an extremely tall expectation – even for adults. Not that it couldn’t be taught and facilitated but
would eventual compliance after a long battle be worth the effort? Further, could that effort be spent in ways that better predict student success in the larger context of school and life?

Questions about rules are the sole consideration of the stakeholders but remember that, to some degree at least, students are also stakeholders. Involving students in this discussion in the classroom will provide stakeholders with a better reference for the parameters of relevant rules in a school culture.

Rules are simply the expected behaviors that must be taught and encouraged in order to predict student success. There are several features of effective rules by location. First, all rules must be defined in an observable way such that a student should be able to accurately act it out immediately afterward. Non-observable rules such as “be happy” or “think positively” are not explicit enough to teach or model. On the other hand “make positive statements” is sufficiently explicit to be modeled as a rule. Further, ill-defined rules are difficult to enforce, as it is not clear whether students are using them. Second, rules should tell students what they should do – not what they should not do. A good rules tells a student how to be successful. The Dean Man’s test is a good way of thinking about whether a rule is positively stated. Any rule that a dead man could accurately demonstrate over time is not a positive rule. Thus, think in terms of “walk” rather than “don’t run” and use “keep hands in lap” as opposed to “don’t touch others.”

Characteristics of Effective Rules

Expected behaviors are . . .

- explicitly defined and observable
- stated positively (dead man’s test)
- stated succinctly (phrase or short sentence)
- made public (easy to see)
- 3-5 rules in length per location
- taught, modeled, encouraged, and enforced
When creating a list of rules it is best not to use lengthy descriptions. Instead, create brief phrases and simple single sentences as these are far easier to explain and recall. Similarly, students can generally recall three to five rules by context and thus it is best to keep the number of rules to five or less in each location. To make this feasible, stakeholders will often be required to prioritize the key rules for each location and to create rules that can cover more than one problem behavior. For example, asking students to keep hands to self in the cafeteria can be a single rule to address pushing, touching, and focusing on one’s own food.

Anything that is important enough to be a rule is important enough to teach. Remember, telling students the rules is not the same as teaching the rules. Anyone can simply tell a student – but a teacher describes, models, engages students in discussion, and provides opportunities to practice with feedback. Once rules are taught they should be made public in a manner that is likely to catch student attention. It is recommended that rules be written by students with accompanying pictures to be posted and serve as reminders. This will be more effective than posting a simple typed list of rules because it engages students with the curriculum and provides more interesting visuals as reminders.

**Routines and Arrangements**

Remember, rules are what we want the students to do and routines and arrangements are the things we do to facilitate success with the rules. When students are unsuccessful with rules it is a signal that adults need to change. Routines and arrangements can be thought of as the array of environmental manipulations that stakeholders can create as a means of increasing the probability of success – and teaching itself is a big part of this. For example, if we were teaching 2 + 2 by simply writing it on the board and expecting students to memorize it would not be considered good instruction – even if the teacher clearly described the skill. Going back to our wagers, what if you could receive $10,000 if the student can answer correctly in response to 2 + 2 tomorrow? Certainly you would do more than just describe the skill. Likely, you’d provide a range of real examples, facilitate discussions, and provide for opportunities to practice with feedback. You may give additional thought to how long this instruction would need to last, what time of day would be most effective, whether the instruction should be in large group or small group, how many students can effectively engage in the lesson, and the arrangement of the students’ desks. A good ABRI prevention system for behavior involves all the same considerations. If we wish for students to walk in the hallway (rule) what can we do to increase the probability of that actually occurring? Clearly, just saying it does not maximize the probability of success. Stakeholders
will need to consider the number of students that reasonably be in the hallway if this rule is to be successful – and also how many adults will need to be present, where they should be located, how often the rule will need to be verbally prompted, and how students will be acknowledged. All of these decisions are part of the routines and arrangements controlled by adults as part of instruction.

Traffic patterns, schedule timing, adult supervision, verbal and physical reminders, seating arrangements, adult proximity to students, and an array of other arrangements are all controlled by adults and must be considered as part of the development of routines and arrangements to facilitate success with rules. A good process for determining routines and arrangements is to have all stakeholders brainstorm what they believe would effectively ensure student success with the rules for each location. After a full list of strategies has been suggested, the team should lead stakeholders back through the list with two questions. The first question is whether there is consensus as to whether the strategy will be effective. Those receiving the highest votes for potential success should be kept and the others crossed off the list. Next, stakeholders are asked to order the strategies from most to least effortful/time consuming and all strategies ordered by what we will call practicality.

It is recommended that the team encourage the stakeholders to agree to implementation of the simplest of the strategies – or the simplest combination of strategies necessary to predict success. In this manner the school selects the best
combination of logic and practicality. Ideally, stakeholders create these plans so that they have at least as many routines and arrangements (things they’ll do) as they do rules (things students will do). That is, if there are four rules for a given location then there should be at least four routine and arrangement strategies upon which the stakeholders have agreed.

**Big Ideas for Behavior**

Assuming that a school identifies five locations and has five rules for each, that is 30 school rules. At this point the school needs to develop 3-5 big ideas to act as anchors for all school rules. Anchored instruction is a logic used with academics. We don’t teach every word in the dictionary or every possible math problem. Rather, we teach larger concepts (i.e., big ideas) by which to anchor smaller examples. For example, we teach that “ph” makes the “eff” sound and we don’t now have to show every possible example. We can show a range of examples and exceptions and lead students to be successful with novel examples. At Tier 1 for behavior we must use this same logic. What is the minimum number of big idea anchors to cover all possible behavior?

If, for example, stakeholders may decide upon three anchors and defined them as: “respect yourself” (keep safe and keep learning), “respect others” (treat others as you would have them treat you), and “respect property” (treat others’ property as you would have them treat yours). These three big idea anchors cover all known problems:

- **Respect Yourself**
  (safe and learning) – unprepared, off task, dangerous behaviors, tardy, etc.
- **Respect Others**
  (golden rule – personal) – all verbal and physical peer relations
- **Respect Property**
  (golden rule – non-personal) – vandalism, borrowing, trading, stealing, etc.

The task is to make the big ideas clear with all students and across all times and locations in the school. Once this is accomplished it is easy to bring in the agreed upon rules as examples of the big ideas. All students will know what it means to respect others and this provides the perfect anchor for asking “what behaviors should we be thinking about in the hallway if we are making certain to respect others?” Stakeholders then use this an opportunity for instruction, guide students through a discussion of expectations for behavior.
It is well established that students will remember more rules and more readily describe what they are supposed to do rather than what they are not supposed to do. And this is what we want independent students to do – recall what is effective and apply it in the real world. Anchored instruction using big ideas create effective instruction opportunities. Once the team helps the stakeholders to understand why it is necessary to develop the big ideas, the school can be creative with the wording for each anchor and find ways to fit the big ideas into the culture of the school.

Teaching Rules
Keys to Teachable Rules

1. Anchor all rules to 3-5 big ideas – School-Wide
2. All rules are taught as examples of the big ideas
3. Organize by location
   - Try for max 5 rules per location
4. Teach to students directly and explicitly
5. Revisit instruction throughout the year – acknowledge compliance

EXAMPLE
Respect Yourself
- in the classroom (do your best)
- on the playground (follow safety rules)
Respect Others
- in the classroom (raise hand to speak)
- in the stairway (single file line)
Respect Property
- in the classroom (ask before borrowing)
- in the lunchroom (pick up your mess)
Developing the Matrix

The matrix is not a component of instruction. Rather, it is an agreement as to the school’s behavior curricula. The matrix represents the big ideas that all have agreed to teach to all students to be applied to all times and locations in school. Inside the matrix are the specific behavior expectations that were agreed upon during the stakeholder discussions – showing where they fit under the anchors in each location. Again, the purpose of the matrix is not as a teaching aid – although teachers may choose to use this as a part of instruction. The purpose is as a written agreement among adults of what we all have agreed to teach to all students. As is obvious in looking at a matrix, the fewer anchors and rules there are by location, the simpler the curriculum is to teach. Larger numbers of anchors create more internal boxes that must have rules. A box without a rule is saying that the big idea does not apply in that location. For example, if there is an anchor, “readiness” that is defined but not a rule to correspond in the hallway. It says to all students that when you are in the hallway you needn’t think about being ready. Rather than add a new rule to fill the box it is recommended to always consider fewer boxes by keeping anchors to at least three – but no more than five.

**a blank matrix is included in the Appendix**

In addition, note that the matrix presented above contains a blank column for the classroom settings. This is because all teachers need to create their own rules to fit
the context and activities planned to teach content. However, all teacher have the same big idea anchors – the just have a different set of examples in the same way that the cafeteria and hallways have different examples.

**Teaching Behavior**

As a summary of what’s been discussed so far in Step 2, the stakeholders have identified appropriate expectations for behavior by location, developed routines and arrangements to increase the effectiveness of the rules, anchored those rules to big ideas to aid instruction, and developed a matrix to summarize anchors and rules by location. All of this is planning – now instruction needs to take place. The teaching portion is the most important in terms of predicting student success. All the best made instructional plans are worthless without the actual instruction. The team needs to guide the stakeholders to make plans for engaging all students with the big ideas and then using that to discuss rules by location.

On the first day of school, or the first day of implementation, all students need to be made aware of the big ideas that will serve as the anchors for instruction. While introduction can occur at an assembly or other large gathering, instruction is best delivered by teachers and other stakeholders within smaller group settings. It is recommended that the first period on the day of implementation be dedicated to the big ideas – description, rationale, model, discussion, and practice as appropriate. Next, discussions of individual rules can occur in context. That is, before students enter the hallway for the first time the anchors should be used to discuss hallway behavioral expectations.

The teacher may ask:

“If you are being responsible to yourself what should you be thinking about doing in the hallway?”

Students then have to tie their answers back to the anchor:

“If responsible to myself means being where I’m supposed to be and doing what I’m supposed to do in order to learn – then I should go directly to my next class.”

This discussion with teacher feedback helps students to understand how 3-5 behaviors in the hallway are simply examples of the big ideas. But this is not the end of instruction. As students move through the school the expectations are following them and adults can use these as opportunities to facilitate student success. Prompts, reminders, encouraging statements, and feedback are all a part of effective instruction. The goal is to continue to manipulate the environment in
ways that further predict success. Involving the students in the instructional process both in the classroom and the natural environments increases engagement when is our best chance of increasing success.

**Teach it Where it Happens**

Acknowledging Positive Behavior

Feedback is an essential component of effective instruction. In fact, positive feedback is the most powerful intervention we know of in terms of predicting future success. However, we can only use positive feedback when students have been successful. Thus, instruction must be the foundation for student success – allowing adults to use positive feedback. Within the behavior realm of ABRI, positive feedback is an area for which there often are misconceptions and reservations among the stakeholders. Positive feedback is a form of positive reinforcement. Although positive reinforcement simply refers to anything done in response to a positive behavior that increases the likelihood of that behavior in the future, the term “reinforcement” tends to immediately bring to mind the delivery of candy, toys, and assorted other tangible items. While these are examples of positive reinforcement, the team needs to be clear that the most frequently used reinforcer across the school should be verbal acknowledgement. That is, just as we would say “very well done” if a student got a math problem correct, we should say “thanks for walking” when we see that behavior in the hallway.
Reinforcement is not an add-on for instruction, it is a crucial component. Consider teaching reading to students without ever telling them when they read correctly. It would be impossible to shape behavior without distinguishing between right and wrong – or correct and incorrect. At Tier 1, the distinction between correct and incorrect behavior is tied to the rules that were defined and taught and delivered primarily through verbal acknowledgement. As locations, behaviors, or times become further predictive of failure, verbal acknowledgements can be increased in both intensity and frequency. For example, if data indicates that problem behaviors have increased in the hallway, stakeholders can agree to use more frequent verbal praise and to be more emphatic with the use of superlatives. Thus, “thanks” on an occasional basis may become “wow, thanks so much for remembering – you’re awesome.” In this way, feedback is made more salient while continuing with only verbal reinforcement. This is the manner in which positive feedback should be used for all students.
Simple verbal acknowledgement constitutes the most basic level of reinforcement. A second level of reinforcement involves the granting of small privileges to students in response to continued positive behavior. These privileges should be positive events built into the curriculum rather than additional activities. For example, the student who has completed his or her work may be given first choice of computer when going to the computer lab. Note that attendance in the computer lab was already going to happen and the student was already going to be working at a computer. The special privilege here is simply the ability to have first choice. Throughout the day there are opportunities for stakeholders to use these types of privileges as a second level of acknowledgement. First in line and running errands for the teacher are generally effective with younger students while choices about seating and first to lunch are more logical for older students. Again, the privileges are not something that is created – we use those that already exist and simply frame them as reinforcers by telling students they are being selected because of exemplary behavior. This level is especially effective with students who have historically not received a good deal of acknowledgement for success.
A third level of positive feedback involves public acknowledgement of larger or more long-term behavior. Public acknowledgement should be simple and without expense for the school. This is simply a larger acknowledgement of behavior – made in a very public manner such as an award, a picture in the newsletter, induction into a hall of fame, or any other public acknowledgement of success. This third level is especially helpful in acknowledging success among the most successful students. Often, stakeholders will be concerned that increasing verbal acknowledgement for all is in some ways unfair to students who were behaving correctly all along. The use of public acknowledgement allows for the most successful students to achieve another level of reinforcement. In addition, it can be a goal for students who have not yet reached this level.
Very often PBIS schools use tokens or tickets as a part of their Tier 1 acknowledgement system. This is not a problem unless this fourth level is used without the previous three levels of acknowledgement. That is, token reinforcement should be reserved for those times or situations in which the previous three levels of acknowledgement have proven insufficient in encouraging positive behavior. For example, data show that problems exist in the hallway, mainly in the afternoon, and with noise and yelling. As a result the school may decide to introduce tickets for appropriate voice level in the hallway during afternoons. In this way the tickets have the maximum effect on a very specific behavior. This will be more effective than simply having tickets available to all students for all behaviors every day for the entire year. The benefit of the token is to provide a focus on a particular behavior and to affect more immediate change. When used in a more ubiquitous manner tickets tend to lose their effect unless there are major reinforcers to maintain interest – and this can get expensive. Further, we want students engaging in positive behavior because it is naturally reinforced by acknowledgement in the environment – not because they get something tangible. Tokens are most effective when used to focus on behaviors that are otherwise not responding to smaller levels of acknowledgement.
Of course, the use of tokens also means that tokens have to be traded for something real. While younger students may be happy with a pat on the back or having their name mentioned on the announcements, older students will not change behavior for a token unless the token is seen as having value. Further, using tickets in such a targeted manner will result in many students earning one. In a continuing effort to make Tier 1 as natural as possible we want to avoid tangible items and expensive trades. One way to provide large quantities of tokens without the expense it to have tokens represent lottery tickets – or the opportunity to get something more. In a lottery system tokens simply represent one more opportunity to win – meaning that any number of tickets can be distributed without need for increasing the value of the reinforce.

Thinking again to reinforcers that are tied to the curriculum, it is recommended that tokens be exchanged for privileges that already exist. For example, choice of computer, first to recess, a special seat during lunch, homework pass, or opportunities to park in a particular parking spot (for older students) are privileges that students desire – but they do not require the purchase or development of anything new. Further, to keep it simple it is best to require that any privileges earned under the lottery of Level 4 acknowledgement be taken within 24 hours. Without this requirement students tend to save up privileges, creating potential problems when they wish to use at an inopportune time. Knowing that the student
has 24 hours to use the privilege allows the stakeholders to select the least intrusive privileges at the time they are given.

Level 4 acknowledgement systems should be kept simple. If allowed to be complicated it can morph into a full blown token economy which is far too complicated for use at Tier 1. We will save this level of complexity for use at Tier 3. The following are recommendations for using token acknowledgement.

Recommendations for the Use of Tokens or Tickets at Tier 1

1. Use only as data indicate need – not always
2. Use in a very targeted manner – for specific behaviors at specific times and in specific places
3. Tell students ahead of time what you are looking for so as to increase the likelihood of their success
4. Whatever the token is worth in trade should be used within one day – avoid savings
5. Use lottery systems to allow for maximum ticket distribution with minimal reinforcers
Responding to Incorrect Behavior

Feedback for errors or misbehavior is just as important as feedback for positive behavior. Again, without feedback for both correct and incorrect students would not be able to discriminate between the two. However, whereas positive feedback indicates that intervention is working, the need for negative feedback indicates that intervention is not effective. If we use office discipline referrals as an indicator of behavioral failure, increased referrals for any time, location, behavior, or student is an indicator that intervention is not working and must be revised. The key is not in preventing the use of negative feedback – it is in reducing the need to use negative feedback. That is, the goal is for the student to behave in ways that allow us to provide more positive than negative feedback, but it is the student’s behavior that tells us which type of feedback is necessary. Student failure is a signal that rules, routines, and arrangements must be revisited and reconsidered.

Negative Feedback

**Big Idea:** Students need to know when they’ve done it wrong – but this is done most effectively when it also sets them up to do it right the next time

- Responding to negative behavior
  - Immediate and consistent
  - Try to keep with natural consequences
  - Use the least amount necessary to get desired behavior
    Pre-plan and teach
  - Correction and re-teaching
- Use only with reinforcement for replacement behavior
- Should defeat function of problem behavior

Technically, negative feedback is a punishment. Most people think of punishment as something more unpleasant but punishment simply refers to anything done in response to a behavior that decreases the likelihood of that behavior in the future. Negative feedback means the same thing but seems to be more palatable than the word “punishment” so it is recommended. Effective consequences for negative behavior are delivered immediately, in a neutral manner, and in consideration of whether the consequence is actually predictive of a decrease in behavior. Too often
consequences are pre-conceived without consideration of how they might affect behavior. For example, schools often use the “detention” as a standard consequence for behavior. However, if the student hates being in the classroom, removal to a place without demands will increase the behavior that promotes that escape. In effect, the wrong negative consequence will only be ineffective – it can actually make things worse.

If the only goal is to decrease the future likelihood of the behavior then it makes sense to use the smallest effective form of negative feedback. The smallest possible form of negative feedback is correction. This is what we use for academic errors because it minimizes the negative by re-teaching and facilitating a success while at the same time providing the feedback that performance was incorrect. Regardless of what negative consequences are being used, correction should be a part of every response to negative behavior. For example, even if the required response to a serious behavior is suspension – that behavior should be addressed with a correction involving 3 terms: (1) a question regarding why the behavior was incorrect, (2) a request that the student describe a better way (i.e., the rule), and (3) encouragement to behave in that way in the future. After the correction sequence the larger consequence can be relayed. However, all negative consequences should be known by all students ahead of time. Stakeholders must define consequences for behavior so that students are well aware. If the students are well aware of the consequences then teachers are less likely to be the “bad guy” for implementing the consequence as the student knew the outcome before behavior.
Discipline Process Decisions

Stakeholders must determine a process for dealing with behavioral errors, beginning with who is responsible and ending with what the range of consequences should be. Schools often develop a flow chart detailing these decisions. This becomes the school’s official agreement as to who handles a given response to misbehavior and how.

Notice in the flow chart presented above that the first decision is in regard to whether the misbehavior should be managed by the stakeholder observing it or sent directly to an administrator. A list of misbehaviors is divided into two categories – those that are “teacher managed” and those that go directly to the administrator.

This flow chart contains an exception to the teacher managed rule: if the same teacher has provided negative feedback for this same behavior without success on three previous occasions then the incident may be referred directly to an administrator.

**a blank version of this is included in the Appendix**

Notice in the flow chart presented above that the first decision is in regard to whether the misbehavior should be managed by the stakeholder observing it or sent directly to an administrator. A list of misbehaviors is divided into two categories – those that are “teacher managed” and those that go directly to the administrator. This flow chart contains an exception to the teacher managed rule: if the same teacher has provided negative feedback for this same behavior without success on three previous occasions then the incident may be referred directly to an administrator.
The next step is to consider what consequences are appropriate for each of the teacher managed behaviors. It is recommended that the ABRI team facilitate a discussion with all stakeholders in order to brainstorm a range of effective responses. There will be at least a few adults who have no idea of how to handle simple situations such as students bringing food to class. Those who have no strategies tend toward more severe first responses – often removing the student from the classroom or implementing other exclusionary practices such as detention or after school time. While these responses may be a part of the repertoire of possible responses, less extreme consequences tend to be more effective first responses. The team presents each of the teacher managed misbehaviors and asks all stakeholders for suggestions of simple responses. As a range of experienced teachers speak up and give their suggestions the team develops a list of simple strategies that can be supplied to all stakeholders. For those who have no other less severe responses in their bag of tricks, this discussion serves as a training of sorts – alerting them to alternatives.

While it is recommended that consequences be taught so that students know what to expect, the consequences may vary teacher by teacher. In addition, the teacher may tell students that a given offense may meet with one of two or three consequences, letting the student know that there will be a particular consequence but leaving open the possibilities to best fit the student and conditions presenting with the misbehavior. Administrator managed behaviors are often a matter of district board policy. Consequences for such behaviors can be spelled out in a code of conduct but needn’t be specifically addressed with the students. That is, there is no need to go through the list of major infractions and talk about what the consequences are. This discussion will be better spent focusing on more frequent minor behaviors.

**Step 3: Fidelity of Implementation**

Step 3 is unique among the four steps because it is actually a set of considerations across all the steps. It is discussed as a third step because it provides a focus on the fidelity and consistency with which agreements from Step 2 (i.e., rules, routines, and arrangements) are implemented by all stakeholders. Of course, fidelity with agreement about how data will collected and used (Step 4) is also important and is monitored. But Step 3 is focused most specifically on the fidelity of instruction, encouragement, and feedback across the school. Clearly, this step could be embedded within Step 2 rather than included separately. The designation of this as a distinct step is meant to place greater emphasis on the importance of fidelity.
Again, the best plans that are implemented in an incomplete or ineffective manner cannot be expected to be affect change.

**ABRI Fidelity Checklist**

The ABRI Fidelity Checklist for Behavior provides a simple and direct manner of assessing the degree to which stakeholders are implementing ABRI for behavior as agreed upon in Step 2 (also contains question about Step 4). It is recommended that the team complete the checklist on a monthly basis as a continuing check of the fidelity of implementation. A “Yes” answer indicates that implementation for a given item is being done consistently and in the manner agreed upon. A “Some” answer indicates that implementation is occurring but is not as consistent as was agreed upon. A “No” answer indicates that implementation is not judged to be absent or occurring with insufficient fidelity. Both “Some” and “No” answers indicate a need for the team to engage the stakeholders in discussion of a need for greater effort or a change in agreements. Even when a school achieves 100% “Yes” throughout the form, reconsideration each month provides assurances that fidelity is maintained and does not fade over time.

**This form is included in the Appendix**
Coaching and Support for Behavior

Remember that the role of the ABRI Team is not to implement, but to facilitate implementation among all stakeholders. At times this involves coaching and support for groups or individual stakeholders. The need for coaching or support may be apparent after completion of the ABRI Fidelity Checklist. An answer of “Some” on a given question should lead the team to identify specific times, locations, or conditions under which fidelity is insufficient. This, in turn, identified a context for further coaching and support with stakeholders who are present and responsible for implementation under those conditions. Other times team members may identify specific individuals who are not implementing as agreed. The team’s role is always one of support and individuals should always be approached in a supportive manner – “how can we help you?” However, when adults simply refuse to comply for whatever reason this is not a matter for the team. Non-compliant adults are an issue for the administrator. Because the administrator is a member of the team he or she will be aware of such circumstances and will handle within the appropriate framework for addressing such employee difficulties.

Step 4: Assessment & Evaluation

Steps 4 and 1 are related in that the information collected in Step 4 can be used to provide additional information regarding prevention. But our focus here will be on using information as an evaluation of the effect of implementation of the plans that have been developed to prevent problem behavior. Technically, data is required only to answer specific questions – did pushing in the hallway decrease, were fewer problems noted in the cafeteria at noon, or have incidents of fighting after school decreased? However, if we collect data only on the issues that have been a problem in the past we have no continuous data regarding other potential problems. It makes more sense to collect data on behavior in a more comprehensive manner – noting who, what, when, and where of all observed problems. To the extent that this can be done without burdening stakeholders with data collection, it will provide worthwhile data for continued decision making. A rule of thumb for considering time is to create assessment and evaluation systems that take no more than 1% of the time of any stakeholder to complete on a daily basis. The recommended process presented herein has been effectively used by numerous schools and is easily within the 1% rule.
Effective Monitoring for Behavior

The first step in developing a monitoring system is to define the behaviors that are to be monitored. Clearly, some limits have to be set with regard to the level of behavior warranting data collection. We likely are not interested in the random audible belch in the hallway or with the number of incidents of students not smiling when greeting one another. While one could probably make a case for the importance of these behaviors we simply have to draw a line somewhere or the number of behaviors being recorded will be unwieldy.

While all will likely agree that non-compliance is a misbehavior worth noting, the exact definition of non-compliance may vary person to person. Some people believe that only the most blatant refusal to follow a direction constitutes non-compliance while others see even the slightest delay in following a direction to be an example. Perhaps some would use words such as “defiance” or “oppositional” to describe variations in the degree to which a student follows a direction. The important point is that an effective monitoring system begins with agreement as to the definitions of behavior. What exactly is a fight? At what speed is a student considered running? At what decibel level would a student’s voice be too loud? These definitions issues are important not only for data collection but also for instruction. We have to be certain that we are all teaching students the same behaviors and that instruction will require a clear rule and the ability to model.

Effective Monitoring

Big Idea: We need data to know if implementation of our plans is worth continuing

- We must agree as to the important behaviors
  - Agree on definitions of behavior and other variables
- It has to be simple enough to not burden us
  - Can typically take no more than 1% of daily staff time
- It has to be useful and reported
  - must be made public and decisions shared with all stakeholders

©Scott, 2013
Creating a Data System

Thus far our efforts at predicting and preventing behavior have focused on the problems that stakeholders report observing during a typical day at school. These observations are the best representation we have of student behavior and when stakeholders are able to record those observations we have data on behavior. At this point the team should develop a data collection form to use with behavior. This form might be referred to as an referral form or a discipline tracking slip. The purpose of the form is simply to record the occurrence of a behavioral failure and not as a punitive consequence. That is, the data is not a negative consequence and the student need not even know that the slip was completed. But recording information surrounding a misbehavior allows for the development of a database from which more comprehensive evaluations may be completed.

When developing a data collection form there are several issues to consider. First, the form should be as small and simple as possible. If possible, all information should be on one page so that forms are easy to carry and complete. Similarly, forms should include all the information – requiring stakeholders to simply use checkmarks or minimal writing to complete. The simpler the form is to complete the more likely it is that stakeholders will use it consistently. A good form covers all the information that is necessary to evaluate. Prevention strategies will be most specific when problems can be assessed by time, location, grade level, and other important variables. However, there is a limit as to what can fit onto one page so the team must be careful to prioritize what is of most importance. The list of potential misbehaviors should include those behaviors that occur most frequently. While it is possible that students could bring weapons to school, this is far less likely than most misbehaviors and needn’t be included on the form. High intensity and low frequency behaviors such as law violations, weapons, explosives, and narcotics can be written in under an “other” category. This will save space on the form. In the case that a severe behavior does occur it likely will require a more detailed description so the “other” category will get the details required.

The team must draft the form and then present it to the stakeholders for discussion and consensus. There likely will be point of disagreement that will require team members to facilitate compromise before there is consensus for the use of the data collection system in a comprehensive and consistent manner across the school.
The referral form presented below is from an elementary school and is approximately 3x4 inches, printed front and back, and bundled as a tablet of forms so that all stakeholders carry a tablet at all times. Note that this form is labeled as both a report and a referral. The referral function of the form refers to recording of behaviors that are office managed – wherein an adult refers a student to the administrator and uses the form as a summary of the observed misbehavior. The bottom of the second page is completed by the administrator and the form is kept in the student’s permanent file as a record of a major offense.
The Report function of the form refers to recording of behaviors that are not office managed but still meet a standard high enough to warrant recording. This is simply data for a database and reports do not go into a student’s permanent file. Someone may ask why there is need for recording if the behavior was managed by a teacher and does not require administration. The answer is, because it is data about behavior. For example, a group of students are in the hallway being loud at 1 PM every day. A teacher goes into the hallway and corrects the students daily – but does not record the issues. At a faculty meeting that teacher may argue that more strategies need to be implemented in the hallway at 1 PM. However, decisions about strategies are made based on data – not on who complains the loudest or whines the most. So when data does not show that problems occur in the hallway at 1 PM there is no evidence for an intervention. Similarly, Jimmy has had a single problem with each of 10 different teachers over the past 2 weeks. Yet when we think about students with chronic problems Jimmy does not come to mind for anyone – he’s only been observed with a single misbehavior. If each instance of misbehavior had been reported with a form we would not have clear data to show that Jimmy has had multiple problems. The data could be further used to better predict Jimmy’s behaviors and to develop the most simple prevention plans. Thus, both reports and referrals are important data pieces. The simpler the form is to use, the easier it will be to get all stakeholders to collect data.

**Summarizing and Graphing Data**

Data from report/referrals needs to be entered into a comprehensive database so that it can be tracked. If all the data is summarized in one spreadsheet it is then simple to ask complex questions regarding multiple variables within the data.

- *What time of day is a fight most likely to occur?*
- *Where do 8th grade boys most often receive referrals during the afternoon?*
- *Who are the most likely culprits if there is a hallway disturbance?*

Getting this data into the database is a simple process. For example, the team can ask all stakeholders to turn in their referrals at the time a student is referred to the office and to turn in all reports for the week by Friday afternoon. A box in the office is designated as for reports and stakeholders may toss completed reports in as they occur throughout the week or may save them up and toss them all in at once at the end of the week. Once all the reports are submitted a designated person transfers the information from all referrals and reports that week into a spreadsheet by simply typing a name and making tally marks.
The sample spreadsheet above shows only the columns for date, name, teacher, and incident. But this spreadsheet continues to the right and includes time of day, grade level, location, outcome (consequence) and any other information that was included on the form. It generally takes about 15 minutes per week to enter all reports/referrals. Once all data is entered, any question about the relationship between variables can be answered with simple sorting and filtering functions in the spreadsheet. Further, graphs can be created to summarize behavior in accordance with questions.
Team Meetings to Evaluate Behavior

As will be discussed in a later section on ABRI Team Meetings (page XX), the team will meet monthly to look at data. During these meetings there are three main tasks: (1) evaluate progress toward articulated goals, (2) look at all data to identify any new “hot spots” (i.e., any times, locations, etc that have become predictive of problems), and (3) look at all data to identify any students who are at risk by the number of failures reported.

The first monthly meeting is different from all others because there is no prior data to which the monthly summary can be compared. At the end of Step 1 the team articulated 1-3 measurable goals for behavior. Because there was no specific data – just stakeholder perceptions – goals included a specific number rather than simply saying “less than.” For example, it was agreed that the cafeteria represented the largest predictor for problem behaviors in the elementary school. Based on this the stakeholders agreed that an average of four misbehaviors per week (16 per month) would represent a vast improvement – and it was determined that 16 per month would be the first goal. Similar goals may have been set for as many as three locations. However, it is cautioned not to exceed 3 goals – there is no harm in having just one goal to begin and allowing the ABRI process to have great focus for success before expanding. Regardless of goals, implementation continues in every area of the school.
When data suggest that strategies are working there is cause for celebration and a positive report back to the stakeholders to reinforce their continued efforts. When data suggest that strategies have been ineffective the team must reflect on whether the strategies are ineffective or whether they simply were not implemented with sufficient fidelity. At this point the checklist from Step 3 is considered as a manner of answering this question.

A second task involves scouring the data for any new “hot spots.” This is where Step 4 merges back into Step 1 as part of the continuous 4-step process. On every new trip through the 4 steps there will be no need to engage in mapping activities in order to predict problem behaviors because there now is hard data to provide the same info. Each month the team looks through all the data for a quick summary of predictors. If the predictors look the same as they always have then there is no new information. However, it may be that a location, the gym for instance, suddenly has an elevated number of reports/referrals. The team’s job would be to dig deeper into that data in search of predictors. Questions are, who in the gym, when in the gym, what problems in the gym, and what else is predictable about the gym? Thus, the data can provide much greater precision in identifying predictors, in turn making the prevention process much more targeted and efficient.

The third task of the monthly team meeting is to identify students for whom Tier 1 strategies are insufficient to facilitate success. To do this the team first needs to identify a criterion. How many reports/referrals should a student have before we officially deem him or her a “non-responder” to Tier 1? On the one hand we don’t want to set this criterion too high lest we miss students in need of further assistance (false negatives). On the other hand we don’t want to set this criterion too low lest we identify large numbers of students who do need further intervention – overburdening our system (false positives). A good rule of thumb is to set the criterion where it will generally identify about 15% of the students. This is about the number of students that we generally would expect to require more assistance. Of course, this is just an estimate for beginning. Some schools may have many more than 15% requiring further assistance and others many less. Each team will continually refine their criterion in consultation with the monthly data. Those students who are identified as requiring further assistance should be referred to a Tier 2 behavior team – as described in the Tier 2 Behavior section on page XX.

Finally, as an evaluation tool, data can also provide information as to the overall effectiveness of the ABRI plans. Generally, when the number of student exhibiting failure is above 25% it is an indicator that Tier 1 is not sufficient. Often, teams simply increase the number of students being referred for Tiers 2 and 3 rather than...
turning the focus back to Tier 1. Remember that a good school-wide system prevents first and responds only when the most effective prevention fails. Large scale failures indicate what prevention was perhaps not as effective as it could or should be.
TIER 1 ACADEMICS

Step 1: Predicting Failure

Step 2: Developing Prevention

Step 3: Fidelity of Implementation

Step 4: Assessment & Evaluation

TIER 1 TEAMING FOR BEHAVIOR AND ACADEMICS

Effective Teaming

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ABRI Implementation Team Meeting</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fidelity Assessment</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Date: ______________________  School: ______________________

Completed by: ______

Team membership: _________________________________________

Assessment Rubric

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>C-2</th>
<th>P-1</th>
<th>0-0</th>
<th>N/A</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Prior to meeting

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>C</th>
<th>P</th>
<th>O</th>
<th>N/A</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| C | P | O | N/A | Meeting date, time and location determined
| C | P | O | N/A | Meeting agenda prepared
| C | P | O | N/A | Academic data compiled
| C | P | O | N/A | Behavior data compiled

Notes/Comments:

**a blank version of this is included in the Appendix
Elementary School posts the monthly data on the mailroom door so staff can look for patterns and changes.

- Notice they post POSITIVES and ODR data.

Post the Data for all Faculty to See
- Staff need to know that data collection has a purpose
- Staff need to see results of efforts

Look at our Star Slip and Office Removal Data! What do you notice?
TIER 2 BEHAVIOR

Step 1: Predicting Failure
Step 2: Developing Prevention
Step 3: Fidelity of Implementation
Step 4: Assessment & Evaluation

TIER 2 ACADEMICS

Step 1: Predicting Failure
Step 2: Developing Prevention
Step 3: Fidelity of Implementation
Step 4: Assessment & Evaluation

TIER 3 BEHAVIOR

Step 1: Predicting Failure
Step 2: Developing Prevention

Step 3: Fidelity of Implementation

Step 4: Assessment & Evaluation

TIER 3 ACADEMICS

Step 1: Predicting Failure

Step 2: Developing Prevention

Step 3: Fidelity of Implementation

Step 4: Assessment & Evaluation
ABRI Manual

APPENDIX

1. Committee Organization Worksheet
2. ABRI Student Failure Survey
3. ABRI Readiness Self-Assessment
4. Predictable Problems Summary for Behavior
5. Blank Behavior Matrix
7. ABRI Fidelity Checklist for Behavior
### Committee Organization Worksheet

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Initiative, Project, Committee</th>
<th>What is Purpose</th>
<th>Outcome</th>
<th>Targeted Group</th>
<th>Staff Involved</th>
<th>Part of SIP?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Committee</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Committee</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Committee</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Committee</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Committee</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Committee</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ABRI Team</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Adapted from George Sugai
ABRI Manual

ABRI
Student Failure Survey

School Name: ____________________________ Date: ______________

Administrator _____ Teacher _____ Staff _____ Specialist _____ Other _____

Use your experience in the school to answer each of the following questions. Your responses will help us to determine priorities in the future in terms of creating a safe and effective school environment.

Consider if you had to wager on when students in your school would most likely fail, with what, when, where . . . and why?

List the most frequent problem behavior that you observe or respond to while at school
example. Loud pushing in the entry hallway at 2:40 PM

1. ______________________________________________________________________
2. ______________________________________________________________________
3. ______________________________________________________________________
4. ______________________________________________________________________
5. ______________________________________________________________________

List the most predictable academic failures that you observe or respond to while at school
example. 3 digit addition with regrouping at 2
d grade

1. ______________________________________________________________________
2. ______________________________________________________________________
3. ______________________________________________________________________
4. ______________________________________________________________________
5. ______________________________________________________________________
ABRI Manual

ABRI Fidelity Checklist

Behavior

To be completed by the ABRI Team on a monthly basis and shared back with all stakeholders. The goal is to have a Yes for each item each month.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Action</th>
<th>Being Done to Fidelity?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Are the rules posted in each identified location of the school?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• were students involved in creating the postings?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• are there pictures or visual prompts associated with rules?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Have all students been taught the big ideas in a direct manner?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• are all stakeholders involved in this instruction?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• are the big ideas visible in all locations of the school?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Have specific rules by location been taught to all students?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• was this instruction engaging rather than simply telling them?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• are all rules tied back to the big ideas?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Do adults provide reminders to students on a regular basis?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• planned reminders prior to entering natural settings?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• verbal reminders throughout the day in natural settings?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Do all adults abide by agreements for routines and arrangements?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• are adults consistent in doing what was agreed upon?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• are adults in the locations where they need to be as agreed?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• are adults encouraging students verbally?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• are adults providing feedback?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Do all adults acknowledge appropriate student behavior verbally?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• does acknowledgement occur throughout the day?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• does acknowledgement occur across all students?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• are public acknowledgements occurring at least monthly?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Do all adhere to teacher vs office managed response to behavior?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• do all adults consequence simple behavior without exclusion?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Do adults use the agreed upon report/referral form?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• are the forms completed correctly when submitted?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>