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Abstract

The purpose of this study was to determine the relative effectiveness and desirability of identified key components of the behavior disorders program delivered by the Wabash and Ohio Valley Special Education District in southeastern Illinois. Sixty-one school superintendents, building principals, and local coordinators of special education responded to a survey addressing key components of the behavior disorders program: technical assistance, timeliness of the Individualized Education Program process, thoroughness of the Individualized Education Program process, academic remediation, behavioral remediation, transition coordination, and follow-up services. The results revealed very little discrepancy between each of the groups of administrators according to their responses to each survey question. Consequently, the results were reported according to the group as an aggregate. The data indicate overall agreement that the current behavior disorders program provides effective services in the key component areas and strong agreement that each of the key component areas is a desirable service. Specific recommendations included development of innovative methods removing acting out children from regular education during crisis situations and returning the child to the regular program as quickly as possible, improved support and transition services for maintaining behavior disordered students in the regular program, immediate crisis intervention contingencies for inclusion in the Individualized Education Program with a thorough examination of the presenting problems, and improved curriculum addressing academic and behavioral deficits for behavior disordered students.
An Evaluation of the Behavior Disorders Classroom Program of the Wabash and Ohio Valley Special Education District

Chapter I
Introduction

Statement of the Problem

Wabash and Ohio Valley Special Education District (WOVSED) in southeastern Illinois operates self-contained classrooms for the behavior disordered. These classrooms are housed in existing public school buildings as well as alternative school settings. The high cost, explosive tendencies of the students placed in the program, individualized needs of each of the students, the multitude of approaches available for teaching the behavior disordered, intense and increased staffing requirements, and an increasingly litigious society make this a difficult population to educate in the public school setting. Since initiating the classrooms, no objective evaluation of the program had been completed in an attempt to determine the perceptions of staff members involved in administering and implementing the program.

The main purpose of this study was to determine the relative effectiveness and desirability of the behavior disorders program provided by WOVSED as perceived by member district school superintendents, building principals, and local coordinators of special education. It was anticipated that the results of this study would identify areas of strengths and weaknesses in the service delivery system and would be beneficial in the development of recommendations for program improvement.

Background and Significance of the Study
WOVSED consists of 23 school districts in nine southeastern Illinois counties, covering a geographical area of 3,417 square miles (see Appendix A). The counties served by WOVSED include: Edwards, Wayne, White, Wabash, Hamilton, Pope, Hardin, Gallatin, and Saline. The larger communities in the area include: Mt. Carmel, Albion, Fairfield, Carmi, McLeansboro, Eldorado, and Harrisburg. Other smaller communities include Golconda, Elizabethtown, Carrier Mills, Old and New Shawneetown, Galatia, Norris City, Grayville, Wayne City, Cisne, and Dahlgren. The Wabash and Ohio river basins define the geographical area that includes a major portion of the Shawnee National Forest in the southern area.

This area is one of the most economically depressed geographic regions in Illinois. The Illinois Department of Labor, Division of Employment Security (1995) documents the jobless rate in the nine county area is as follows:

<p>| | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Edwards</td>
<td>11.3%</td>
<td>5. Pope</td>
<td>16.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Gallatin</td>
<td>15.6%</td>
<td>6. Saline</td>
<td>12.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Hamilton</td>
<td>27.5%</td>
<td>7. Wabash</td>
<td>16.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Hardin</td>
<td>09.2%</td>
<td>8. Wayne</td>
<td>13.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>9. White</td>
<td>13.9%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Traditionally, the primary sources of employment in the area have been mining, agriculture, education, small town commerce, and light industry. However, the service industry is the only job area increasing in the entire area. Employment is difficult to find.
Educational services provided by the cooperative for its member districts include psychological evaluations, outside referrals for medical and psychiatric evaluations, physical and occupational therapy, social work, instructional coordination and supervision of special programs, hard-of-hearing, visually impaired, behavior disordered and communication disordered classroom programming, hearing and vision diagnosis, early childhood mass screening, diagnosis, consultation and instruction. Generally, services are provided to students by written referral to the local school district from school personnel, outside agency, parents or students. A Multi-Disciplinary Team determines specific special education and related services based on the individual educational needs of each child.

In response to the need to adequately provide educational services for students eligible for special education services in the category of behavior disorders, WOVSED initially developed five tuition based self-contained classrooms housed in various school districts within the cooperative's geographical boundaries. The classrooms were established in 1987. The current program includes 11 classrooms, 11 certified and 20 non-certified classroom teachers and program assistants, school social workers, school psychologists, school to work transition coordinators, and an administrative assistant. The program serves approximately 100 students with behavior disorders at any time during the school year. The current classroom locations and the age range served by each one are as follows: Mt. Carmel High School (9-12), Mt. Carmel North School (5-8), Mt. Carmel South School (K-4), Edwards County K-12 (6-10), Carmi Middle School (5-8), Eldorado High School
(9-12), Mill Shoals Attendance Center (9-12), and the Glassford Education Center (1-4) (5-6) and (7-8).

Some behaviorally disordered students have very serious problems in school that interfere with their learning and the learning of other children in the class. These problems may be so severe that the student is placed in a self-contained program. The primary purpose of this type of classroom is for proactive treatment and remediation.

Most students who are placed in self-contained classrooms for the behaviorally disordered are there because of misbehavior and/or skill deficiencies so severe that they cannot be taught effectively in a regular education setting, part-time special education or a full-time cross-categorical classroom. Disruptive behaviors are frequently directed toward the external environment (adults, peers, or property). Such behaviors as noncompliance, tantrums, vandalism, verbal aggression, physical aggression, arguing, inattentiveness, and theft are common, and are excesses in the sense that they occur frequently, intensely, and an extended duration.

Some students are placed because of problems that do not affect the external environment as much as they reflect problems within the self. Shyness, anxiety, fear, worry, bodily complaints, social withdrawal, social misperception, and depression are examples of internalized behavior or emotional problems.

Although some students with internalizing emotional disorders are placed in self-contained classrooms, most of these students can be educated in less restrictive settings. Thus, the majority of students placed in self-contained classrooms demonstrate externalized behavior disorders.
Systematic behavior management strategies are the cornerstones of these programs. The ultimate goal of these strategies is to internalize appropriate behaviors so they become the students' "modus operandi." This is attempted by:

1. decreasing inappropriate behaviors.
2. increasing survival skills in social and academic areas.
3. transferring behavioral control from external sources to internal sources.
4. facilitating generalization to less restrictive educational settings.

The self-contained WOVSED behavior disorders classroom uses a three-tiered behavior management system (see Appendix B) as a shaping, fading, and generalization tool within the classroom. At the beginning levels, externalizing behaviors are decreased, in the middle levels basic academic and social skills are taught, and in the upper levels self-control procedures and generalization skills are taught. A major function of this approach is to transfer control from external behavior management to more internal self-control by the student. This model of classroom management is a systematic approach that emphasizes timely placement in less restrictive educational settings with improved social and academic skills. An integral component of the program is the daily communication with families via the "school note" (see Appendix C).

In many circumstances, a student already has behavior disorders eligibility before being considered for a self-contained placement. The criteria for placement in this program are highly individualized. In general, the Multi-Disciplinary Conference (MDC) participants must concur that the degree of severity, frequency, and intensity of the student's behavior disorder is such that the student cannot be contained in a regular education, resource, cross categorical, or other special
education class. A current psychological evaluation must be available, as well as documentation of intervention strategies that have been used.

To be considered for placement, a student must exhibit affective and/or adaptive behavior problems in at least two areas that significantly interfere with school success. Those areas are:

1. an inability to build or maintain satisfactory interpersonal relationships with others, (peers, staff, other school authorities).
2. inappropriate types of behavior or an inability to function in normal circumstances.
3. inappropriate types of feelings or a general feeling of unhappiness and despair under normal circumstances.
4. physical symptoms or fears associated with school and/or personal problems.

The behaviors in question do not include those which are age and/or developmentally appropriate or behaviors that occur primarily as a result of cultural differences. Self-contained placement is not designed for an individual for whom substance abuse or truancy is the sole condition.

Referral for placement in a self-contained program is initiated at the local level. A Student Review Team conference is held, and further evaluation is conducted on an individual basis. Following the evaluation and collection of data, an IEP conference is held to determine goals, objectives, and appropriate educational placement.

During the eight years since program implementation no formal assessment of program effectiveness has been completed. It was anticipated that successful
completion of this study would culminate with recommendations for improvement of services to students receiving special education services in the area of behavior disorders within the nine-county special education cooperative.

Research Questions

Using a survey instrument, the study was designed to assess the following research questions:

1. What was the perception of each respondent within his/her respective school district as to the current effectiveness and desirability regarding technical assistance for maintaining behavior disordered students in the regular program?

2. What was the perception of each respondent within his/her respective school district as to the current effectiveness and desirability of timely IEP meetings?

3. What was the perception of each respondent within his/her respective school district as to the current effectiveness and desirability of thorough IEP meetings?

4. What was the perception of each respondent within his/her respective school district as to the current effectiveness and desirability of remedying academic deficits of behaviorally disordered students?

5. What was the perception of each respondent within his/her respective school district as to the current effectiveness and desirability regarding remedying behavioral deficits of behavior disordered students?
6. What was the perception of each respondent within his/her respective school district as to the current effectiveness and desirability regarding services to students transitioning into mainstream educational settings?

7. What was the perception of each respondent within his/her respective school district as to the current effectiveness and desirability regarding follow-up services to students transitioned into mainstream educational settings?

Operational Definitions, Assumptions, Delimitations

Operational Definitions

For the purposes of this study the following definitions will be used throughout the study:

Behavior Difficulties
See Behavior Disordered

Behaviorally Challenging
See Behavior Disordered

Behavior Disordered

Students evaluated and receiving special education services according to State of Illinois guidelines. According to the Illinois State Board of Education (1992) "the term means a condition exhibiting one or more of the following characteristics over an extended period of time and to a marked degree, which adversely affects educational performance, even after supportive assistance has been provided. The student must demonstrate an inability to learn which cannot be explained by intellectual, sensory, health, cultural, or linguistic factors; an inability to develop or maintain satisfactory interpersonal relationships with peers
and adults; or inappropriate types of behavior or feelings under normal circumstances; or a general pervasive mood of anxiety, unhappiness, depression; or a tendency to develop physical symptoms or fears associated with personal or school problems" (p. 3).

Building Principal
The building level administrator in charge of the day to day building operations in each district targeted for response in this field study.

Local Coordinator of Special Education
The local district designee with authority to commit district services for special education students.

Respondent Group
Group of area superintendents, local coordinators of special education, and teachers of the behavior disordered responding to the study survey.

Service Delivery Area
Nine county geographic area served by WOVSED.

Special Education
Services delivered by WOVSED staff.

Superintendent
The contracted chief executive of each of the school districts targeted for response in this field study.

Wabash and Ohio Valley Special Education
A special education cooperative providing services in a nine county region in southeastern Illinois.

Assumptions
For the purposes of this study, the author assumed that each of the respondent group members had some degree of experience regarding the behavior disorders program.

**Delimitations**

This study did not attempt to evaluate the overall delivery of special education services throughout the service delivery area. The scope of such a comprehensive evaluation lies outside the parameters of this paper and does not directly relate to the stated purpose of the study. Additionally, the administrative staff of the special education cooperative was not included in the respondent group. The author's direct involvement in program implementation was the primary reason for this exclusion.

The author limited the respondent group to the group of school superintendents, local coordinators of special education, and building principals within the geographic borders of the WOVSED. The author considered the respondent group a natural limitation for this study given the stated purpose of developing recommendations for program improvement within the previously stated geographic area.

In a small number of the targeted school districts, individual targeted respondents served in all three capacities as superintendent, principal, and local special education coordinator. The individual responses were included in the group indicated as his/her primary area of responsibility.
Chapter II

Literature Review and Related Research

In an attempt to complete a comprehensive literature review for this study, the author accessed ERIC, ERIX, and BEHA databases on-line from the University of Illinois, the University of Missouri, and Southern Illinois University current through April 15, 1996. An additional search via the World Wide Web provided the author literature and other sources for review. Literature regarding the necessity of providing special education services to those eligible for services as behavior disordered, therapy and intervention techniques, evaluations of residential treatment facilities, and statewide evaluations of special education services were found in the searches. However, the literature directly related to assessing the effectiveness and desirability of programming for the behavior disordered in the public schools as perceived by school administrators proved sparse.

Norlander (1994) reports that if teachers of students with behavior disorders are to be more effective, there must be several changes in preservice education. Teachers need training in one predominant theoretical philosophy, in remediation of academic deficits, in competent use of behavior management skills, and in writing individualized education programs.

Berryman, Evans, and Kalbag (1994) report that recent developments in behavior therapy for persons with developmental disabilities and behavior disorders emphasize positive treatment designs that focus on understanding the causes of behavior, teaching functional alternatives, and enhancing the quality of daily experiences, rather than simple contingency management. They indicate there is little information on how well direct care staff can support these non-aversive
strategies. Their study examined the effects of training in traditional positive behavior management versus non aversive principles on the understanding and attitude of direct care staff. The effectiveness of staff, as well as program evaluation, were identified as important components of the continued success of behavior therapy, especially in residential settings, both institutional and community based.

A highly structured, brisk paced instructional curriculum with behavioral intervention strategies was the focus of a multiple baseline study completed by Kinder and Bursuck (1993). Teacher perception, careful curriculum selection, behavior criteria, along with pre and post test behavioral charting indicate significant improvement over instruction that employed traditional instruction methods.

Buchard (1993) completed a program evaluation of the Alaska Youth Initiative, a community based interagency program serving children and adolescents with several emotional and behavioral disorders. Principles of the program included a no reject policy and a "wraparound" service delivery system. This concept is very similar to the Child and Adolescent Local Agency Network (C& A LAN) currently under development in Illinois. The monograph details the effect of the program on children receiving the services and includes surveys utilized to gather data from staff and families regarding program effectiveness.

A study to assess the effectiveness of determining eligibility and placement of students in the areas of leaning disabilities, behavioral disorders, and speech/language and to assess the effectiveness of preassessment instructional programming options used prior to placement of students in Kansas was completed
by the Department of Education (1988). The study uncovered three essential factors differentiating successful from unsuccessful programs:

1. accurately describing the student's problem
2. using direct, appropriate interventions
3. evaluating the outcome of interventions. Survey samples and results offer examples of questions used to gain objective, measurable results regarding perceptions of program effectiveness.

Swan (1987) prepared the final report of a one year reset project on the characteristics of seriously emotionally disturbed and severely behaviorally disordered students served by the Georgia Psychoeducational Program Network during 1984-85. Survey questionnaire samples and results describe objective measuring techniques for data collection in educational background and professional experience of classroom, clinical, and administrative personnel. Cost effectiveness, alternative treatment packages, and pupil demographic characteristics were examined.

To gain more information about the skills needed and used by teachers of students with serious emotional disturbance, 19 teachers of the behavior disordered were surveyed to determine the amount of time, level of importance, and perceived adequacy of training received on 20 teacher competencies in six major task areas. Examples of survey development, response techniques, and data analysis are included in the study (Denti and Atkinson, 1994).

Bramlett (1993) examined barriers facing rural schools in serving students at-risk and the perceptions of teachers, parents, and administrators related to the difficulty in changing theses barriers. Seventeen rural school districts participated
and the study collected 846 responses. The survey items were ranked on a Likert scale. The studies appendix included survey examples and response tabulation methods.

The review of literature and related research provided insight into methods of gathering program evaluation data in an objective fashion. Survey examples and methods of data tabulation and reporting proved valuable in the completion of this study.
Chapter III
Design of the Study

This study included twenty-three school districts comprising the member districts of the WOVSED. A survey instrument obtained data from each of the superintendents, principals, and local coordinators of special education from each member district. Each respondent answered questions developed to address the main objectives of the study: technical assistance, timeliness of the IEP process, thoroughness of the IEP process, academic remediation, behavior remediation, transition coordination, and follow-up services. WOVSED administrative staff field tested the survey instrument prior to implementation by responding to each question and providing feedback on clarity and suggestions for improvement.

The author mailed the survey instrument to each targeted respondent. Responses to the survey were kept confidential. Each survey was coded for follow-up purposes only. No district or individual was identified by name in the analysis. Provisions were made for respondents to receive a result of the findings of the study upon request. Mailing of each survey provided each targeted respondent with a self-addressed, stamped envelope to return the completed survey to the researcher. A one-week turn-around time-table was allowed. A follow-up phone call was made if completed surveys were not returned within that time frame. Additional copies of the survey instrument were faxed to the follow-up respondent upon request. Completion of the survey instrument afforded the respondent the opportunity to express opinions regarding questions developed addressing each specific research question identified in the main objectives of this study.
Behavior Disorders Evaluation

Upon receipt of the completed survey instruments, the results were analyzed by the researcher according to basic respondent demographic information and specifically by each objective. The returned surveys were tabulated electronically using a Macintosh 520c Powerbook computer and Excel 5.0 software. General information gained about the respondent group consisted of current position, total years of experience in current position, type of district, and district enrollment. A Likert scale measured perceptions of respondents by eliciting their responses to questions developed for each specific goal area.

Selection of a survey instrument that would provide appropriate data for measurement and evaluation of data occurred. The researcher developed the survey instrument. Specific survey administration procedures were determined. Field testing of the survey instrument occurred with WOVSED administrative staff on March 22, 1996. A revised version of the survey instrument was mailed to each respondent on March 27, 1996 (see Appendix D). A cover letter accompanied the survey. The cover letter provided information as to the purpose of the survey (see Appendix E). Also, the letter explained who was chosen to participate in the field study. Anonymity was assured. Each survey return envelope was coded for identification, allowing the researcher to insure a high return rate. The researcher provided respondents with the opportunity to receive the field study results. A self-addressed, stamped envelope accompanied the survey instrument to facilitate accurate and prompt return of the survey instruments to the researcher. If return of the surveys had not been accomplished by April 9, 1996, a follow-up phone call was made in an attempt to increase the rate of return. A faxed copy of the survey
instrument was supplied to the respondent upon request. On April 13, 1996, the returned envelopes were opened and electronic compilation of the data began.
Chapter IV
Results and Conclusions

Overview

The purpose of this project was to determine the relative effectiveness and desirability regarding key components of the behavior disorders program provided by WOVSED as perceived by member district school superintendents, building principals, and local coordinators of special education. This field experience surveyed the opinions of 68 school administrators regarding their perceptions of the desirability and effectiveness of the WOVSED behavior disorders program in seven specific areas. Of the targeted 68 school administrators, 61 (90%) responded to the survey. A cursory review of the data revealed very little discrepancy between the mean of each of the groups compared to the mean of the total (see figure 1). Therefore, the mean response of the entire survey population was reported for each research question.

To investigate the research questions, a survey instrument was developed to assess the opinions of each of the targeted respondent groups in seven areas: technical assistance, timeliness of the IEP process, thoroughness of the IEP process, academic remediation, behavior remediation, transition coordination, and follow-up services.

The survey results were analyzed by entering the individual responses into a spreadsheet developed in Excel 5.0, operating on a Macintosh 520c Powerbook. Responses to the demographic information were assigned numeric value and the results tabulated and reported accordingly. Results from the Likert scale questions were entered individually and results were tabulated on each question by number of
respondents indicating strongly disagree, disagree, neither agree nor disagree, agree, or strongly agree. Additionally, analysis of the percentages of respondents answering the Likert scale questions and the mean of the respondent group occurred. The results were tabulated and developed graphically in Microsoft Excel 5.0. Graphic presentation of the survey results pairs the current effectiveness and desirability responses for each of the seven research question areas. Graphic representation of the data was exported from Excel 5.0 to Microsoft Word 5.1a where the narrative descriptions were developed.

Figure 1

Respondent Demographic Information

Analysis of the data regarding the respondent group revealed that 21 of the 61 respondents (34%) reported their primary role as superintendent of their school district, 33 of the 61 (54%) reported their primary role as principal of a local
building, and seven (11%) indicated their primary role as the local coordinator of special education for their district (see figure 2).

The type of district represented by the respondent group was as follows: eight K-8 Elementary Districts (24%), five high school districts (8%), and 48 unit districts (79%) (see figure 3).

The enrollment of the districts represented by the respondent group was:
Under 100-Zero (0%), 101-200-six (10%), 201-300-one (2%), 301-400-three (5%), 401-500-six (10%), and 45 districts (73%) reported their enrollment exceeding 500 students (see figure 4).

The experience levels of the different school administrators in their current position were reported as follows: zero to five years-40 (66%), six to ten years-11 (18%), 11 to 15 years-3 (5%), 16 to 20 years-1 (2%), and six respondents (10%)
reported an experience level of over 20 years in their current position (see figure five).

Figure 3
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Specific Research Questions

Technical Assistance

Research question one asked what was the perception of each respondent within his/her respective school district as to the current effectiveness and desirability regarding technical assistance for maintaining behavior disordered students in the regular program? Three (5%) of the respondents strongly disagreed, seven (11%) disagreed, 18 (30%) neither agreed nor disagreed, 26 (43%) agreed, and seven (11%) strongly agreed that WOVSED's technical assistance in effective in enabling students with behavior difficulties to remain in the regular education program (see figure 6). The mean of the respondent group regarding survey question one was 3.44 on a 5-point scale (see figure 13). None (0%) of the
respondents strongly disagreed, seven (11%) disagreed, eight (13%) neither agreed nor disagreed, 31 (51%) agreed, and 15 (25%) of the respondents strongly agreed that it is desirable for WOVSED to provide technical assistance to enable students with behavior difficulties to remain in the regular classroom (see figure 6). The mean of the respondent group to survey question two was 3.88 on a 5-point scale (see figure 13).

**Timeliness of IEP Process**

Research question number two asked what was the perception of each respondent within his/her respective school district as to the current effectiveness and desirability of timely IEP meetings? When asked if the current IEP process for intervening with students with behavior difficulties is timely, two (3%) strongly disagreed, three (5%) disagreed, 12 (20%) neither agreed or disagreed, 38 (62%) agreed, and six (10%) of the total respondent group strongly agreed that the current IEP process is timely in intervening with students with behavior difficulties (see figure 7). The mean of the total respondent group for survey question three was 3.70 on a 5-point scale (see figure 13). When asked if it is desirable to have a timely IEP process for intervening with students with behavior difficulties none (0%) strongly disagreed or disagreed, three (5%) neither agreed or disagreed, 23 (38%) agreed, and 35 (57%) strongly agreed (see figure 7). The mean of the total respondent group for survey question four was 4.52 on a 5-point scale (see figure 13).
Figure 6
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Figure 7
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Question 1
Thoroughness of IEP Process

Research question number three asked what was the perception of each respondent within his/her respective school district as to the current effectiveness and desirability of thorough IEP meetings? One (2%) indicated strong disagreement, three (5%) disagreed, ten (16%) neither agreed or disagreed, 39 (64%) agreed, and eight (13%) of the total respondent group strongly agreed that the current IEP is thorough when intervening with students with behavior difficulties (see figure 8). The mean of the respondent group for survey question number five was 3.81 on a 5-point scale (see figure 13). None (0%) of the respondent group strongly disagreed or disagreed, four (7%) neither agreed or disagreed, 26 (43%) agreed, and 31 (51%) strongly agreed that it is desirable to have a thorough IEP process to intervene with students with behavior difficulties (see figure 8). The mean of the respondent group for question six was 4.44 on a 5-point scale (see figure 13).
Academic Delays

Research question number four asked what was the perception of each respondent within his/her respective school district as to the current effectiveness and desirability of remedying academic deficits of behaviorally disordered students? None (0%) strongly disagreed, seven (11%) disagreed, 36 (59%) neither agreed or disagreed, 16 (26%) agreed, and two (3%) of the total respondent group strongly agreed that the WOVSED behavior disorders program is effective at remedying academic delays for students with behavior difficulties (see figure 9). The mean of the total respondent group for survey question seven was 3.21 on a 5-point scale (see figure 13). No respondent strongly disagreed, one respondent (2%) disagreed, eight respondents (13%) neither agreed or disagreed, 31 respondents (51%) agreed, and 21 (34%) strongly agreed that it is desirable to have a behavior disorders program that remedies academic delays (see figure 9). The mean of the respondent group for survey question eight was 4.18 on a 5-point scale (see figure 13).

Remediation of Behavior Deficits

Research question number five asked what was the perception of each respondent within his/her respective school district as to the current effectiveness and desirability regarding remedying behavioral deficits of behavior disordered students? One (2%) strongly disagreed, nine (15%) disagreed, 24 (39%) neither agreed or disagreed, 25 (41%) agreed, and two (3%) of the total respondents strongly agreed that the current WOVSED behavior disorders program effectively remediates behavior deficits (see figure 10). The mean of the total group of respondents for survey question nine was 3.29 on a 5-point scale (see figure 13). One (2%) indicated strong disagreement, none (0%) disagreed, five (8%) neither
agreed or disagreed, 23 (38%) agreed, and 32 (52%) strongly agreed that effective remediation of behavior deficits is a desirable component of the behavior disorders program (see figure 10). The mean for the total group of respondents for survey question ten was 4.39 on a 5-point scale (see figure 13).

**Transition into the Regular Program**

Research question number six asked what was the perception of each respondent within his/her respective school district as to the current effectiveness and desirability regarding services to students transitioning into mainstream educational settings? None (0%) strongly disagreed, nine (15%) disagreed, 26 (43%) neither agreed or disagreed, 22 (36%) agreed, and four (7%) of the respondents strongly agreed that the current program effectively transitioned students with behavior disorders into the regular program (see figure 11). The mean of the total respondent group for survey question 11 was 3.34 on a 5-point scale (see figure 13). None (0%) strongly disagreed or disagreed, four (7%) neither agreed or disagreed, 21 (34%) agreed, and 36 (59%) strongly agreed that effective transition into the regular program was a desirable component. The mean for the total respondent group to survey question 12 was 4.52 on a 5-point scale (see figure 13).
Figure 9

Academic Delays
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<tr>
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<th>Percentage of Respondents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
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</tr>
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</tr>
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</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Question 7

Question 8

Figure 10

Remediation of Behavior Deficits

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Likert Scale Response</th>
<th>Percentage of Respondents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>60%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>40%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>30%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Question 9

Question 10
Research question seven asked what was the perception of each respondent within his/her respective school district as to the current effectiveness and desirability regarding follow-up services to students transitioned into mainstream educational settings? One (2%) strongly disagreed, 12 (20%) disagreed, 23 (38%) neither agreed or disagreed, 22 (36%) agreed, and three (5%) of the respondents strongly agreed that follow-up services to students with behavior disorders subsequent to transition are effective (see figure 12). The mean of the respondent group for survey question 13 was 3.22 on a 5-point scale (see figure 13). The final survey question asked it is desirable to have follow-up services in the regular class subsequent to transition for students with behavior disorders. No respondents strongly disagreed or disagreed with the question. Four (7%) of the respondents neither agreed or disagreed, 21 (34%) agreed, and 36 (59%) strongly agreed (see
The mean of the total group of respondents to survey question 14 was 4.52 on a 5-point scale (see figure 13).

Figure 12
Figure 13

Total Respondent Mean

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question Number</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
<th>10</th>
<th>11</th>
<th>12</th>
<th>13</th>
<th>14</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Likert Rating</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Chapter V
Summary, Findings, and Recommendations

Summary

The purpose of this project was to determine the relative effectiveness and desirability regarding key components of the behavior disorders program provided by WOVSED as perceived by member district school superintendents, building principals, and local coordinators of special education. This field experience surveyed the opinions of sixty-eight school administrators regarding their perceptions of the desirability and effectiveness of the WOVSED Behavior Disorders program in seven specific areas. To investigate the research questions, a survey instrument was developed to assess the opinions of each of the targeted respondent groups in seven areas: technical assistance, timeliness of the IEP process, thoroughness of IEP process, academic remediation, behavior remediation, transition coordination, and follow-up services.

A review of the literature and research regarding evaluation of the behavior disorders programs was included. As a result, an overview of the current behavior disorders program was presented.

Findings

61 of 68 (90%) of the superintendents, principals, and local coordinators of special education in the school districts served by WOVSED responded to a survey instrument designed to measure their opinions regarding the effectiveness and desirability of issues concerning delivery of the behavior disorders program provided by the special district. The group consisted primarily of principals and superintendents in unit districts with an enrollment of over 500 students. Although
their collective experience is varied, 40 (65%) of the respondents report they have been in their current position five or fewer years.

Research Question #1

Research question number one asked what was the perception of each respondent within his/her respective school district as to the current effectiveness and desirability regarding technical assistance for maintaining behavior disordered students in the regular program? Survey questions one and two attempted to assess the perception of each respondent within his/her respective school district as to the current effectiveness and desirability regarding technical assistance maintaining behavior disordered students in the regular program. Over one-half (54%) of the respondents either agreed or strongly agreed that the current technical assistance program was effective in enabling students with behavior difficulties to remain in the regular program. However, over three-fourths of the respondents (76%) either agreed or strongly agreed that having such technical assistance was desirable. Examination of the mean of the respondents reveals very little discrepancy between the current practice and desirability. A mean of 3.44 was tabulated reflecting current practice compared to a mean of 3.88 reflecting desirability.

Research Question #2

Research question two asked what was the perception of each respondent within his/her respective school district as to the current effectiveness and desirability of timely IEP meetings? Survey questions three and four attempted to assess the perception of each respondent within his/her respective school district as to the current effectiveness and desirability of timely IEP meetings. Nearly three-fourths of the respondents agreed or strongly agreed that the current IEP process
was timely in intervening with students with behavior problems. Additionally, more than nine out of ten respondents (95%) agreed or strongly agreed that the IEP process needs to be timely when intervening with students with behavior difficulties. While 57% of the respondents strongly agreed that the IEP process should be timely, only 10% strongly feel that the current process was timely. Examination of the mean reveals a wider discrepancy between the questions. The mean of 4.52 regarding the respondents desire to have timely IEP meetings compares with a mean of 3.70 rating of the current practice.

Research Question #3

Research question four asked what was the perception of each respondent within his/her respective school district as to the current effectiveness and desirability of thorough IEP meetings? Survey questions five and six addressed the perception of each respondent within his/her respective school district as to the current effectiveness and desirability of thorough IEP meetings. Again, the majority of respondents indicated either agreement or strong agreement with the need to thoroughly intervene in the IEP process with students with behavior difficulties. While 51% strongly agreed that a thorough IEP process was desirable, only 13% indicated they strongly agreed that the current process was thorough.

Research Question #4

Research question four asked what was the perception of each respondent within his/her respective school district as to the current effectiveness and desirability of remedying academic deficits of behaviorally disordered students? Survey questions seven and eight addressed the perception of each respondent within his/her respective school district as to the current effectiveness and
desirability of remedying academic deficits of behaviorally disordered students. 85% of the respondents either agreed or strongly agreed that a behavior disorders program that remediates academic delays was a desirable component of the behavior disorders program as addressed in survey questions seven and eight. However, only 29% indicated their opinion was that the current program was effective in doing so. The mean of the group was 4.18 while the current program was evaluated at a mean of 3.21.

Research Question #5

Research question five asked what was the perception of each respondent within his/her respective school district as to the current effectiveness and desirability regarding remedying behavioral deficits of behavior disordered students? Survey questions nine and ten were an assessment of the perception of each respondent within his/her respective school district of the current program's effectiveness at remedying behavioral deficits of behavior disordered students and the desirability of having such a component. 90% of the respondents indicated at least agreement with the desirability of such a component in the behavior disorders program. However, less than 50% expressed the opinion that the current program was effective in remediating behavior deficits. Examination of the means revealed a mean of 4.39 for desirable and a mean of 3.29 for current effectiveness.

Research Question #6

Research question six asked what was the perception of each respondent within his/her respective school district as to the current effectiveness and desirability regarding services to students transitioning into mainstream educational settings? Survey question 11 and 12 were an assessment of the perception of each
respondent within his/her respective school district as to the current effectiveness regarding services to students transitioning into mainstream educational settings and the desirability of having such a service. When asked if student's transition from the WOVSED behavior disorders program into the regular program was effectively coordinated, 15% percent disagreed, almost one-half (43%) expressed neither agreement or disagreement, and another 43% agreed or strongly agreed. By comparison, 59% indicated that they strongly agreed that effective transition from the behavior disorders program into the mainstream program was a desired component of the program. Comparison of the means indicates 3.34 regarding the current program compared to 4.52 for the desire to have effective transition into the regular program.

**Research Question #7**

Research question seven asked what was the perception of each respondent within his/her respective school district as to the current effectiveness and desirability regarding follow-up services to students transitioned into mainstream educational settings? Survey questions 13 and 14 were an assessment of the perception of each respondent within his/her respective school district as to the current effectiveness regarding follow-up services to students transitioned into mainstream educational settings and the desirability of having such services. While nearly the same percentage agreed that the current program (38%) was effective with follow-up services, 59% strongly agreed that follow-up services were a desired component. Only 5% strongly agreed that the current program effectively provided follow-up services to students subsequent to transition into the regular programs.
The mean for the question regarding the desirability of follow-up services was 4.52 compared to 3.22 for perceptions of the current program and follow-up services.

Recommendations

Technical Assistance

The data indicate that the administrators of the school districts within the geographic boundaries of WOVSED want technical assistance that will enable students with behavior difficulties to remain in the regular classroom programs. The overwhelming majority indicated agreement that a technical assistance service component was desirable. Also, the data indicate that the WOVSED program was currently providing reasonably effective technical assistance in this area. However, it was disturbing that nearly half of the respondents rated the current program in the middle or below range regarding effectiveness. WOVSED should consider examining current pre-placement intervention techniques while working with regular and special teachers in an effort to accommodate behaviorally challenging students prior to placement in behavior disorders classrooms. As the literature suggests, this area of concern exists not only within the borders of WOVSED. Behaviorally challenging students, and how to provide programs and service necessary to educate them in an appropriate least restrictive environment was a nationwide topic.

Timeliness of IEP Process

This question generated the most specific comments from the respondent group. The group indicated that given the crisis intervention nature of behavior disorders, the schools need the IEP team to convene as soon as possible. This opinion was also reflected in the data. Fifty-seven percent strongly agreed that timely intervention with the IEP was a desirable component of the program. The
data also indicates that WOVSED reacted in a timely fashion when IEP team meetings were needed. WOVSED staff should continue to react to the needs of the member districts regarding IEP's as quickly as possible. Additionally, contingencies for immediate crisis intervention should be explored and such strategies should be incorporated into the IEP when appropriate.

**Thoroughness of IEP Process**

The responses to these questions were very similar to the previous question. The group rated WOVSED's performance as adequate while expressing a strong desire for improvement. Behaviorally challenging students often present a multitude of difficulties, not necessarily specific to the school setting. Difficulties in the home and community environments often occur simultaneously with acting out behaviors at school. IEP conferences for behaviorally challenging students often become complex and involved. The data indicate a strong desire for an examination of the presenting problems and strong support that the current process accomplishes that service.

**Academic Delays**

The literature indicates that a strong academic component was a key component to successful behavior disorders programs. The data in this study indicate that the overwhelming majority (85%) of district administrators agree that a strong academic component was desired. However, over one-half of the respondents indicated ambivalence toward the program's current effort at remediating academic delays for students with behavior disorders. The WOVSED staff should closely examine current academic practices within their approach to behaviorally challenging students. Specific instructional approaches to teaching basic academic areas should
be researched and utilized within the program. A comprehensive examination of the current academic structure should be completed, including evaluation of individual academic achievement levels and growth demonstrated over time during placement in the program. Additionally, a highly structured academic environment would likely contribute substantially to an overall reduction in disruptive behaviors.

**Remediation of Behavior Deficits**

The respondent group was virtually unanimous in its opinion regarding the desirability of the behavior disorders program effectively remedying behavior deficits. Ninety percent either agreed or strongly agreed with the question. The group indicated support for the current program as well. The recommendation was for WOVSED's behavior disorders program to closely examine the current curriculum used to teach appropriate social skills. Training in aggression replacement skills for the teaching and support personnel was recommended. Specific curriculum approaches that involve a high degree of structure with the opportunity for students to succeed were supported in the literature.

**Transition Coordination**

The administrators targeted for this study were in agreement regarding the desirability of effective transition services for reintegration into the regular program. The data indicate the need for improvement in this area for the WOVSED behavior disorders program. Selection of a pilot site consisting of students from two behavior disorders classrooms, the teachers, related service personnel, regular education staff, and administration from regular and special education was recommended. This pilot site should be used to develop effective strategies for reintegration of students into the regular program. By focusing on a small group,
the program could develop, implement, and evaluate what strategies succeed or fail. Any attempt should include a method of crisis intervention that does not remove the child long-term from the regular program. Additionally, the regular and special teachers would need a team approach working with the behavior disordered child. Traditionally, the WOVSED program removes the child when a change in the level of the program occurs. An attempt should be made to find innovative ways to remove the child from the regular program in a crisis situation, but return the child as quickly as possible once the crisis passes.

**Follow-up Services**

According to the data, the current follow-up services for students with behavior disorders subsequent to transition into the regular program was one of the weaker areas. As in other areas, the administrators expressed a strong desire to have effective follow-up services for behaviorally difficult students. A close examination of existing WOVSED personnel and their respective roles regarding students participating in the regular program was recommended.

**Conclusion**

The overall evaluation of the WOVSED behavior disorders program in the seven targeted areas was viewed as positive or neutral. The mean of the total group of respondents was over 3.0 for each of the 14 questions submitted for response. However, examination of the data indicates a desire for improved services in the opinion of the administrators of the member district schools. Improved technical assistance prior to placement, timely and thorough intervention through the IEP process, effective remediation of academic and behavioral deficits, and improved
transition from placement to the mainstream with effective follow-up services were services that member districts indicated they want.
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BEHAVIOR MANAGEMENT PROGRAM

8/95
Welcome to the Wabash and Ohio Valley Special Education District Behavior Management Program. Our staff is excited about the activities that have been planned just for you and hope that you will make the time you are enrolled, educational, beneficial and enjoyable. This booklet explains the program.
THE STUDENT IS RESPONSIBLE FOR:

1. Bringing pencil, paper, any necessary supplies and issued books to school each day or make sure these items are in his/her desk for each day's assignments.

2. Greeting staff appropriately upon arrival to class.

3. Turning in homework when assigned.

4. Being in your assigned area.

5. Remaining awake, with head up during school hours.

6. Keeping your hands and your belongings to yourself.

7. Walking your waste paper to the wastebasket (not throwing it).

8. Handing in all work with your name, the date, page number and subject written at the top of the page to be graded (otherwise an F will be given for that assignment).

9. Following all classroom behavior rules.

10. Following all directions given by the staff.

ATTENDANCE:

Students are expected to be in school except when illness or doctor's appointments make it necessary to be absent for all or part of the school day. If an absence occurs or is necessary, the parent should call the classroom and inform the teacher or write a note explaining the absence when the student returns. A note or phone call from the parent(s) will make the absence EXCUSED, and work missed may be made up. Otherwise, the absence is unexcused and the work cannot be made up and all assignments will be recorded as zeros for that day and averaged as zeros in the grade book. Parent(s) will be notified when the student misses more than one day of school.
Behavior Disorders Evaluation

DRESS CODE:
1. Neat, clean, comfortable clothing appropriate for the temperature and for school will be worn.
2. Shirts must be buttoned.
3. Hats and bandannas must be removed in the classroom.
4. Coats will be removed in the classroom and hung on the coat rack unless temperature requires them to be worn (staff will make this determination).
5. Only post earrings may be worn (or clip).
6. If any student uses clothing or jewelry or other items in an inappropriate manner, they will be required to relinquish the item(s) to the staff.
7. Shoes will be worn at all times.
8. Tube tops are allowed only in the summer and only if worn under a blouse.
9. Clothes that identify drugs, a cult or a gang are not allowed.

GRADES:
Grades will be issued to students quarterly. Daily grades for daily work are recorded and averaged to determine quarter grade averages.

Grade cards will be withheld if student has lost or damaged materials, supplies, equipment, test books, etc. and damage cost has not been settled with the staff.

TOBACCO PRODUCTS, LIGHTERS, MATCHES:
No tobacco is allowed in the classroom. Any tobacco products, lighters or matches in the student's possession will be relinquished to the staff upon entrance to the building. (These items will be returned to the student upon dismissal).

DANGEROUS ITEMS:
Having in one's possession a sharp object, an object that could be used as a weapon, dangerous items, such as drugs, unauthorized medication, liquor or other prohibited items such as pornographic materials are strictly prohibited.

THE CLASSROOM LEVEL SYSTEM:
The level system is the backbone of the behavior management program in the WOVSEDA self-contained classrooms. The level system shapes behaviors, fades behavior management techniques, and generalizes new skills.

The level system is a hierarchy of skills and behaviors, a student is expected to master. It has four basic advantages:

1. Classroom rules/behaviors are explicit.
2. Visual feedback about performance is available.
3. Classroom privileges are contingent on explicit and well defined performance.
4. The system serves as a program for shaping, fading and generalizing.

The major function of the level system is to master control from external behavior management to more internal self-control by the student. Integration back into the regular curriculum will be made available based on behavioral progress contingent upon advancement within the pro-social program (Level System).

**Level I**

Level I is the most restricted of the three (3) levels and the one in which students enter the program. Level I behavioral requirements are designed to control behavioral excesses. At this level, the behavioral management techniques feature the school note, the pro-social response formation techniques, social skills training and relaxation among others.

Students will be under the supervision of staff at all times. This includes at this level, being supervised to and from the restroom and a supervised lunch in a restricted area. Students will have the opportunity to participate in scheduled break(s) during the day, if they have completed their work, stayed in their assigned areas, have no physical aggression and have earned the necessary points.

**Level II**

To enter Level II, a student must be in the school program (Level I) at least three (3) weeks. Additional criteria is maintaining 85% or above in cumulative chartered behaviors for three consecutive weeks (physical aggression, verbal aggression, object aggression, non-compliance, assigned area). The week prior all assigned areas points must be earned, 85% percent of work points must be earned and no aggression points lost. Regardless of above criteria if a student fails to maintain 80% attendance two weeks prior to movement he cannot move up to Level II.
Level II students will be allowed to go to the restroom unsupervised (with a pass), will be allowed to eat in the lunchroom (with or without supervision depending on the educational staff) and will continue to participate in break activities based on earned points. Students also will have the opportunity to participate in non-academic regular education classes.

A student will remain at Level II providing he/she maintains a 75% average in cumulative chartered behaviors through a four (4) week cycle. If a student fails to maintain a 75% average he/she will drop to Level I.

Level III

Level III is earned contingent on the student maintaining 85% or above in cumulative chartered behaviors for three (3) consecutive weeks. In addition all assigned area points must be earned, 85% of work points earned, no aggression points lost, and 80% attendance must be maintained during the three (3) week period (actual attendance).

Level III includes all components of Level II with the addition of one or more academic classes in a regular education program. This level will also include self-monitoring by the student although the staff will continue to monitor behaviors. This is considered a transition level back to the regular education program. After six (6) weeks at this level, the teacher will inform the appropriate personnel to discuss movement back to the less-restrictive placement.

RESTRICTION STATUS:

Students enter Restriction Status immediately following an episode of physical aggression toward staff. Students also enter Restriction Status as the result of chronic and severe aggression or not responding to the contingencies in Level I. A student who leaves the grounds without permission will re-enter the program in Restriction Status. A student may move from Restriction Status to Level I following one full day in which there is no aggression, 75% of work points are earned, 90% assigned area points are earned, and following the recommendation of the staff.

Procedures used in Restriction Status include:

1. The student will be stationed at a desk segregated from the other students.

2. The student will be provided with supplies, and a seat-work assignment for each period.

3. The student's school note will be in effect.

4. Beginning with the first period, the teacher will inform the student of the work to be completed through that period, the teacher will also provide instruction directed at the academic materials.
5. Other than direct instruction, interactions will not occur between the student and teacher. If the student talks, the teacher will reply, "When you are off restriction, I will talk to you."

6. Washroom access will be provided noncontingent every 2 hours.

7. Lunch will be served at the scheduled period in the restriction room/area.

**SCHOOL NOTE:**

The school note is recorded in triplicate each day for each student. It contains a record of assignments, grades, and homework. It also is a record of points lost for aggression and non-compliance and points earned for assigned area and work completion. Two copies are sent home with the student. The parent should examine, sign and send the signed copy back and keep the other for their records. The original copy is kept in the classroom.

**Lunch Procedure:**

Lunch will be served in a restricted area when students are on Level I. Students will be supervised by the educational staff. Students will receive their lunches and sit at an assigned table. Educational staff members will sit at the table and engage in pleasant conversation with the youths. During this time, the staff will model and socially reinforce appropriate interpersonal skills. The lunch program will count as part of the school day. Each student will quietly and/or appropriately sit and wait for all to finish and for lunch period to be declared over before leaving the assigned area. Inappropriate behavior during lunch will result in eating in the classroom the following day with loss of points. Students are required to clean up their area after eating.

**Social Skills Instructions:**

Social skill instruction is an integral part of the behavior management program. Many behaviorally disordered students do not possess interpersonal skills expected by mainstream educators. Because of this, each class is generally visited by the School Social Worker weekly and group and individual activities are implemented. In addition to this, direct social skills instruction takes place 3-4 times a week for the older students from 30-45 minutes a day and for the younger students 20-30 minutes per day.

**Unassigned Area On-Grounds:**

Unassigned area on-grounds is being in any area in which you are not assigned by the educational staff.
Unassigned Area Off-Grounds:

Unassigned area off-grounds is leaving the program area without permission. Movement of a student to an unassigned area will be handled first by asking this student to return to the scheduled area. If the student fails to comply:

1. Five (5) points will be docked from assigned area column on school note.

2. The student will be permitted to remain in the unassigned area if it is not hazardous and points will be docked.

3. If hazardous, graduated physical guidance will be implemented (hazardous is defined as behavior which is dangerous to the student and others). Leaving the school grounds is considered hazardous.

Physical resistance by the student involving staff constitutes physical aggression toward staff and that program will be implemented.

If a student runs out of the building, the educational staff will remain in visual contact with the student until they are off grounds.

The City Police and central office will be notified by phone if the staff loses visual contact with the student.

Behavior While Being Transported:

Any student who is being transported will follow the rules established by their driver during transportation time. Inappropriate bus behavior will result in loss of points.

Field Trips:

Field trips are off-grounds activities which are supportive of curricular, social-personal and emotional development. All youths engaged in field trips will meet pre-determined behavioral criteria. Inappropriate behavior the day before the field trip may result in the loss of the field trip privilege (at the discretion of the educational staff). Inappropriate behavior on the field trip may result in the loss of future trip privileges.
**Classroom Behavior Rules:**

1. Follow directions the first time they are given (compliance).
2. Keep hands, feet, objects to yourself (physical or object aggression).
3. No inappropriate language, gestures, threats, name calling (verbal aggression).
4. Complete assignments (work).
5. No disruptive talking, actions, note-passing, etc. (verbal or object aggression)
6. Do not leave classroom without permission or be in an unauthorized area or be tardy (assigned area).

**Social Vocabulary:**

- **Aggression:** any attack
- **Verbal aggression:** negative statement directed toward people or things. Any statement which threatens to hurt people or things is verbal aggression.
- **Physical aggression:** any action toward a person which is likely to cause harm or disrupt the class.
- **Object aggression:** any action toward an object which is likely to cause damage, harm, or disrupt the class.
- **Unassigned area:** any area other than the assigned work area designated by the staff
- **Work:** a task assigned on the schedule that should be completed. Work is compliance with initial instructions given by staff regarding the assignment or independent work upon the request of staff with termination of the task or assignment at the discretion of the staff.
- **Social Skill:** being polite, asking for what you want in a friendly manner, negotiating for what you want, expressing dislike in a supportive manner.
- **Relaxed:** Muscles are loose, breathing is deep and through the mouth using the tummy, talking in a normal tone, smiling and no evidence of strain.
- **Non-compliance:** not following directions and/or the program.
**Aggression Management:**

Student aggression is consequented by using the 10 R procedure. In addition, there is an automatic 60 point dockage for physical aggression. Physical management (graduated physical guidance) will only be used when the student refuses to go to the mat by the second request.

**Physical Aggression Toward Staff:**

Physical aggression toward staff is defined as any action toward staff intended to or likely to cause injury. Such behaviors will be consequented by a 60 point loss, the 10 R program will be followed and an incident report will be filed.

When aggression toward staff occurs, the student automatically earns restriction time in an alternate educational area (restriction room) for the remainder of the day plus one whole additional school day.

**Destruction of Property, Equipment, Etc.**

Whenever a student is involved in property destruction, points for object aggression are docked and an incident report is filed which includes the cost of replacement of the property in question. When an incident report is filed, a copy is sent to: 1) central office, 2) teacher, 3) parent.

Teachers' desks and file cabinets are off limits to all students. If something of yours is on the teacher's desk you must leave it alone unless you have staff permission otherwise. Desks, chairs, walls, books, and any other school property shall be kept clean and in original condition.

**The Ten R's:**

1. Response cost (stating rule broken and how many points student loses)
2. Relax
3. Rectify (fix it)
4. Recognize (what happened before inappropriate behavior to make you behave in an inappropriate way)
5. Rehearse (practice appropriate behavior)
6. Reinforce (praise student for appropriate practice)
7. Reflect (ask student which way is better and why)

8. Re-enter (have student re-enter his schedule at point determined by staff after filling out self-evaluation sheet)

9. Record (make notations on school note, and write incident report, if necessary)

10. Repeat (if necessary)

**GUIDELINES FOR USING GRADUATED PHYSICAL GUIDANCE**

A series of procedures for altering verbally and physically aggressive behaviors have been instituted in the school program. While the emphasis of the majority of these procedures is on prevention and teaching alternative behaviors, from time to time it may be necessary to address severely aggressive reactions. When these reactions occur, physical management may be necessary. The following guidelines apply to educational program staffs' use of physical management.

1. Physical management is only used to prevent the learner from causing harm to himself, others, or objects. It is not used as a therapeutic or educational procedure. In this context physical management may be used to keep a learner from exiting an assigned area. Physical management may also be used to prevent a student from hitting himself, others and/or objects. It is not necessary for a student to engage in these behaviors prior to being physically managed. However, the staff person must be reasonably certain that the learner's behavior will escalate to this point.

2. Physical management is not used to force a student to behave in a certain manner (e.g., physically guiding the student through a restitution exercise). Rather, as emphasized above, it is only used to prevent injury. Consequently, the management procedures involves only keeping the student stationary in a safe environment (e.g., on a mat). The only exception to this involves the movement of an aggressive student from an unsafe area such as a room with numerous pieces of furniture, to a safe area such as a hallway or open room.

3. Every opportunity should be provided for the student to control his or her own behavior prior to physical management. To insure this guideline a graduated physical guidance procedure should be used. Specifically, the following steps should be followed:

   a) Verbally instruct the student to engage in nonaggressive behavior and wait three seconds.
b) If the student remains in an aggressive posture, provide a gentle manual prompt (e.g., softly press against the learner's shoulder) and repeat the verbal prompt. Wait three seconds.

c) If the student is still in an aggressive posture, physically direct the learner to a safe area, preferably on a mat.

d) Once restrained on a mat, provide frequent verbal cues indicating, "When you are relaxed, we can let go of you."

e) Following three minutes of relaxed behavior on the mat, the staff should gradually relinquish physical control.

The only exception to the graduated physical guidance process is if the student's behavior escalates rapidly to the point that waiting three seconds between steps would be hazardous. When this is the case, direct physical management should be used immediately.
4. When physically managing a student, extreme care should be taken to provide for the safety and comfort of the student. Specifically:

   a) At no time should pressure be exerted against joints.
   
   b) Physical contact should be limited to that necessary to maintain a nonaggressive posture.
   
   c) The student should be placed face down on a soft mat.
   
   d) Self-abusive behavior should be prevented (e.g., if a student bangs his head on the mat, place a pillow under his head, etc.).
   
   e) A comfortable room temperature should be maintained.
   
   f) If physical management occurs through lunch or dinner, meals should be provided at the site. (Meals should never be withheld as a consequence for any behavior).

5. Staff should maintain a neutral affect throughout the physical management process. Expressions of agitation or anger, whether verbal or physical, must not occur. These may include: speaking in a harsh tone, clenching fists, threatening the student, excessive physical management, or similar responses.

6. A written report of physical management episodes will be made immediately following each incident. The appropriate reporting form is appended to this document and includes: a statement of the antecedents, a specific behavioral description, and a statement of the consequences.

7. Because the physical management process is not viewed as being a treatment component of the program, social learning procedures should be employed by the staff along with the management process.

8. Written reports will be reviewed at weekly staff meetings. Staff will determine the appropriateness of continued use of current procedures. If a reduction in the rate of aggressive responses is indicated, current procedures will continue. If aggressive behaviors are at a stable and high rate, alternative procedures will be implemented.
THE 10 R'S OF PROSOCIAL RESPONSE FORMATION (ABBREVIATED)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Response Cost</td>
<td>Immediately and consistently withdraw a predetermined amount of some reinforcing event.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relax</td>
<td>Remove the child from all sources of reinforcement until relaxed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rectify</td>
<td>Instruct the child to correct any physical or emotional damage caused by the behavior.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recognize</td>
<td>Assist the child in identifying provoking cues and an alternative prosocial response to the disruptive behavior.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rehearse</td>
<td>Instruct the child to act out the prosocial response under the same cue conditions.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reinforce</td>
<td>Label for the child both the process and product of the prosocial response.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reflect</td>
<td>Encourage the child to compare the consequences of the disruptive behavior with the prosocial response.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reenter the</td>
<td>Return the child to the most unpleasant scheduled activity Schedule that he or she missed during the preceding steps.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Record</td>
<td>Monitor and evaluate the effects of the program.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Repeat</td>
<td>Remain consistent in the application of these procedures. Also, socially reinforce the prosocial response as it reoccurs in the natural environment.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
CONTINUOUS RECORDING FORM
TO BE FILLED OUT FOLLOWING THE
OCCURRENCE OF TARGETED BEHAVIOR(S)

Antecedent Event(s): Events which cued or triggered the behavior.
Target Behavior(s): Objective description of the specific behavior.
Consequent Event(s): Effect of the behavior on others or things.

Student Name: _______________________
Setting: _______________________
Recorder: _______________________
Date: _______________________
Time: Start_______ Stop_______

Antecedent(s) Target Behavior(s) Consequence(s)
Appendix C
Appendix D
WOVSED Behavior Disorders Program Questionnaire

Please mark (X) beside the appropriate response

1. Your current position
   Superintendent
   Principal
   Local Coordinator

2. Type of District
   K-8 elementary
   High School
   Unit District

3. District Enrollment
   Under 100
   101-200
   201-300
   301-400
   401-500
   Over 501

4. Experience in your current position
   0-5 Years
   6-10 Years
   11-15 Years
   16-20 Years
   Over 20 Years

Please answer the following questions by circling the response that best matches your opinion:

1. Strongly Disagree
2. Disagree
3. Neither agree or disagree
4. Agree
5. Strongly Agree

1. Is WOVSED's technical assistance effective in enabling students with behavior difficulties to remain in the regular classroom (i.e. avoiding special education placement)?

2. Is it desirable for WOVSED to have technical assistance to enable students with behavior difficulties to remain in the regular classroom?
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Question</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Is the current IEP process for intervening with students with behavior difficulties timely (i.e. does the team respond when problems arise)?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Is it desirable to have a timely IEP process when intervening with students with behavior difficulties?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Is the current IEP process thorough when intervening with students with behavior difficulties?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Is it desirable to have a thorough IEP process?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Is WOVSEDS's Behavior Disorders program effective at remedying academic delays?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Is it desirable to have a Behavior Disorders program that remedies academic delays?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Is WOVSEDS's Behavior Disorders program effective remediating student's behavioral deficits?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Is it desirable that the WOVSEDS Behavior Disorders program remedies student's behavioral deficits?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Are student's transition from the WOVSEDS Behavior Disorders program into the regular program effectively coordinated?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Is it desirable to have a well coordinated transition from the WOVSEDS Behavior Disorders program into the regular program?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Are follow-up services in the regular class subsequent to transition effective for students with behavior disorders?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Is it desirable to have follow-up services in the regular class subsequent to transition for students with behavior disorders?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Please feel free to indicate your thoughts regarding this topic in the space below.
Appendix E
March 27, 1996

Mail Merge
Mail Merge
Mail Merge

Dear Mail Merge:

I am conducting a study to determine the opinions of school administrators regarding the Wabash and Ohio Valley Special Education (WOVSED) Behavior Disorders program. Although this study is being conducted to complete requirements for my Specialist Degree through Eastern Illinois University, your opinions are valued as the WOVSED Behavior Disorders program undergoes an internal evaluation designed to improve service delivery to the member districts.

The survey is being distributed to each superintendent, principal, and local coordinator of special education in each of WOVSED's member school districts. Please take a few minutes to respond to the enclosed survey. All responses will be kept confidential. The self-addressed envelopes are numbered for follow-up purposes only and no individual or school district will be identified individually.

If your position includes multiple roles (i.e. principal and local coordinator), please indicate which position most accurately reflects your primary area of responsibility.

Please complete the survey and return by April 9, 1996, in the enclosed self-addressed, stamped envelope. If you are interested in the findings, the results should be available by the end of the school year.

Thank you very much for your cooperation and participation in this endeavor.

Sincerely,

Daniel Allen
WOVSED
Box E
Norris City, IL 62869