

Inclusion of Students with Significant Disabilities in SWPBS Evaluation Tools

Jennifer A. Kurth

University of Kansas

Alison Zagona

University of Arizona

Mayumi Hagiwara

University of Kansas

Matt Enyart

University of Kansas

Citation: Kurth, J. A., Zagona, A., Hagiwara, M., & Enyart, M. (2017). Inclusion of students with significant disabilities in SWPBS evaluation tools. *Education and Training in Autism and Developmental Disabilities, 52*, 383-392.

### Abstract

Students with significant disabilities (intellectual and developmental disabilities) are predominantly educated in separate settings, and tend to have little access to schoolwide positive behavior supports (SWPBS). In this study, we first identified the most commonly cited SWPBS evaluation tools in the literature between 2010 and 2016. The SET, TIC, and BoQ were identified as the most commonly cited. Next, these evaluation tools were analyzed for their purposeful inclusion of students with significant disabilities. Findings revealed the tools emphasize all staff and all students when describing systems and data aspects of SWPBS which have limited direct impact on students, but make allowances, such as “most students” when describing the implementation SWPBS that directly impact students, thus creating loopholes that may inadvertently permit the exclusion of learners with the most significant disabilities from fully participating in, and benefitting from, SWPBS efforts. Implications and recommendations for practitioners and researchers are provided.

### Inclusion of Students with Significant Disabilities in SWPBS Evaluation Tools

The prevalence of schools implementing schoolwide positive behavioral supports (SWPBS) is increasing across the United States (Landers, Courtade, & Ryndak, 2012). The effectiveness of SWPBS has even prompted organizations, such as juvenile justice facilities, to modify the tools and tenets of schoolwide services to embrace its use organization-wide (Houchins, Jolivette, Wessendorf, McGlynn, & Nelson, 2005). The increasing prevalence of SWPBS is likely due to its success in reducing or preventing problem behaviors for students across the country, as well as other positive outcomes, including improved academic achievement, school attendance, and social competence (Sugai, Simonsen, Bradshaw, Horner, & Lewis, 2014). SWPBS is a broad-based, preventative approach to supporting student behavior (Andreou, McIntosh, Ross, & Kahn, 2014). Unlike individual behavior interventions, which focus on the problem behaviors of individual students on a case-by-case basis (Bambara & Lohrmann, 2006), SWPBS focuses on teaching positive, prosocial behavior skills to all students (Hawken & O'Neill, 2006).

SWPBS is applied through a multi-tiered continuum, including: tier 1 interventions and supports, focusing on all staff and all students across all settings; tier 2, targeted support for students whose behaviors are unresponsive to tier 1 practices; and tier 3, intensive support for those students unresponsive to tiers 1 and 2 (Sugai et al., 2014). Importantly, Sugai and colleagues (2014) emphasize these tiers are inclusive and cumulative, meaning they add to, but do not replace, existing supports in earlier tiers. Further, positive behavior supports as a whole (inclusive of SWPBS) includes systems, practices, data, and outcomes (Kincaid et al., 2016).

The needs of students with significant disabilities, defined here as students with intellectual and developmental disabilities who take the alternate achievement assessment (1-2%

of all students), and have support needs across life domains (Kennedy, 2004), were the original beneficiaries of individualized behavior interventions (Bambara & Lohrmann, 2006). As such, there is a long track record of success using positive behavioral interventions and supports (PBIS) to teach skills and improve behavioral outcomes for students with significant disabilities (Carr et al., 2002). For example, individualized strategies have been used to improve choice-making and quality of life outcomes (McClellan & Grey, 2012), communication skills (Hetzroni & Roth, 2003), and self-management skills (Lee, Poston, & Poston, 2007) for students with significant disabilities. Similarly, individualized interventions have been used to improve behavior during home activities (Buschbacher, Fox, & Clarke, 2004).

In part due to the overwhelming effectiveness of individualized behavior interventions, the term “positive behavioral interventions and supports” (PBIS) was introduced in the 1997 amendments to the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA). Then, Congress required its use for all students when reauthorizing the Individuals with Disabilities Education Improvement Act (IDEA) in 2004. However, providing individualized supports for *all* students, including those with infrequent problem behaviors, was unfeasible, thus resulting in the development of system-wide approaches to behavior problems, namely, SWPBS (Crimmins & Farrell, 2006). Similar to individualized behavior interventions, SWPBS has an established research base with demonstrated positive outcomes for students. For example, Ross and Horner (2014) found the use of SWPBS improved elementary student behaviors related to bullying prevention. Others, including McIntosh, Bennett, and Price (2011), have found the use of SWPBS reduces the number of student office discipline referrals. Similarly, many others, including Sanchez and colleagues (2015) have demonstrated the effectiveness of Check-in,

Check-out procedures in SWPBS implementation. Notably, however, this research focuses on the needs of students without significant disability.

Consequently, while individualized behavior interventions and SWPBS are each effective practices, they have tended to focus on different populations of students, with limited research exploring the extent to which SWPBS is effective for students with significant disabilities. In fact, a recent review of the literature found only two empirical studies focusing on access to SWPBS for students with significant disabilities (Kurth & Enyart, 2016). The first study, completed by Landers et al. (2012) surveyed state SWPBS coordinators in nearly 4,000 U.S. schools, finding students with significant disabilities were largely absent from SWPBS instruction. Further, SWPBS state coordinators reported personnel attending SWPBS trainings would not be prepared to meet the needs of students with significant disabilities. No empirical studies have been identified examining the effectiveness of SWPBS for students with significant disabilities.

The second study included a survey of alternative school administrators in the state of Michigan (Schnelling & Harris, 2016). These alternative schools, serving students with significant disabilities, were found to implement some key features of SWPBS, but implementation across SWPBS components, particularly tier 1 interventions, was low and in some cases incongruous. For example, Schnelling and Harris (2016) found highest fidelity related to having procedures in place to address emergency/dangerous situations (86%) and the presence of a school administrator as an active participant of the behavior support team (73%). However, many key areas, including clearly defining problem behaviors and defining consequences for problem behaviors, were implemented with much lower fidelity (24 and 18%, respectively).

The reasons for the overall exclusion of students with significant disabilities from SWPBS literature and instruction (in both public and alternative settings) remain unknown. One hypothesis articulated by Kurth and Enyart (2016) is that, while the SWPBS literature describes an intended focus on the needs of all students (Horner et al., 2014; Sugai, O’Keeffe, & Fallon, 2011), “all” is repeatedly interpreted as “some” or “most” in schools. For example, school-wide reading models have excluded students with significant disabilities (e.g., Simmons et al., 2002), as has the movement to educate students with disabilities in general education settings (Kurth, Morningstar, & Kozleski, 2014), despite the inclusion movement originating in the significant disabilities community (Wolfsenberger, 1972).

Lending further credence to this hypothesis, Hawken and O’Neill (2006) found the content of “frequently used tools for evaluating school-wide behavior support initiatives...[indicate] that students with disabilities, particularly severe disabilities, have not been clearly included in the SWPBS process” (p. 48). In other words, it is possible the SWPBS movement, in embracing “all” students, has inadvertently failed to outline ways to include students with significant disabilities in SWPBS assessments. However, the movement towards SWPBS has only gained pace since Hawken and O’Neill’s claim, and it is possible newer or updated tools more directly and adequately include students with significant disabilities in their evaluations.

Thus, the purpose of this study is to complete a contemporary analysis of commonly used SWPBS evaluation tools and their direct and implicit inclusion of students with significant disabilities. We then offer recommendations for use of the tools (i.e., modifications or further explanations) and implications for tool use by practitioners and researchers.

## **Method**

To analyze SWPBS evaluation tools, two strategies were used. First, we completed a comprehensive literature review to identify the most commonly cited SWPBS evaluation tools between 2010 and 2016. Next, we completed a content analysis of the three most frequently cited SWPBS evaluation tools for evidence of their inclusion of students with significant disabilities (Hsieh & Shannon, 2015).

### **Literature Review**

To identify the most frequently used SWPBS tools in the literature, defined as those tools cited in 10% or more of research studies, we conducted a systematic, electronic database search of peer reviewed studies using EBSCO host, Academic Search Complete, ERIC, Education Full text, Psycharticles, and Psych INFO. We used combinations of the following Boolean search terms, which were derived from search terms in other peer-reviewed publications related to implementation of SWPBS: *SWPBS, SWPBIS, school wide positive behavior support, school wide positive behavior intervention\* and support\*, PBIS, positive behavior intervention\* and support\*, evaluation, implementation, fidelity, measure, measurement, and school*, resulting in 167 articles.

After duplicates were removed, the first two authors read the remaining 165 abstracts and selected articles for full-text review if they met the following inclusion criteria: articles were peer-reviewed, published between 2010 and 2016, referenced the SWPBS process (implementation or evaluation), detailed an evaluation tool or validation of a SWPBS tool, referenced data collection, and was a literature review or meta-analysis. Articles were excluded from full-text review if they documented the results of a training, took place outside of the United States, detailed results of an intervention within only one specific tier, or surveyed a

specific aspect of the SWPBS process. Inter-rater agreement for selecting articles for full text review was 100%.

Upon application of the inclusion and exclusion criteria, the authors selected the resulting 97 articles for full text review with the purpose of identifying the total number of articles that mentioned each SWPBS tool. The first two authors searched the articles and reference lists and recorded SWPBS tools that were mentioned at least once. As seen in Table 1, there were 126 mentions of tools within these 97 articles. Inter-rater agreement for articles mentioning the tools was also 100%.

### **Evaluation of SWPBS Tools**

Given that our target population was students with significant disabilities, who are often served in separate settings, we evaluated the most frequently cited SWPBS tools for mentions of students with significant disabilities in different settings. To do this, we identified the following search terms related to possible placements and types of disabilities: *all classrooms, all teachers, all staff, all students, disability\*, general, segregate\*, access, inclu\*, resource, self-contained, separate\*, low incidence, severe, significant, multiple, and disorder\**.

Next, we downloaded the three most commonly cited evaluation tools (see Results) from the PBIS website ([www.pbis.org/evaluation/evaluation-tools](http://www.pbis.org/evaluation/evaluation-tools)): School-wide Evaluation Tool (SET) version 2.1 (Sugai, Lewis-Palmer, Todd, & Horner, 2005), SET Manual version 2.0 (Todd et al., 2012), the Team Implementation Checklist (TIC) version 3.1 (Sugai, Horner, Lewis-Palmer, & Rossetto, 2012), Benchmarks of Quality (BoQ) Scoring Form, BoQ Scoring Guide, and BoQ Team Member Rating (Kincaid, Childs, George, 2010). To remain focused on the most current version of SWPBS evaluation tools, only the most recently updated or revised versions were analyzed.



The second author searched each evaluation tool for each search term individually and recorded the findings on a spreadsheet. Only relevant uses of the terms were recorded; for example, the term *resource* may have been referring to resources such as people or materials. For purposes of this analysis, we were interested in uses of the term *resource* related to the placement of students with disabilities in resource classrooms; therefore, other uses of the term were excluded. The third author applied the search terms to each evaluation tool, and initial agreement between the two authors was 88.88%. Next, the second and third authors met to discuss discrepancies until they reached 100% agreement.

After conducting this initial search, it became apparent that there were many components of the tools that used terms such as “many,” “almost all,” or referred to percentages of students or staff. Therefore, we expanded the list of search terms to include terms referring to only *some* of the staff or students: *almost, nearly, percentages, %, most, some, several, many, and a few*. The second author searched each evaluation tool for each term individually and recorded instances in which the terms were used in relation to our research question. The third author also applied the search terms, and the initial agreement was 100%. The second and third authors completed this secondary search after they met to discuss discrepancies in the search using the first set of terms. At that time, the authors discussed the necessity to only include relevant uses of the terms; therefore, the reliability for this secondary search was 100%.

## **Findings**

### **Most Frequently Cited SWPBS Evaluation Tools in Literature Review**

A total of 13 SWPBS evaluation tools were identified in this review of the literature, as seen in Table 1. The three most commonly cited tools were the School-wide Evaluation Tool (SET), Team Implementation Checklist (TIC), and the Benchmarks of Quality (BoQ). These

tools were mentioned or referenced in more than 10% of the 97 full-text articles reviewed. The SET was mentioned in 45% of the articles, the TIC was mentioned in 12%, and the BoQ was mentioned in 11% of the articles. The remaining 10 evaluation tools were mentioned in 9% or less of the collected articles, and thus excluded from further review.

### **Analysis of Most Common SWPBS Tools**

Across the SET Scoring Guide, SET Manual, TIC, and BoQ forms, we found the following terms mentioned: *all staff*, *all students*, *disabilities*, *general*, *special*, *almost*, *nearly*, *most*, *some*, *several*, *many*, and *a few*. We also found instances of items or indicators referring to a percentage of staff or students. As seen in Table 2, we found the presence of the terms *all staff* and *all students* in the tools referred to the team, expectations, and the discipline system; in other words, elements of SWPBS evaluation and implementation that occur at the systems or data level, and not those levels directly impacting students (i.e., practices and outcomes). Interestingly, the terms that represented only a portion of the students or staff (e.g., *almost*, *nearly*, *most*, *some*) predominantly referred to components of SWPBS that directly impact students, including the system of rewards, lessons on behavior, and the procedures for responding to inappropriate behavior.

**References made to all staff and all students.** Across the most common SWPBS evaluation tools, the term *all staff* was mentioned in reference to team membership, teaching expectations to students, expectations of staff, and teaching the discipline system to all staff. In the SET manual, *all staff* was mentioned 6 individual times in the original forms (excluding samples of completed forms). For example, one mention of *all staff* was in evaluation question F3: “Does the administrator report that team membership includes representation of all staff?” This mention was repeated 10 times in the samples of the evaluation criteria. The other five

times in which *all staff* was mentioned were in the Self Assessment Survey within the SET. This includes the definition of school-wide: “School-wide is defined as involving all students, all staff, and all settings” (Todd et al., 2012, p. 163).

Across the tools, the phrase, *all students*, was mentioned in reference to expectations taught to students, expectations of students, participation of students in the SET process, and the definition of school-wide. The phrase *all students* was mentioned in the SET manual a total of 12 times. However, only two of these occurred outside of the sample documents. The first of these mentions was in the PBIS Background Information: “The goal of PBIS is to prevent the development and the intensifying of problem behavior and maximize academic success for all students” (Todd et al., 2012, p. 116). The other mention of *all students* was in the frequently asked questions section of the manual regarding allowing all students in a group to answer questions.

**References to general and special educators.** General and special educators were only mentioned in the SET Manual and the TIC. In the SET manual, the respondent to the Self Assessment Survey was instructed to indicate their role, and there is a note that the PBIS team should include a special educator and general educator. The TIC also mentioned that the SWPBS team should include a special educator. The particular licensure of special educator (e.g., teacher of students with “mild” or “significant” disabilities) was not included in any tool.

**Disabilities.** The term *disabilities* only appeared one time across all of the tools; the term *disability* was not used. In the SET manual, *disabilities* appeared as part of a definition of harassment listed in the “Definitions for Behavior Tracking Form.” A student may be harassing or bullying others if they deliver “disrespectful messages to another person” based upon, among others, *disabilities* (Todd et al., 2012, p. 137).

**References to a portion of students or staff.** Across the tools, we found use of various terms that made reference to portions of students, teachers, staff, or classrooms including: *almost, nearly, most, some, several, and many*. Within the SET scoring guide, TIC, and the BoQ scoring guide, there were also uses of percentages either with exact percentages or “large percentage.” We found these terms used in reference to giving and receiving rewards; teaching of behavioral expectations; responding to inappropriate behavior; and classroom rules, routines, and procedures.

**Rewards.** In the BoQ Scoring Guide and the SET, several benchmarks refer to the system of rewards in place at the school. For example, the BoQ Scoring Guide Benchmark 52 is “Staff use reward system appropriately” (Kincaid et al., 2010, p. 12). The scores range from *almost all staff* (3 points) to *few staff* (0 points) “understand and use identified guidelines for reward system” (Kincaid et al., 2010, p. 12). Therefore, a school could receive a high score of 3 for Benchmark 52, even if 10% of the staff are not using the reward system appropriately. The SET Scoring Guide also included evaluation questions about the portion of students who have received a reward and a portion of staff who have delivered a reward (Todd et al., 2012).

**Teaching expectations.** The SET and the BoQ Scoring Guide also include indicators of a portion of faculty teaching the behavioral expectations. For example, item B2 in the SET Scoring Guide asks if “90% of staff asked state that teaching of behavioral expectations to students has occurred this year?” (Todd et al., 2012, p. 5). Similarly, the BoQ Scoring Guide Benchmark 32 is “Lessons are embedded into subject area curriculum” (Kincaid et al., 2010, p. 7). Then, the scoring for that benchmark ranges from “nearly all teachers,” to “about 50% of teachers, to “less than 50% of teachers.”

***Responding to inappropriate behavior.*** The BoQ also includes a benchmark for the staff use of the “referral process (including which behaviors are office managed vs. which are teacher managed)” (Kincaid et al., 2010, p. 12). The range of scores is similar to other benchmarks in the BoQ in that a school can receive a score of 3 (the highest rating) if “almost all staff know the procedures for responding to inappropriate behavior” (Kincaid et al., 2010, p. 12). Although slightly different, the SET also includes scoring items related to staff response to inappropriate behavior. For example, the SET asks if 90% of staff agree with the principal about which behaviors are managed by the office, the procedures for handling emergencies, and that behavior data is used to make decisions (Todd et al., 2012).

***Classroom rules, routines, and procedures.*** In the BoQ Scoring Guide, several benchmarks refer to classroom rules, routines, and procedures. The ratings for these items range from “evident in most classrooms” or “> 75% of classrooms” (2 points) to “evident in only a few classrooms” or “less than 50% of classrooms” (0 points; Kincaid et al., 2010, p. 10). For example, one of the benchmarks refers to the posting of classroom rules and procedures. Another benchmark is “expected behavior routines in classroom are taught” (Kincaid et al., 2010, p. 10).

### **Discussion**

A review of the SWPBS literature revealed researchers referenced over a dozen evaluation tools, with the most frequently cited between 2010 and 2016 being the SET, the TIC, and the BoQ. Analysis of these tools revealed no explicit reference to students with, or teachers of students with, significant disabilities. In fact, reference to specific groups of students and teachers in general was absent, with little reference made to general or special education teachers, or students with disabilities.

This finding of generality is not surprising, given the stated aim of SWPBS to focus on *all* students and staff. However, references to all students and all staff appeared in the tools when discussing “behind the scenes” aspects of SWPBS not directly impacting students, occurring at the systems or data levels of PBS. . For example: ensuring membership on SWPBS teams is available to all staff; that all staff should teach expectations to students; and that all students can participate in the SET process. Conversely, exceptions to all staff and students, by using limiters such as “some,” “most,” or a proportion, appear in SWPBS evaluation tools when SWPBS directly impacts students. For example, *almost all* or *most* staff might provide rewards, teach behavioral expectations, or know how to respond to inappropriate behaviors. Thus, loopholes arise which may enable schools to persist in omitting students with significant disabilities in SWPBS efforts.

### **SWPBS Evaluation Tool Loopholes**

Given the findings of this analysis, and the loopholes that exist, it is possible for some students, staff, or classrooms to be left out of the SWPBS evaluation process. At great risk of being left out are those students with significant disabilities who are routinely taught outside of the mainstream in self-contained classrooms and even separate schools (Kurth et al., 2014), and therefore remain absent from universal SWPBS instruction and activities. Thus, while SWPBS has potential to advance inclusive practices using tiered approaches that meet the needs of all students (Freeman et al., 2006), the reality is many will interpret SWPBS as another continuum with intensive interventions delivered in separate settings (Brown & Michaels, 2006). This poses a risk for students in separate settings because they may have limited access to the elements of tier 1 and tier 2 SWPBS.

We propose the omission of learners with significant disabilities and their teachers from SWPBS evaluation tools is problematic for at least two reasons. First, because students with significant disabilities are customarily physically and practically segregated from the whole school experience, special education teachers and paraprofessionals tend to provide intensive, individualized tertiary interventions using behavior management and consequence systems that are out of alignment to SWPBS (Hawken & O'Neill, 2006). Consequently, discipline issues are insular with little, to no, oversight from school administrators. This lack of oversight, coupled with a lack of preventative supports and instruction, increases the risk of restraint and seclusion as reactionary measures to student challenging behaviors (Amos, 2004).

For example, one of the items in the evaluation tools is a system for determining which behaviors are managed in the classroom and which behaviors the office staff handles (Kincaid et al., 2010). If this system is not well-developed for students with significant disabilities, a lack of documentation of these behaviors may exist if the behaviors are only managed in the classroom. This could lead to lack of administrative and district support for the teachers in addressing the student's serious behaviors simply because the administration is not aware of the behaviors are occurring. This is particularly concerning because of the behavior support needs of students with significant disabilities and the fact that evidence suggests students with significant disabilities are at greater risk of experiencing seclusion and restraint at school compared to students in any other disability category (Westling, Trader, Smith, & Marshall, 2010). Therefore, the presence of evaluation loopholes that could directly impact students with significant disabilities allows researchers and school teams to avoid examining practices that truly impact *all* students across *all three* tiers of the SWPBS framework, which has the potential to inadvertently maintain separate, exclusionary practices for this sub-group of students.

A second reason we believe the omission of explicit reference to students with significant disabilities in SWPBS evaluation tools is problematic is this exclusion allows evaluators to refrain from examining practices across the *entire* school. That is, there are no cues in the examined SWPBS tools to prompt evaluators to examine SWPBS supports provided to students with significant disabilities or students in self-contained classrooms. As a consequence, it is not possible to evaluate the types of supports and instruction these students are receiving. Many presume students with significant disabilities receive exclusively intensive, tier 3 supports (Brown & Michaels, 2006). Thus, it is unlikely school personnel will acquire skills to develop coordinated, cumulative multi-tiered systems of support that could positively impact learners with significant disabilities.

### **Limitations**

Before discussing the implications of our findings, we must recognize the limitations of the present study. First, the extent to which schools use the SWPBS evaluation tools cited in the research literature is unknown. It is possible schools use evaluation tools other than those examined here (SET, TIC, and BoQ), and that those tools used by schools are more explicit in evaluating the presence and participation of students with significant disabilities and their teachers. Second, it is possible schools take measures to include these students and their teachers without explicit cues to do so. In our experience in schools, however, this is not the case. Nevertheless, further research should examine the extent to which students with significant disabilities and their teachers participate in SWPBS instruction and evaluation, across all tiers. Third, we acknowledge students with emotional behavioral disorders (EBD) are also among the students most likely to be taught in self-contained, separate classrooms and schools (McLeskey, Landers, Williamson, & Hoppey, 2012). Like students with significant disabilities, students with



EBD may greatly benefit from SWPBS. Future research should examine the inclusion of students with EBD, who are taught primarily or entirely in separate classrooms, in SWPBS evaluations and instruction.

### **Recommendations and Implications**

Presently, there is an assumed inclusion of all students and staff in SWPBS evaluation, instruction, and activities. The extent to which students with significant disabilities are part of the schoolwide system, despite their physical removal from general education classrooms and activities (e.g., Kurth et al., 2014) remains unclear. Further, the extent to which students with significant disabilities can and will benefit from SWPBS remains uncertain (Hawken & O'Neill, 2006). However, assuming students with significant disabilities constitute the student body (all students), and further assuming they may derive some benefit from SWPBS, efforts must be made to improve participation of this group in SWPBS evaluations and activities. Four recommendations are derived from these assumptions and the findings of this study.

First, SWPBS evaluation tools should include explicit directives to consider the inclusion of students with significant disabilities in SWPBS evaluations. Providing explanations and guidance for obtaining input and participation of students with significant and disabilities and their teachers should be added. For example, the SET and TIC presently provide instructions to include special education teachers in the evaluation. These directions could be expanded to specify the inclusion of special education teachers working in self-contained classrooms. Relatedly, a shift from use of the word “all,” which takes a macro-, group-level view, to the word “each,” which focuses attention on individuals, may be beneficial. It’s possible that reference to each student, and each staff member, will more specifically ensure that truly each and every student and staff is part of SWPBS efforts.

Second, to facilitate representation from students with significant disabilities and their teachers in SWPBS evaluations, guidance may be offered within the tools to use approaches that target a truly random selection of students and staff, such as a lottery. This approach could minimize the loopholes we have articulated, particularly related to the scores in the SET and BoQ which refer to some, most, and proportions of students and staff. Using the lottery approach, it is possible that, even if only a proportion of staff or students demonstrate the behavior or knowledge, there is an improved chance those representing students who have significant disabilities will be included in this calculus.

Third, the findings of this study serve as a reminder that, even without explicit or implicit directives or guidelines, practitioners should be mindful of participation of students served in self-contained classrooms, those students with extensive support needs (such as communication support needs), and those with intellectual disability should be included in SWPBS evaluations and activities. That is, regardless of directives or guidance from the tools themselves, we urge practitioners to embrace the intent of *all* students and *all* staff as articulated throughout SWPBS tools, descriptions, and research. Practitioners can engage in context-relevant activities to actively recruit participation from students and teachers at their own school campuses who have not traditionally been part of SWPBS teams, evaluations, activities, or instruction. Additionally, practitioners can work to include students with significant disabilities in SWPBS efforts by ensuring their access to elements of tier one SWPBS through teaching behavior expectations across the school and including them in the schoolwide system for rewards and incentives.

Fourth and finally, researchers are urged to complete investigations of the appropriateness of SWPBS for students with significant disabilities and the degree to which these students are included in all tiers of SWPBS instruction and activities. With this data in

hand, researchers can then describe how instruction and evaluation includes students with significant disabilities in all tiers of instruction. Lastly, research describing the tools used by schools, and how schools use tools to include the needs of students with significant disabilities in SWPBS evaluations, is needed.

## References

- Amos, P. A. (2004). New considerations in the prevention of aversives, restraint, and seclusion: Incorporating the role of relationships into an ecological perspective. *Research and Practice for Persons with Severe Disabilities, 29*, 263-272.  
doi:<http://dx.doi.org/10.2511/rpsd.29.4.263>
- Andreou, T. E., McIntosh, K., Ross, S. W., & Kahn, J. D. (2014). Critical incidents in sustaining school-wide positive behavioral interventions and supports. *The Journal of Special Education. doi:10.1177/0022466914554298*
- Bambara, L. M., & Lohrmann, S. (2006). Introduction to special issue on severe disabilities and school-wide positive behavior support. *Research & Practice for Persons with Severe Disabilities, 31*, 1-3. doi: 10.2511/rpsd.31.1.1
- Brown, F., & Michaels, C. A. (2006). School-wide positive behavior support initiatives and students with severe disabilities: A time for reflection. *Research and Practice for Persons with Severe Disabilities, 3*, 57-61. doi: 10.2511/rpsd.31.1.57
- Buschbacher, P., Fox, L., & Clarke, S. (2004). Recapturing desired family routines: A parent-professional behavioral collaboration. *Research & Practice for Persons with Severe Disabilities, 29*, 25-39.
- Carr, E. G., Dunlap, G., Horner, R., Koegel, R., Turnbull, A., Sailor, W., . . . Fox, L. (2002). Positive behavior support: Evolution of an applied science. *Journal of Positive Behavior Interventions, 4*, 4-16.
- Crimmins, D., & Farrell, A. F. (2006). Individualized behavioral supports at 15 years: It's still lonely at the top. *Research & Practice for Persons with Severe Disabilities, 31*, 31-45.  
doi: 10.2511/rpsd.31.1.31

Freeman, R., Eber, L., Anderson, C., Irvin, L., Horner, R., Bounds, M., & Dunlap, G. (2006).

Building inclusive school cultures using school-wide positive behavior support:

Designing effective individual support systems for students with significant disabilities.

*Research and Practice for Persons with Severe Disabilities, 31*, 4-17. doi:

10.2511/rpsd.31.1.4

Hawken, L. S., & O'Neill, R. E. (2006). Including students with severe disabilities in all levels of

school-wide positive behavior support. *Research & Practice for Persons with Severe*

*Disabilities, 31*, 46-53. doi: 10.2511/rpsd.31.1.46

Hetzroni, O. E., & Roth, T. (2003). Effects of a Positive Support Approach to Enhance

Communicative Behaviors of Children with Mental Retardation who have Challenging

Behaviors. *Education & Training in Developmental Disabilities, 38*, 95-105.

Horner, R., Kincaid, D., Sugai, G., Lewis, T., Eber, L., Barrett, S., . . . Johnson, N. (2014).

Scaling up school-wide positive behavioral interventions and supports: Experiences of

seven states with documented success. *Journal of Positive Behavior Interventions, 16*,

197-208.

Houchins, D. E., Jolivet, K., Wessendorf, S., McGlynn, M., & Nelson, C. M. (2005).

Stakeholders' view of implementing positive behavioral support in a juvenile justice

setting. *Education & Treatment of Children, 28*, 380-399.

Hsieh, H.-F., & Shannon, S. E. (2005). Three approaches to qualitative content analysis.

*Qualitative Health Research, 15*, 1277-1288.

Individuals with Disabilities Education Improvement Act, H.R. 1350, Pub. L. No. P.L. 108-446

(2004).

- Kennedy, C. (2004). Students with severe disabilities. In C. Kennedy & E. Horn (Eds.), *Including students with severe disabilities* (pp. 3-14). Boston, MA: Allyn & Bacon.
- Kincaid, D., Childs, K., & George, H. (2010). *Benchmarks of quality*. University of South Florida: Tampa, FL2
- Kincaid, D., Dunlap, G., Kern, L., Lane, K. L., Bambara, L. M., Brown, F., . . . Knoster, T. P. (2016). Positive behavior support: A proposal for updating and refining the definition. *Journal of Positive Behavior Interventions, 18*, 69-73. doi:10.1177/1098300715604826
- Kurth, J. A., & Enyart, M. (2016). Schoolwide positive behavior supports and students with significant disabilities: Where are we? *Research & Practice for Persons with Severe Disabilities*. doi:10.1177/1540796916633083
- Kurth, J. A., Morningstar, M. E., & Kozleski, E. (2014). The persistence of highly restrictive special education placements for students with low-incidence disabilities. *Research & Practice for Persons with Severe Disabilities, 39*, 227-239. doi:10.1177/1540796914555580
- Landers, E., Courtade, G., & Ryndak, D. (2012). Including students with severe disabilities in school-wide positive behavioral interventions and supports: Perceptions of state coordinators. *Research & Practice for Persons with Severe Disabilities, 37*, 1-8. doi: 10.2511/027494812800903256
- Lee, S.-H., Poston, D., & Poston, A. J. (2007). Lessons learned through implementing a positive behavior support intervention at home: A case study on self-management with a student with autism and his mother. *Education & Training in Developmental Disabilities, 42*, 418-427.

- McClellan, B., & Grey, I. (2012). An evaluation of an intervention sequence outline in positive behavior support for people with autism and severe escape-motivated challenging behaviour. *Journal of Intellectual & Developmental Disability, 37*, 209-220.
- McIntosh, K., Bennett, J. L., & Price, K. (2011). Evaluation of social and academic effects of school-wide positive behaviour support in a Canadian school district. *Exceptionality Education International, 21*, 46-60.
- McLeskey, J., Landers, E., Williamson, P., & Hoppey, D. (2012). Are we moving toward educating students with disabilities in less restrictive settings? *Journal of Special Education, 46*, 131-140.
- Ross, S. W., & Horner, R. (2014). Bully prevention in positive behavior support: Preliminary evaluation of third-, fourth-, and fifth-grade attitudes toward bullying. *Journal of Emotional and Behavioral Disorders, 22*, 225-236.
- Sanchez, S., Miltenberber, R. G., Kincaid, D., & Cho Blair, K. (2015). Evaluating check-in check-out with peer tutors for children with attention maintained problem behaviors. *Child & Family Behavior Therapy, 37*, 285-302.
- Schelling, A. L., & Harris, M. L. (2016). School-wide positive behavioral interventions and supports: A snapshot of implementation in schools serving students with significant disabilities. *Journal of Positive Behavior Interventions*. doi:10.1177/1098300716632360
- Simmons, D. C., Kameenui, E. J., Good, R. H., III, Harn, B. A., Cole, C., & Braun, D. (2002). Building, implementing, and sustaining a beginning reading improvement model: Lessons learned school by school. In M. R. Shinn, H. M. Walker, & G. Stoner (Eds.), *Interventions for academic and behavior problems II: Preventative and remedial approaches* (pp. 537-569). Bethesda, MD: NASP.

- Sugai, G., Horner, R. H., Lewis-Palmer, T., & Rossetto Dickey, C. (2012). *Team implementation checklist version 3.1*. Educational and community supports: University of Oregon.
- Sugai, G., Lewis-Palmer, T., Todd, A. W., & Horner, R. H. (2005). *School-wide evaluation tool version 2.1*. Educational and community supports: University of Oregon.
- Sugai, G., O'Keeffe, B. V., & Fallon, L. M. (2011). A contextual consideration of culture and school-wide positive behavior support. *Journal of Positive Behavior Interventions, 14*, 197-208. doi:10.1177/1098300711426334
- Sugai, G., Simonsen, B., Bradshaw, C., Horner, R., & Lewis, T. J. (2014). Delivering high quality school-wide positive behavior support. In J. McLeskey, N. L. Waldron, F. Spooner, & B. Algozzine (Eds.), *Handbook of effective inclusive schools: Research and practice* (pp. 306-321). New York, NY: Routledge.
- Todd, A. W., Lewis-Palmer, T., Horner, R. H., Sugai, G., Sampson, N. K., & Phillips, D. (2012). *School-wide evaluation tool (SET) implementation manual, version 2.0*. OSEP Center on Positive Behavioral Interventions and Supports: University of Oregon.
- Westling, D., Trader, B. R., Smith, C. A., & Marshall, D. S. (2010). Use of restraints, seclusion, and aversive procedures on students with disabilities. *Research and Practice for Persons with Severe Disabilities, 35*, 116-217.
- Wolfsenberger, W. (1972). *The principle of normalization in human services*. Toronto: National Institute on Mental Retardation.



Table 1

*SWPBS Evaluation Tools Mentioned in Reviewed Literature*

<b>Tool</b>	<i>N</i>	<i>%</i>
Schoolwide Evaluation Tool	57	45.2%
Team Implementation Checklist	15	11.9%
Benchmarks of Quality	14	11.1%
Implementation Phases Inventory	7	5.6%
Schoolwide Universal Behavior Sustainability Index	7	5.6%
Self-Assessment Survey	6	4.8%
Effective Behavior Self-Assessment Survey	5	4%
Effective Behavior Support Survey	5	4%
Preschool Evaluation Tool	4	3.2%
Facility Evaluation Tool	3	2.4%
School Assessment Survey	2	1.6%
Individual Student Systems Evaluation Tool	1	0.8%
Total mentions of a tool:	126	100%

Table 2

*Relationship Between Terms and SWPBS Elements*

Term	“Behind the Scenes”			Impacts Students				
	Rules / Expectations	Team Membership	Staff Training	Praise / Rewards	Responding to behaviors	Handling emergencies	Discipline data used	Teaching students
All classrooms								
All teachers								
All staff	X	X	X					X
All grades								
All students								X
Disabilit*								
General								
Special		X						
Almost	X			X	X			
Nearly								X
Percentage	X	X		X	X	X	X	X
Most	X			X	X		X	X
Some				X	X		X	
Several								
Many	X			X	X		X	X
Few	X			X	X		X	X

*Note.* X = The term appeared