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EXECUTIVE SUMMARY
Engrossed Substitute Senate Bill (ESSB) 5946 requires the Office of Superintendent of Public Instruction (OSPI) to convene a panel of experts to identify best practices in reducing disruptive classroom behavior. This panel developed a menu of best practices and strategies to help eligible students in grades K–12 served by the state’s Learning Assistance Program (LAP) to receive behavior supports and, by extension, improve their academic success.

ESSB 5946 also tasked OSPI to convene panels of experts to develop menus of best practices and strategies in mathematics and English language arts for students served by LAP in grades K–12. All three menus must be updated by July 1 every year.

School districts in Washington are expected to use practices from the Reducing Disruptive Behaviors (RDB) menu starting with the 2016–17 school year. Districts that wish to use a practice not on the menu must provide evidence of the effectiveness of their proposed, alternative intervention and apply for approval by OSPI to use such intervention.

The Reducing Disruptive Behaviors Panel collaborated with the Washington State Institute for Public Policy (WSIPP) in the development of the menu. As required in separate legislation, WSIPP provided a companion report which identifies research-based and evidence-based practices, strategies and programs that are shown to improve student outcomes. Many of the best practices and strategies identified for inclusion in the panel’s menu were also included in the WSIPP report. In addition, the WSIPP companion report identifies an average effect-size for identified interventions and performs a cost-benefit analysis.

It is important to note that the existence of a Reducing Disruptive Behaviors Menu of Best Practices and Strategies is not sufficient to ensure all students will succeed. Instruction and interventions are complex. Not all behavior intervention strategies work all of the time with all students. The expert panel, in their deliberations, strongly voiced the importance of ensuring that each of the intervention strategies and best practices described in the menu be designed to meet the diverse needs of students and be implemented with fidelity.

Educators must engage in a process of observation, analysis, action, and reflection in their classrooms regardless of the interventions chosen. This approach helps solve problems as they arise, and can ensure that the interventions chosen by the teacher or district have a greater chance of succeeding.
This Reducing Disruptive Behaviors Menu of Best Practices and Strategies is organized by type, based upon the currently allowed LAP service categories. The report also contains a section describing how to evaluate promising practices—those practices identified by the RDB panel of experts as showing signs of effectiveness, but lacking sufficient research to be considered a “best practice” as of June 2015. OSPI and will seek input from districts and the expert panel on newly identified research on both best and promising practices for struggling students.
BACKGROUND

Engrossed Substitute Senate Bill (ESSB) 5946–Strengthening
Student Educational Outcomes

Washington’s 2013 Legislature passed ESSB 5946 in the 2nd Special Legislative
session in June 2013. The overall bill sets forth a vision for improving educational
support systems for every student in grades K–12. The first Section of Part 1
references the importance of collaborative partnerships essential to supporting
students; using research and evidence-based programs for all students,
especially in the early years for grades K–4; and providing statewide models to
support school district in implementing a multi-tiered system of support. Part 2 of
the bill references the LAP’s focus on evidence-based support for students
struggling in reading (with primary emphasis on grades K–4), mathematics, and
behavior across grades K–12. Section 203 tasks OSPI to convene expert panels
to develop menus of best practices and strategies for English language arts
(ELA), mathematics and behavior.

The Menu of Best Practices and Strategies for Reducing Disruptive Behavior, as
published July 1, 2015, must be undated by July 1 every year. Beginning in the
2016-17 school year, districts must select a practice or strategy from the menu or
may use a practice or strategy that is not on a state menu for two years initially. If
the district is able to demonstrate improved outcomes for participating students
over two school years at a level commensurate with the best practices and
strategies on the state menu, the OSPI will approve use of the alternative
practice or strategy by the district for one additional school year. Subsequent
annual approval by OSPI to use the alternative practice or strategy is dependent
on the district continuing to demonstrate increased improved outcomes for
participating students.

Additionally, by each August 1st, school districts must report to OSPI:

a) The amount of academic growth gained by students participating in the
learning assistance program;

b) The number of students who gain at least one year of academic growth;
and

c) The specific practices, activities, and programs used by each school
building that received learning assistance program funding.

OSPI will analyze this data and summarize the effects of LAP on student
achievement in a report to the Legislature. The Learning Assistance Program
Growth Data report to the Legislature for 2014 is currently available online.

To ensure that school districts are meeting the requirements of this legislation,
OSPI is tasked to review districts through the Consolidated Performance Review
process to monitor school district fidelity in implementing best practices.
WSIPP Inventory of Evidence-Based and Research-Based Best Practices

In addition to direction to OSPI per ESSB 5946, the 2013 Legislature directed the Washington State Institute for Public Policy (WSIPP) to “prepare an inventory of evidence-based and research-based effective practices, activities and programs for use by school districts in the learning assistance program” (Senate Bill 5034, Section 610). The WSIPP Inventory of Evidence- and Research-Based Practices: Washington’s K–12 Learning Assistance Program classifies LAP strategies as evidence-based, research-based, or promising according to average effect-sizes for identified interventions, a cost-benefit analysis, and other criteria. Both OSPI and WSIPP consider the two reports to be companion pieces. As such, OSPI and WSIPP coordinated their tasks to ensure that the content of both reports were consistent while still adhering to the unique directives given to each agency.

Both agencies collaborated on identifying topics for consideration for best practices and strategies. WSIPP Assistant Director Annie Pennucci and Research Associate Matt Lemon were key participants in the expert panel sessions as non-voting members. They provided important research references to the panel members, and solicited panel member input regarding effective practices. The two agencies then followed different, complementary processes for identifying practices for the WSIPP inventory and best practices and strategies for inclusion in the Menu of Best Practices and Strategies for Reducing Disruptive Behaviors.

WSIPP, as noted above, conducted a rigorous meta-analysis of each potential practice and identified evidence- and research-based practices for the inventory according to the average effect-size and a cost-benefit analysis of each practice. The identification of best practices and strategies in the OSPI report was informed by WSIPP’s findings and ultimately determined by the expert panel. OSPI included notation indicating whether the practices included in the menu are evidence-based or research-based, as determined by WSIPP. The items noted with an asterisk in the menu have been identified by WSIPP as evidence-based or research-based (see Table 1). Additional practices and strategies are included in the menu based on research reviewed by the expert panel.
PHILOSOPHY OF REDUCING DISRUPTIVE BEHAVIOR

The Need to Address Behavior in Washington State
During the past three decades, local and national research have demonstrated the continual challenges that schools face in order to meet the many mental health and behavioral needs presented by students in the public education system (Healthy Youth Survey, 2012; National Prevention Council, 2014).

In 2014, the U.S. Department of Education released a report that highlights the utilization of multi-tiered system of support frameworks (MTSS) as a research-based model. This has proven effective in helping schools to meet these needs by providing a systematic framework of guidelines for organizing and implementing evidence-based practices. These guidelines call on schools to:

1. Take deliberate steps to create a positive school climate that helps prevent and address inappropriate behaviors;
2. Ensure that clear, appropriate and consistent expectations and consequences are in place to prevent and address misbehavior; and
3. Clearly understand their civil rights obligations and actively strive to ensure that all students receive fair and equitable support and treatment by continuously tracking and reviewing data related to discipline policies and practices.

To underscore these points, in a letter to the educators across the nation, Secretary of Education Duncan stated that schools “should take deliberate steps to create the positive school climates that help can prevent and change inappropriate behaviors” (U.S. Department of Education, 2014, p. ii).

Joint work conducted in prevention science by the Department of Education (DOE), Department of Justice, and Department of Health and Human Services further defines and funds the Secretary of Education’s recommendations through initiatives such as the School Climate Transformation Grant Program (2014). The federal effort to improve student emotional and mental development through healthier school climates specifically focuses on “evidence-based, multi-tiered decision-making frameworks, such as Positive Behavioral Interventions and Supports (PBIS).” To support these changes, the DOE has made federal grants available to enable “state education agencies and local school districts to

Social and emotional learning can serve as an organizing principle for coordinating all of a school’s academic, youth development and prevention activities.

Collaborative for Academic, Social, and Emotional Learning
develop and adopt, or expand to more schools, a multi-tiered decision-making framework that guides the selection, integration, and implementation of the best evidence-based behavioral practices for improving school climate and behavioral outcomes for all students” (National Prevention Council, 2014, pp. 11).

Additional funds from the U.S. Department of Education granted to the Center on Great Teachers and Leaders (GTL Center) at the American Institute for Research (AIR) has aided in the development of publically available tools to support teachers in building competency and instructional strategies to improve students’ social and emotional learning (SEL). The federally funded GTL Center also emphasized the positive impact school-based universal interventions have on enhancing students’ SEL (Durlak, Weissberg, Dymnicki, Taylor & Schellinger, 2011) and noted the importance for educators to infuse SEL into core instruction. Moreover, the GTL Center reported that socially and emotionally competent educators foster supportive relationships with their students and help their students improve the basic social and emotional skills needed to engage in meaningful classroom learning activities.

Additionally, over the past several years, research has found that a positive school climate contributes significantly to increased academic achievement, and may actually be more influential on learning outcomes than other resources available to a school (Voight, Austin & Hanson, 2013). The National Center on Safe and Supportive Schools defines the three components of an effective school climate as (Yoder, 2014):

1. Engagement: Strong relationships exist between teachers and students, among students, among teachers, and between teachers and administration.
2. Safety: Students are safe from bullying and violence, and they feel emotionally and academically safe to take risks in the classroom.
3. Environment: Well-managed schools and classrooms fulfill students’ basic needs of autonomy, competence, and connectedness.

These three components of effective schools are further defined in the Positive Learning Environments Table 1 located in the Appendix.

In alignment with these national reform efforts and the ongoing research that supports infusing SEL into core instruction, Washington state adopted the Teacher Principal Evaluation Protocol (TPEP; RCW 28A.405.100 (2)(b); Washington Administrative Code, 329.191A.) to support educators in “fostering and managing a safe and positive learning environment.” In partnership with Governor Inslee’s office, the Office of Superintendent of Public Instruction (OSPI) conducted a survey of Washington school districts in the fall of 2013. District superintendents were asked what major issues contributed to students dropping out in their respective districts. Of the 230 districts that responded, administrators overwhelmingly identified the need to address students’ behavioral-health issues
as most critical (78 percent), and they called for a system-wide multi-tiered framework to address prevention, intervention and social/emotional/health issues. These findings clearly speak to the need for a larger system of support to ensure the success of our students.

In light of these findings and recommendations, Washington legislators acted by implementing ESSB 5946. This law is designed to provide support to districts that are implementing MTSS initiatives such as response to intervention, positive behavior intervention support systems or other similar comprehensive models of data-based identification and early intervention.

The Interconnectedness of Learning & Behavior: The Importance of Social/Emotional Learning (SEL)

Schools today are faced with tremendous challenges as they attempt to meet the social/emotional and academic needs of an increasingly diverse student body. Educators must be aware that student learning and behavior are inextricably linked.

Schools that systematically address both academic and social/emotional learning (SEL) have shown increased student achievement when compared to schools that do not address both factors (Elliott, Huai, & Roach, 2007; Hawken et al., 2008; Knoff, 2009; U.S. Department of Education, 2014). When schools can find approaches that decrease the disruptive behavior of students and improve instructional practices, struggling students are much more likely to improve both their academic and SEL outcomes (Sutherland, Lewis-Palmer, Stichter & Morgan, 2008).

In a recent study, Durlak and colleagues found that systematic attention to SEL actually increased students’ capacity to learn (Durlak et al., 2011). Further, their study found that students who had participated in SEL programs implemented by their teachers showed the following gains:

- Increased academic achievement
- Increased social-emotional skills
- Improved attitudes toward self and others
- Improved positive social behaviors
- Decreased conduct problems and emotional distress

These findings were consistent across the K–12 grade levels, location, and in schools serving diverse communities. To that end, schools that use a proactive, systematic process for identifying and addressing student needs across both academic and social/behavioral areas are better able to provide supports and promote skill development in the key areas before many students develop a more serious or prolonged problem that requires intensive, formalized, and
expensive supports (Elliott, Huai, & Roach; Hawken, Vincent, & Schumann, 2008).

It is because of this inextricable link between academics and SEL and the significant need to address behavior more productively that the Washington State Legislature included the priority of reducing disruptive behaviors along with providing academic support for low-achieving students in Engrossed Substitute Senate Bill (ESSB) 5946.

**Effective Student Supports: MTSS and SWPBIS**

Multi-Tiered System of Supports (MTSS) incorporates two models; Response to Intervention (RTI) and School-wide Positive Behavior Intervention and Supports (SWPBIS). SWPBIS is based on decades of research and practice in both public health and prevention science, and it has been established over the past 20 years as an evidence-based approach to service delivery that systematically addresses the social/emotional and behavioral supports provided to students throughout a school and/or district (Walker et al., 1996).

In many areas, RTI is used to describe interventions related to the academic aspects of education, while SWPBIS represents addressing social/emotional and behavioral needs. MTSS is now more commonly used because it is a comprehensive model that integrates both approaches to provide the most effective prevention and early intervention to increasing academic learning and reducing disruptive behavior.

MTSS is defined as a whole-school, data-driven, prevention-based framework for improving learning and SEL outcomes for EVERY student through a layered continuum of evidence-based practices and systems. The MTSS framework uses a proactive prevention based framework, which allows schools to more systematically deliver needed supports to students. This emphasis on early identification and intervention helps to reach students in a preventative, rather than reactive, mode and reduces the risk for school failure. The MTSS model emphasizes the use of evidence-based practices to enhance the academic and behavioral performance of all students. The model has typically been displayed as in the figure below.
When students are not meeting their educational goals in the general education curriculum, problem-solving teams in schools meet to discuss the next best steps to provide effective instruction and intervention. For example, when a student in a general education classroom is displaying behavior that does not meet the social expectations and school-wide behavior program (Tier 1), teachers can refer a student for Tier 2 supports and interventions in an attempt to ameliorate the behavior problem and teach the student more effective behavior for school success. This level usually addresses the needs of about 80 percent of the student population.

The Tier 2 intervention should be an efficient and accessible approach that has a standard assessment plan and clear criteria for entering and exiting an intervention. An important factor about Tier 2 is that it is a “rapid” intervention meant to quickly meet the needs of students identified as “at risk” in certain areas. It is designed to quickly screen for and target students who need extra skill instruction or to get back on track. This level usually addresses the needs of about 15% of a student population.

The final tier (Tier 3) for behavior should be individualized and intensive, as it targets the improvement of productive behavior while effectively decreasing problem behavior. Tier 3 interventions may take more time. This level typically addresses the needs of about five percent of a student population.
Whereas assessment and intervention approaches vary at present, it is generally agreed that the transition between tiers in the MTSS model should be data-based, systematic, and accessible to both teachers and students (see Hawken, Vincent, & Schumann, 2008). Another important factor is that the MTSS levels are considered “permeable,” meaning that students are expected to go up and down the three levels of support over time, depending on their needs and circumstances. An effective MTSS is designed to respond accordingly and to anticipate changes in student needs over time. Data-based progress monitoring indicates a need to shift students and supports based upon a student’s response to intervention and supports, as well as emerging needs.

MTSS integrates RTI and SWPBIS approaches emphasizing these key practices for increasing BOTH student academic achievement and social/emotional learning. Schools can use these features to provide academic and social/emotional supports to all students (Bohanan, Goodman & McIntosh, 2009) using basic education funding:

1. **Universal screening:** Learner performance and progress (in academic and social/emotional and behavioral areas) should be reviewed on a regular basis and in a systematic manner to identify students who are: a) making adequate progress, b) at some risk of failure if not provided extra assistance, or c) at high risk of failure if not provided specialized supports.

2. **Data-based decision making and problem solving:** Information directly reflects student learning based on measurable and relevant learning criteria and outcomes should be used to guide decisions regarding instructional effectiveness, student responsiveness, and intervention adaptations and modifications.

3. **Continuous progress monitoring:** Student progress should be assessed on a frequent and regular basis to identify adequate or inadequate growth trends and support timely instructional decisions.

4. **Student performance:** Priority should be given to using actual student performance on the instructional curriculum to guide decisions regarding teaching effectiveness and learning progress.

5. **Continuum of evidence-based interventions:** An integrated and linked curriculum should be available such that:
   a. A core curriculum is provided for all students;
   b. A modification of this core is arranged for students who are identified as nonresponsive, and
   c. A specialized and intensive curriculum is developed for students whose performance is deemed nonresponsive to the modified core.

Elements of this continuum must have empirical evidence to support efficacy (intervention is linked to outcome), effectiveness (intervention outcomes are achievable and replicable in applied settings), relevant (intervention can be implemented by natural implementers and with high
fidelity), and durable (intervention implementation is sustainable and student outcomes are lasting).

6. **Implementation fidelity**: Team-based structures and procedures are in place to ensure and coordinate appropriate adoption and accurate and sustained implementation of the full continuum of intervention practices.


This document focuses on strategies for supporting social emotional learning, reducing disruptive classroom behaviors, and it emphasizes the SWPBIS aspects of the MTSS model. Over the past 20 years, the Department of Education has made significant investments in the development and research on practices related to SWPBIS. This includes developing and supporting the National PBIS Technical Assistance Center (www.pbis.org), which provides free resources, tools, and materials to schools interested in implementing this approach.

SWPBIS is currently described as the most widely used framework for implementing evidence-based practices in human services (Fixsen & Blase, 2008). The Washington State Institute for Public Policy (WSIPP) issued a 2014 report on a meta-analysis study performed on positive behavior supports showing a 99 percent return on investment for cost versus return and for showing a strong evidence-base (Washington State Institute for Public Policy, 2014). SWPBIS has been implemented in all 50 states and over 21,000 schools across the U.S. (Office of Special Education Programs Technical Assistance Center on Positive Behavioral Interventions and Supports, 2014).

A SWPBIS model helps schools to establish a positive school climate that is culturally responsive to meet the needs of our diverse learners. This is done by establishing multiple tiers of support designed to address the needs of all students first with additional supports to some students and more intensive support to a few students as indicated by their presenting needs. The premise of the SWPBIS system of supports is that practices are proactively put in place so that problem behavior is less likely to occur or exacerbate (Carr, et al., 2002). The OSEP National PBIS Technical Assistance Center summarizes the key features of SWPBIS that are listed in the appendix and can also be located at (https://www.pbis.org/school/primary-level).
Research specifically on SWPBIS has shown many positive outcomes. Students in schools implementing PBIS with fidelity are 33 percent less likely to receive an office discipline referral and demonstrate increases in academic performance (Bradshaw, Koth, Bevans, Ialongo, & Leaf, 2008). Larger statewide evaluations of the delivery model have also shown significant reductions in suspensions (Barrett et al., 2008). SWPBIS has also been associated with increased perceptions in school safety and (Horner et al., 2011) and in school staff members’ perception of organization health (Bradshaw et al., 2008).

It is important to reiterate that neither MTSS nor SWPBIS are new approaches. These models have been used in Washington at some level in schools for over 15 years. In 1999, a “behavioral task force” was assembled by former OSPI Superintendent Terry Bergeson and then-Secretary of the Department of Social and Health Services (DSHS) Lyle Quasim to explore supports designed to address the unmet needs of students in schools with or at risk of developing serious emotional, behavior and mental health issues. This task force, co-chaired by Douglas Cheney and Mary Sarno, was charged: “to make recommendations and identify resources in the areas of 1) policy and regulation, 2) program and placement, 3) funding, 4) cross-system access and collaboration, 5) parent involvement, and 6) school safety” (p. 2). As a result, it was recommended that schools and districts implement a trans-disciplinary, three-tiered, comprehensive student support model of prevention, targeted interventions, and intensive services. The SWPBIS model has been explored and implemented at various levels in schools and districts across the state ever since.

Schools and districts moving forward with implementation of SWPBIS should recognize that systematic changes in student supports takes time. There are predictable stages of development all schools and districts experience when implementing this type of system with fidelity including exploration, installation, initial implementation, and full implementation (Fixsen & Blasé, 2008). These stages are dynamic with schools and districts moving back and forth among them as personnel and circumstances change. It may take 3-5 years for a program to become fully sustainable. Schools and districts that commit to systems change over time will see the most sustainable improvements.

This report provides detailed information regarding evidence-based strategies to reduce disruptive classroom behaviors and increase SEL of students receiving LAP services. In the context of the MTSS or SWPBIS models, these strategies would fall in the targeted (Tier 2) and intensive (Tier 3) levels of support. Because SWPBIS and MTSS are multi-tiered systems, the effective implementation of one tier of implementation is dependent on successful implementation of the foundational tiers. In order for the strategies detailed in this report to be most effective in supporting students, it is strongly recommended that schools also systematically implement the components of the universal level (Tier 1) supports. Specifically, key aspects or core features at the universal level of SWPBIS include (OSEP PBIS Technical Assistance Center, 2014):
Establishing and systematically teaching school-wide expectations or values (in classrooms and common areas of the school).
High rates of feedback and acknowledgement to students for meeting expectations.
Consistent and logical responses to problem behavior;
Continual use of fidelity and outcomes data for monitoring progress and decision making.
Emphasis on early intervention and prevention.
Use of evidenced based interventions in response to student needs.
Established leadership team to guide implementation.

Effective Classroom Management Strategies
Along with providing systematic approaches to teaching and supporting positive behaviors at the school-wide level, SWPBIS practices translate effectively to individual classroom management. PBIS strategies for the classroom provide a framework that focuses on consciously building systems and routines that support the development of a positive classroom community, and teach students the skills and behaviors needed to be successful learners. Lewis (2014) has identified eight key practices essential to effective classroom management that have been shown to increase instructional time and student academic engagement. These are:

- Classroom expectations that are aligned with school-wide expectations, posted, and referred to regularly.
- Classroom procedures and routines that are created, posted, taught, and referred to regularly.
- Positive specific performance feedback that is provided using a variety of strategies and at a ratio of at least 4:1.
- A variety of strategies (redirect, re-teach, provide choice, and conference with the student) are used consistently, immediately, and respectfully in tone and demeanor in response to inappropriate behavior.
- A variety of strategies to increase students’ opportunities to respond (e.g., turn to talk, guided notes, response cards, etc.) are used.

Before a student is referred for additional services and supports such as LAP or special education it is important to assure that these practices are implemented with consistency in the classroom environment.
• The classroom is arranged to minimize crowding and the teacher actively supervises during instruction.
• Activity sequencing and choice are offered in a variety of ways (e.g., order, materials, partners, location and type of desk).
• A variety of strategies are used to modify difficult academic tasks and to ensure academic success.

Before a student is referred for additional services and supports such as LAP or special education, it is important to assure that these practices are implemented with consistency in the classroom environment. This allows teams to determine if the behaviors a student is presenting are the result of environmental variables or issues specific to the student. These supports should remain in place while a student is being assessed and receiving supplemental services. This provides a consistent foundation for additional services and supports to build upon, increasing the effectiveness of the strategies at every level. Implementing effective classroom management can be challenging. Teachers benefit from specific coaching, ongoing feedback, and a self-assessment process for determining the fidelity of implementation of these strategies. A number of free or low-cost resources to support teachers in developing these classroom management strategies are available at the SWPBIS Technical Assistance Center (www.pbis.org) and the Missouri Positive Behavior Support Network (http://pbismissouri.org/educators/effective-class-practice).

What are Core Competencies Related to Social/Emotional Learning?
While the state is adopting Common Core for academic performance across academic content areas, there is yet to be established a national or state definition of effective social/emotional and behavioral success for students. In the 2014 report, Guiding Principles: A Resource Guide for Improving School Climate and Discipline, the U.S. Department of Education drew upon the work of the Collaborative for Academic, Social and Emotional Learning (CASEL) and defined social and emotional learning competencies as “the development of non-cognitive student competencies- including self-awareness, self-management, resilience, social agility, and responsible decision-making which collectively support healthy interpersonal relationships, community participation, and successful pursuit of individual goals (p. 7). The report, Teaching the Whole Child Instructional Practices That Support Social-Emotional Learning in Three Teacher Evaluation Frameworks (Yoder, 2014) further develops these competencies by identifying specific skills that align with each. (For details on these skills see Table 3 located in Appendix A: Universal Behavioral Systems).

The Illinois Board of Education was one of the first states to establish standards for social emotional learning (http://www.isbe.net/ils/social_emotional/standards.htm 2003). These include:
- Goal 1 - Develop self-awareness and self-management skills to achieve school and life success.
- Goal 2 - Use social-awareness and interpersonal skills to establish and maintain positive relationships.
- Goal 3 - Demonstrate decision-making skills and responsible behaviors in personal, school, and community contexts.

As stated previously, schools and districts can help students meet these standards and competencies using the systematic, proactive approach of SWPBIS to intentionally build a positive climate and directly teach these skills to students in school-wide and classroom settings. Additionally, when SEL is directly linked to academic instruction in the classroom, students have the opportunity to practice and apply their learning from both perspectives in a meaningful context (Schoenfeld, Rutherford, Gable & Rock, 2008). Providing all students in a school with a basic or core level of SEL, along with academic instruction, would be considered a universal level of support. The American Institute of Research (AIR) has recently developed a tool to help teachers self-assess their level of effectiveness in teaching SEL and identifying areas for development entitled, *The Self-Assessing Social and Emotional Instruction and Competencies: A Toolkit for Teachers* (Yoder, 2014).

Restorative justice is a practice that also integrates SEL into daily school interactions, helping to increase school connectedness, and improve overall school culture (School Health Services Coalition, 2011). The Collaborative for Academic, Social, and Emotional Learning (CASEL; [www.casel.org](http://www.casel.org)) provides a wide range of free or low-cost resources to help schools better implement social/emotional learning, including a guide that summarizes and evaluates the effectiveness of numerous curricula and approaches ([http://www.casel.org/guide](http://www.casel.org/guide)). Appendix A of this report details strategies for effectively teaching SEL in a more specific and individualized way.

**Assuring Cultural Relevance in SEL**
When establishing a set of core competencies and expectations, it is important for schools to keep in mind the importance of cultural relevance as they establish and implement systematic supports to address SEL. As our schools and communities become increasingly diverse, all educators need to increase their understanding of the integral relationship between culture and social behavior, and the need to view staff and students' behaviors within a cultural context.

Students from culturally diverse backgrounds are at risk for having their actions misperceived and judged unfairly.
Students from culturally diverse backgrounds are at risk for having their actions misperceived and judged unfairly. Likewise, these students may often misinterpret the culture of the school and behave in ways that negatively impact their school success and future opportunities. (Bal, Thorius & Kozleski, 2012; Cartledge & Loe, 2001; Cartledge & Kourea, 2008).

Additionally, a common concern expressed about the implementation of a universal, school-wide system of positive behavior interventions is the question about who makes decisions about what is appropriate and inappropriate behavior (Bal, Thorius & Kozleski 2012; Klingner et al., 2005). If those decision-makers lack an understanding of the cultural differences and the needs of the school community, issues with disproportionate discipline and student engagement remain. For example, in some cultures eye contact with the adult is considered an important signal of attention and respect, and it is often demanded of students in classrooms and in discipline meetings. Yet, in many other cultures, it is the exact opposite behavior, averting one’s eyes, that is considered a signal of attention and respect, particularly when someone in authority is correcting a student. If a school establishes core standards or expectations for SEL and behavior that require eye contact as part of expectations for student behavior, it creates a terrible dilemma for students whose cultural background has taught them another set of behaviors. Yet, if these different expressions of attention and respect are both accepted and integrated into the broader school culture and expectations, the school-wide approach can help to build a sense of belonging, understanding, and unity for all students and families.

To improve school success for every student, educators must address supports that are not typically considered a part of education. This includes working with communities and families to examine issues related to classroom discipline, cultural diversity, and culturally responsive teaching to develop successful approaches for teaching pro-social skills and reducing antisocial behavior (Townsend, 2000). Epstein and Sheldon (2002) examined school officials’ efforts to implement family and community involvement activities to reduce the number of disciplinary actions and ensure positive school climates focused on learning. They found that the more family and community involvement activities were implemented, the fewer students were disciplined. Additionally, teachers who meaningfully involved families in classroom activities indicated that their own cultural understanding and insights were broadened and that they better understood the perspectives of their students (Tucker, 2005).
Therefore, schools that are implementing core practices related to SWPBIS should assure that their approach meaningfully engages families, cultural groups, and other community representatives to assure that systems and expectations are inclusive of the broader cultural frameworks of their students (Bal, Thorius & Kozleski, 2012).

Educators must be aware of and address their own potential biases and how these might influence their approach to teaching and discipline, as well as student behavior, and understand that our perceptions of behavioral appropriateness are influenced by cultural expectations. What is perceived as appropriate or inappropriate behavior varies across cultures, genders, and life experiences, and all behaviors occur within larger social and cultural contexts (Klingner et al. 2005). The *Double Check Self-Assessment*, developed by Hershfeldt and colleagues (2009), provides a useful framework and tool for educators to reflect on their understandings of culturally responsive teaching and behavior management, and how those may be affecting student outcomes. A number of resources to assist educators in further developing their culturally responsive teaching and classroom management skills can be found in the Resources section of this document.

**Screening to Proactively Identify Students with Academic and/or Behavioral Needs**

A key component of developing a continuum of services and supports for students who may be struggling in school, whether through MTSS or SWPBIS, is proactive, school-wide screening. While schools are often familiar with a number of tools and strategies for screening students for academic needs, the idea of doing the same for social/emotional or behavior needs is fairly new.

Proactive screening for students with or at-risk for developing academic and/or social and behavioral problems is also effective and efficient in terms of identifying students in need of further supports for SEL and the use of resources to better meet the social emotional needs of all learners. Walker, Cheney, Stage, and Blum (2005) found that a systematic screening process to identify students with social or behavioral problems assisted elementary schools involved in a SWPBIS initiative in making crucial decisions regarding the use of limited school student support resources such as counseling, pro-social skills training, and academic supports. They also found that the emphasis on preventive supports that is built into an effective screening process reduced the number of students who needed more intensive supports such as special education.
A study comparing schools with comprehensive prevention and early intervention programs containing these components to schools that had more traditional referral programs in Baltimore, Maryland, found that only eight percent of the teachers in schools with comprehensive prevention programs referred students to “special programs,” compared with 19 percent in the “traditional” schools. It also found that teachers rated their school climate more positively than the teachers in the comparison schools (Bruns, Walrath, Glass-Siegel, & Weist, 2004). This difference not only suggests important improvements in student learning, it also represents a significant savings of instructional and leadership time, and other related resources required when students are referred for special education. Lastly, comprehensive, school-wide screening allows schools to track overall levels of performance within and across school years. This data supports more effective long-range planning and school improvement efforts (Lane, Oakes & Menzies, 2010). Effectively and efficiently identifying student needs and providing corresponding supports when issues are emerging helps schools make the most of their limited resources.

Screening in the area of social and behavioral problems is most effective if it occurs with all students, in the context of a comprehensive, school-wide screening process, which includes areas of health, academic, and social-emotional functioning. Additionally, school staff also need to be ready to move away from reactive systems of responding only to long-standing need so typical in schools today (Hawken & Schumann, 2008; Severson, Walker, Hope-Doolittle, Kratchowill & Gresham, 2007). Given these parameters, it is likely that screening will be most effective when completed in schools and districts where a comprehensive model of MTSS is also being implemented.

Figure 2 provides a flowchart outlining how a comprehensive screening process across both the academic and social/behavioral domains can occur in an integrated system (Walker, 2010). More specific details on implementing a comprehensive screening process can be found in the Appendix of this document.
The Importance of Implementation Fidelity in Systemic Improvement

A hallmark of any program or practice implemented in schools must be a commitment to formal evaluation. A cycle of continuous school improvement flows from planning, to implementing, to evaluating, to improving (Bernhardt, 2013). Meaningful evaluation of fidelity of improvement must be embedded in any school improvement initiative (Walker & Cheney, 2012). Fidelity of MTSS or SWPBIS implementation is the extent to which staff adhere to systems procedures as they were designed, intended, and planned. Fidelity indicators should reflect the extent to which professional development and systems change initiatives have resulted in change in the actual practices used in participating schools, and in the behavior of administrators, teachers, staff and students.

Fidelity of implementation allows schools to determine if unsuccessful outcomes were due to a failure of the model or a failure to implement the model as intended (Sánchez, Steckler, Nitirat, Halfors, Cho & Brodish, 2007). This is an important distinction in determining the effectiveness of any school improvement initiative. More information about strategies for measuring fidelity of these practices can be found in Appendix A: Universal Behavioral Systems.

Figure 2. Flowchart of a comprehensive screening process.
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MENU OF BEST PRACTICES AND STRATEGIES

Overview
Over the six sessions convened by OSPI, the expert panel worked together to develop a comprehensive menu of best practices and strategies based on the most current evidence and rigorous research available. Additional best practices and strategies will be identified during 2015–16 as the RDB panel updates the initial menu.

WSIPP is charged with making the determination of which practices are evidence- or research-based, which they do by carefully and systematically evaluating the quality of the aggregate work and ensuring that the studies have valid comparison groups and measure outcomes of interest, such as test scores and graduation rates. WSIPP’s work on behavior-related practices is emerging and ongoing, and will not be complete before this report’s deadline.

Thus, for this first report on reducing disruptive classroom behavior, OSPI relied more heavily on the expert panel’s judgment of the identified practices, rather than WSIPP’s assessment of the practice. To be included in the menu, at least 51 percent of the panel members agreed that the practice was a best practice. In most cases, all of the panel members concurred with the inclusion of the practices on the menu.

WSIPP uses the following definitions for evidence-based and research-based studies.

Evidence-based

- Multiple randomized and/or statistically controlled evaluations, or one large multiple-site randomized and/or statistically controlled evaluation.
- Where the weight of the evidence from a systematic review demonstrates sustained improvements in outcomes: ELA test scores.
- When possible, has been determined to be cost-beneficial.

Research-based

- Tested with a single randomized and/or statistically-controlled evaluation demonstrating sustained desirable outcomes.

The RDB menu lists practices and strategies that have been shown to support behavior improvement for struggling learners. Many of these practices and strategies are used in commercially available supplemental programs that districts can acquire and use. It is important to note that the work of the expert panel was to identify proven general practices and strategies, not specifically branded programs that might employ those practices. Districts that are contemplating acquisition or use of one or more branded programs are
encouraged to determine if the practices and strategies included in the menu are utilized by the branded programs.

The table below shows a quick summary of the practices that are proven to be effective in strengthening student educational outcomes, as determined by the expert panel. Each practice is described in more detail later in the report.

*Table 1. Menu of Best Practices and Strategies.*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Best Practice/Strategies</th>
<th>Panel Support (%)</th>
<th>Page #</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Tutoring</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Behavior Monitoring¹</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>De-escalation</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peer Mediation</td>
<td>88.9%</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mentoring²</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Skills Instruction</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Behavioral Health</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Book Programs – Bibliotherapy</td>
<td>77.8%</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Service Learning</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University-Based Partnerships</td>
<td>77.8%</td>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community-Based Internships/Job-Shadows</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project Learning &amp; Experiential Learning</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cultural/Community Arts</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Extended Learning Time</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extended Year – Summer, Vacation and Weekend Programs</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extended Day – Out of School Time</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extended Day – During School Time</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>54</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

¹ WSIPP-identified research-based best practice.

² WSIPP-identified evidence-based best practice.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Best Practice/Strategies</th>
<th>Panel Support (%)</th>
<th>Page #</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Professional Development</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Targeted Professional Development</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional Learning Communities</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consultant Teachers</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Behavioral Consultant Teacher</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family Involvement</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family Involvement at School</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Outreach</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Partnership</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Special Assistance for 8th, 11th and 12th Graders (Services under RCW 28A.320.190)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supports for Successful High School Completion</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>79</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
TUTORING
Tutoring is defined as an interaction with a trained individual using an explicit, well-designed program or practice that is matched to students' needs. These needs may be academic and/or behavioral in nature. The administrator of a tutoring program should provide training to the tutors that includes error correction procedures, student response protocols, and engagement practices for content and instruction. Tutors should also receive training to support students' increasing proficiency in non-cognitive factors related to academic performance (Farrington et al., 2012). As an instructional delivery model, tutoring is considered a best practice when training is provided, small group or individualized instruction is used, and the data are monitored in a systematic way. In the context of tutoring for behavior, adults or peers may facilitate groups. These groups may be scheduled or incident based. Finally, behavioral tutoring may be used preventatively, prior to an incident, or as a planned response to a specific behavior or a pattern of behaviors.

A substantial connection between behavior problems and academic failure has long been acknowledged (Barriga, Doran, Newell, Morrison, Barbetti, & Robbins, et al., 2002). Children may use problem behaviors to get their needs met. Behaviors may manifest for myriad reasons - academic exceptionalities (deficits or high achievement); social-emotional delays; difficulties with peer interactions; neglect or trauma; and absence of instruction. It is often very difficult and complex to identify the sources of challenging behaviors, prevention strategies that can be implemented to prevent these behaviors from developing, and, once identified, what can be done via intervention to divert the challenging behaviors to more socially appropriate interactions (Dunlap et al., 2006).

Teachers, peers, and other adults can help students acquire the skills to behave appropriately by providing instruction and reinforcement of the new skills. Efforts to reduce behavior problems will assist in increasing academic performance. As discussed earlier, it is well established that student learning and behavior are inextricably linked (USDOE, 2014). The Reducing Behavior Problems in the Elementary School Practice Guide (Epstein et al., 2008), describes a teaching progression for behavior as follows:

1. Explain the appropriate behavior
2. Break the skills into concrete, teachable steps
3. Model the skills with a variety of examples
4. Guided and independent practice
5. Prompting and cueing students about skill use
6. Give students specific feedback about skill performance, recognizing successive approximations
7. Gradually diminish external prompts and reward for displaying the skills
8. Reinforcing use of the behavioral skills over time
Durlak, et al., offer a similar framework known by the acronym SAFE (sequenced, active, focused, and explicit). The main tenets of the framework include:

1. **Sequenced** step-by-step training approach
2. Use **Active** forms of learning
3. **Focus** sufficient time on skill development
4. Have **Explicit** learning goals

Ultimately, just as with an academic skill, behavior instruction will follow an instructional path in which students learn a skill, students practice the skill to gain fluency and mastery, and ultimately, students transfer (or generalize) the skill to their natural routines and environments.

In 2014, the American School Counselor Association (ASCA) published a set of 35 mindset and behavior standards. These standards, specifically the Behavior Standards, outline the behaviors “commonly associated with being a successful student.” Regardless of which set of standards a district may choose to inform its practices, the fact remains that in order to create an efficiency of efforts, attention should be paid to lesson design and delivery so that multimodal prevention (behavior management, social skills, and learning strategies) is intentionally embedded within the lesson delivery of classroom teachers, paraprofessionals and tutors. As students learn social and emotional skills, it is important they have opportunities to practice and apply the skills in actual situations (McIntosh & MacKay, 2008). Given time, monetary, and staffing limitations, coordination of classroom instruction and development of social-emotional and behavioral skills is important.

Tutors specializing in behavior may include educators, paraeducators, parents, same-age/cross-age peers, or community volunteers. Tutors are valuable to the system when they are involved in instructional practices that improve both academic and social-emotional competencies. A strong, system-wide process that promotes organization can be effective in helping tutors collect important data that helps monitor students’ progress. Through proper selection, training, supervision, on-going data collection, and evaluation, tutoring can be a positive influence within the school and community (McGannon, Carey, and Dimmit, 2005).

The meta-analysis conducted by Durlak, et al. (2011), found that classroom teachers and other school staff were able to provide effective social-emotional learning programs. Practitioners and others were able to...
incorporate this skills instruction into daily education practices. Furthermore, the researchers found that implementation of the programs were not dependent on outside personnel for effective delivery. However, training, job-embedded professional development, and ongoing evaluation of implementation were required. Finally, these programs were noted to be successful at all educational levels (elementary, middle, and high school) and across multiple educational settings (urban, suburban, and rural).

For the purposes of this document, tutoring will be discussed through the following components:

1. Behavior monitoring
2. De-escalation
3. Peer Mediation
4. Mentoring
5. Social skills
6. Behavioral Health
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Behavior Monitoring

Behavior monitoring involves data being collected on a regular basis over a period of time and the data being compared to a pre-set goal. The use of behavior monitoring can involve varying levels of complexity depending on the skill(s) being monitored, the degree of student involvement in data collection and goal setting, as well as the alignment with motivational systems. This flexible intervention involves the student(s) monitoring their own progression data or in conjunction with an adult (Moss, O’Conner & Peterson, 2013) and can be used to increase a positive behavior or decrease a negative behavior (Sprick & Garrison, 2008).

Effective structured group and individual behavior monitoring systems and programs can be part of a comprehensive school-wide framework that provides screening, early identification, intentional supports, and best practices for students at-risk for school failure and improve engagement. Research has shown effective Tier 2 and 3 behavior monitoring approaches include the following core components:

- A process for early identification for students in need of support through screening and/or nomination.
- A relationship-based intervention to enhance student engagement through individualized attention for students in partnership with other school staff, family members, and other community service organization.
- Data-based data for decision-making and progress monitoring: school data such as attendance, behavior, and academic indicators are used to problem solve and improve academic and social competence.
- A team-based or individual process is identified to review data, problem solving, and enhance or intensify supports based on data.
- A daily behavior and/or academic report card to monitor progress.

Behavioral and academic progress monitoring records are used by staff to provide students with specific feedback and instruction to develop skills and continually used monitor performance.

An example of an effective behavior monitoring intervention is the use of daily behavior report card. (What Works Clearinghouse, 2012). A daily report card is a list of targeted behaviors and overall behavioral goals that are individualized for that student. Teachers use the daily behavior report cards to provide ongoing feedback to the students during class. Variations on the use of daily report cards involves home or school-based incentives for daily performance. Students often meet with a designated staff member at the beginning and end of the day or at scheduled times to review the expected academic targets and/or behavioral expectations and review goals for improvement. (Cheney, Lynass, Flower, Waugh, Iwaszuk, Mielenz & Hawken, 2010).


**Grade Level Considerations**
Given the variety of target behaviors that can be addressed by this intervention, as well as the ability to vary the task complexity when students are involved in self-monitoring, there is evidence indicating that this is a successful strategy across the K–12 grade span. (Peterson, et al., 2006; Cheney, Lynass, Flower, Waugh, Iwaszuk, Mielenz & Hawken, 2010; Moss, O'Conner, & Peterson, 2013).

**Cultural Considerations**
As noted earlier, care should be taken to ensure that monitors have cultural competency related to the student populations they serve. Otherwise, the school runs the risk of identifying behaviors that are culturally appropriate as disruptive.

**Implementation Success Factors**
There is research supporting the use of self-management and self-monitoring skills for the successful transfer of newly acquired skills to non-training settings (Peterson, et. al, 2006).

No matter which behavior monitoring strategy will be utilized, it is of upmost importance to clearly define the behavior being monitored using objective and measurable terms. Once the target behavior is measured, the next critical step will be to identify a data collection system. The data system selected needs to be
one that is easily used by the adult and/or student and is not embarrassing for the student. (Sprick & Garrison, 2008).

Self-regulation is an effective strategy when the student’s behavior difficulties result from a performance deficit rather than a skill deficit. (Reid, Trout & Schartz, 2005). It often works best when a student meets with a staff member at the beginning and end of the day when the student’s function of behavior is attention, rather than escape. (McIntosh, Campbell, Carter, & Dickey, 2009).
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De-escalation

The ultimate goal of positive behavior interventions and supports is to prevent problematic behaviors from occurring by arranging the environment, teaching expectations, reinforcing desired behaviors, teaching desired social/self-management behaviors and creating an overall conducive educational landscape. This is considered a universal intervention and should be the overall focus of school wide systems.

There will be a small number of children who engage in challenging behaviors that are significantly outside of the norm, running the gamut from angry outbursts to aggression. In these rare cases, the child is considered to be in an escalated state, which can resemble anything from frustration to unsafe behaviors that present a danger to the child and/or others. This is a cause for high concern for school teams, families, and community at large. While uncommon, these situations can and do present themselves in the school setting and are best approached systematically. Children who experience this level of difficulty can benefit from a school team that is able to approach these situations from both a prevention and intervention perspective.

Behavioral escalation can occur for a wide variety of reasons. For some children, this is due a behavioral history of negative reactions to social, academic or other situations. Others may be dealing with a temporary crisis situation such as a death in the family or other sudden loss. In the case of an escalation, there are usually multiple points along a continuum in what could be termed a behavioral “crisis cycle” (Long, 2007; Seiler, 2012). A child may begin the cycle with mild agitation, where they are somewhat in control and progress to a point at which they have little to no control over their choices, behavior, or thought process. Rather than telling a child that we will “wait until you are calm” to assist, the theory here is that adult intervention is a primary tool to teach self-regulation skills. The child NEEDS skill instruction in order to learn how to calm down strategically during a crisis.

De-escalation, as a technique, involves a trained adult providing support to a child experiencing an escalated state (Bath, 2008). This includes adult assistance to identify escalated situations, provide methods for calming and, ultimately, instruction in future skills and techniques that the child can select and use to self-regulate. As a method of intervention, de-escalation, should ultimately lead to the teaching of new skills that can be used in a variety of situations independently.
**Grade Level Considerations**

De-escalation is appropriate for all grade levels K–12. Younger children may need more support to identify emotions and to engage in self-calming behaviors. Teaching younger children may also include different techniques based upon their developmental level and readiness. Older children and young adults can rely on increasing knowledge of emotions, and coping mechanisms and may benefit from adult support to pair/match coping with emotions and behaviors.

**Cultural Considerations**

Staff should be aware of cultural considerations representative of the dominant school culture that may exacerbate escalated behavior and/or delay calming and de-escalation. For example, demanding eye contact is a common practice used by most educators to garner attention. Demanding eye contact may be a violation of some children’s cultural norms, appearing to the staff member as non-compliance. Care should be taken to consider cultural practices and their relationship to behavioral supports at all times.

**Implementation Success Factors**

There are factors outside of the school’s control that may trigger an escalation. Intervention at this cycle should be carefully organized, planned, and practiced. Factors to consider for quality intervention/tutoring include:

- Staff should be trained in de-escalation techniques.
- Staff should rely upon the Functional Behavior Analysis (FBA) if available to identify triggers.
- Staff should use de-escalation to teach and reinforce self-regulation skills.
- Staff should recognize escalated situations as opportunities for identifying future instructional targets.
- All staff should use similar language, strategies and approaches in order to promote generalization of skills.

Marston (2001) and McGowan (2002) recommend linking (FBA) to the de-escalation process. Identifying triggers can help all team members implement similar strategies, thereby increasing opportunities for generalization. Repeated interventions and multiple opportunities for teaching may be needed by some children for maximum generalization (Bath, 2008).
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Peer Mediation

Peer conflict, both in and out of the classroom, can have a detrimental impact on the school and classroom climate. Peer mediation can be an effective intervention by which two students experiencing conflict are guided by a trained and impartial peer mediator to come to a deeper understanding of the others’ perspective for the purpose of coming to a mutually agreed upon resolution. It is based on the assumption that conflict is normal and can be resolved in a mutually agreeable manner. **Mediation is not intended for situations where bullying or harassing behaviors, as defined by a repeated and unwanted act by a person with actual or perceived power over another, are suspected or are occurring.** See RCW 28A.300.285 for the WA state definition of bullying.

Peer mediation programs can be delivered school-wide, in a manner that is class specific, or via a “pull-out”/club model. Outcomes of peer mediation programs include: reductions in discipline referrals, improvements in school climate (when part of a school-wide conflict resolution program), satisfaction with solutions, and increased mediator skills in problem solving, decision making, tolerance for alternate points of view and respect for others (Burrel et al. 2003; Chittooran, M. et al 2004; Association for Conflict Resolution, 2007).

**Grade Level Considerations**

Peer mediation delivered through tutoring is not recommended for K–4 students as the student’s social-emotional skills are developing and rely heavily on adult instruction and role modeling.

Developmentally, peer mediation programs are appropriate for secondary students as they rely heavily on their peers for social-emotional support and capacity for advanced communication and empathy skills (Chittoran, M., et al 2005).

**Cultural Considerations**

A culturally diverse mediation program is one that recognizes, supports, values and uses people’s differences and similarities in support of the program’s goals and objectives. The composition of peer mediators should reflect the cultural demographics of the school. Peer mediators and adult supervisors need specific training and skills to identify and effectively address overt and covert acts of
bigotry, bias, prejudice and institutional and structural oppression in their own practice as well as in the peer conflict.

Implementation Success Factors
As the purpose of this guide is to provide recommendations on best and promising practices, it was agreed among the experts that mediation should be included with caution. Meta-analysis research conducted by Burrell et al (2003), as well as, individual studies on peer mediation programs, are at least ten years old, and focus mainly on satisfaction with the process, impact on overall school climate and skill acquisition by mediator as compared to skill acquisition of participants.

Additionally, the majority of studies on mediation have been completed on established curricula. Therefore, it is not recommended that mediation be offered at a school unless an evidence-based curriculum with outcomes specific to the demographics of the school, including age and race, are shown to have positive impact.

Initial and ongoing support and staffing and training for peer mediation programs by school administration are crucial to the success of the program. Best and promising practices in peer mediation have the following shared components:

1. Peer mediators should receive specialized initial and ongoing training.
2. Peer mediators should be neutral and void of a conflict of interest.
3. Peer mediators should be supervised by school professionals with training and expertise in the model.
4. Participation in peer mediation should be voluntary and amendable to both parties. It should not be considered an option if the incident may or does meet the definition of bullying behaviors.
5. Confidentiality must be addressed according to district and federal guidelines.
6. Mediation must be delivered in a timely manner according to school or district policies and practices.
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Mentoring provides a structured and trusting relationship that brings young people together with caring individuals who offer guidance, support, and encouragement (adapted from Mentor/National Mentoring Partnership and Robyn Hartley’s "Young people and mentoring: towards a national strategy" 2004 Report). Mentoring is most often defined as a relationship in which an experienced person (mentor) assists another, less-experienced person (mentee) in developing specific skills and knowledge that will enhance the mentee’s growth.

What does a mentor do? The following are among the mentor’s functions:

- Teaches the mentee about a specific issue.
- Coaches the mentee on a particular skill.
- Facilitates the mentee’s growth by sharing resources and networks.
- Challenges the mentee to move beyond his or her comfort zone.
- Creates a safe learning environment for taking risks.

Mentoring can focus on particular areas including:

- **Social and emotional wellbeing.** Mentoring to assist young people to increase their self-esteem, self-efficacy and resilience by actively supporting their social and emotional wellbeing. The focus includes improving both the young person’s life skills and the positive connections they have with their community.

- **Individual talents and leadership.** Mentoring to assist young people to further develop their individual talents and/or leadership skills in a specific area (e.g. sports, photography, and drama) in order for them to reach their full potential.

- **Identity and culture.** Mentoring to assist young people to grow in their understanding of their faith and/or culture and cultural identity. The program actively supports young people to be proud and confident of their identity and culture, and to be able to exercise this in their community.

- **Youth justice and crime prevention.** Mentoring to assist young people to avoid anti-social and offending behaviors by encouraging connectedness with positive elements in their community and increasing protective factors.
• **Education, training and employment.** Mentoring to assist young people to positively engage in and maintain their participation in education, training, and employment. These programs assist young people to develop a vision for their future and provide support to achieve their education, training and career goals.

**Cultural Considerations**
Cultural competency is a factor that may impact the success of the mentoring relationship. Cultural competence refers to the extent to which individuals have the capacity to effectively work with individuals of a cultural group (Sue, 2006). In regards to youth mentoring, cultural competence requires mentors to acknowledge and reflect on how their values and biases play a role in the perceptions of mentees, and in how they experience their relationships with mentees.

It is important to consider the mentor’s interpersonal sensitivity and capacity to build rapport with youth and possibly their families. Sanchez, Feuer, et al (2012) found that mentees who perceived their mentors to be more culturally competent reported better quality relationships. Ultimately, mentoring is dependent upon how effective mentors are in establishing relationships with mentees, and cultural competency is an important component of building these relationships.

**Implementation Success Factors**
Mentoring relationships should be clearly defined. These relationships are not the same as a coaching or “buddy system”. Buddy systems are temporary and used to help new students adjust to routines within the first few months of attendance. These systems do not require specialized training.

Mentoring is relational and requires time in which both partners can learn about one another and build a climate of trust that creates an environment in which the mentee can feel secure in sharing the real issues that impact his or her success. Though a mentor may be a student’s peer, most often a mentor is a person at least one or two grade levels higher. Mentor pairings may include middle school students with elementary age students, high school with middle school, or adults with students.

**Resources**


**References**


**Social Skills Instruction**

Tutoring services focused on social skills development are typically devised to support those students who have low social competence as perceived by their teachers and/or peers, struggle with peer relationships and/or need to acquire socially and age-appropriate behaviors. Within a tutoring situation, social skill instruction can be successfully implemented in both adult tutoring and peer tutoring arrangements. (Cook, Gresham, Kern, Barreras, Thornton & Crews, 2008; Greenwood, 1997; Gresham, 1997; Ginsburg-Block, M. D, Rohreck, C. A. & Fantuzzo, J. W.; Heron, Villareal & Yao, 2006; Pelco & Victor, 2007). Peer tutoring interventions focused on academic learning have also been found to have positive social, self-concept and behavioral effects. (Fuchs, D., Fuchs, L.S., Mathes, P.G., & Simmons, D. C, 1996; Nath & Ross, 2001)

Social-emotional skills instruction increases social competence. Gresham, Sugai & Horner (2001) defined social competence as the acquisition of positive peer relational skills, self-management, academic skills, compliance skills, and assertion skills. Social skills instruction in these specific abilities supports the development of students’ social and emotional competence in both direct and indirect ways, which significantly improves academic performance (Gresham, Elliott, Cook, Vance, & Kettler, 2010; Weisz, Sandler, Durlak, & Anton, 2005; Zins & Elias, 2007).

Social skills are defined as those skills or competencies which are necessary for students to initiate and maintain social networks and friendships, meet the demands of adults and peers, as well as adapt to changes in social environments. (Walker, Colvin, & Ransey, 1995; Lane, Menzies, Barton-Arwood, Doukas & Munton, 2005; Durlack, Weissberg, Dymnicki, Taylor & Schellinger, 2011, Gresham & MacMillan 1997). Students who demonstrate a fluent use of social skills are viewed by others as being "socially competent" and experience many positive school outcomes including teacher acceptance, peer acceptance, positive peer relationships, academic achievement, and friendships (Lane et. al, 2005; Lane, Wehby & Cooley, 2006). Like any academic content area, social skills are behaviors that can be taught. (Algozine, Horner, Sugai, Barrett, Dickey, Eber, Kincaid, et al. 2010)
Grade Level Considerations
Social skill instruction has been demonstrated as an effective intervention for students, preschool through age 21. (What Works Clearinghouse, 2014, 2011, 2006; Cook, Gresham, Kern, Barreras, Thorton & Crews, 2008) Peer tutoring interventions focused on academic learning have been found to have more positive results on both academic and social growth for elementary aged students. (Evans, Axelrod, & Sapia, 2000). Social skill instruction has shown to be only minimally effective when used with students diagnosed with emotional and behavioral disorders (Evans, Axelrod, & Sapia, 2000)

Cultural Considerations
Throughout the process of assessing and providing social skill instruction, it is imperative for staff to recognize that cultural differences are not the same as social skill deficits. Additionally, staff need to be aware that within school and classroom settings, judgments of social competence are frequently made based upon the dominant White, middle class American culture, which may be a mismatch for the culture of the students, thus causing misunderstandings and frustration. (Cartledge, 2001) Peer tutoring interventions focused on academic learning have been found to have more positive results on both academic and social growth for minority versus non-minority students (Evans, Axelrod, & Sapia, 2000).

Implementation Success Factors
To increase their mastery of social skills, students need to be provided skill instruction, and they need sufficient opportunities to master the skills they learn, become fluent in their use, and adapt the use of these skills to a wide variety of social settings. (Lane et al., 2005; Walker et. al, 1995) Skills taught in tutoring situations, such as friendship groups or social skill “buddy” groups, generalize better when those skills are taught in a tutoring model (e.g. 1:1 or direct, small group) and then transferred to a group or classroom experience (Bierman & Furhman, 1984). In other words, prescriptive tutoring in social skills, whether 1:1 or small group, is more powerful and generalizes more effectively when transferred to a class-wide focus.

Students are more likely to generalize the social skills they are taught if the social skills instruction focuses on targeted social behaviors that are valued and likely to be reinforced in the students’ natural settings. Generalization is also enhanced when the social skill instruction is provided across persons and settings that the student is likely to encounter daily. Additional strategies for ensuring the generalization of social skill instruction include the planned fading of training supports (such as prompting) to approximate the natural setting and contingencies, purposely teaching and reinforcing applications of the skill to new and applicable situations, as well as the inclusion of peers in the social skill instruction (Elliot & Busse, 1991; Heron, Villareal, & Yao, 2006; Evans, Axelrod, & Sapia, 2000).
Social skills instruction is found to be the most effective when the skills taught have social validity for the student and their social contexts, utilized precise assessment, systematic programming for generalization across settings and time, as well as additional support services for those students with chronic problems (Evans, Axelrod & Sapia, 2000).

Prior to providing social skills instruction, it is imperative to accurately identify the students who could benefit from additional instruction in a targeted social skill, based on the presence of a social skills deficit (Lane et. al, 2005; Walker, et. al, 1991). The use of a formalized and consistent assessment system, including a combination of teacher ratings and teacher nominations for those students receiving targeted social skills instruction, will help increase the effectiveness and efficiency of the social skill instruction being provided (Walker, et. al, 1991; Lane, et. al, 2005; Evans, Axelrod, & Sapia, 2000). The implementation of social skill instruction is most effective when the deficit skills are clearly identified, teaching of the skills is provided, and gradual programming for generalization is included (Evans, 2000).

In many cases, social skills instruction alone may not be an effective intervention to address the comprehensive needs of students at risk for challenging behaviors or those already displaying complex disruptive behaviors. In these cases, social skill instruction should be combined with other behavioral interventions within an RTI/MTSS Framework and tied to the identified function of the student’s targeted behaviors. (Fox & Lentini, 2006, Hawken, Vincent & Schuymann; 2008 (McIntosh), Ginsburg-Block, Rohrbeck & Fantuzzo (2006). In the case of students with significant behavioral difficulties, social skill instruction should be seen as part of an "evidenced-based system of care." (Evans, 2000)
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**Behavioral Health**

Behavioral health refers to a state of mental/emotional being and/or choices and actions that affect wellness (SAMSHA 2011). It includes behaviors resulting from actual or suspected substance abuse, violence (domestic, peer, or community) and/or mental health concerns of students and/or their caregivers. Research suggests attentiveness to three main characteristics when identifying tutoring interventions for behavioral health concern. (Quinn, Osher, & Hoffman, 1998); (OSPI 2012).

Interventions must be:

1. Meaningful and have developmentally appropriate content and strategy.
2. Aligned to a three-tiered approach to prevention and intervention services at all grade levels.
3. Coordinated across the system so that students can move among the levels with minimal disruption to routine or program services.

The effects of the behavioral health interventions are enhanced when:
1. They are comprehensive, integrated, multifaceted, and coordinated with other school and community resources (Adelman & Taylor, 2011).

2. The intensity of the intervention is commensurate with the severity or intensity of the problem behavior (Quinn, Osher, Hoffman, & Hanley, 1998, p. 31).

3. The effectiveness and efficiency of the individual student system matches the effectiveness and efficiency of the school-wide system (Quinn et al, 1998).

Washington’s Student Assistance Program Manual (OSPI 2012) identifies the following individual and small group tutoring activities for youth with moderate to high behavioral health needs:

1. **Identification and screening**: a formalized process for identifying students who exhibit risk factors leading to behaviors that interfere with the learning process or that are harmful to the student or others in the school setting. If substance use or mental health issues are suspected, further information is gathered to help determine whether some form of treatment is necessary.

2. **Intervention and support services activities**: identification of students who are:
   a. At-risk of initiating substance use or exhibit signs of behavioral health issues.
   b. Coping with the substance use and/or mental health issues of significant others.
   c. Using tobacco, alcohol, or other drugs (including prescriptions drugs).
   d. Developing a dependence on drugs. Support services help motivate students and their families to address the documented concerns. An array of counseling, peer support groups, social skills training, and individual and family interventions are used to address the particular needs of each student and provide assistance for youth returning to school after treatment.

3. **Referral and case management**: identified services for students whose severity of substance use or social, emotional, or mental health issues requires services that cannot be provided in the school setting. Students are referred to community services such as mental health and chemical dependency treatment. School-based case management services include follow-up, re-entry, and reengagement.

The intensity and severity of the problem behavior determine the level of involvement of behavioral health interventions.

1. Tier 1 (low risk/involvement): Tier 1 behavioral health interventions involve universal delivery of behavioral expectations and SEL skills and are not included as a tutoring intervention to reduce disruptive behavior.
2. Tier 2 (medium risk/involvement): Tier 2 behavioral health interventions target children and youth identified to be in the early stages of mental health, violence, or substance abuse problem behaviors affecting a safe learning environment. Small group tutoring and individual tutoring is appropriate for Tier 2 youth, mainly focusing on SEL and resiliency skill building with knowledge building and screening for severity.

3. Tier 3 (high risk/involvement): Tier 3 behavioral health interventions target children and youth assessed as high risk using a validated screening tool. Interventions for students identified as Tier 3 include further assessment by professionals certified in substance abuse or mental health issues which often result in recommendations for the student to attend treatment. Behavioral tutoring for Tier 3 students include individual and small group sessions supporting the treatment plan and successful re-entry of the student should treatment recommendations result in an in-patient stay.

Grade Level Considerations
At the elementary level, prevention and intervention focuses on students with social, emotional, behavioral or mental health issues or those who exhibit conduct disorder symptoms such as aggression, persistent disruptive behaviors, acting out, destruction, dishonesty, theft, or serious violations of rules.

Middle schools, on average, experience the highest level of student social, emotional and problem behaviors, typically have higher levels of disorder, and usually exhibit the greatest level of need (Washington State Student Assistance Prevention-Intervention Services Program Manual, 2012). Risk behaviors peak in mid or late adolescence, as do adolescent stressors. Protective factors, such as resiliency and the capability to overcome barriers, can develop when students are engaged with the right support services. Research has shown that middle school students who learn these fundamental life skills delay the onset of alcohol, tobacco and drug use, and social and emotional behavior problems, such as violence, aggression, delinquency and issues with mental health.

High school strategies include reinforcing and sustaining prevention and intervention lessons learned during the middle school years and providing crisis intervention services to Tier 3 students who are most vulnerable. Typically, if a crisis intervention is warranted, a certified mental health or substance abuse professional should be deeply involved. It is beyond the scope of this document to fully document appropriate crisis intervention strategies for high-risk or vulnerable students, for example, those with signs and symptoms of suicidal ideation. Rapid response time and regular follow-up, however, are often major success factors in crisis interventions.

Implementation Success Factors
Behavioral health interventions are most successful when implemented as part of a comprehensive school-wide positive behavior intervention system.
Certified mental health and substance abuse professionals should be a part of the team that addresses behavioral health interventions.

School-based services should be coordinated with other community resources, and should complement other treatments that the student is receiving.
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The following interventions are examples of other programs and services that have been shown to reduce disruptive behaviors. Educators are encouraged to consider tailored approaches for individuals, depending upon the unique needs and circumstances for the student and the school. These programs can be provided before, during or after school, or during weekends, vacation periods or over the summer.

**Book Programs - Bibliotherapy**

Bibliotherapy is an expressive, therapeutic, safe and nurturing technique and intervention that utilizes books as an avenue for students to connect to content, to learn new ways of solving problems, to address behavior concerns, and to explore and try new behaviors and strategies (Sullivan & Strang, 2002). Teachers and school personnel can use bibliotherapy as a way to assess student’s development, self-confidence, problem-solving abilities, communication skills, empathy, social awareness, and connections. Bibliotherapy uses intentional literature that connects to the student’s needs and includes guided questions used to facilitate the student’s growth process.

Bibliotherapy can be used individually, in the classroom, and in small groups. It can be can be used as a stand-alone prevention/intervention or easily integrated into the core academic curriculum K–12 and can be paired with creative writing, poetry, and art (Prater et al, 2006; Stewart & Ames, 2014).
Service Learning
Service learning provides opportunities for students to make contributions to their communities based upon the identification of a community need, the generation of a plan to meet that need, implementation of the plan, and a celebration at the project’s completion (Kielsmeier, 2011). It is the reciprocal nature of service-learning, whereby all stakeholders benefit from the project that sets it apart from community service (Billig, 2011).

A successful service-learning project should combine both academic and project objectives through a hands-on approach to master both social-emotional and academic skills (Billig, 2011). By focusing on students’ positive assets and their contributions to the project, adults should contribute to assisting students in reducing their disruptive behaviors by serving as mentors and assisting students in overcoming adversity (Nelson & Eckstein, 2008).

University-Based Partnerships
“University-based partnerships can help schools save time and resources while expanding the opportunities and programs available to support students” (http://apep.gseis.ucla.edu/bestla/BEST-InsideSchlUnivPartnerships.pdf). For example, student mentors can be recruited to work with students who demonstrate disruptive behaviors. These students could provide services that include conducting bibliotherapy, organizing experiential learning activities, facilitating service-learning, and leading cultural art sessions. However, any activity that is conducted within a university-based partnership must have a strong emphasis on providing social-emotional skill development for the students with whom they serve. (Greenberg, M. T., 2013)

Community-Based, Internships/Job-Shadows
Schools are responsible for preparing students for life beyond high school, and assisting them in becoming college and career ready (Protheroe, 2012). For students who exhibit disruptive behaviors, learning how to reduce those behaviors and present prosocial behaviors is essential for their development to become a productive citizen. Participating in apprenticeships, internships, or job-shadows helps students to gain skills necessary for retaining employment, such as prosocial skills, flexibility, and the ability to follow a routine (Kammermann, Stalder, & Hattich, 2011; Poortman, Illeris, & Nieuwenhuis, 2011).

Additionally, for students with disruptive behaviors and/or low academic achievement the acquisition of internships is particularly appropriate for helping students secure a position within the workforce in the future (Curtin & Garcia, 2011; Kammermann et al., 2011). Furthermore, in a study by Curtin and Garcia (2011), they found that students who participated in paid-internships or service-learning activities demonstrated improvements in their social skills and ability to conform to work-based standards.
Project Learning & Experiential Learning

Project Based Learning and Experiential Education are broad terms that describe a method of instruction that allows students to acquire and apply knowledge and skills in a relevant setting. Direct experiential encounter with a learning event requires active engagement of the student that results in the student interacting with the learning process. This has been shown to be relevant methodology in supporting social and emotional development in students (Thomas, 2000; Cason & Gillis, 1994).

Cultural/Community Arts

In a meta-analysis, Robinson (2011) described how the research indicates a link between integrating arts education and student success; specifically, the arts can assist students in improving relationships, developing self-esteem, self-efficacy, and self-regulation skills, increasing motivation, and teaching perseverance.

Utilizing the cultural arts to explicitly teach social-emotional skills, including self-regulation, to students with disruptive behaviors has been shown to reduce those disruptive behaviors, increase self-efficacy in both social and academic realms, and decrease mental health issues (Rapp-Paglicci, Stewart, & Rowe, 2011). Additionally, a cultural arts program allows students to practice responding appropriately to situations and can encourage their reflection on behavioral improvements (Thompson & Webber, 2010).

The inclusion of individual and small group discussion and mentoring within the program provides additional support in the development and evaluation of social-emotional learning; therefore, encouraging students to take responsibility for their behavior and develop individual social-emotional skills (Mowat, 2010). Additionally, Ledford and Wolery (2013) advocated for the use of peers to model appropriate behavior; they claimed that when students model those behaviors through the arts, those students who lack socially competent behaviors begin to exhibit those behaviors. Also, Milligan, Badali, and Spiroiu (2015) found that providing students with challenging behaviors opportunities to participate in martial arts helped them to develop a sense of calmness, improve their levels of tolerance, better accept situations that cause distress, and experience greater levels of self-understanding.

There are clear links between arts integration and student success in school. Arts integration has positive effects on cognition, academic achievement, social relationships, school environment, self-esteem, motivation, self-efficacy, confidence, perseverance, self-perception, self-regulation, and attitudes toward school. Research consistently shows that arts integration has even greater effects on diverse students, including economically disadvantaged students, English language learners, and students with disabilities.
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EXTENDED LEARNING TIME
Providing services to students with disruptive behavior can occur during the regularly scheduled school day, as well as outside of traditional school hours. The use of this additional time can provide opportunities for students to participate in learning activities that assist their acquisition of positive behaviors and help to reduce incidents of disruptive behaviors. The section on tutoring practices earlier in this report lists many interventions that can be offered during extended learning time, depending upon the unique needs and circumstances of the student and the school district.

Extended learning opportunities offer students the chance to participate in a learning activity that can be individualized and aligned with the individual student’s academic or behavioral needs.

Extended learning may include:

- An extra period during the day for students to spend additional time working on social-emotional skills, with a focus on their specific needs for developing skills that allow for success in the classroom.
- An additional staff member may provide targeted social-emotional resources during the core instructional time (e.g. tutors, school counselors, school psychologists working with a group of students while the general education teacher works with another group).
- System-wide multi-tiered interventions that build upon core social-emotional skills that focus on supplementing core instruction to enhance the achievement of targeted students that occurs before or after school, on weekends, or during vacations.

Yampoloskaya, Massey, and Greenbaum (2006) found that students exhibiting at-risk behaviors for dropping out of high school benefited from participating in formalized learning and behavior related activities that took place outside of the school day; specifically, the students who took advantage of these activities exhibited an increase in positive behavior outcomes, including increased academic achievement, within the school setting.

It is essential to ensure that students with disruptive behaviors who are candidates for participating in extended learning activities do not perceive that the activity is punitive in nature. These students must understand that the intent is to help them develop appropriate
social and emotional skills and reduce their disruptive behaviors so that they can become successful, productive citizens. Schools should seek to create a culture of accountability versus a culture of punishment, and they should find alternatives to helping reduce students’ disruptive behaviors rather than resort to using exclusion (Bear, 2012, Gregory et al., 2010).

Students with mental health, social, and emotional needs often struggle to self-regulate their behavior, which has a direct impact on their ability to perform in an academic environment. Failure by school personnel to provide support to assist with managing disruptive behaviors potentially prevents academic progress and leads to the student dropping out of school (Teske, 2011).

When school personnel strive to help students improve their social-emotional skills, these students will likely decrease their disruptive behaviors and increase academic achievement (Menzies & Lane, 2011; Ning & Downing, 2012). Specifically, in a meta-analysis, Durlak, Weissberg, & Pachan (2010) found that extended learning opportunities positively impacted students’ academic achievement, grade point average, and self-esteem. Given that schools have a responsibility to educating students in academic content, explicitly teaching social and emotional skills to students with disruptive behaviors is essential (Sklad, Diekstra, Ritter, Ben, & Gravesteijn, 2012).

A key consideration with social-emotional skill intervention programs and extended learning time is the content of the program, as opposed to the selected time of service delivery. It is the explicit teaching and development of the social-emotional skills that will reduce disruptive behaviors in students. Early intervention to assist students in developing social and emotional skills reduced incidents of anger, violence, and mental health (Howell, 2003). The design and implementation of a program should focus on meeting predetermined academic and social learning targets that result from an assessment of student needs (Vandell et al., 2005). Furthermore, intervention programs are more successful when they include structured and age-appropriate choices, a supportive environment, and are not perceived as punitive (Vandell et al., 2005). In addition, frequent program monitoring must follow to ensure that it is meeting the needs of the students and aiding in reducing disruptive behaviors.

Successful extended learning time programs have been shown to have at least these five characteristics in common:

- Strong leadership
- Teacher commitment and leadership
- Data-driven and evidence-based decision-making
- School, parent, and community involvement in the development and administration
- Alignment of core academics and enrichment activities with other goals and reforms
Extended learning is not more of the same, but emphasizes more time on specific student needs as determined through assessment. Evidence tells us that expanding time during the day and over the academic year, particularly in high-poverty and low-performing schools, can improve student achievement and reduce disruptive behavior in the classroom (McCombs, 2012).

For the intent of this report, the LAP allowable practices for extended learning under consideration are shown below:

1. School Year
   a. Summer School
   b. Vacation Programs
   c. Weekend Programs
2. School Day
   a. Before and After School
   b. During the School day

**Extended Year—Summer, Vacation and Weekend Programs**

Summer programs may be designed to promote students who have failed or been retained, accelerate learning, prevent future academic and social-emotional issues, improve student and parent attitudes toward school performance, and provide academic enrichment (Cooper, et al., 2000).

Local schools and districts should use data to design, develop, and evaluate programs. Programs should be designed to serve different student groups, including English language learners (ELLs), and/or students with disabilities at various grade levels from Kindergarteners through 12th grade.

**Implementation Success Factors**

- Summer programs should support a connection to core instructional strategies and content which, in turn, must be articulated within the system.
- Summer programs should be staffed by highly qualified and trained staff.
- Students should have access to materials that match instructional levels.
- Program evaluation is a critical component to ensure the summer program is effective at improving student outcomes (Newhouse et al., 2012). Evaluations should use observational data; student, parent, and staff input, and student academic data. Evaluations should measure quality, engagement, student academic and behavioral outcomes, and how well the gains are sustained.
- Capture enough time every day for multiple weeks to make a difference.
- Align to regular year curriculum, assessment, and evaluation.
- Follow the progress of these students intentionally; making adjustments to program based on this information.
- Provide transportation and meals.
- Intentionally engage parents.
Promote positive relationships.

Extended Day—Out of School Time

Extended day is defined as time for students outside the regular, instructional day. It could include a longer day by adding instruction time before or after school, or use of break times during the day.

Implementation Success Factors

Collaboration among the intervention team (all the adults serving the student) will determine the instructional and assessment plans for each student to develop his or her social-emotional skills. Students should be able to articulate the purpose for learning.

Other success factors include:

- The amount of time should be adjusted to the age of the student.
- Instruction needs to include activity to engage students beyond the school day.
- Staff should to be consistent.
- Align to regular-day curriculum and assessment.
- Amount of time needs to be consistent; over a significant amount of time.
- Individual/group data should be used to target instruction.
- Ongoing progress monitoring and student self-assessment should be conducted during any extended learning time.
- Students should receive services until they meet the targets identified for them by the instructional/support team.
- Providing snacks, physical exercise, and transportation contribute to effective learning and consistent participation.

Extended Day—During School Time

Extended content time is defined as additional content time that enhances core instruction within the regular instructional day. This may include:

- An extra period during the day provided for students to get more time working on social-emotional skills, with a focus on their specific needs for developing skills that allow for success in the classroom.
- An additional staff member providing targeted social-emotional resources during the core instructional time (e.g. tutors, school counselors, school psychologists working with a group of students while the general education teacher works with another group).
- A system-wide, multi-tiered assessment and intervention that builds upon core social-emotional skills that build upon core instruction to enhance the achievement of targeted students.
Grade Level Considerations
Considerations for younger students would include knowledge of the student’s skill levels, fatigue levels, ability to sustain focused concentration over longer periods, ability to follow directions, and social skills. Parents or guardians should be clearly informed of the need for intervention and how they can support their child. Additional considerations would include frequent progress monitoring, use of evidence-based interventions, training for staff members implementing interventions and use of evidence-based interventions.

Implementation Success Factors
All work during the extended learning time should be closely aligned to core social-emotional competencies. Collaboration time among teachers must be provided to develop clarity and coherence among the general education teachers and the staff members providing the extended content time for students to develop their social-emotional skills. The intervention team (all the adults serving the student) should determine the instructional and assessment plans for each student to meet the instructional targets. Students should be able to articulate the purpose for their interaction with their learning, practicing and growing their agency in their own achievement.

Ongoing progress monitoring and student self-assessment should be conducted during any extended learning time. Students should meet the targets identified for them by the instructional team.

Sample Programs
Virtually all of the tutoring practices described in a previous section can be used in any of the extended learning time periods. Some are better suited to specific time frames, but a flexible approach is warranted depending upon the unique needs and circumstances of the student, the school district, and the available resources.
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PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT

Professional development for the Learning Assistance Program may be provided for professionals working with LAP students on topics relevant to the needs of struggling learners. According to WSIPP’s inventory of evidence-based and research-based practices for LAP (2014), targeted professional development was determined to be evidence-based with an 84 percent cost-benefit percentage. Targeted professional development refers to a focus on improving teaching practices in a particular content area and/or a particular grade level. General, not-targeted professional development was determined by WSIPP to produce null or poor outcomes and is not included in this Menu of Best Practices and Strategies (Washington State Institute for Public Policy, 2014).

Targeted Professional Development

Research suggests that targeted professional development can positively impact student outcomes. A recent review of the most current research on best practices in professional development, “Professional Learning in the Learning Profession” (Darling-Hammond, et al. 2009), notes that professional development is most effective when it is targeted to address specific content that has been explicitly tied to goals for student achievement and school improvement. Professional development shown to improve student achievement is focused on “the concrete, everyday challenges involved in teaching and learning specific academic subject matter, rather than focusing on abstract educational principles or teaching methods taken out of context” (Darling-Hammond et al., 2009, p. 10). Further, effective professional development should be aligned to learning standards and/or instructional strategies, and must be aligned to the needs of learners.

Evidence suggests that in order to positively impact student achievement, professional development must be contextualized and sustained; that is, effective professional development must be provided as an ongoing, systematic process informed by evaluation of student, teacher and school needs, and embedded within a comprehensive plan for school improvement (Darling-Hammond et al., 2009). As noted by McREL’s (Snow-Renner & Lauer, 2005) report “Professional Development Analysis,” professional development that is long-lasting, content-focused, and based on student and teacher performance data, takes more time and effort to implement when compared to less effective types of professional development. In a study by Weiss and Pasley (2006), it was found that “impacts on teachers and their teaching were typically evident after approximately 30 hours of PD, with further impacts detected through 80 hours of PD” (p. 14). But as Garet et al. (2001) state, “[a] professional development activity is more likely to be effective in improving teachers' knowledge and skills if it forms a coherent part of a wider set of opportunities for teacher learning and development” (p. 927).
As Knowles (1983) notes, “professional development should engage an educator in an ongoing cycle of reflection and ultimately, support the transfer of new knowledge into the classroom and daily practice.” Effective professional development for educational professionals supports motivation and commitment to the learning process. It combines the needs of individuals with school or district goals. According to Joyce and Showers (2002), professional development should consist of a continuum in which participants receive a presentation of the theory, see demonstrations, practice and receive feedback around an applied practice, and are ultimately provided with coaching or other classroom supports to self-evaluate with the goal of positive growth. Ultimately, best practices in professional development must be focused on improving student achievement. The chart below further explains the benefits of professional development for teachers:

![Teacher Professional Development Cost-Benefit Graph](http://www.wsipp.wa.gov)

**Figure 3.** Teacher professional development cost-benefit graph, retrieved from Washington State Institute for Public Policy, [http://www.wsipp.wa.gov](http://www.wsipp.wa.gov).

**Targeted Professional Development Focused on Reducing Disruptive Behavior**

Morris, Millenky, Raver, and Jones (2013) found that providing teachers with PD opportunities to improve their capacity to manage students’ disruptive behaviors increased their ability to identify these behaviors, while also increasing their use of effective student interventions. Additionally, participating in PD to develop skills for working with students with antisocial behaviors also increases the cognizance regarding the importance of student-teacher relationships, which encourages positive interactions that might reduce the disruptive behaviors (Coggshall et al., 2013; Spilt et al., 2012). It is also important for teachers and school staff to have training and professional development on students concerns that directly impact student behavior and academic (mental health issues, impact...

Stand-alone PD opportunities, such as workshops, do not necessarily connect to the daily reality of an educator’s role, nor do they provide for collegial networking (Goldring et al., 2012). Collaborative PD, on the other hand, allows members of the group to benefit from the shared and collective knowledge of the group as a whole, which builds individual’s skills in managing disruptive behaviors (Carmeli, Gelbard, & Reiter-Palmon, 2013). Washington districts have all been required to adopt both an instructional and a leadership framework. Criterion 5 (Fostering and managing a safe, positive learning environment) of the teacher evaluation system and Criterion 2 (Providing for school safety) in the administrator system specifically address social emotional learning and climate. Within collaborative PD opportunities, members of the group should consider initiatives, problems, or practices and discuss methods to address and improve practices or routines (Barnes, Camburn, Sanders, & Sebastian, 2010). Also, Enomoto (2012) postulated that collaborative PD encourages the establishment of relationships among the group members, which serves to allow individuals to get to know each other on both a personal and professional basis. Enomoto suggested that these relationships further encourage networking among the group members.

Implementation Success Factors
Planning for professional development should be systematic, explicit, and based upon rigorous data analysis. Effective professional development should be job embedded, which provides context and focus for the learning (Knowles, 1983). Collaborative teaming structures, such as professional learning communities, may support teachers’ professional learning goals. Effective professional development is:

- Of considerable duration—time spent in theory, demonstration, practice and feedback, and classroom support (Yoon et al., 2007; Darling-Hammond et al., 2009).
- Focused on specific content and/or instructional strategies rather than a general approach (Darling-Hammond et al., 2009).
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**Professional Learning Communities**

A large body of rigorous research suggests that the most effective professional development should involve relationship-building among teachers. While this research does not involve comparison-group studies, evidence in support of professional learning communities (PLCs) is credible, large-scale, longitudinal, and empirical (Newmann & Wehlage, 1995; Hord, 1997; Darling-Hammond et al., 2009). In fact, in Learning Forward’s (Darling-Hammond et al., 2009) recent review and analysis of the most credible research on effective professional development, “collaboration” is one of four identified characteristics of the kind of professional development that positively impacts student achievement. As the authors of the report write, “[a] number of large-scale studies have identified specific ways in which professional community-building can deepen teachers’ knowledge, build their skills, and improve instruction” (Darling-Hammond et al., 2009, p. 11). The development and utilization of professional learning communities as a strategy for professional development capitalizes on the positive effects of collaborative learning.

A professional learning community, or PLC, can be defined as a group of teachers, administrators, coaches, or school staff (or a combination of people in these roles) that meets on a regular, planned basis with the goal of collaboratively improving practices in the classroom and school in order to improve student learning outcomes. Shirley Hord (1997) provides a simple definition: “[p]rofessionals coming together in a group—a community—to learn.” As Richard DuFour (2008) suggests, however, effective PLCs must be developed and implemented on the basis of clearly articulated shared goals for student achievement and school improvement. According to DuFour (2008), an effective professional learning community is more than just a given group of educators. As Killion and Crow (2011) note, “[l]earning communities apply a cycle of continuous improvement to engage in inquiry, action research, data analysis, planning, implementation, reflection, and evaluation.”

A PLC must work collaboratively as part of a coherent, comprehensive improvement plan, developed in response to an evaluation of student learning data, focused on a shared vision, and in the service of a clear set of goals to student achievement.

**Cultural Considerations**

- A PLC should consider the needs of diverse learners, including ELLs and students with disabilities.
• Use data and student work to guide instructional planning and decision-making.
• Use a variety of instructional strategies to support struggling learners.

**Implementation Success Factors**

• Clear and shared mission, vision, values, and goals (DuFour, 2008): Teachers, paraeducators, and administrators share a vision focused on student learning and a commitment to improvement (Reichstetter, 2006).

• Collaborative culture: “A PLC is composed of collaborative teams whose members work interdependently to achieve common goals—goals linked to the purpose of learning for all—for which members are held mutually accountable” (DuFour, 2008, p. 15).

• Focus on examining outcomes to improve student learning: A central component of PLCs is a focus on continuous improvement driven by outcome data. Data is continually scrutinized and improvements to teacher practice are made when goals for student outcomes are not demonstrated (Louis, 2006).

• Action orientation: PLCs have a strong focus on bridging the knowing-doing gap. As DuFour (2008) notes, within PLCs, “aspirations are turned into action and visions into reality” (DuFour, 2008, p. 16). Using the continuous improvement model, each action is evaluated for effectiveness. The central question is whether this action resulted in improved outcomes for students.

**Resources**


• All Things PLC: [http://www.allthingsplc.info](http://www.allthingsplc.info)

• The Center for School Reform and Improvement: [http://www.centerforcsri.org/plc/](http://www.centerforcsri.org/plc/)
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CONSULTANT TEACHERS

Behavior Consultant Teacher

Behavior consultant teachers are defined as staff members within school districts whose role it is to support core classrooms teachers' instructional practices and student academic and behavioral achievement. Serving in a variety of roles within school districts, behavior consultant teachers are mentors, coaches, and trainers. When the focus is around student behavior, often behavior consultant teachers are known by a variety of job titles including Behavior Facilitators, Instructional Coaches, Behavior Specialists, Intervention Specialists, Behavior Technicians, Teacher Leaders, Teachers on Special Assignments (TOSAs), Behavior Coaches, but the role and responsibilities tend to be the same.

The power of the behavior consultant teacher includes the specific guidance, measurement, analysis and evaluation of the implementation of evidenced behavioral interventions that is teacher/situation specific. (Wilkinson, 2003) Behavior Consultant Teachers provide their services within the framework of a behavioral consultation model, which involves:

- The identification of the student’s targeted behavior
- Selecting and planning for the use of evidence based practice(s) to address the targeted behavior
- Training, coaching and support for staff to implement the intervention
- Ongoing progress monitoring of the targeted behavior
- Ongoing monitoring regarding the fidelity with which the intervention is implemented
- Adjustment and adaptation of the intervention based on student and fidelity assessment (National Center on Intensive Interventions, 2013)

The behavior consultant teacher shifts the learning modality from professional development outside the classroom to more varied and specific learning opportunities within the classroom. This collaborative process is done with the teacher, rather than to the teacher (Epstein, Atkins Cullinan, Kutash & Weaver, 2008; Reynolds & Fletcher-Jantzen, 2007; Wilkinson, 2003).

The behavior consultant teacher’s job is to promote the implementation of evidenced-based behavioral supports and interventions and to hold educators accountable for the interventions’ fidelity. Because the model is embedded within the daily practice of teachers, it becomes part of the work, rather than something outside of the daily routine. When guided by a behavior consultant teacher, the classroom teacher is more likely to use the new learning, feel a sense of shared responsibility, and invest in the collaborative model to improve behavioral supports (Barr, Simmons, & Zarrow, 2003; Coggins, Stoddard, & Cutler, 2003; WestEd, 2000). Studies have documented that the teacher consultant model improves teachers’ classroom management, instructional practice and behavioral...
interventions (Gutkin & Curtis, 1990; Medway, 1979; Neufeld and Roper, 2003; Poglinco et al., 2003;)

Behavior consultant teacher must have a strong foundation of knowledge specific to applied behavioral analysis including: behavioral principals, functional behavior assessment, evidence based classroom management strategies, and behavior change approaches (Epstein, et. al, 2008; Kratcohwill & Bergan, 1990; Reynolds & Fletcher-Jantzen, 2007; Wilkinson, 2003). Additionally, the behavior consultant teacher needs to demonstrate the ability to translate this information for the teacher(s) in a manner that is assessable and practical for the classroom and school setting (Epstein, et. al, 2008). The behavior consultant teacher must have an understanding of the consultation skills that lead the teachers to insight of and change in practice (Epstein, et. al, 2008; Kratcohwill & Bergan, 1990; Reynolds & Fletcher-Jantzen, 2007; Wilkinson, 2003).

Implementation Success Factors
Along with increasing effective teaching practices, behavior consultant teachers promote reciprocal accountability as well as support improvements in instructional capacity of teachers through collaboration and reflection about their work (Poglinco et al. 2003; Neufeld and Roper 2003;). Using new skills and tools that are guided by the behavior consultant teacher, educators work collaboratively and hold each other accountable for improved teaching and learning in real situations (Barr, Simmons, and Zarrow 2003; Coggins, Stoddard, and Cutler 2003; Neufeld and Roper 2003; WestEd 2000).

Through their direct work with teachers, the behavior consultant teacher fosters a collegial and problem-solving consultant-consultee relationship with the intent of improving the student’s behavioral and academic success in school (Epstein, et. al, 2008; Reynolds & Fletcher-Janzen, 2007; Wilkinson, 2003). In this role, the behavior consultant teacher should have no direct authority over the teachers and should be viewed as a support to the teachers’ ongoing behavioral professional learning (Reynolds & Fletcher-Jantzen, 2007).

Additionally, the consultant’s schedule should be flexible enough to allow for the scheduling of meetings and supporting student observations that are convenient for the teacher (Epstein, et. al, 2008). While behavioral consultant teachers are supporting classroom teachers to implement strategies focused on behavior change in the target student(s), they are also supporting the teachers themselves to make behavioral changes. Successfully managing behavior change on these multiple levels necessitates that the consultant is responsive to the needs of the adult learner, understanding the principals of behavior change, and translating evidence based practice into practical application (Epstein, et. al, 2008; Kratcohwill & Bergan, 1990; Reynolds & Fletcher-Jantzen, 2007; Wilkinson, 2003;).
It should be noted that reducing disruptive classroom behaviors begins with an emphasis on prevention. Behavior consultant teachers must incorporate these preventative practices in their work by supporting staff as they set, encourage, and reinforce positive behavioral expectations for all students. (Epstein, et. al, 2008). The IES Practice Report identifies five research-based recommendations on best practices in reducing disruptive behaviors, which also facilitate generalization. These include teaching practitioners and administrators to develop and implement systems supporting:

- Identification of the specifics of the problem behavior and the conditions that prompt and reinforce it.
- Modifying classroom-learning environments to decrease problem behavior.
- Instruction and reinforce skills to increase appropriate behavior and preserve a positive climate.
- Relationships with professional colleagues and students families.
- Assess whether school wide behavior problems warrant school-wide strategies or programs.

To be most effective, these preventative strategies can be embedded within larger school-wide and district-wide multi-tiered systems of support and proactively coached through the behavior consultant teacher.
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FAMILY INVOLVEMENT

Family Involvement at School

Families can and do make a difference in the academic and social-emotional lives of students, and family involvement is one of the eight National Education Goals of the Goals 2000 federal legislation. Family involvement is a partnership that promotes the social-emotional and academic growth of children, including student achievement, attendance, homework completion, attitudes, and other school success indicators (Simon, 2001). The No Child Left Behind Act of 2001 identified six common themes that a rigorous district or school Family Involvement program contains:

- Welcoming All Families: Is the school inviting? Do families feel like they belong there? Do the school's programs honor the diversity of the community?
- Communicating Effectively: Is it easy for families to communicate with the school? Is the family well-informed by the school?
- Supporting Student Success: Are student expectations well understood by families? Is student success measured and progress monitored and then shared with families?
- Speaking Up for Every Child: Do families understand how the school system operates? Do students and families understand their rights and responsibilities under the law?
- Sharing Power: Does the school make families a full partner in decision-making? Is the family involved in decisions affecting their own child?
- Collaborating with Community: Does the school seek out and collaborate with community organizations? Does the school access community resources and make them available to families?

These six themes continue to resonate with and serve as foundations for organizations such as the national Parent Teacher Association (PTA), Danielson’s Framework for Teaching, the Annie E. Casey Foundation, and the Johns Hopkins University’s Center on School, Family, and Community Partnerships. When family involvement concepts are implemented routinely and consistently, schools are able to impact “family functioning, cohesion, communication, and parents’ social networks and self-confidence” (President and Fellows of Harvard College, 2006). This, in turn, has a positive impact on reducing student misconduct and substance use and improving academics and attendance.

Welcoming Families

For a school to be an effective learning community, it must welcome ALL families. The current demand to serve a diverse range of students requires thoughtful partnerships with families. All students do better when their parents
and teachers are partners. In a welcoming school, educators appreciate differences and involve all families in many ways throughout the school year.

It is critical to have a well-organized plan around partnership with families. One suggestion is to have an Action Team for Partnerships (Epstein & Salinas, 2004). This team consists of teachers, administrators, parents, and community partners, and is proactively connected to the school council or school improvement team. The focus of this partnership team is to promote student success, develop the annual plans for family involvement, evaluate family involvement, and develop activities to include all families in the school community.

There are six types of research-based parent/family involvement that the Action Team can focus their goals in their annual plans to welcome families (Epstein et al., 2001):

1. **Parenting**: This is providing professional development and information for families to assist with parenting skills, understanding child and adolescent development, supporting learning in the home, setting home conditions at each age and development to promote success in school. This also provides educators in the school with professional development and information on understanding families' backgrounds, cultures, and goals for children.

2. **Communicating**: Developing two-way communication between school and home to provide information around student progress and school programs.

3. **Volunteering**: This is to improve ways that involve and support families volunteering their time participating and volunteering in school activities and becoming part of the audience. This also supports educators in how to work with and support volunteers in the school community.

4. **Learning at Home**: This action goal develops strategies to support family involvement with their children around academic learning at home. This includes homework help, enrichment curriculum, and other curriculum-related activities. This also supports educators in designing home activities that enable students to collaborate with their families around relevant topics.

5. **Decision Making**: This goal supports including the family voice and participation in school governance, decisions, goal setting and advocacy through the development of school councils, improvement teams and/or parent organizations.

6. **Collaborating with the Community**: Coordinate resources and services for families, students, and the school with community groups, including businesses, agencies, cultural and civic organizations, and colleges or universities. Enable all to contribute service to the community.

The implementation of all six types of activities of involvement supports the process of welcoming parents and increases their involvement at school. These
activities allow for true partnerships and two way collaboration between families and schools to support student success.

**Communicating Effectively**

Communication with families is vital to promote collaboration between students’ home and school, and provides the direct benefit of increased student achievement (DOE: Title 1 Parental Involvement Part A). School teams should make a considerable effort to promote collaboration by creating multiple means of communication. Effective communication with families assists school teams to build collaboration between school and home and can be implemented in a variety of ways (Cheatham & Santos 2011).

Barriers can and do exist that limit effective communication with families and caregivers (Drake, 2000). These barriers may include, but are not limited to, working families who are unable to meet during PTA meetings that are scheduled during the school day, lack of email or Internet, or negative experiences with previous school staff/systems or language barriers. Creating a range of communication options, obtaining translation services, addressing positive student and community attributes, and offering community meetings (PTA National Standards for Family-School Partnerships) can help to bridge these gaps. Cultural communication preferences and understandings should also be addressed as part of the school and team’s overall efforts (see Cheatham & Santos, 2011).

Regular communication with families should be a part of the school’s overall instructional plan. This will, of course, meet the needs of some, but not all, parents and caregivers. Newsletters, both paper and electronic, provide parents and caregivers with information about ongoing school events. Classroom teachers should also ensure regular communication with families and caregivers regarding instructional activities and needs. Individualized communication systems should be created as needed with families whose children require more intensive interventions. These systems should be tailored to the family’s needs and created in a fashion that allows them to actively participate in a meaningful exchange. Schools may wish to survey their parents to find out what types of communication work best and adjust their practices as needed.

Often families only receive communication with the school when their child has done something “wrong.” Families in this situation are less motivated to engage in communication due to the negative nature of their interactional history with the school (Tucker & Schwartz, 2013). Families with these experiences require a coordinated effort on the part of the school staff to experience positive communication. Staff will want to make a special effort to connect with these families when their child does something well at a frequency that is commensurate or more frequent than calls to report challenging behaviors.
Supporting Student Success

The National Standards for Family-School Partnership Assessment Guide (PTA) describes “Supporting Student Success” as a process in which families and school staff utilize on-going collaboration to support each student’s learning and healthy development. This collaborative process focuses on addressing the student’s learning and healthy development in both the home and school environments. Supporting Student Success includes regular opportunities for both teachers and parents to strengthen their knowledge and skills to effectively support each student.

Two goals of Supporting Student Success include (a) sharing information about student progress and (b) supporting learning by engaging families. Each goal is derived of several success indicators. The Guide (PTA) provides a rubric for schools to assess the current quality of implementation for each indicator. This rubric can inform the collaborative process to improve its effectiveness over time. The first goal of sharing information about student progress is to ensure that “families know and understand how well their children are succeeding in school and how well the entire school is progressing” (National Standards for Family-School Partnerships Assessment Guide, p. 13). Indicators include:

1) Ensuring parent-teacher communication about student progress
2) Linking student work to academic standards
3) Using standardized test results to increase achievement
4) Sharing school progress

The second goal of supporting learning by engaging families is to ensure that “families are active participants in their children’s learning at home and at school.” Indicators include:

1) Engaging families in classroom learning
2) Developing family ability to strengthen learning at home
3) Promoting after-school learning

Speaking Up for Every Child

An advocate can be defined as “someone who stands up for another who maybe can’t do it alone.” (Team Child Advocacy Manual, 2008). For many school-aged children, their daily advocate is their parent(s) or another family member. The need for advocacy on behalf of students with behavior challenges is frequently heightened due to their increased involvement with school administration regarding discipline consequences and the resulting lack of access to rigorous academic opportunities. This need for advocacy is exacerbated by current research and data on school discipline, which indicates that a disproportionate percentage of disciplined students, are from populations that are already marginalized in our society and schools (e.g. youth of color, students with disabilities and youth who identify as lesbian, gay, bisexual, or transgender) (School Discipline Consensus Report, 2014).
Parents can be assisted with their development of advocacy skills on behalf of their children through a variety of avenues including workshops, trainings, support groups, publications, supports to access resources and problem/conflict resolution (PTA National Standards). Whichever approaches are selected by schools to enhance the advocacy skills of parents, it is important to address the unique cultural, language and family situations represented. As with any school efforts to promote student engagement, school must make a positive connection with parents, provide frequent and varied opportunities for parents to be fully engaged and successfully reducing barriers to parental engagement.

Sharing Power
Ideally, decisions that inform and influence practices and programs are shared between families and school staff. Not only are there opportunity for families to respond and give input to proposed changes, but families are given voice on the research and the creation of proposed changes through formal systems such as Comprehensive School Improvement Teams, School Leadership Teams, PTA, and hosted dialogues.

Some of the most important areas for parental involvement include: reducing the opportunity gap, addressing barriers to family involvement, honoring diversity and cultures, budget allocation, school climate, grading systems, school safety, and school schedules. Schools that excel in sharing power offer leadership opportunities for parents and develop parents’ skills in group facilitation and communication. The school leadership team connects and builds relationships with community agencies and local police, fire and public officials.

By incorporating an attitude of partnership, schools and families share the responsibility for students’ education as a mutual effort. “When schools build partnerships with families that respond to their concerns and honor their contributions, they are successful in sustaining connections that are aimed at improving student achievement” (Southwest Educational Development Laboratory).

Collaborating with Community
Community partnerships are an essential component to fostering strong family-school partnerships. For details on practices to build collaboration between school and community see the Community Outreach section within this menu of recommended practices.

Implementation Success Factors
Describe the factors that may impact successful implementation and positively outcomes. The following guidelines can be used to help focus your thoughts. Some practices may use a subset of these guidelines.

Resources
Center on School, Family, and Community Partnerships at Johns Hopkins University [http://www.csos.jhu.edu/p2000/center.htm](http://www.csos.jhu.edu/p2000/center.htm)

Epstein, Joyce L, October 2002, Leadership Development Conference, Baltimore, MD


National Network of Partnership Schools at Johns Hopkins University [www.csos.jhu.edu/p2000/nochild](http://www.csos.jhu.edu/p2000/nochild)

No Child Left Behind Act of 2001, Department of Education

OSPI Equity & Civil Rights: For Families [https://www.k12.wa.us/Equity/Families/default.aspx](https://www.k12.wa.us/Equity/Families/default.aspx)


PTA National Standards for Family-School Partnerships, Assessment Guide; [info@pta.org](mailto:info@pta.org) or [www.pta.org](http://www.pta.org)
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COMMUNITY OUTREACH

Community Partnerships
A community partnership serves as a formal arrangement between a school or schools and entities outside of the school district in order to provide appropriate programs, services, or resources to help facilitate and support student achievement (Ohio Department of Education [ODE], n.d.a). Any community engagement initiative should provide comprehensive and integrated services that specifically address the identified needs of a unique student population.

The intent of collaborative school-community partnerships should be to merge school, and possibly school district, resources with resources available within the larger community or local neighborhoods that are sustainable over time (Center for Mental Health in Schools at UCLA [CMHS-UCLA], n.d.a). Community resources not only include the plethora of community organizations or agencies, but also include individual members of the community, local businesses, colleges or universities, religious and civic affiliations, parks and library programs, and other facilities that provide opportunities for students to participate in recreation or learning opportunities, or may receive enrichment or support services (CMHS-UCLA, n.d.a).

According to a resource guide sponsored by the Building Educational Success Through (BEST) Collaboration in Los Angeles County, there are several key elements to building a solid foundation for successful partnerships that include: Trust, Shared Vision, Explicit Assessment and Accountability and Communication (http://apep.gseis.ucla.edu/bestla/BEST-InsideSchlUnivPartnerships.pdf).

When schools form partnerships within the community, they adopt a more integral and positive role within the community (CMHS-UCLA, n.d.a). The CMHS-UCLA found that these collaborative partnerships positively impact academic achievement, increase staff morale, result in fewer discipline issues, and improve the use of school’s resources. In addition, the ODE (n.d.a) explained that schools are no longer solely responsible for improving students’ academic achievement and their social-emotional health development; all community stakeholders are responsible for assisting student academic and social-emotional growth. Given that students will become contributing members of society, and that the economic health and growth of the community will be reliant on the next generation, it is essential that individual and community groups assume responsibility for students’ growth and development and that educators appreciate the potential of these partnerships for facilitating student success (ODE, n.d.a).
Examples of community partnerships include:

- Local & regional municipalities, including law enforcement (police, security, probation and parole)
- Local businesses
- Public, profit and non-profit behavioral health agencies
- Legal assistance groups
- Public & private physical health agencies
- Faith-based organizations
- Early learning and child care centers
- Assisted living and retirement centers
- Post-secondary institutions and programs
- Media
- Libraries
- Museums and other art-focused organizations or agencies
- Service and civic organizations
- Military
- Informal partners may include:
  - Community identified and non-traditional leaders, and neighbors
  - Citizen groups

**Community Assessment**

Successful community partnerships depend upon completing a community assessment. The Office of Community Services (2012) explained that a community assessment should include an assessment of both the community's needs and assets.

- A community need is the identified gap between what is and what should be. This oftentimes is referred to as a "community problem"; however, this phrase should be avoided because it might potentially create an adversarial relationship that inhibits collaboration.
- A community asset is something that is used to improve the quality of life. A community assessment should include an analysis of assets or resources that exist within the community to meet community needs.
- The identification of community assets is possible by:
  - Identifying the current assets available to support the community's needs.
  - Building upon the experiences of other communities to highlight resources that might be available.

While there are many different ways to conduct a community assessment, the Office of Community Services (2012) identified the following six steps as key components to address:

1. Define the scope of the community
2. Collaborate
3. Collect data
4. Determine key findings
5. Set priorities and create an action plan
6. Share your findings

Cultural Considerations
As student demographics become increasingly diverse, schools should be increasingly adept at reaching out to people, organizations, and agencies that reflect the varied ethnic and cultural aspects of their school and community. *The Minority Parent and Community Engagement Best Practices and Policy Recommendations for Closing the Achievement Gap* outlines strategies for improving ethnic minority parent and community engagement. Outreach strategies familiar to the White, dominant culture may not be effective in these communities. The Seattle Office for Civil Rights (2012) presented six essential strategies for inclusive engagement:

1. Build personal relationships with target population
2. Create a welcoming atmosphere
3. Increase accessibility
4. Develop alternative methods for engagement
5. Maintain a presence within the community
6. Partner with diverse organizations and agencies

Implementation Success Factors
- Cohesive policy alignment
- Effective communication and feedback loops, including data sharing agreements or Memorandum of Understanding to ensure compliance with all federal laws that may impact public entities, such as FERPA or HIPPA.
- Build from localities outward from a decentralized perspective. This allows partnerships to focus on evolving a comprehensive continuum of services and programs (Center for Mental Health at UCLA [CMHS-UCLA], n.d.)
- Build capacity. An infrastructure of organizational and operational mechanisms at all levels is requisite for oversight, leadership, resource development, and ongoing support.
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SPECIAL ASSISTANCE FOR 8TH, 11TH AND 12TH GRADERS

Supports for Successful High School Completion

In addition to their use with student’s qualifying for LAP services, evidence-based practices for reducing disruptive classroom behavior should also be used in extended learning opportunities, for 11th and 12th-grade students who are not on track to meet graduation requirements, and for 8th-grade students who need additional assistance to have a successful entry into high school (RCW 28A.320.19). The goal for targeted services at these grade levels is to provide students with the skills and supports needed for graduation, as well as dropout prevention.

Across grade levels, the behavioral challenges of students are frequently linked with deficits in academic performance which, at the high school level, becomes a barrier to graduation (Bruce, Bridgeland, Fox & Balfanz, 2011). Students’ academic and behavior deficits are interactive, requiring schools to address situations when students’ behavior is interrupting and disrupting learning opportunities as well as when students’ disruptive behavior is their response to being asked to complete academic tasks beyond their skill level (McIntosh, et al. 2008). Additionally, students exhibiting behavioral challenges in the school setting are at increased risk for dropout, especially when they experience exclusionary discipline as a consequence for their behavioral incidents. (Hoff, Olson, & Peterson, 2015; McIntosh, Flannery, Sugai, Braun & Cochane, 2008) In these situations, practices focus on positive school engagement and alternatives to exclusionary discipline are needed (Hoff, et al., 2015).

Recent national and state reports have documented the extensive use of exclusionary discipline, which disproportionately affects students of color and has multiple negative impacts on students and their communities. (Morgan, Salomon, Plotkin & Cohen, 2014). Within Washington State, during the 2012–13 school year, over 4.5 percent of Washington’s K–12 students were suspended or expelled. Exclusion rates for all K–12 students reached their highest rates in Grades 7–9, with about 9.25 percent of 8th-grade students experiencing an exclusion event. These students were most often excluded for “other behaviors”. In fact, “other behaviors” exclusions (n≈37,000) were three times greater than the next highest exclusion offense, fighting without major injury (n≈12,000), and accounted for more exclusions than all other offense codes combined (OSPI, 2013).
Dropping out of high school is a process, it begins well before students enter high school, and there are identifiable warning signs at least one to three years before students actually drop out. Research shows that identifiable early warning signs are evident up to three years prior to when a student actually drops out. (Burrus et al 2012; McIntosh, et. al, 2008).

Feldman, Smith & Waxman (2013) interviewed students who dropped out and found the majority of students follow a four-phase process including: initial disengagement, early skipping, more serious truancy, followed by actual dropping out. Early warning indicators (course failure, truancy, and discipline referrals) continue to be the best predictors of dropping out for all ages. Specific behavioral risk factors for dropout include, truancy, not completing schoolwork, suspension/expulsion, involvement with juvenile justice, substance abuse, mental health, and being victims of bullying. (Dalton, Glennie & Ingels, 2009; Smink & Reimer, 2009). For 11th and 12th-grade students, these behaviors have greater significance due to nearness of graduation.

Eighth grade is a pivotal year for predicting student retention and graduation rates. The reasons for students falling off the graduation track during their first year of high school is attributed to the social and developmental adjustment, structural and organizational changes, and increased academic rigor experienced as a result of the transition (Erickson, Peterson & Lembeck, 2013). In 8th grade, there are three factors that contribute to a 75 percent high school
dropout rate: failing 8th grade math, failing 8th grade English, and an attendance rate less than 80 percent (Curran-Neild, 2010). Dr. Robert Balfanz, a researcher at Johns Hopkins University, is one of the nation's leading experts on high school dropouts. His work suggests that behavior should be considered in addition to attendance and course performance. Districts and middle schools systematically reviewing the ABCs (Attendance, Behavior, and Course performance) can identify those at-risk of dropping out and help put them on the path to graduation. An intentional focus on the middle grades’ transition program is essential due to the difficulties that students’ experience with social, emotional, cognitive, and physical changes, which often exacerbate the transitional concerns (Andrews & Bishop, 2012; Balfanz, Herzog & Iver, 2007; McIntosh, et. al 2008; Somers, Owens & Piliowsky, 2009). According to survey of recent research, a smooth transition for students into ninth grade contributes to their success in high school and beyond. (Erickson, et al., 2013)

Recommended practices for increasing student engagement and graduation rates at the secondary level begin with the establishment and utilization of an early warning data system in order to identify students who are at a heightened risk of dropping out of school, as well as those who need timely and focused interventions to get back on the graduation path. (Balfanz, 2007; Hoff, Olsen, & Peterson, 2015; America’s Promise Alliance, 2014). Effective dropout prevention interventions which fall within the scope of reducing disruptive behavior include:

- Increasing teacher and staff support (Balfanz Herzog, & Iver, 2007; Hoff, Olsen & Peterson et.al 2015; Somers, Owens, & Piliowsky, 2009);
- Parental involvement. (Balfanz Herzog, & Iver, 2007; Hoff, Olsen & Peterson 2015; 2014; Somers, Owens, & Piliowsky, 2009; White & Kelly, 2010);
- Peer support and social skill development, (Morgan, Salomon, Plotkin, & Cohen, 2014; White & Kelly, 2010);
- Adult mentors (Hoff, Olsen & Peterson 2015; Somers, Owens, & Piliowsy, 2009; White & Kelly, 2010);
- Monitoring and reinforcement of behavioral progress (Hoff, Olsen & Peterson 2015; Morgan, Salomon, Plotkin, & Cohen, (2014);
- Assisting with transitions from middle school to high school (Erickson, et.al, 2013; Hoff, Olsen & Peterson, 2015);
- Restorative practices (Morgan, Salomon, Plotkin & Cohen, (2014); and
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PROMISING PRACTICES
In education, there is a wealth of evidence-based practices that can be considered supplemental supports for students who qualify for LAP supports. This report attempts to summarize many of those practices. As often as possible, teams should identify and implement practices that have been well researched, replicated, and operationalized and have therefore have been identified as evidence-based practices (EBP). The Resources section below includes a number of websites that help educators identify these practices.

There are times, however, when schools find that they need to explore practices that are becoming well known but do not yet meet the benchmark of evidence-based. The Washington State Institute of Public Policy (WSIPP) identifies these as “promising practices.” WSIPP (2012) defines a promising program or practices as:

Based on statistical analyses or a well-established theory of change, shows potential for meeting the “evidence-based” or “research-based” criteria, which could include the use of a program that is evidence-based for outcomes other than the alternative use.

To assist schools in identifying promising practices that are both effective and cost effective, this report includes a decision-making framework to assist teams in selecting a promising practice that best meets their needs. School teams may also find that this decision-making framework useful when considering or implementing any of the practices in this menu of best practices.

Promising Practices Decision-Making Framework
1. What evidence exists that this practice would be effective in meeting the identified needs of the population to be served?
2. Is the practice culturally responsive, strength-based, growth-oriented, inclusive and adaptable? Is it meaningful and relevant to the local community?
3. How will the implementation and outcomes of this practice be monitored over time using observable, measurable and time specific goals and objectives?
4. How is the practice aligned with the school and district’s school improvement plan mission, and other top priorities?
5. What resources and supports do the school need to effectively implement this practice, including expert assistance or coaching available, exemplars for observation, and how well is the practice operationalized?
6. How sustainable is this practice over time? Is it feasible to implement given the school’s existing resources (staff time, training, skill level, etc.)?
7. What is the capacity and readiness of the school or district to incorporate this practice into existing programs and school improvement priorities?
8. How does this practice increase access to and engagement with learning in the classroom?
9. How does this practice enhance the universal level (or core) supports the school already has in place?
10. What is the potential for this practice to affect students, families, or communities disproportionately or inequitably? How can the school prevent or address these affects?

Resources
These websites provide more detailed information on resources and supports that can inform school teams when exploring promising and effective practices.

ASCA - American School Counselor Association
ASCA supports school counselors’ efforts to help students focus on academic, career and social/emotional development so they achieve success in school and are prepared to lead fulfilling lives as responsible members of society.

http://schoolcounselor.org

CASEL – Collaborative for Academic, Social, and Emotional Learning
CASEL’s mission is to help make evidence-based social-emotional learning (SEL) an integral part of education from preschool through high school.

http://www.casel.org

CECP – Center for Effective Collaboration and Practice
It is the mission of the Center for Effective Collaboration and Practice to support and promote a reoriented national preparedness to foster the development and the adjustment of children with or at risk of developing serious emotional disturbance. To achieve that goal, the Center is dedicated to a policy of collaboration at federal, state, and local levels that contributes to and facilitates the production, exchange, and use of knowledge about effective practices.

http://cecp.air.org/

CLASP- Center for Law and Social Policy
CLASP strives to develop and promote policy solutions that work for low income.

www.clasp.org
EOGOAC – Educational Opportunity Gap Oversight and Accountability Committee

The committee is charged by RCW 28A.300.136 to synthesize the findings and recommendations from the five 2008 Achievement Gap Studies into an implementation plan and recommend policies and strategies.

http://www.k12.wa.us/WorkGroups/EOGOAC.aspx

Educational Resource Information Center

This Toolkit is archived on ERI C and was created by the U.S. Department of Education in partnership with multiple countries. While it does not directly address reducing disruptive behavior, it includes practices to engage families and students in a proactive manner.


The Gay, Lesbian, Straight Education Network

At GLSEN, we want every student in every school to be valued and treated with respect, regardless of their sexual orientation, gender identity or gender expression. We believe that all students deserve a safe and affirming school environment where they can learn and grow. We accomplish our goals by working in hallways across the country -- from congress and the Department of Education to schools and district offices in your community -- to improve school climate and champion LGBT issues in K–12 education.

http://glsen.org/learn/research

NABSE – National Alliance of Black School Educators

NABSE seeks to promote and facilitate the education of all students, with a particular focus on African American students.

http://www.nabse.org/

NASP – National Association of School Psychologists

NASP empowers school psychologists by advancing effective practices to improve students’ learning, behavior, and mental health.

http://www.nasponline.org
The National Center for Culturally Responsive Educational Systems

The National Center for Culturally Responsive Educational Systems (NCCRES), a project funded by the U.S. Department of Education’s Office of Special Education Programs, provided technical assistance and professional development to close the achievement gap between students from culturally and linguistically diverse backgrounds and their peers, and reduce inappropriate referrals to special education. The project targeted improvements in culturally responsive practices, early intervention, literacy, and positive behavioral supports.

http://www.nccrest.org/publications.html

NIRN – National Implementation Research Network

The mission of NIRN is to contribute to the best practices and science of implementation, organizational change, and system reinvention to improve outcomes across the spectrum of human services.

http://nirn.fpg.unc.edu

OSEP – Office of Special Education and Rehabilitative Services

The Office of Special Education Programs (OSEP) is dedicated to improving results for infants, toddlers, children, and youth with disabilities ages birth through 21 by providing leadership and financial support to assist states and local districts.

http://www2.ed.gov/about/offices/list/osers/osep/index.html

Oregon Department of Education

Oregon Department of Education (ODE) has drafted a document to create standard operating procedures for the consideration and adoption of proven practices. Criteria for standard practices, emerging practices, promising practices, and proven practices are identified. References are included.

https://www.pbis.org/Common/Cms/.../2-nProven%20Practices.docx

Positive Behavioral Intervention and Supports

The Technical Assistance Center on Positive Behavioral Interventions and Supports is established by the U.S. Department of Education’s Office of Special Education Programs (OSEP) to define, develop, implement, and evaluate a multi-tiered approach to Technical Assistance that improves the capacity of states, districts and schools to establish, scale-up and sustain the PBIS framework.
Emphasis is given to the impact of implementing PBIS on the social, emotional, and academic outcomes for students with disabilities.

http://www.pbis.org

**SAMHSA – Substance Abuse and Mental Health Services Administration**

The Substance Abuse and Mental Health Services Administration (SAMHSA) is the agency within the U.S. Department of Health and Human Services that leads public health efforts to advance the behavioral health of the nation. SAMHSA’s mission is to reduce the impact of substance abuse and mental illness on American’s communities.

http://www.samhsa.gov/about

**U.S. Department of Education**

“Our mission is to promote student achievement and preparation for global competitiveness by fostering educational excellence and ensuring equal access.


**WSIPP - Washington State Institute for Public Policy**

WSIPP’s mission is to carry out practical, non-partisan research – at legislative direction - on issues of importance to Washington.

http://www.wsipp.wa.gov

**WSU College of Education: Native Teaching & Learning**

This website shares a report *From where the Sun Rises: Addressing the educational achievement of Native Americans in Washington State from 2008* as well as the Shadow of the Salmon Curriculum Guide. The Shadow of the Salmon is a docu-drama designed for 8th-grade classrooms, and teaches the history and environmental legacies of the Pacific Northwest.

http://education.wsu.edu/nativeclearinghouse/achievementgap/

**WWC - What Works Clearinghouse**

The goal of the WWC is to be a resource for informed education decision making. WWC identifies studies that provide credible and reliable evidence of the effectiveness of a given practice, program, or policy (referred to as “interventions”).
CONCLUSION AND NEXT STEPS

This work is significant because it has the potential to improve student outcomes across the state. Historically, even with similar funding levels, student outcomes among districts have been uneven. The Legislature, with ESSB 5946, directs districts to use proven practices to help struggling students reduce disruptive behavior in the classroom. Even with proven practices, it is critically important to ensure they are implemented with fidelity because the best practices and strategies, when implemented poorly, can fail to raise student outcomes.

This Menu of Best Practices and Strategies will be refreshed annually, no later than July 1 each calendar year. Interested stakeholders are invited to submit recommendations for intervention practices, along with related research references, for consideration by the expert panel and possible inclusion in subsequent menus. It is important to note that if new research emerges that disproves the effectiveness of a practice that has historically been included in this report, the practice may be removed and no longer allowed under LAP guidelines.

Next Steps

The RDB panel of experts recognizes that there are a number of next steps to ensure that the RDB Menu of Best Practices and Strategies are implemented across the state. Following are a list of activities that will be carried out in the 2015–16 school year:

1. The RDB panel will continue their work which includes the following:
   a. Examine proposed best practices and strategies that the committee chose to table for future consideration for placement on the updated July 1, 2016 RDB Menu of Best Practices and Strategies.
   b. Address public comments that suggest additional practices and strategies for inclusion in the July 1, 2016 RDB Menu of Best Practices and Strategies.
   c. Vet potential RDB best practices and strategies recommended by districts and others.

2. Distribute the RDB Menu of Best Practices and Strategies to stakeholders through a variety of avenues including:
   a. Electronic distribution.
   b. Workshops and trainings provided in partnership with OSPI, Educational Service Districts, and districts to educators across the state.

3. Prepare and distribute data collection instruments that districts will be required to submit to meet the reporting requirements within parts 1 and 2 of ESSB 5946.
APPENDIX A: UNIVERSAL BEHAVIORAL SYSTEMS

The following sections provide more detailed information about guidelines for School Wide PBIS (SWPBIS), Social Emotional Learning (SEL), Systematic Screening, and Implementation Fidelity discussed in the first part of this report.

School Wide Positive Behavior Interventions and Supports

The OSEP National PBIS Technical Assistance Center summarizes the key features of SWPBIS. ([https://www.pbis.org/school/primary-level](https://www.pbis.org/school/primary-level)).

1. **We can effectively teach appropriate behavior to all children.** All PBIS practices are founded on the assumption and belief that all children can exhibit appropriate behavior. As a result, it is our responsibility to identify the contextual setting events and environmental conditions that enable exhibition of appropriate behavior. We then must determine the means and systems to provide those resources.

2. **Intervene early.** It is best practices to intervene before targeted behaviors occur. If we intervene before problematic behaviors escalate, the interventions are much more manageable. Highly effective universal interventions in the early stages of implementation, which are informed by time-sensitive continuous progress monitoring, enjoy strong empirical support for their effectiveness with at-risk students.

3. **Use of a multi-tier model of service delivery.** PBIS uses an efficient, needs-driven resource deployment system to match behavioral resources with student need. To achieve high rates of student success for all students, instruction in the schools must be differentiated in both nature and intensity. To efficiently differentiate behavioral instruction for all students. PBIS uses tiered models of service delivery.

4. **Use research-based, scientifically validated interventions to the extent available.** No Child Left Behind requires the use of scientifically based curricula and interventions. The purpose of this requirement is to ensure that students are exposed to curriculum and teaching that has demonstrated effectiveness for the type of student and the setting. Research-based, scientifically validated interventions provide our best opportunity at implementing strategies that will be effective for a large majority of students.

5. **Monitor student progress to inform interventions.** The only method to determine if a student is improving is to monitor the student’s progress. The use of assessments that can be collected frequently and that are sensitive to small changes in student behavior is recommended. Determining the effectiveness (or lack of) an intervention early is important to maximize the impact of that intervention for the student.

6. **Use data to make decisions.** A data-based decision regarding student response to the interventions is central to PBIS practices. Decisions in PBIS practices are based on professional judgment informed directly by student office discipline referral data and performance data. This principle requires that ongoing data collection systems are in place, and that
resulting data are used to make informed behavioral intervention planning decisions.

7. **Use assessment for three different purposes.** In PBIS, three types of assessments are used: 1) screening of data comparison per day per month for total office discipline referrals, 2) diagnostic determination of data by time of day, problem behavior, and location and 3) progress monitoring to determine if the behavioral interventions are producing the desired effects.

**The Ecology of Social-Emotional Learning: Promoting Positive Learning Environments**

The three components in a positive learning environment are:

1. **Engagement:** Strong relationships exist between teachers and students, among students, among teachers, and between teachers and administration.
2. **Safety:** Students are safe from bullying and violence, and they feel emotionally and academically safe to take risks in the classroom.
3. **Environment:** Well-managed schools and classrooms fulfill students' basic needs of autonomy, competence, and connectedness.

*Table 2. Positive Learning Environments Include (Yoder, 2014):*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Engagement</th>
<th>Safety</th>
<th>Environment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Positive student-teacher relationships</td>
<td>• Effectively addressed discipline problems</td>
<td>• Cohesive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Teacher academic and emotional support</td>
<td>• Emotional and academic safety</td>
<td>• Democratic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Peer academic and emotional support</td>
<td></td>
<td>• Goal directive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Trust in teachers</td>
<td></td>
<td>• Captivating</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Personalized relationships</td>
<td></td>
<td>• Challenging</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Meaningful control</td>
<td></td>
<td>• Relevant</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

According to CASEL ([http://www.casel.org/social-and-emotional-learning/core-competencies](http://www.casel.org/social-and-emotional-learning/core-competencies)), there are five core social-emotional competencies. The five overarching competencies are as follows:
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Social-Emotional Competency</th>
<th>Learning Skills Related to Each Competency</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **Self-awareness**         | • Label and recognize own and others’ emotions  
• Identify what triggers own emotions  
• Analyze emotions and how they affect others  
• Accurately recognize own strengths and limitations  
• Identify own needs and values  
• Possess self-efficacy and self-esteem |
| **Self-management**        | • Set plans and work toward goals  
• Overcome obstacles and create strategies for more long-term goals  
• Monitor progress toward personal and academic short- and long-term goals  
• Regulate emotions such as impulses, aggression, and self-destructive behavior  
• Manage personal and interpersonal stress  
• Attention control (maintain optimal work performance)  
• Use feedback constructively  
• Exhibit positive motivation, hope, and optimism  
• Seek help when needed  
• Display grit, determination, or perseverance  
• Advocate for oneself |
| **Social awareness**       | • Identify social cues (verbal, physical) to determine how others feel  
• Predict others’ feelings and reactions  
• Evaluate others’ emotional reactions  
• Respect others (e.g., listen carefully and accurately)  
• Understand other points of view and perspectives  
• Appreciate diversity (recognize individual and group similarities and differences)  
• Identify and use resources of family, school, and community |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Social-Emotional Competency</th>
<th>Learning Skills Related to Each Competency</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Relationship management</td>
<td>• Demonstrate capacity to make friends</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Exhibit cooperative learning and working</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>toward group goals</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Evaluate own skills to communicate with</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>others</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Manage and express emotions in</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>relationships, respecting diverse</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>viewpoints</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Communicate effectively</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Cultivate relationships with those who</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>can be resources when help is needed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Provide help to those who need it</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Demonstrate leadership skills when</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>necessary, being assertive and persuasive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Prevent interpersonal conflict, but</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>manage and resolve it when it does occur</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Resist inappropriate social pressures</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Responsible decision making</td>
<td>• Identify decisions one makes at school</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Discuss strategies used to resist peer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>pressure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Reflect on how current choices affect</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>future</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Identify problems when making decisions,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>and generate alternatives</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Implement problem-solving skills when</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>making decisions, when appropriate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Become self-reflective and self-evaluative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Make decisions based on moral, personal,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>and ethical standards</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Make responsible decisions that affect</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>the individual, school, and community</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Negotiate fairly</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Further Steps in Implementation of Student Screening

The following steps provide more detail on how the components of the overall process are implemented, with suggestions for effectively managing the resulting data, and using it for meaningful decision-making in a MTSS framework (Walker, 2010):

1. **The School Leadership Team determines that screening for potential social and emotional problems is a priority and identifies a screening tool appropriate to their school.** A number of free or low-cost screening tools have been developed that address the social and behavioral domains and used successfully by many schools. The references listed at the end of this section can provide more detailed information on the screening process as well as programs for consideration.

2. **Regularly scheduled comprehensive screening occurs.** At a minimum, a school will systematically screen students for a variety of academic, health, and social/behavioral risk factors every fall. Screening across all these areas is important because, as mentioned earlier, often students who are struggling in school have needs across these domains. Schools with a very high level of student turn over have had success completing the screening process again in the early spring. This provides a chance for new students to be considered, resources focused more effectively for the coming year, as well helping to inform the development of class lists and groupings for the upcoming school year.

3. **School Leadership Team reviews data.** This group is developed with the specific focus of structuring and guiding the screening process throughout the year. This team meets regularly throughout the year with the focus of collaborating with classroom teachers to review student data, manage other incoming referrals, and provide support and consultation. The screening data is collected and then analyzed by designated members of the Leadership Team in consultation with members of the school’s Student Support Team (SST) in order to determine if any students may be in need of a referral for special education. The team then summarizes the data allowing the team to see exactly where a student may have needs. Teachers are then asked to indicate which students appear to need immediate supports, and those who they feel are currently stable given the supports provided within the classroom. The latter are then placed on a “watch” list so that if needs become more evident, further supports can be identified.

4. **Students with immediate needs are matched to supports.** Existing supports and interventions include the range of services found throughout many schools, including volunteer tutors, focused academic skill instruction, family support services, small group social skills training,
individual behavior contracting, functional behavior assessment, and a referral for special education evaluation or 504 plan. It is important that students not have to wait long before accessing these supports. Matching students identified in the screening process to specific supports before they begin to have difficulty is the hallmark of the prevention approach. The screening process does not eliminate the need for a system that can respond to a new student with existing needs, or the emergence of issues for a student later in the year. But it can greatly reduce the amount of time it takes to access supports in those cases. As a result of this process, a teacher or parent might not have to wait weeks or months to meet to discuss their concerns and discuss a potential special education referral with the SST because many other students have been stabilized by the preventive supports.

5. **Intensity and Scope.** The focus of this model is that supports are provided to a student that match the intensity and type of need identified during the screening process in an efficient and effective manner, typically this represents accessing a continuum of supports from across the universal, secondary, or tertiary levels. For many schools, the primary difference in this model may be only in shifting towards identifying the students with needs and matching them to services prior the emergence of a significant problems rather than struggling to react to emerging problems later.

6. **Ongoing Monitoring of Data on Student Progress.** An important feature of an effective screening and intervention process in both the academic and social domains is the ongoing, data-based monitoring of student progress that continues throughout the year via the School Leadership Team. New to the process may wonder how this team can find the time to track all the students who may be identified in a comprehensive screening process, yet still provide supports to students with clearly defined needs. Schools are used to lengthy waits for teachers and parents to access the SST during the school year. The difference in this model is that a comprehensive screening process allows the team to build a scaffold of supports for students in a preventive manner, which means that there are fewer emergency or high-intensity issues to manage throughout the year. As a result, the screening process integrates effectively into a MTSS initiative while providing a systematic way to respond across both the academic and social/behavioral domains.
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**Guidelines for Measuring Fidelity**
The extent to which any program is implemented with fidelity relies primarily on the staff delivering the program. Studies have shown that teachers frequently
make modifications to a program even when the program is decidedly specified (Datnow & Castellano, 2000). If staff alter or stray from the implementation procedures used in the validation research, their changes could affect the approach’s effectiveness and consequently cause the approach to fail. This speaks to the importance of ongoing measures of fidelity of implementation.

Effective evaluations tell a story about the SWPBIS program. They document the extent to which the program is meeting its goals, using appropriate activities, being implemented as intended, and succeeding in a manner that is generating evidence suitable for replicating, sustaining, and improving services being provided in schools. High-quality evaluations are grounded in scientific methods in which data are used to answer important questions about the value or worth of the SWPBIS program. Fortunately for schools, there are now a number of free or low-cost tools for measuring the fidelity of implement of a SWPBIS initiative. (Algozzine, et al. 2010)

For examining the fidelity with which any given practice or program was implemented we need to assess:

- To what extent was SWPBIS implemented as designed?
- To what extent was SWPBIS implemented with fidelity?

In SWPBS evaluations, fidelity indicators detail how faithfully the program was implemented relative to its original design and focus and the resources that were directed to it. Assessing the fidelity of SWPBS implementation requires attention to the multi-tiered prevention model that guides SWPBS content (Walker et al., 1996). Fidelity indicators and assessments represent data gathered while a SWPBS program is implemented as evidence that core features are in place (O'Donnell, 2008).

Research in the area of effective program improvement points the fact that the goal of every evaluation is to assess the worth of a program and identify ways to continue to improve it. Effective evaluation directs action. It informs decisions, clarifies options, focuses strengths and weaknesses, and provides information for improvements as well as policies and practices. Information gathered from the evaluation of fidelity can be used in developing an action plan, preparing informal and formal dissemination or school improvement reports, and informing discussions and problem-solving with data (Algozzine et al., 2010; Walker & Cheney, 2012).
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APPENDIX B: LEARNING ASSISTANCE PROGRAM (LAP)

What is LAP?
The Learning Assistance Program (LAP) is a supplemental services program that assists underachieving students in reading, writing, and mathematics, as well as the readiness skills needed to successfully learn these core content areas. LAP also serves students who need behavioral support in order to reduce disruptive behavior in the classroom. Additionally, school districts may use up to five percent of LAP funds for “Readiness to Learn” services, which include the development of partnerships with external organizations to provide academic and non-academic supports for students and their families. These supports are intended to reduce barriers to learning, increase student engagement, and improve readiness to learn. The Learning Assistance Program was created by the Legislature in 1987 and, over the past 25 years, LAP has grown to reach 12.0 percent of the statewide, K–12 population (126,627 students).

Table 1 shows LAP enrollment by grade level and subject area for the 2013-14 school year. As you can see, over 60,000 students in Washington received LAP services in mathematics in 2013-14.

Table 1: LAP Enrollment by Grade Level and Subject Area in 2013-14

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Grade Level</th>
<th>Reading</th>
<th>Math</th>
<th>Language Arts</th>
<th>Readiness</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Full-Day K</td>
<td>5,880</td>
<td>1,413</td>
<td>313</td>
<td>1,332</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Half-Day K</td>
<td>4,131</td>
<td>788</td>
<td>238</td>
<td>1,408</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1st</td>
<td>11,898</td>
<td>2,776</td>
<td>664</td>
<td>307</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd</td>
<td>10,547</td>
<td>3,584</td>
<td>506</td>
<td>229</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3rd</td>
<td>8,623</td>
<td>4,445</td>
<td>552</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4th</td>
<td>7,285</td>
<td>4,694</td>
<td>418</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5th</td>
<td>4,851</td>
<td>4,412</td>
<td>407</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6th</td>
<td>5,303</td>
<td>6,381</td>
<td>735</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7th</td>
<td>5,786</td>
<td>7,512</td>
<td>1,314</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8th</td>
<td>4,831</td>
<td>6,563</td>
<td>1,110</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9th</td>
<td>3,224</td>
<td>7,646</td>
<td>1,567</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10th</td>
<td>2,024</td>
<td>4,202</td>
<td>1,344</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11th</td>
<td>1,235</td>
<td>2,975</td>
<td>1,092</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12th</td>
<td>1,073</td>
<td>2,630</td>
<td>1,335</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>76,691</td>
<td>60,221</td>
<td>11,595</td>
<td>3,266</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Columns left blank had an n < 30

A Read as “5,880 full day kindergarteners received services in LAP reading.”
B Read as “1,413 full day kindergarteners received services in LAP math.”
C Read as “313 full day kindergarteners received services in LAP language arts.”
D Read as “1,332 full day kindergarteners received services in LAP readiness.”
LAP funds are distributed at the district level and are allocated based on the district-wide percentage of students in grades K–12 who were eligible for free or reduced-price meals (FRPL) in the prior school year. A student is eligible to participate in LAP if they are in kindergarten through 12th grade, and are below standard in reading, writing, or mathematics. Districts determine which students are eligible by using multiple measures of performance. Performance measures may include the state assessment, other standardized assessments, classroom- or district-developed assessments, teacher observation, and credits earned/GPA.

**LAP Allowable Services**

Beginning in the 2015-16 school year, expenditure of funds for the Learning Assistance Program must be consistent with the provisions of [RCW 28A.655.235](https://app.leg.wa.gov/laws/codified/28A.655.235). Beginning in the 2016-17 school year, school districts must use a practice or strategy in accordance with the RDB Menu of Best Practices and Strategies for LAP services for reducing disruptive behavior per [RCW 28A.165.035](https://app.leg.wa.gov/laws/codified/28A.165.035). Beginning in the 2016-17 school year, school districts may use a practice or strategy that is not on the RDB Menu of Best Practices and Strategies if the district is able to demonstrate improved outcomes for participating students.

The following are categories of services and activities that may be supported by the Learning Assistance Program, per [RCW 28A.165.035](https://app.leg.wa.gov/laws/codified/28A.165.035), and shown in Figure 1 below:

1) Extended learning time occurring:
   a) Before or after the regular school day;
   b) On Saturdays; and
   c) Beyond the regular school year.

2) Services under RCW 28A.320.19 which include:
   a) The extended learning opportunities program, which was created for eligible 11th and 12th-grade students who are not on track to meet local or state graduation requirements, and for 8th-grade students who need additional assistance to have a successful entry into high school.
   b) Under the extended learning opportunities program, instructional services for eligible students can occur during the regular school day, evenings, weekends, or at a time and location deemed appropriate by the school district (i.e., the educational service district). Instructional services can include, the following:
      i) Individual or small group instruction;
      ii) Instruction in English language arts and/or mathematics to pass all or part of the Washington state assessments;
      iii) Attendance at a public alternative school or a skill center for specific courses;
      iv) Inclusion in remediation programs;
v) Language development instruction for English language learners;
vi) Online curriculum and instructional support, including programs for credit retrieval or preparatory classes for Washington assessments; and
vii) Reading improvement specialists to serve 8th, 11th, and 12th-grade educators through professional development (in accordance with RCW 28A.415.350). The reading improvement specialist may also provide direct services to eligible students, which includes students enrolled in a 5th year of high school who are still struggling with basic reading skills.

3) Professional development for certificated and classified staff that focuses on:
   a) The needs of a diverse student population.
   b) Specific literacy and mathematics content and instructional strategies.
   c) The use of student work to guide effective instruction and appropriate assistance.

4) Consultant teachers to assist in implementing effective instructional practices.
5) Tutoring support for participating students.
6) Outreach activities and supports for parents of participating students. This could potentially include employing the parent or the employment of a family engagement coordinator.
7) Finally, up to five percent of a district's LAP funding allocation may be used for the development of partnerships with community-based organizations, educational service districts, or other local agencies. The purpose of these partnerships is to deliver academic and nonacademic supports to participating students who are at risk of not being successful in school. The goals of these partnerships are to reduce barriers to learning, increase student engagement, and enhance students’ readiness to learn. The Office of Superintendent of Public Instruction (OSPI) must approve any community-based organization or local agency before LAP funds may be expended.
Figure 5: Current LAP Service Categories and Examples.

Behavior Panel of Experts
Panel members were appointed by the State Superintendent of Public Instruction, Randy Dorn. Panel candidates were solicited through several professional channels. Candidates were nominated from OSPI, Educational Services Districts, school districts, and state educational associations. Educators were drawn from existing OSPI advisory groups, such as the Curriculum Advisory and Review Committee, the Bilingual Education Advisory Council, and the Special Education Advisory Committee. Nominations were collected and reviewed by OSPI’s Strengthening Student Educational Outcomes Team. OSPI sought leaders nationally and within Washington possessing expertise and experience with multi-tiered systems of support frameworks (such as Response to Intervention), state learning standards, and broad assessment systems that use data to make instructional decisions.

Candidates were nominated and selected based on evidence of their expertise in one or more of the following criteria:

- Classroom and/or district leadership experience.
• Classroom and system expertise in supporting students struggling with behavior.
• Educational/behavior intervention research expertise and experience with implementing new strategies.
• Knowledge of research best practices and strategies in working with diverse student populations, including ELLs and students with disabilities.
• Representatives from high-poverty school districts that range in size from urban to rural.
• Representatives that reflect the diversity of the state’s student population.
• Involvement with national behavior intervention research on, and implementation of, effective social emotional instruction.

After a review of all candidates, OSPI’s team recommended panel candidates to the state superintendent for his consideration. The cross-disciplinary panel reflects a wide range of experience and professional expertise within the K–20 environment.

**Development of the Menu of Best Practices and Strategies for Reducing Disruptive Behavior**

There were six work sessions held over the course of the 2014-2015 school year. Significant research, writing, and collaboration happened outside the formal panel meetings. The following work plan outlines the work of the expert panel over the six scheduled sessions.

The work sessions were organized around the framework of the currently allowed LAP service categories, with one key addition of identifying emerging or promising practices that might not fit into the currently allowed categories, as shown below.

![High-Level Work Plan for the Expert Panel](image)

Panelists were asked to review selected research literature in advance of each session. Panelists then worked in small groups to review the body of peer-reviewed research on each of the proposed practices. Panelists provided written
descriptions of the practices, citing evidence of effectiveness and considerations for implementation.

During the sixth and final session, panelists reviewed all of the completed menu entries and voted on each practice for inclusion in the menu. Panelists voted based on the strength of the body of research and their expert opinion on the effects of the practice in positively impacting student behavior. Panel votes are represented in Table 1. Menu of Best Practices and Strategies.

Practices that did not garner support from at least 50 percent of the panelists were not included in the menu. For practices that received more than 50 percent support, but less than 100 percent support, panel members provided research-based evidence representing the counterclaims. Counterclaims tables can be found with the menu entries.
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Annie Pennucci, MPA, has conducted applied policy research for the state Legislature for over 12 years, specializing in education (spanning early childhood, K–12, and higher education topics). In her K–12 studies, she has examined educational services for students who are deaf and hard of hearing, English language learners, recent immigrants, and in foster care; the Learning Assistance Program; academic assessments; education finance; and innovative schools in Washington state. She has experience as a fiscal analyst for the K–12 capital budget in the state House of Representatives, and as an evaluator for a nonprofit that provides social services to adults. Annie holds a certificate from the Senior Executives in State and Local Government program at Harvard’s Kennedy School of Government and an M.P.A. from New Mexico State University.

Barb Pope, MA, has been an educator for over 30 years as a teacher and principal. She serves currently as Director of Student Services and School Safety in the Puyallup School District. She received her Master’s in School Administration at Western Washington University. Her responsibilities include oversight and management of school emergency plans, school discipline, risk management, campus security and school resource officers, McKinney-Vento homeless education, attendance/BECCA truancy reporting, and hearings and re-entries. Barb routinely provides professional development to district employees and community members in the areas of systems management, policies and procedures, adverse childhood experiences (ACEs), community truancy boards, alternatives to suspension, and restorative justice.

Bridget Walker, PhD, is a certified special education teacher who has worked in the field of for over 25 years. Throughout her career, she has worked as a special education teacher, day treatment teacher, district behavior specialist, and she served as the first state positive behavior interventions and supports project coordinator at the University of Washington Behavior Research Center. She earned her Ph.D. at the University of Washington in 2006. Bridget is currently an Associate Professor at Seattle University where she teaches in the Masters in Teaching and Special Education programs. Bridget also consults with districts and has extensive experience helping district and school teams develop and sustain systems and strategies to effectively support students with academic and behavioral challenges across all three tiers of intervention. She also works with districts to help them evaluate and improve their programs for students with significant emotional and behavior disabilities.

Carol Frodge, MA, is currently an instructional coach with OSPI’s Office of Student and School Success. She coaches priority and focus schools in continuous school improvement including creating positive discipline and support systems. Carol received her Bachelor’s degrees in Education and Psychology from University of Colorado, Boulder. She started her career teaching science and math in the Peace Corps at Asankrangwa Secondary School, Ghana and then completed her Master’s program at Humboldt State University, CA in
science education. She has taught at all levels K–12 and worked in the Edmonds School District for 24 years as a middle school science and math teacher and as a middle school and elementary school administrator. She was a member of Cambridge University’s Carpe Vitam Project, an international progressive education consortium funded by the Wallenberg Foundation. As a school administrator, she received the Parent-Teacher Association’s Outstanding Educator and Outstanding Advocate Awards. When she was an assistant principal, she received the AWSP Distinguished Assistant Principal Award. Under her leadership as principal, her last school received the OSPI Closing the Achievement Gap Award. She is on the board of Northwest Positive Behavior Interventions and Supports (NWPBIS) and, in addition to being a leadership coach with OSPI, trains schools in PBIS. Her focus is on building systems in schools for continuous growth and developing capacity to make data driven decisions.

David Tudor, MAT Special Education, is currently curriculum director of the Washougal School District. David received his Master’s in Special Education from Pacific University. He spent seven years in the classroom where he taught students with emotional and behavioral disabilities at the high school level and resource room at the middle school level. David left the classroom to work for OSPI. He was a Program Supervisor in the Special Education department. He supported districts with learning improvement for mathematics and reading. He also served as the RTI coordinator for a year before moving to the School Improvement department. For the next two years, David helped to conduct system and program reviews and provide targeted supports to schools and districts in working with struggling learners.

Lori Lynass, PhD, is the owner and Executive Director of Sound Supports, a professional development and consultation company. Dr. Lynass has over 20 years of experience working to support students, families and schools, school districts and state departments of education. She has worked directly with over 350 schools in over 40 districts and 3 state departments of education on their implementation of multi-tiered academic and behavioral systems of support. Dr. Lynass’ previous career positions have included being a special education teacher, a research scientist at the University of Washington and the executive director of the NorthWest PBIS Network, a non-profit agency serving 5 states with behavioral supports. Dr. Lynass has written, overseen and coordinated over $5.5 million in grants and contracts related to academic and behavioral systems and interventions and has also actively disseminates results through over 200 presentations and publications. Dr. Lynass has taught courses in Special Education as an adjunct professor for the University of Washington, Seattle University, and Seattle Pacific University.

Mary Amanda Graham, PhD, is an Associate Professor and previous Program Director of the School Counseling Program at Seattle University. She began her career in 1991 working as a Juvenile Rehabilitation Counselor for the state of
Washington with youth who were incarcerated. She is a certified school counselor with the State of Washington and has been an elementary, middle and high school counselor. She has worked as the Director of Upward Bound and Talent Search, and spent her career working with disengaged students and families. She has over 20 years of experience. Dr. Graham is also a Basic Instructor for the Glasser Institute and is Reality Therapy certified. She is currently the post-secondary vice president for The Washington School Counselor Association.

Faye Britt, EdD, is an assistant principal at Haller Middle School, Arlington Public Schools. Faye has over 20 years of experience in public education. She received her bachelor’s degree from Leeds Metropolitan University in England and began her career teaching Health and Fitness and Math in England, and Berlin, Germany, before moving to the United States. After receiving her Master’s in Educational Leadership from City University of Seattle, Faye has spent the last 10 years as an assistant principal for Arlington Public Schools at both the high and middle school levels. Her doctorate in Administrator Leadership for Teaching and Learning is from Walden University where her dissertation focus was a qualitative study into school leaders’ perceptions of students’ disruptive behavior.

Jill Patnode, MSW, is the Director of Dropout Intervention and Reengagement at the Puget Sound Educational Services District. She achieved a Master’s Degree in Social Work from the University of Washington. During her 25 years working with at-risk youth she has worked as a juvenile parole counselor and sex offender treatment coordinator. In 2001 she shifted her focus from rehabilitation to prevention and has been working in the education systems since. Her roles have spanned the continuum of direct service to systems change and include: prevention intervention specialist, middle school intervention coordinator, program manager and director. Jill provides professional development to educators in the areas of: cultural competency, data coaching, crisis response teams, Issues of Abuse, Olweus Bully Prevention, navigating school systems, resiliency and dropout intervention, and reengagement.

Laura Matson, PhD, is a Special Services Director at Puget Sound Educational Service District (ESD). Laura received her Master’s in special education from Central Washington University and her Doctorate in special education from the University of Oregon. During her 33 years in the education profession, she has worked in public schools as a special education teacher, behavior intervention specialist, and special education administrator. She has been an adjunct professor at the University of Washington and Pacific Lutheran University. She is a frequent trainer on topics related student behavior including functional behavior assessments, behavior intervention planning, classroom management, reducing the use of aversive interventions and school-wide positive behavior support.

Lisa Hoyt, PhD, has experience as a classroom special education teacher for students with emotional and behavioral disabilities (EBD), learning disabilities
and students with autism. She received her Master’s degree in Special Education in 1993 and her doctorate in Special Education in 2010, both at the University of Washington. Currently, Dr. Hoyt is the Director of Renton Academy, a K–12 therapeutic school for students with EBD within an urban public school district. As the founding director, she facilitates the development of evidenced-based systems and structures to best serve students with EBD both academically and behaviorally. The school was recognized by the Council of Exceptional Children (CEC) as a host site for their national conference in 2009. In 2011, Lisa Hoyt was honored as the Council for Children with Behavior Disorders with the Outstanding Professional Performance Award for her leadership at Renton Academy.

**Matt Lemon, MPA**, conducts applied policy research for the Washington State Legislature with a focus in education. His work in K–12 policy includes studies of innovative schools in Washington and the Learning Assistance Program, which provides academic support to struggling students. His work in higher education has examined a scholarship program for foster youth (Passport to College Promise) and the Washington State Need Grant for low-income undergraduate students. In addition to his research, Matt is a member of the K–12 Data Governance group that oversees the development and implementation of an education data system in Washington. Matt graduated magna cum laude from Western Washington University with a BA in political science and received an MPA from The Evergreen State College.

**Tricia Hagerty, M.Ed.**, is an educator and advocate for improving academic and social outcomes for all children. She is the Washington Director of NorthWest PBIS Network and an Implementation Scientist for the Center for Strong Schools. She has extensive experience with Universal, Targeted, and Tertiary supports and interventions. She provides PBIS training, coaching, and evaluation services supporting school and district level implementation of Positive Behavioral Interventions and Supports. With over 15 years of experience, Tricia worked as the PBIS Coordinator for Highline Public Schools conducting Summer Institutes and workshops for school leadership teams, faculty members, and administrators implementing PBIS. She was previously employed as a special education teacher, educational assistant, and PBIS school and district coordinator for two Federal Research Grants issued to the University of Washington Behavioral Research Center. The BEACONs Project and Check, Connect, and Expect applied school-wide, classroom, targeted, and intensive level supports to provide early intervention for students at-risk of school failure. Both research projects studied the effectiveness of implementing a three-tiered, Response to Intervention model via the PBIS framework. Tricia received her M.Ed. at Seattle Pacific University and completed her BA at Washington State University. She is a SWIS Facilitator supporting school teams using PBIS and discipline data for decision-making. She has experience and expertise in conducting and implementing functional behavior assessments and individual behavior support plans.
Valinda Jones, M.Ed., received her Bachelor’s degree from Eastern Washington University in Applied Psychology, and her Master’s degree in Educational Leadership from University of Puget Sound. Val’s early career was spent in the Los Angeles area working as an adolescent substance abuse therapist at a 90-day inpatient treatment facility. This work led her to the world of education where she spent many years as a case manager in the Franklin Pierce School District developing collaborative school/community based teams to reduce non-academic risk factors for underserved youth K–12. Over the years, Val has held several positions in Franklin Pierce including, the Safe and Drug Free Schools Coordinator, Responsive Services Coordinator, and the Comprehensive Guidance and Counseling Assistant Director. Upon receiving a Master’s Degree in Educational Leadership, Val has continued to serve Franklin Pierce Schools as the Director of Alternative Education, and she is currently the principal of three 9–12 alternative high school programs. In 2001, she co-founded the Franklin Pierce Youth First Coalition, a non-profit organization which seeks to reduce community risk factors and increase protective factors for the Parkland community. Securing federal, state, and community grants has been a role Val has played over the 25 years she has served the Franklin Pierce community. Some of these include collaborative efforts such as Safe and Civil Schools, Drug Free Communities, and Violence Prevention.

Vanessa Tucker, PhD, received her dual certification to teach from Western Washington University in 1995. She began her career working with children with EBDs and moved into classrooms serving students with high support needs. She got her M.Ed. from the University of Washington, Seattle in Low Incidence Disabilities in 2003. She moved from the classroom into a specialist position in 2004 and coordinated the autism programs in Tacoma Public Schools for seven years. She left in 2010 to join the University of Washington, Tacoma as a full-time lecturer where she coordinated the Teacher Certification Program. She joined PLU in 2012 as an assistant professor. Tucker received a PhD in Special Education from the University of Washington in 2009, and an M.Ed. in Low Incidence Disabilities, University of Washington in 2003. She obtained her BA in Elementary Education and Special Education from Western Washington University in 1995.
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# APPENDIX D: GLOSSARY AND LIST OF ACRONYMS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Acronym</th>
<th>Definition</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AIR</td>
<td>American Institute for Research</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ASCA</td>
<td>American School Counselor Association</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BEST</td>
<td>Building Educational Success Through Collaboration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BIP</td>
<td>Behavior Intervention Planning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CASEL</td>
<td>Collaborative for Academic, Social, and Emotional Learning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CECP</td>
<td>Center for Effective Collaboration and Practice</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CHMS-UCLA</td>
<td>Center for Mental Health in Schools at University of California Los Angeles</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CLASP</td>
<td>Center for Law and School Policy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DOE</td>
<td>United States Department of Education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DSHS</td>
<td>Department of Social and Health Services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EBD</td>
<td>Emotional/Behavioral Disorders</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EBP</td>
<td>Evidence-Based Practices</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ELA</td>
<td>English Language Arts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ELL</td>
<td>English Language Learner</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EOGOAC</td>
<td>Educational Opportunity Gap Oversight and Accountability Committee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ERIC</td>
<td>Educational Resource Information Center</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ESD</td>
<td>Educational Service District</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ESSB</td>
<td>Engrossed Substitute Senate Bill</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FBA</td>
<td>Functional Behavioral Assessment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FERPA</td>
<td>Family Educational Rights and Privacy Act</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GLSEN</td>
<td>Gay, Lesbian &amp; Straight Education Network</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GTL</td>
<td>Great Teachers and Leaders</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HIPAA</td>
<td>Health Insurance Portability and Accountability Act</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IES</td>
<td>Institute of Education Sciences</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LAP</td>
<td>Learning Assistance Program</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MTSS</td>
<td>Multi-Tiered System of Support Framework</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NABSE</td>
<td>National Association of Black School Educators</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NASP</td>
<td>National Association of School Psychologists</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NCES</td>
<td>National Center for Education Statistics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NIRN</td>
<td>National Implementation Research Network</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ODE</td>
<td>Oregon Department of Education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OSEP</td>
<td>Office of Special Education Programs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OSPI</td>
<td>Office of Superintendent of Public Instruction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PBIS</td>
<td>Positive Behavior Intervention System</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PD</td>
<td>Professional Development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PLC</td>
<td>Professional Learning Community</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PTA</td>
<td>Parent Teacher Association</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acronym</td>
<td>Definition</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PTSD</td>
<td>Post-Traumatic Stress Disorder</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RCW</td>
<td>Revised Code of Washington</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RDB</td>
<td>Reducing Disruptive Behavior</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RTI</td>
<td>Response to Intervention</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SAMHSA</td>
<td>Substance Abuse and Mental Health Services Administration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SEL</td>
<td>Social and Emotional Learning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SWPBIS</td>
<td>School-wide Positive Behavior Intervention System</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TPEP</td>
<td>Teacher Principal Evaluation Protocol</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WSIPP</td>
<td>Washington State Institute for Public Policy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WWC</td>
<td>What Works Clearinghouse</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Topic</th>
<th>Definitions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Behavior Intervention Planning (BIP)</td>
<td>Behavior Intervention Planning (BIP) is the process of designing plans for students to address behavior identified through a functional behavioral assessment (FBA). Effective plans employ interventions designed to support, not punish the student. They should increase the acquisition of new skills that the student can use in place of the maladaptive skills.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collaborative for Academic, Social, and Emotional Learning (CASEL)</td>
<td>Collaborative for Academic, Social, and Emotional Learning (CASEL) mission is to help make the evidenced social and emotional learning (SEL) an integral part of education from preschool through high school. <a href="http://www.casel.org">www.casel.org</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Common Core</td>
<td>According to OSPI, “Common Core is a real-world approach to learning and teaching. Developed by education experts from 45 states, these K–12 learning standards go deeper into key concepts in English language arts and mathematics. The standards require a practical, real-life application of knowledge that prepares students for success in college, work and life.”<a href="https://www.k12.wa.us/CurriculumInstruct/CCSS/default.aspx">https://www.k12.wa.us/CurriculumInstruct/CCSS/default.aspx</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Culturally Responsive</td>
<td>Culturally responsive practice involves utilizing the cultural knowledge, life experiences, and learning styles of culturally diverse students to make learning more relevant and effective for them. Building upon the knowledge and strengths students bring with them from their homes and communities, it validates who they are and sets high expectations for behavior and learning. It comprehensively creates an environment where diversity is affirmed and</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Topic</td>
<td>Definitions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>establishes a cultural lens for determining normative behavior and learning expectations (Gay, 2000).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Data-based Decision Making</strong></td>
<td>The analysis of fidelity and outcomes data to determine progress and needed next steps with a practice, program or framework.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Disruptive Behavior</strong></td>
<td>Behavior is disruptive when a student exhibits an ongoing pattern of physical or verbal actions that are off task, interfere with and adversely impact the student’s learning and the learning process of other students, and interrupt school and classroom routines. Disruptive behavior habitually impedes the instructor’s ability to teach effectively, diverts energy and resources from the educational process, is unresponsive to conventional classroom and/or building intervention(s), and reduces the student’s access to learning.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Engrossed Substitute Senate Bill (ESSB) 5946</strong></td>
<td>Strengthening Student Educational Outcomes - The overall bill sets forth a vision for improving educational support systems for every student in grades K–12. The first Section of Part 1 references the importance of collaborative partnerships essential to supporting students; using research and evidence-based programs for all students, especially in the early years for grades K–4; and providing statewide models to support school district in implementing a multi-tiered system of support. Part 2 of the bill references the LAP’s focus on evidence-based support for students struggling in reading (with primary emphasis on grades K–4), mathematics, and behavior across grades K–12.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Evidence-based Practices (EBP)</strong></td>
<td>Empirically supported interventions, program and practices. To be considered evidenced-based, at least two randomized control trial research studies have been conducted on the intervention, program or practice.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Functional Behavior Assessment (FBA)</strong></td>
<td>Functional Behavior Assessment (FBA) is structured a problem-solving process for addressing student problem behavior. It relies on a variety of techniques, strategies and assessments to identify the purposes (function) of the specified behavior and to help schools select appropriate interventions to address the behavior.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Implementation Fidelity</strong></td>
<td>A program or practice that is implemented as intended to adhere to the validity and reliability of the program or practice.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Implementation Science</strong></td>
<td>Implementation Science promote the integration of research and evidence into practice and policy. It employs implementation drivers and predictable stages when schools/districts adopt systems level framework. These drives and stages help schools and districts to scale up</td>
</tr>
<tr>
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<tr>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
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</tr>
<tr>
<td>evidenced-based practices. Phases include: Exploration, Installation, Initial Implementation, Full Implementation (Fixsen &amp; Blase 2008)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Multi-Tiered Systems of Support (MTSS)</strong></td>
<td>A whole-school, data-driven, prevention-based framework for improving learning and SEL outcomes for every student through a layered continuum of evidence-based practices and systems.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Response to Intervention (RTI)</strong></td>
<td>RTI grew from efforts to improve identification practices in special education. It is a process of systematically documenting the performance of students as evidence of the need for additional services after making changes in classroom instruction.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Response to intervention (RTI) is defined as “the practice of providing high-quality instruction and interventions matched to student need, monitoring progress frequently to make decisions about changes in instruction or goals, and applying child response data to important educational decisions” (Batsche et al. 2005)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Social Emotional Learning (SEL)</strong></td>
<td>Social Emotional Learning (SEL) is the process through which adults and children the knowledge, skills and attitudes in the core competencies of Self-Awareness, Self-Management, Social Awareness, Relationship Skills and Responsible Decision-Making. These help persons to understand and manage emotions and set and achieve positive goals.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>School-wide Positive Behavioral Interventions and Supports (SWPBIS or SWPBS)</strong></td>
<td>SWPBIS is a framework or approach for assisting school personnel in adopting and organizing evidence-based behavioral interventions into an integrated continuum that enhances academic and social behavior outcomes for all students. PBIS is NOT a packaged curriculum, scripted intervention, or manualized strategy.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>PBIS is a prevention-oriented way for school personnel to (a) organize evidence-based practices, (b) improve their implementation of those practices, and, (c) maximize academic and social behavior outcomes for students. PBIS supports the success of ALL students.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Tier 2 Secondary Prevention or System of Support for At-Risk</strong></td>
<td>Secondary Prevention is designed to provide intensive or targeted interventions to support students who are not responding to Primary Prevention efforts. Interventions within Secondary Prevention are more intensive since smaller numbers of student require services. Secondary</td>
</tr>
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</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tier 3 Tertiary Support &amp; Intervention for Individuals</td>
<td>Tier 3 Tertiary Support involves a process of conducting a comprehensive functional behavioral assessment (FBA) and a support plan comprised of individualized, assessment-based intervention strategies that are then assembled into a behavior intervention plan (BIP). These services are then implemented, monitored and adjusted based on student response.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Universal Screening</td>
<td>Universal screening refers to a school’s process for proactively screening for students with or at risk for developing social and behavioral problems. A systematic screening process assists schools in early identification of students potentially in need of further intervention and supports. Universal screening moves away from a traditional wait to fail model towards a more preventative, proactive approach that allows schools in making crucial decisions regarding the limited school resources such as counseling, pro-social skills training, and academic supports.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Washington State Institute for Public Policy (WSIPP)</td>
<td>WSIPPs mission is to carry out practical, non-partisan research at the direction of the Legislature or Board of Directors. WSIPP works closely with legislators, legislative and state agency staff and experts in the field to ensure that studies answer relevant policy questions. <a href="http://www.wsipp.wa.gov">www.wsipp.wa.gov</a></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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