Communities In Schools of North Carolina is leading the national network in providing the most effective student supports and wraparound services directly in schools to support students and teachers. Working collaboratively with 400 schools across North Carolina, Communities In Schools impacts the lives of more than 230,000 youth each year. Driven by research-based practices surrounding the best predictors of student success – attendance, behavior, coursework and parent and family engagement – Communities In Schools is changing the picture of education for students across North Carolina. Learn more about Communities In Schools of North Carolina at www.cisnc.org.

The Nonprofit Evaluation Support Program (NESP) is a collaborative effort between two University of North Carolina Greensboro organizations – The SERVE Center and The Office of Assessment, Evaluation, and Research Services (OAERS). NESP's mission is to provide program evaluation services and program evaluation capacity building support to nonprofit and community-based organizations while providing authentic learning experiences for future leaders in the field of program evaluation.

The SERVE Center at The University of North Carolina Greensboro is a university-based research, development, dissemination, evaluation, and technical assistance center. For more than 24 years, SERVE Center has worked to improve K-12 education by providing evidence-based resources and customized technical assistance to policymakers and practitioners.

The University of North Carolina Greensboro (UNCG) is one of the sixteen university campuses of The University of North Carolina. UNCG holds two classifications from the Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching, as a "research university with high research activity" and for "community engagement" in curriculum, outreach, and partnerships.

Table of Contents

Overview

CISNC Introduction

In the 2014-2015 school-year, Communities In Schools of North Carolina (CISNC) introduced a framework that aligns site and student metrics and services to four areas that have been shown to have the greatest impact on student success: attendance, behavior, coursework, and parent involvement, or ABC+P. Both combined and individually, attendance, behavior, and coursework are among the best predictors of a student's academic success and on-time graduation. While collecting data around ABC+P is critically important to understanding the school and student, it is even more important to use the data to drive high impact service delivery to empower each student to reach their full potential. To this end, Communities In Schools of North Carolina has partnered with the SERVE Center at the University of North Carolina at Greensboro to design curricula specifically for CIS within the ABC+P framework to enhance student outcomes in school and success in life. This document is one of more than 50 modules developed to support local CIS staff and most importantly the students that are served. We encourage you to explore all of the modules available online at www.cisnc.org.

Using Evidenced-Based Strategies

There are a multitude of strategies that claim to address attendance, but there are few that actually do so for all students. We suggest that schools use an evidence-based, decision-making model to ensure that high quality information informs the decisions made.

The Institute of Education Sciences (IES) at the U.S. Department of Education defines evidence-based decision making as routinely seeking out the best available information on prior research and recent evaluation findings before adopting programs or practices that will demand extensive material or human resources (including both funding and teacher time) and/or affect significant numbers of students (Whitehurst, 2004).

CISNC uses the Response to Intervention (RTI) framework as the basis for its practices. RTI is a multitiered framework of academic and behavioral interventions that require school staff to make instructional decisions based on data. This document focuses on a Tier 2 strategy. Tier 2 strategies typically focus on students who have not responded to Tier 1 supports and includes supplemental instruction and interventions that are periodically monitored to ensure students are responding to the supports. Tier 2 supports are targeted, structured, explicit, and can take place in small groups or general education classrooms.

CISNC calls for the use of evidence-based interventions versus generally researched practices. The National Center on Response to Intervention (NCRTI) defines evidence-based interventions as:

> … an intervention for which data from scientific, rigorous research studies have demonstrated (or empirically validated) the efficacy of the intervention.

Applying findings from experimental studies, single-case studies, or strong quasi-experimental studies, an evidence-based intervention improves student learning beyond what is expected without that intervention (Center on Response to Intervention [Center on RTI] at American Institutes for Research and the National Center on Intensive Intervention (NCII), 2014, p. 4).

A research based curricula "may" incorporate strategies that have been generally researched, but not studied using a rigorous research design. The following suggestion is based on interventions that have been studied using a scientific, rigorous research design. When incorporated with fidelity and as a part of a systematic process, students should positively respond to these strategies.

This document is written to provide schools with behavior management strategies based on the best evidence from prior research and recent evaluations in middle schools. In the context of our review, we propose two strategies designed to assist students that are experiencing behavioral challenges:
- Behavior Contracts
- Social Skills Training Class/Seminar

This document will focus on one easy to implement strategy for using Behavioral Contracts as a Tier 2 intervention.

Problem/Rationale

Implicit in the ABC+P framework is the focus on behavioral issues and how one area of the framework impacts another. In the past, schools expected families to teach their children important social skills, but more and more schools have become a partner with families to teach these skills. Epstein and colleagues (2008) state, "When a student's behavior problem has emerged, teachers can approach parents as partners by encouraging them to apply the classroom's behavioral rules and expectations at home and by asking for their ideas on ways to correct their child's behavior (p. 41)." One strategy that could include parents on the front end is the use of Behavior Contracts.

Behavior contracts have proven effective with students in grades K – 12. Bowman-Perrott and colleagues (2015) found that a modest effect on behavior change can be credited to behavior contracts. They can be used with all students, including those with disabilities, as part of a Tier 1 behavior strategy or in a Tier 2 strategy, as proposed in this document. Behavior contracts are a low cost strategy that can provide that link between home and school and provide explicit behavioral goals for students.

Purpose

Behavior Contracts place a lot of responsibility on the student and they have to be willing to participate in a behavioral contract. The purpose of this strategy is to create a mutually agreed upon action plan that will help students manage their behavior. However, the student has to be capable of controlling the challenging behavior.

Implementation Plan

Uses

Student Support Specialists can use the information provided in this guide to develop and implement Behavioral Contracts. However, the Behavior Contracts are not meant to stand alone, and should include some of the same techniques as Check and Connect and PBIS (see the Level 1 Behavior Modules for more details). In addition, this strategy can be used in conjunction with the Social Skills Training module.

Audiences

The primary audience is the CISNC Student Support Specialist.

Materials/Equipment/Space

- Behavioral Contract (and other related forms)
- Student records
- Level 1 Attendance and Behavior Modules

Note: For presentations, check for access to computer, Smartboard or data projector and screen, relevant power cords, and remote slide advancer.

Time

- 6 – 9 weeks from the first meeting to the last meeting.
- The initial meeting may take an hour, but after that there is a check in at least every few days. The check-in moments should not add up to more than 20 minutes a week (not including documentation).

Sample Intervention – Behavioral Contracts

Activity	Process Notes
Identify students with the Student Support Team	*With the Student Support Team, examine behavior and academic information and determine which students would benefit from the development of a contract.*
Meet with parents/guardians. - Share student's	*Include one of the student's teachers in the meeting with the parents and the students. In addition, include the teacher as a signature on the final behavior contract.*

Activity	Process Notes
documented behavior issues with parents. - Discuss school behavior expectations.	*Before the contract is finalized, you should meet with the student's parents/guardians to discuss the behavior challenges the student is experiencing. You may want to include a guidance counselor or another teacher.* *You should have documentation from the teacher so that specific behavioral problems can be shared. For example, you may want to encourage teachers to create a Behavior Log. See the example on Doing What Works at* http://dwwlibrary.wested.org/media/problem-behavior-logs *During the meeting:* - *Find out more about the student's behavior at home and what solutions work in that setting.* - *Discuss school expectations and the type of behavior you expect from the student.* - *Discuss one solution you would like to try. Share the definition of a "behavior contract."* • *A behavior contract is a written agreement that describes a specific behavior that must be completed, keeps a record of progress, and specifies a reward to be received once the behavior is achieved.* *Please note this solution will require that you combine it with other strategies like PBIS and Check-in/check-out.*
During the meeting, discuss with the parents one or two behaviors that the contract should focus on.	- *You do not want to create an unrealistic behavior contract.* - *Focus on one or two specific behaviors that you want to see the student display.* - *Discuss rewards or consequences – See PBIS Module for more details.*

Invite the student to join your meeting.	- *Give the student a summary of your meeting with the parents.*
	- *Ask the student:*
	  • *To share their perception of the situation*
	  • *Why is this behavior a challenge? Is someone picking on them?*
	  • *Is a behavior plan with positive reinforcements something they can try?*
	- *Try to get to the root cause of the problem behavior.*
	- ***It is important that the student understand the behavior you are targeting.*** *Be prepared to define the targeted behavior and provide example and non-examples.*
	- *Explain why the contract is important and that it is a collaborative effort.*
	- *Discuss the outline of the behavior contract including time frame. Please note that you don't need to prolong the contract longer than a quarter.*
	- ***Remember: You are negotiating with the student!***
	- ***Remember: It is important that there is an honest conversation and all the stakeholders have input.***
	
	While the parents and student are in the room, finalize the behavior contract, print it out, and have the student sign (as well as yourself and any other school staff member you think is important). Send a copy home with the parents and student.

Activity	Process Notes
	Remember: - *Identify the behaviors you want to change.* - *Describe behaviors that are observable and measureable (be very specific and break it down into small increments if necessary).* - *Incorporate the rewards that the student identified (within reason). Be very clear about when the reward will occur. (Hint! - May want to take some time in advance and come up with a preliminary list of rewards you would be comfortable offering. You do not want to start with a blank slate.)* - *The rewards should be motivating and inexpensive.* *Resource:* *National Education Association* http://www.nea.org/tools/behavior-contracts-how-to-write-them.htm
Follow up with student and his/her teachers at least once a week.	- *Check-in with students and their teachers* **at least once a week and if possible at least twice.** - **Monitor the student's behavior.** *Ask the student about their general well-being and then inquire about their behavior. You can then follow-up with the specific behavior identified in the contract.* - *If possible, provide the student with a self-monitoring tool.* - *If the student needs to make some adjustments (reasonable changes), then address their concerns.* - *In addition,* **follow up with teachers who have students with behavior contracts.** *Inquire about the student's behavior and whether or not the contract is having an impact.* - *This "check-in" needs to be conducted for each student that has a contract.* *Note. It is important to periodically review the contract to enhance implementation.*
Monitoring (see Targeted Intervention Management Module).	- *Monitoring is an ongoing process.* - *Remember, the goal of providing Tier Two services is to provide the appropriate services to those students identified as needing additional supports so that they can be successful in school and life.* - *Prior to your close out meeting, review your documentation and make some notes about the next steps. Is the student ready to transition from Tier Two to Tier One? Is the student in need of more individualized plans and should be placed in Tier Three?*
Close Out Meeting: Meet with parents/guardians and students.	- *Provide the student an opportunity to discuss what went well and what did not work so well.* - *Summarize the progress or lack thereof of the student.* - *If needed, discuss the development of another behavioral contract.*

Suggested Supplemental Activities

Prior to determining your final participants, you may want to conduct some classroom observations. Simonsen et al. (2011) provides some adaptable observation tools with explicit directions and operational definitions of the behavioral codes.

Simonsen, B., Myers, D., & Briere, D. E. (2011). Comparing a behavioral check-in/check-out (CICO) intervention to standard practice in an urban middle school setting using an experimental group design. *Journal of Positive Behavior Interventions*, *13*(1), 31-48.

Another activity to consider is gathering all the students that have a contract for small group meetings. If so, you may want to have a discussion around their behavior goals and progress. On the Doing What Works website there is a document that could be modified for classroom discussions as well as a self-monitoring tool. The top half could be used during your meeting. The bottom half could be modified and used by the students on a daily basis However, remove the row asking for a daily teacher signature because you will also frequently "check in" with teachers. (See: http://dwwlibrary.wested.org/media/jaguar-academy-behavior-goals-worksheet)

Resources

The following resources are identified as part of the activity. Read through these resources carefully to become familiar with any concepts and instructions as they pertain to the content and activity.

Michigan's Integrated Behavior and Learning Support Initiative MiBLSi
> MiBLSi is a structure that creates local capacity for an integrated behavior and reading Multi-Tier System of Support. MiBLSi provides CICO resources for elementary and middle school students.
> http://miblsi.cenmi.org/MiBLSiModel/Implementation/ElementarySchools/TierIISupports/Behavior/TargetBehaviorInterventions/CheckInCheckOut.aspx

Character Education – http://character.org/
> Formerly Character Education Partnership, character.org is a nonprofit organization that strives to ensure young people are becoming ethical and engaged citizens. It is an online resource center for educators, students, parents and the community. Character.org provides many lesson plans for K-12 and each lesson plan relates to their 11 Principles of Effective Character Education.

National Association of School Psychologists (NASP) – http://www.nasponline.org/
> NASP is an online resource for schools, parents and teachers to promote social skills and its impact on positive behavior, academic success, and school safety. Resources include types of social skills, identifying social skills deficits, interventions/training, and examples of evidence-based social skills programs.

Peer Mediators A Complete School Curriculum – http://www.peermediators.org/
> Peer Mediators provides an extensive collection of peer mediation training resources for those who seek to help youth more constructively engage peer conflicts. The curriculum combines program and training objectives from various standards and best practices guidelines from the youth development, peer mediation and conflict resolution fields.

School Mediation Associates – http://www.schoolmediation.com/index.html
> School Mediation Associates provides services for mediation through trainings, books, videos and newsletters to students (grades 4 through college), teachers, administrators, staff and parents. Their mission is to transform schools into safer, more caring, and more effective institutions.

Epstein, M., Atkins, M., Cullinan, D., Kutash, K., & Weaver, R. (2008).
> *Reducing behavior problems in the elementary school classroom* (NCEE2008-102). Washington, DC: National Center for Education Evaluation and Regional Assistance, Institute of Education Sciences, U.S. Department of Education. Retrieve from http://ies.ed.gov/ncee/wwc/pdf/practice_guides/behavior_pg_092308.pdf

The following resources will provide additional information and suggestions for developing behavior contracts.

Doing What Works (US Department of Education, Institute of Education Sciences)
http://dwwlibrary.wested.org/media/student-behavior-contract

PBIS World
PBIS World is an online resource center for managing negative behaviors. Instructions on "Why, When, and How" interventions/strategies should be implemented are also provided for Tier 1, 2 and 3 along with resources and support for each technique.
http://www.pbisworld.com/tier-2/behavior-contract/

While the above resources are at your disposal, you may want to develop a few templates depending on the goals of the contract and the age of the student. In general, the contracts have: name of all stakeholders, the qualities you want the student to display, strategies the student can use to improve their behavior, consequences for student misbehavior, positive reinforcements/rewards for correct behavior, timeframe, support that will be provided to the student and a place for stakeholder signature(s).

Note: All posters, images, and activity guides identified are copyright cleared for non-commercial use.

Measuring Success

Identifying outcomes and collecting data to measure the success of the intervention can help track the quality of implementation as well as the effectiveness of the intervention. In addition to state/district benchmark assessments, following are some additional suggestions that may be useful to measure success.

- Social Skills Improvement System – Rating Scales (SSIS-RS; Gresham & Elliott, 2008).
  - Used to identify social skills acquisition and performance deficits.
  - 46 social skills across seven domains (cooperation, communication, assertion, responsibility, empathy, engagement & self-control).
  - 4-point frequency scale of never, selfdom, often and almost always.
- Decrease in discipline referrals.
- Ratings by others.
  - Classroom teacher survey.
    - Ask about the changes in the participating student's behavior.
  - Parent survey.
    - Ask about changes in child's academic competence.
    - Ask about any behavior changes since the start of the behavior contract.
- Self-ratings.
  - Student survey.
    - Ask about the utility of the contract (and other related strategies).
    - Ask about any changes in their behavior.

Appendices

A. References

B. Research Alignment

Appendix A: References

Bowman-Perrott, L., Burke, M. D., de Marin, S., Zhang, N., & Davis, H. (2015). A meta-analysis of single-case research on behavior contracts: Effects on behavioral and academic outcomes among children and youth. *Behavior Modification, 39*(2), 247-269.

Center on Response to Intervention (Center on RTI) at American Institutes for Research and the National Center on Intensive Intervention (NCII), (March 2014). *RTI glossary of terms.* Center on RTI and NCII: Washington, DC.

Epstein, M., Atkins, M., Cullinan, D., Kutash, K., & Weaver, R. (2008). *Reducing Behavior Problems in the Elementary School Classroom: A Practice Guide* (NCEE #2008-012). Washington, DC: National Center for Education Evaluation and Regional Assistance, Institute of Education Sciences, U.S. Department of Education. Retrieved from http://ies.ed.gov/ncee/wwc/publications/practiceguides.

Gresham, F. M., & Elliott, S. N. (2008). *Social skills improvement system.* Minneapolis, MN: Pearson Assessments.

Simonsen, B., Myers, D., & Briere, D. E. (2011). Comparing a behavioral check-in/check-out (CICO) intervention to standard practice in an urban middle school setting using an experimental group design. *Journal of Positive Behavior Interventions*, *13*(1), 31-48.

Whitehurst, G. J. (2004, April). *Making education evidence-based: Premises, principles, pragmatics, and politics.* Evanston, IL: Northwestern University Institute for Policy Research, Distinguished Public Policy Lecture Series. Retrieved from http://www.northwestern.edu/ipr/events/lectures/DPPL-Whitehurst.pdf

Appendix B: Research Alignment

Citation	Brief Summary of Strategy	Sample Size	Impact/Evidence of Effectiveness	Implementation
Allen, L.J., Howard, V. F., Sweeney, W. J., & McLaughlin, T.F. (1993). Use of contingency contracting to increase on-task behavior with primary students. *Psychological Reports, 72,* 905-906.	The purpose of this research was to evaluate the effectiveness of contingency contracting with primary age students displaying a wide range of behaviors (poor completion of assignments, low attention to task, aimless wandering, and poor academic achievement). The contract was developed by the teacher and the consequences were selected by the students. On task behavior was defined as remaining seated, completing assignments, and	Three students enrolled in 2nd or 3rd grade.	The overall results suggest that students increased their on task attention when contingency contracting was in effect. During the first contingency-contracting phase, average on task behavior increased for each student (Students 1, 2, and 3 = 46.6%, 50%, and 40% respectively). Reductions in on task behavior were found when contingency contracting was removed. Average on task behavior increased for each student again during the second contracting phase (Students 1, 2, and 3=63.3%, 67%, and 60% respectively). During the last baseline period performance remained high for all students.	Each contract was individualized and specified the behavior to be changed, the consequences employed, and duration of the contract. The teacher and each student reviewed the student's performance at the end of the school day. The teacher and teacher's aide took student data for 60 minutes.

Communities In Schools
North Carolina

Citation	Brief Summary of Strategy	Sample Size	Impact/Evidence of Effectiveness	Implementation
	remaining attentive. Students were evaluated with an ABABA single-subject replication design.			
Cheney, D. A., Stage, S. A., Hawken, L. S., Lynass, L., Mielenz, C., & Waugh, M. (2009). A 2-year outcome study of the check, connect, and expect intervention for students at risk for severe behavior problems. *Journal of Emotional and Behavioral Disorders, 17*(4), 226-243.	This study combined the primary features from both the C&C and BEP (Behavior Education Program) programs to assess the efficacy of the *Check, Connect, and Expect* (CCE) program on reducing problem behaviors and increasing social skills and academic performance of students with severe behavior problems. The primary features from C&C and the BEP used in the CCE intervention	Nine schools were assigned to each condition, intervention and comparison. The final sample of students included 121 1st - 3rd grade students in the intervention group and 86 comparison students.	Analysis of the SSRS Social Skills Scale showed the graduate group finished the study about eight standard score points below the comparison group, and the non-graduate group finished the study about four standard score points above the comparison group. The statistical analysis of slope shows that the graduate group significantly decreased in their problem behavior across the study compared with both the comparison and non-graduate groups. By the end of the intervention, the graduate group still maintained higher social skills than the comparison group with the non-graduate group showing	All students entered the CCE program as the basic level. In the **Basic** program, coaches checked-in students in the morning and checked-out students at dismissal. Coaches used a consistent routine during check-in and check-out. Success in the CCE Basic level was defined as the student earning more than 75% of possible points on more than 80% of days across an 8-week period. When students were successful at the Basic level, they entered **Self-Monitoring**. At this level, students rated their own behavior on the DPR and compared it with teacher ratings. With partial agreement on 10 out

Citation	Brief Summary of Strategy	Sample Size	Impact/Evidence of Effectiveness	Implementation
	include the following: students checking in and out daily with adult mentors, students receiving DPRs from mentors, teachers providing behavioral feedback to students throughout the day on DPRs, mentors holding problem-solving sessions with students when they did not meet daily goals, students receiving feedback from mentors at check-out about whether daily behavior goals were met, mentors charting and reviewing DPR data weekly, and mentors using charted data to reinforce students when they met daily		the lowest social skills.

Taking the results for both the Externalizing and Internalizing Problem Behavior Scales together, the graduate group showed statistically significant lower externalizing and internalizing problem behavior scores at the end of the intervention as well as significant decreases over the intervention. | of 15 days, the student transitioned to Self-Monitoring only, in which the student independently rated himself on the DPR for a 2-week period. After meeting the Self-Monitoring criteria for at least 4 weeks, the student graduated. If students were not successful in Self-Monitoring, they returned to the Basic level for 4 weeks with an emphasis on understanding the teacher's scores to prepare them for Self-Monitoring.

The **Basic Plus** level was for students that received additional services if they did not succeed at the Basic level when data were reviewed after the first 8 weeks. The coach provided tutoring for academic work completion when DPR data suggested that academic task completion was difficult and social skill instruction was provided from *The Stop and Think Social Skills Program*. The Basic Plus level |

Citation	Brief Summary of Strategy	Sample Size	Impact/Evidence of Effectiveness	Implementation
	and weekly goals. Five levels were established in the intervention to monitor progress over time: basic, basic plus, intensive, self-monitoring and graduate. Students were identified using the Systematic Screening for Behavior Disorders (SSBD). It is an instrument that allows teachers to nominate students who may be at risk for serious social, behavioral, or academic failure.			lasted 8 weeks and those students who successfully met their criteria on 80% of the days returned to the Basic level. **Intensive**: students who still did not meet their criterion on 80% of days after 8 weeks of Basic and then 8 weeks of Basic Plus were eligible for a functionally based behavior intervention using a multi-method multi-source procedure. The FBA procedure required a teacher interview using the *Functional Assessment Checklist for Teachers and Staff*, a student interview using the *Student Directed Functional Assessment Interview*, and five behavioral observations using conditional probabilities to see whether teacher attention, peer attention, or avoidance reliably followed the student's inappropriate behavior. One of three scripted interventions was used as a result: differential reinforcement when the function

Citation	Brief Summary of Strategy	Sample Size	Impact/Evidence of Effectiveness	Implementation
				was teacher attention, differential reinforcement for appropriate behavior using free time after completing work tasks if the function was escape or the *Good Behavior Game* if the function of the inappropriate behavior was peer attention. **Graduates and non-graduates**: after meeting the Self-Monitoring criteria for at least 4 weeks, students graduated from the program. After graduation, students were provided with feedback on their behavior on a monthly basis for the duration of the school year, and the coach informally interacted with the students at least weekly. Non-graduates were those students enrolled in the program who did not meet criteria at the Basic level in order to move on to the Self-Monitoring level or who were not successful at the Self-Monitoring level. Also, students who were not successful in Basic

Citation	Brief Summary of Strategy	Sample Size	Impact/Evidence of Effectiveness	Implementation
				Plus and moved on to the Intensive level were considered non-graduates.
Gresham, F. M., Van, M., & Cook, C. R. (2006). Social skills training for teaching replacement behaviors: Remediating acquisition deficits in at-risk students. *Behavioral Disorders, 31*(4), 363-377.	The purpose of the present study was to assess the effectiveness of a social skills intervention on a targeted group of students with social skill acquisition deficits. The participants selected were between the age of 6 and 8 years of age and were at risk for developing emotional and behavioral disorders. The design for each student was an ABAB, two baseline and two treatment	Four students.	Outcome measures: Total Disruptive Behavior (TDB), Alone time (AT), and Negative social interaction (NSI). For Kev, SST was highly effective for TDB and NSI. It was moderately effective for AT. For Laurie, SST was effective for TDB and AT. It was less effective on NSI for her. For Debbie, SST was effective for NSI and moderately effective for TDB. It was less effective on AT for her. For Nate, SST was highly effective for TDB and AT. It was moderately effective for NSI. Combined, the group's total social skills score increased from	Students received 60 hours of social skills training for 20 weeks (3 hours per week) using the Social Skills Intervention Guide (SSIG). The guide called for modeling, coaching, and behavioral rehearsals to remediate social skills acquisition deficits. Instruction was delivered in a small-group pullout setting. In addition to instruction, consultation and recommendations were provided to the students' teachers and parents. Four basic instructional variables were used to remediate students' acquisition deficits in the small group setting: direct instruction, rehearsal, feedback/reinforcement, and reductive procedures.

Citation	Brief Summary of Strategy	Sample Size	Impact/Evidence of Effectiveness	Implementation
	condition design.		78.25 pretest to 101.25 posttest. Total problem behaviors decreased from 124 pretest to 102.75 posttest.	**Verbal instruction** involves using concrete and abstract concepts to teach social skills while **modeled instruction** delivers instruction visually to the learner so that he can learn how to combine and sequence the behavioral components of a given social skill. **Rehearsal** involves the repeated practice of a social skill once it has been learned and **feedback/reinforcement** procedures were used to enhance students' performances of acquired social skills.
Hawken, L. S., MacLeod, K. S., & Rawlings, L. (2007). Effects of the behavior education program (BEP) on office discipline referrals of elementary school children. *Journal of*	The purpose of this study was to evaluate the effects of the BEP on problem behavior with 12 elementary school students. The Behavior Education Program (BEP) is a modified check-in, check-out	12 students.	The primary dependent variables with the total number of office discipline referrals (ODRs) per group of three students per month. The BEP intervention was associated with reductions in the average total ODRs per month across all four groups. The BEP phase for Group 1 documents an	Students who entered the BEP within 1 month of each other were grouped together for a total of four groups, with three students in each group. During baseline, typical school-wide behavior support procedures were in place for all students, including those participating in this study. The

Communities In Schools
North Carolina

Citation	Brief Summary of Strategy	Sample Size	Impact/Evidence of Effectiveness	Implementation
Positive Behavior Interventions, 9(2), 94-101.	intervention implemented with students who are at-risk for more severe problem behaviors. The students exhibited a number of problem behaviors, including talking out; making inappropriate comments; failing to complete work; and failing to keep hands, feet, and objects to self.		average total of 3.67 ODRs per month, which represents a 51% reduction from baseline. Groups 2 and 3 averaged 1.75 and 2.67 total ODRs per month, respectively, following implementation of the BEP. These levels represent 46% and 36% reductions from baseline means. Group 4 demonstrated the smallest change from baseline with an average total of 1.5 ODRs per month, which represents a 25% reduction from baseline mean. Of the 12 students who received the intervention, 9 (75%) showed reductions in average referrals per month and this change was statistically significant.	total number of ODRs per month was summed for each group of three students. The BEP process involved the following five elements: First, students were required to "check in" with a paraprofessional before school. The paraprofessional provided the student with a Daily Progress Report (DPR) form that was carried to class for feedback throughout the day. Second, during natural transitions in the school day teachers would provide students with feedback on their DPRs. Third, at the end of the school day, students took the DPR to the paraprofessional to check out. Student percentage of points for the day was calculated, and students received praise and rewards if they met their daily point goal. For all students in this study, 80% of the total points earned was their daily point goal. Fourth, students

Communities In Schools
North Carolina

Citation	Brief Summary of Strategy	Sample Size	Impact/Evidence of Effectiveness	Implementation
				then took their DPR home to be signed by a parent/guardian, and fifth, the Daily Progress Report was signed by a parent and returned the next morning.
Martini-Scully, D., Bray, M. A., & Kehle, T. J. (2000). A packaged intervention to reduce disruptive behaviors in general education students. *Psychology in Schools, 37*(2), 149-156.	The purpose of this study was to determine if a packaged intervention would decrease disruptive behaviors of two students. The foundation of the packaged intervention was the precision request program, but it also included contingency contracts, mystery motivators, a token economy, and public posting of classroom rules.

Teachers were instructed to make | Two 8 year old students and one 8 year old students serving as the control. | At baseline, student 1's average disruptive behavior was 46%. During the treatment phase it decreased to an average of 15%. At withdrawal, disruptive behavior increased to an average of 24% and again decreased to 21% during treatment reinstatement.

At baseline, student 2's average disruptive behavior was 35%. During the treatment phase it decreased to an average on 24%. At withdrawal, disruptive behavior on average was 25% and again decreased to 18% during treatment reinstatement.

The control student's percentage of disruptive behavior remained constant with an average of 16% | Each phase of the research design (ABAB) was approximately two weeks.

Baseline data was collected for 7 and 21 days for students 1 and 2 respectively.

During the intervention stage the package treatment was explained to the teacher. Following teacher instruction, the entire program was explained to the students. Students signed the contingency contract after the fully understood and agreed to the intervention. During this phase, verbal reinforcement, token economy and mystery motivators were used.

After the two week intervention |

Citation	Brief Summary of Strategy	Sample Size	Impact/Evidence of Effectiveness	Implementation
	precision requests and wait five seconds before initiating the second request. If the student complied within five seconds, the student was given verbal reinforcement. If the second request was given the word "need" was used in the command. If the student complied, verbal reinforcement was given and if not, the opportunity to receive a token was lost for the day.		across all four phases of the study. Student satisfaction with the treatment was above average, with a mean of 3 on a 4 point scale. Teacher's rating revealed a strong satisfaction with the treatment as indicated by a mean of 4.7 on a 5 point scale.	stage, the treatment was withdrawn for two weeks. After the two week withdrawal phase, the treatment phase was reinstated with the exception of the reinforcers and mystery motivators.
Miller, D. L., & Kelley, M. L. (1994). The use of goal setting and contingency contracting for improving children's	The purpose of the study was to assess the efficacy of goal setting and contingency contracting for augmenting children's homework	Four parent-child dyads. Students ranged in age from 9 to 11.	**On task behavior**: During baseline, on average Richard displayed on task behavior for 68% of intervals and increased his on task behavior to 97% of intervals during treatment. The percentage of on task behavior decreased to 67% at withdrawal	An ABAB research design was used for this study. During baseline, parent and child conducted homework as usual, except they were seated in a quiet, secluded location with all materials accessible.

Citation	Brief Summary of Strategy	Sample Size	Impact/Evidence of Effectiveness	Implementation
homework performance. *Journal of Applied Behavior Analysis, 27*(1), 73-84.	performance. Parents and children used homework goal worksheets to set challenging yet attainable homework goals for children. Parents and children also discussed rewards contingent on homework goals in contracts.		and again increased to 97% are treatment reinstatement. Jenny's level of on task behavior during baseline averaged to 74%. On task behavior increased to 91% during treatment and decreased to 65% during withdrawal. With reintroduction of the treatment, on task behavior increased to 95%. Adam's level of on task behavior averaged 60% at baseline. During treatment, on task behavior increased to 88%. This percentage remained stable throughout the withdrawal and reinstatement phases. Ann was on task for an average of 83% of intervals. On task behavior increased to 94% during the treatment phase. Her levels also remained stable throughout withdrawal and reinstatement phases.	During treatment, parents were given instructions on goal setting and contingency contracting. The homework goals worksheet was used in the goal setting process. Each week, the parent and child negotiated contracts that specified daily and weekly rewards contingent on achievement of homework goals and bringing materials home.

Citation	Brief Summary of Strategy	Sample Size	Impact/Evidence of Effectiveness	Implementation
			Accuracy of completed homework: Richard's accuracy was 64% during baseline and increased to 85% during treatment. Accuracy decreased to 45% during withdrawal and again increased to 92% during final treatment phase. Jenny achieved an accuracy score of 64% during baseline and increased to 92% during treatment. Return to baseline resulted in a decrease in accuracy to 75% which again increased to 90% during treatment reinstatement. The accuracy of Adam's completed work averaged 71% during baseline and increased to 91% during treatment. During withdrawal, it decreased to 70% but again increased to 91% during reinstatement. Ann averaged 64% accuracy during baseline and increased to	

Communities In Schools
North Carolina

Citation	Brief Summary of Strategy	Sample Size	Impact/Evidence of Effectiveness	Implementation
			88% during treatment. At withdrawal, accuracy decreased to an average of 69% but increased to an average accuracy of 925 when goal setting and contingency contracting were reinstated.	
Miller, L. M., Dufrene, B. A., Sterling, H. E., Olmi, D. J., & Bachmayer, E. (2015). The Effects of Check-In/Check-Out on Problem Behavior and Academic Engagement in Elementary School Students. *Journal Of Positive Behavior Interventions, 17*(1), 28-38.	This study evaluated the effectiveness of Check-in/Check-out (CICO) for improving behavioral performance for three students referred for Tier 2 behavioral supports.

Participants were three African American elementary students who exhibited disruptive behavior despite exposure to Tier 1 of SWPBIS.

Students had a CICO | Three students. | The dependent variable was problem behavior, characterized as being off task, talking out, being out of their seat, having negative peer interactions and low academic engagement.

During CICO, Connor and Oliver's problem behavior decreased and their academic engagement increased, remaining stable throughout the phase. Susan's initial levels of problem behavior and academic engagement were similar to baseline; however, she displayed a substantial decrease in problem behavior and increase in academic engagement on the fourth day of CICO, which remained stable over the rest of | In baseline, dependent measures were evaluated in the absence of CICO and without students' knowledge. Daily direct observations were conducted in the class identified as most problematic and teachers completed the DBRCs throughout the day.

Check-in: each morning, the student checked in with the CICO mentor who greeted the student and collected the previous day's DBRC; checked the DBRC for parent/guardian signature; praised the student for returning the DBRC; asked whether the student had materials for class; reviewed the |

Citation	Brief Summary of Strategy	Sample Size	Impact/Evidence of Effectiveness	Implementation
	mentor who participated in the study. To be chosen, mentors had to be nominated by the student, be available to implement check-ins and checkouts, and consent to participate. The students' other teachers also participated in the intervention, providing behavioral feedback and completing DBRCs.		the phase. During withdrawal, all participants' problem behavior and academic engagement returned to levels similar to baseline. When CICO was reinstated, Connor and Susan displayed immediate decreases in problem behavior and increases in academic engagement, which were maintained throughout the phase. For Oliver, when CICO was re-implemented, display of problem behavior and academic engagement were initially similar to levels observed during withdrawal. However, he displayed a marked decrease in problem behavior and increase in appropriate behavior on the third day and improvements maintained for the remaining nine sessions.	point goal and student performance from the previous day; provided encouragement and suggestions on how to meet the goal; gave the student a new DBRC; and recorded the date, if student attended check-in, if the previous DBRC was signed, and the point goal on a student record form. Check-out: at the end of each day, the student checked out with the CICO mentor who collected the DBRC and provided praise for appropriate behaviors, provided constructive feedback for areas in need of improvement, calculated percentage of points earned, Determined whether the point goal had been met, allowed the student to choose a reward if point goal was met, made a copy of the DBRC to send home for signature, and noted whether the DBRC was sent home on a student record form.

Citation	Brief Summary of Strategy	Sample Size	Impact/Evidence of Effectiveness	Implementation
				Withdrawal: during withdrawal, observations and teacher ratings occurred in the same manner as baseline. Students were told that they were "taking a break" and no longer needed to carry the DBRC or check-in. Students did not receive feedback or have opportunities to earn rewards. Return to intervention: when re-implemented, CICO was conducted as it was in the initial B phase. Data collection procedures were also identical to the initial B phase. Mystery Motivator: when a stable or decreasing trend in problem behavior was observed in the return to intervention phase, MM was introduced. During MM, if a student met the point goal, the CICO mentor presented him with an envelope containing slips of paper marked with an "M" indicating a reward, or an "X"

Citation	Brief Summary of Strategy	Sample Size	Impact/Evidence of Effectiveness	Implementation
				indicating no reward. When a stable or decreasing trend in problem behavior was observed during MM, self-monitoring was introduced. Self-monitoring: during self-monitoring, students continued to attend check-ins and check-outs and teachers completed DBRCs in the same manner as during baseline and withdrawal phases, but students did not receive teacher feedback and completed DBRCs themselves.