

5-2021

Staff Perceptions of SWPBIS in Middle School

Eric Westbye

Follow this and additional works at: https://scholarworks.umf.maine.edu/ed_leadership_projects

 Part of the Educational Leadership Commons

Staff Perceptions of SWPBIS in Middle School

Eric Westbye

University of Maine Farmington

Abstract

Student behavioral issues lead to lost learning opportunities by the student misbehaving and the students trying to learn (Gage, Grasley-Boy, George, Childs, and Kincaid, 2018), a punitive approach of suspensions and expulsions is never in the best interest of these students. Staff members need a behavior model that is proactive and consistent. Many schools have implemented SWPBIS (School Wide Positive Behavioral Interventions and Supports) programs as a preventative way to decrease suspensions and increase morale. There are several critical factors to look at in schools that are implementing SWPBIS, staff buy in and staff perception are two of the biggest. This study examines the attitudes of staff at a middle school during its initial year of SWPBIS.

Keywords: middle school, kids, behavior, staff, supported, negative, implementation, barrier, relationships.

Literature Review

Student behavioral issues lead to lost learning opportunities by the student misbehaving and the students trying to learn (Gage, Grasley-Boy, George, Childs, and Kincaid, 2018), a punitive approach of suspensions and expulsions is never in the best interest of these students. Staff members need a behavior model that is proactive and consistent. Many schools have implemented SWPBIS (School Wide Positive Behavioral Interventions and Supports) programs as a preventative way to decrease suspensions and increase morale. In order for SWPBIS to work schools must have significant buy-in by staff members. According to Feuerborn, Tyre, and King (2014) getting all of the staff on board can be a very difficult undertaking. A study by Lohrmann., Forman, Martin, and Palmieri (2008) reports that there is not enough research on the actual implementation of SWPBIS with regard to administration support, time to plan, and adequate personnel to do the job. It is critical for any school undertaking SWPBIS to make sure they are doing it with fidelity, and that they understand variables that may undermine the initiative. School district and administrative support, time, school characteristics, and staff buy in are all critical factors that can play a role in the success or failure of SWPBIS. With regards to time and school characteristics, a study by Nese, Nese, McIntosh, Mercer, & Kittelman (2018), looked at the makeup of schools in an attempt to understand the time it takes schools to adequately implement SWPBIS while factoring in different school characteristics, and if those characteristics predict adequate implementation of SWPBIS. The study looked at 708 public

elementary, middle school, and high schools across five states. They found that elementary schools were 2.5 times more likely to reach adequate implementation of SWPBIS before middle schools, and eight times more likely before high schools. They found that non Title 1 schools were two times more likely to reach adequate implementation of SWPBIS before Title 1 schools, and suburban schools were two times more likely to reach adequate implementation before city schools. The researchers were not surprised that elementary schools reached fidelity faster because of the difference in the makeup of elementary versus secondary schools. Secondary schools have larger staff and require more time to train. This study brought up a very important point. The researchers made mention of the fact that many states offer training for Tier I in year one, Tier II in year two, and Tier III in year three. By following this progression it can negatively impact schools that have not reached adequate implementation of Tier I in the first year. This study suggests that schools with a higher socioeconomic status in non urban areas reach adequate implementation of SWPBIS faster.

What about the abandonment rate of SWPBIS? Do certain characteristics of schools play a role? A study by Nese, Mcintosh, Nese, Hoselton, Bloom, Johnson, & Ghemraoui (2016) conducted research about the abandonment of SWPBIS. The researchers stated that previous research on this issue indicates schools abandon SWPBIS if they are not doing it with fidelity in the first year of implementation, if they are in a high poverty area, and if they do not have state support. This study collected data from three states totalling 915 public schools, elementary, middle, and high schools. They found that the abandonment rate of these schools was very low,

only 7%. This contradicted previous studies that reported abandonment was more likely than sustainability. They reported that having state level support may contribute to sustainability. The only real significant factor they found in abandonment had to do with schools that were located in cities. The study recommended that qualitative studies should be done to further understand reasons for abandonment.

School characteristics and time are themes that have emerged in researching SWPBIS, but what about staff buy in? A study by Freeman, Simonsen, McCoach, Sugai, Lombardi, & Horner. (2015), reported the importance of staff buy-in and implementation of SWPBIS with fidelity. They discussed using a School Wide Evaluation Tool (SET), and a Benchmark of Quality (BoQ) assessment tool to gauge the integrity of SWPBIS, if schools meet 70% of the criteria on the BoQ and 80% on the SET they are considered implementing SWPBIS with fidelity (as cited by Cohen et al., 2007; Horner et al., 2004). This same study confirms the previous studies with regards to the fact that SWPBIS is more difficult to do at the high school level for several reasons. Many students do not have the same respect for adults that children do in elementary and middle schools, class sizes are generally much larger at the high school, and some teachers are not as willing to spend time teaching SWPBIS at the high school level when they are trying to get through difficult content. Another measurement tool for staff buy in was done by Feuerborn, Tyre, & King (2014). They created a survey tool to gauge how staff feels about school climate, behavior, availability of resources, and support, it is called The Staff Perceptions of Behavior and Discipline (SPDB). The survey contained 24 items, they were,

“Wording to measure philosophies that can facilitate or create tensions in the implementation of SWPBIS” (p. 114). For this study the researchers looked at 36 schools, five districts were urban, two were rural, and two were suburban. Of the schools, 25 were elementary, eight were middle schools, and three were high schools. The findings of the study showed that staff from the elementary schools had a higher SPDB than the staff from the secondary schools. The finding from this study supports other studies that show elementary schools have a more positive outlook towards SWPBIS as opposed to secondary schools.

Staff perception of SWPBIS is a critical component to gauge for its sustainability, Goodman-Scott, Hays, & Cholewa (2017) conducted a qualitative single case study about a middle school that was located in an urban area and at one point was labeled as a failing school, it is also a high poverty school with 65% of the students qualifying for free and reduced lunch. A new principal, Mrs. Jackson, took over and right away implemented SWPBIS. The study looks at the first five years of SWPBIS implementation in the school from 2009-2014. The purpose of the study was to understand how SWPBIS was implemented in this school, the effects it had on the school, and to hear the voices of the staff members. The researchers measured for SWPBIS fidelity and calculated a 94% SET score, as mentioned in the previous article, this is a strong fidelity score. Through interviews with staff members the researchers found that the principal had a significant impact on the turnaround of the school and staff morale. The principal made sure to meet with every staff member to solicit feedback, she made sure to go out of her way to compliment the teachers, and she gave them adequate time to implement the initiative. The

success of this school, located in an urban setting with a high poverty rate, also contradicts previous studies that reported difficulties implementing SWPBIS in schools with this type of demographics.

The findings from these studies have some common themes. Reaching fidelity with SWPBIS is generally easier to do at the elementary school level, and staff members need to feel they are supported and that they have time to implement the initiative. Some studies show schools in an urban setting face more challenges than those outside of the urban area, but there are also contradictory findings. The qualitative study mentioned above was done at a school in an urban setting with a high poverty rate, the school was having success with SWPBIS, interviews with staff suggest effective administrative leadership is a key factor. Some studies have shown the abandonment rate of SWPBIS is high, but there are other studies that show the abandonment rate is actually very low. Positive staff perception seems to be the common theme that drives success. Going forth there needs to be more qualitative studies done with staff members to understand additional key factors that can impact the success or failure of SWPBIS. Understanding these variables are invaluable in helping school districts create and modify professional development, and address school climate and culture, to ensure the success of SWPBIS.

Methods

My research question is: SWPBIS is a new initiative at (I'm changing the name) American Middle School, how is it being received by staff? In order to answer this question I

conducted one-on-one qualitative interviews of self selected staff members from American Middle School about their attitudes and experiences related to their school's first year implementing SWPBIS. I recorded the data, coded it, and looked for themes that helped me to understand the attitude that staff has towards SWPBIS. My selection model was purposeful sampling, with all participants employed in the same building. I wanted to develop as many perspectives as possible, I used Maximal Variation Sampling where I selected staff members that have different levels of experience teaching, and I also selected staff members based on their tenure at the school. I wanted some teachers that were new to American Middle school, some that have been at the school for a few years, and some tenured teachers. I wanted to determine if any themes developed based on tenure at the school. I also explored if there were any themes that developed based on teaching experience. The research site was at American Middle School, the sample size of participants was eight. I conducted semi-structured, open-ended, interviews with staff in the school, at a time and place that was convenient for the participant. My method of data collection was conducting interviews, recording the responses, and later transcribing them. Before the interview they were given a participant consent form (see Appendix A), I asked the same seven open ended questions to each participant, I did ask several clarifying and follow up questions. I recorded the interviews using GarageBand, after the interviews I transcribed and coded the interviews. Once I had the interviews recorded I analyzed the data. Creswell and Gutterman (2019) describe six steps that should be used when analyzing qualitative data, The six steps are:

(1) preparing and organizing the data for analysis, (2) engaging in an initial exploration of the data through the process of coding it, (3) using the codes to develop a more general picture of the data (descriptions and themes), (4) representing the findings through narratives and visuals, (5) interpreting the meaning of the results by reflecting personally on the impact of the findings and on the literature that might inform the findings, and, finally, (6) conducting strategies to validate the accuracy of the findings. In practice, researchers do not always follow these steps in sequence but iteratively proceed back and forth through the steps of qualitative analysis. (p. 237)

After I completed the audio recordings of my interviews I reread the transcripts, analyzed the codes, and found the themes that emerged from the interviews based on the multiple perspectives. As I analyzed all of this data I brought it back to my research problem and question: SWPBIS is a new initiative at American Middle School, how is it being received by staff? I wanted to understand the attitude staff has towards the implementation of SWPBIS. Creswell and Gutterman (2019), describe the types of themes that may emerge from the different sites: Ordinary themes, Unexpected themes, Hard-to-classify themes, and major and minor themes. The authors also make mention of the fact that it is important to look for contrary evidence, information from participants that does not support the emerging themes (Creswell and Gutterman, 2019). Once the coding was finished and the themes were developed I had to be able to represent the findings. I chose a narrative discussion. This type of reporting is the best way to share my information in a way that gives an accurate portrayal of the interview subjects.

Creswell and Gutterman (2019) list ways to structure the discussion, they mention that the researcher should use quotes from the interview, write in vivid detail, and specify tensions and contradictions in individual experiences. (p. 259) Once the narrative was written I had to interpret my findings by summarizing the main ideas, interjecting my personal feelings about the research, and making connections from my findings to previous literature on the same topic. I also had to make mention of weaknesses in my study, and limitations that prevented a more thorough report. In an effort to make sure that my reports are accurate I engaged in member checking where I summarized the key ideas of the interview to the participants to make sure that I accurately recorded their responses.

Results

I interviewed eight staff members from AMS, some have worked at the school between one and three years, some have worked at the school from between four and six years, and some have worked at the school greater than six years. I felt it was important that I spoke to as many veteran teachers as possible. I was especially interested in hearing their perspective on SWPBIS because they have experienced at least three different principals, each with different philosophies on behavior management. All of the participants were very willing to share their opinions and spoke freely. With the exception of one teacher, the rest are willing to try SWPBIS, even though all of them had reservations about the behavior model in its current form.

After completing the interviews I coded the transcripts and several themes emerged: alternative placement, administration support, lack of administration support, no tier two or three

interventions, lack of consequences, and inconsistency. I will discuss each theme in detail in the following pages, while providing quotes to add substance.

Lack of Having an Alternative Placement

One of the themes was the lack of having an alternative placement for kids that chronically misbehave. This is the first year of SWPBIS at AMS, there are no tier two or three interventions currently, so all students are following the same behavior plan. Teachers give a student a reminder, a warning, a reset, and if the problem behavior continues they are sent to a buddy teacher. If and when they get back from the buddy teacher (usually a five to ten minute break), and they are unable to follow the rules, the teacher calls an administrator. The administrator will remove the student to process with them and eventually they will be sent back to class. Many of the teachers interviewed expressed frustration with this. One teacher said,

“There needs to be more spaces in the school for those tier one, tier two, tier three students to go to when they're not being successful in the classroom. Whether that's due to outside influences on them, there's just not enough places for students to go when the classroom isn't a good place for them. So I would definitely add some sort of, like, reflection room.”

Another teacher said,

“I do have a problem with some kids being so disruptive in class, as they have been in the past, but they're allowed to be here because there's no place else. I feel like we need alternative programs here in the school where they can go, because they can't handle the

regular classroom.”

Lack of Having Tier Two and Three Supports in Place

An overlapping theme was the lack of having tier two and three supports in place. I interviewed several people on the SWPBIS team, one said that the plan for our school was to have tier one in place this year, do tier two next year, and tier three the following year. It was evident in my interviews that not all staff was aware of this timeline. Many of the people interviewed expressed distress for not having tier two and tier three in place because they felt that we already have a lot of tier two and three kids with no plan for them. Several of the people interviewed expressed frustration in the fact that they felt the ability to hand out discipline was taken away from them. They mentioned that having recess detentions was a great motivator for some of their students to not get in trouble last year, this year they have lost the ability to hand out this type of punishment. Some of the quotes from this theme were,

“I think that we are kind of going backwards with how it should be implemented. Uh, I think that we have a lot of kids that already should be into tier two and tier three interventions and all of those aren't in place yet. Uh, I think that we did it the opposite way and we should have had our tier three interventions kind of in place. If they did tier three and the same with tier two, and then rolled it out and did the whole thing with tier one I think it would be more effective.”

Another quote was, “I think challenging students who might be tier two or tier three may be discouraging to some folks who are looking for answers and right now we're, you know, building

the airplane, while we're flying it.” One person on the SWPBIS team said, “I would amp up the arrival of tier two and tier three. We need some strategies, we need some consistency on how to deal with the kids that PBS is not working for.”

Lack of Consequences

A third theme that emerged was lack of consequences. As mentioned earlier, some of the teachers interviewed felt that SWPBIS eliminates autonomy, taking away their ability to manage behaviors as they see fit. Teachers mentioned that they are no longer able to give recess detentions and that kids aren't getting consequences from administration when they do get into trouble. One teacher said,

“I would say there's a lot of teacher frustration with thinking they can't, um, give a lot of consequences. And with that, they think other kids see that kids aren't getting consequences. They may be getting consequences, but we don't see it, and the kids don't see it, and all of a sudden you've got more behaviors because the kids don't see that person get in trouble for, let's say, you know, going on the school roof.”

Another teacher said,

“I think because we're so focused on the positives and we're taken away every single consequence, students are kind of figuring this out and overall, it's making students feel more emboldened to do things that they may not normally do because they know there won't be any consequences.”

This quote was in response to a particular student that had some very difficult behaviors starting

with the first day of school. She was constantly leaving class without permission, keeping her airpods in her ears, listening to music, and on her phone. All of these behaviors are against school rules. The other kids saw her doing this and questioned why they couldn't do it as well. Many of the teachers interviewed reported this situation and may be struggling with it. There are several students that were mentioned that they felt were getting away with whatever they wanted. One quote related to this situation was as follows,

“Um, I would make sure that the rules apply to everyone. Children with special privileges, like being able to have their airpods in all day and walk around with their cell phones, that just sends a really bad message to the other kids, and I really wish that everybody would enforce all the rules, because then kids start playing you like they play their parents. Well, mom lets me do this but you don't so it's your problem. Sometimes I feel just writing up a kid for a minor without actually correcting the behavior is wrong, like a kid that walked into the gym from lunch without a pass. I followed him in there and I said to the person on duty that this person doesn't have a pass. And they go, I know. I was like, that's not doing anything, like, I told him he's not supposed to be here. Okay, but you're not following through. So if you're not following through that kid just realized they can just walk past you and get away with it.”

Inconsistency

Lack of consequences overlaps with my next theme, inconsistency. Many of the teachers said that not all of their coworkers are complying with the PBIS guidelines and rules and it's

poisoning the culture of the school. It is pitting teacher against teacher. The previous quote spoke to this situation. Another teacher talked about inconsistency in this quote, and how it varies from team to team.

“It (SWPBIS) claims consistency, but I don't see consistency. And I don't think that any system can work unless we all buy in and we all follow through. And my biggest concern is not only is there not consistency from team to team. There's no consistency between how the classroom teacher is supposed to deal with stuff.”

Staff buy in was brought up by several of the interviewees, the fact that although there should be one set of rules for the whole school, different teams do things differently. At AMS there are three eighth grade teams, four seventh grade teams, and two teams for kids with special needs. For the most part the teams are autonomous with no common schedule. Every team is required to follow protocol with SWPBIS, but the feeling is that there are different rules depending on where you are in the building. Another issue that was brought up was handing out SWPBIS Tickets. When a teacher catches a student in the act of doing the right thing they are encouraged to give that student a SWPBIS Ticket. The students put the tickets in buckets in the main office, daily drawings are held and there are multiple winners announced every day for various prizes. Some of the teachers interviewed said that the way tickets are handed out is inconsistent. It was mentioned that some teachers do give them out and some give them out when they aren't necessarily deserved. One teacher interviewed spoke of this situation, they said,

“I would say that the kids that get identified as needing behavior plans, I think they need

to be concrete and followed through with, you know, to a tee. Uh, You know, I think that if you identify a kid that needs some support great. Obviously that kid is going to have some things that they need to do in order to receive an award or reward, and it might be different than the other kids in school, but I think that teaching the responsibility of being accountable for your actions, and if this is in your behavior plan and you don't meet it your end, then that reward definitely shouldn't be given. I think I've seen some times that kids are still getting rewards when they probably haven't followed up on their end.”

Administration Support, Both Positive and Negative

Administration support, both positive and negative, are the last two themes that developed. Three of the people interviewed had positive things to say about administration. The feeling among them was that both the principal and vice principal are in a very difficult situation and are doing their best under the circumstances. One staff member praised the vice principal directly and said, “I would say (assistant principal) is doing a great job of being there for teachers.” Another teacher said, “I think that our administration has really been awesome in supporting the implementation and having a consultant come in to help us while we're rolling it out.” While there were positive comments there were also negative feelings. Four of the people interviewed said that lack of administration support negatively impacted their view of SWPBIS at AMS. One teacher expressed frustration with the fact that they felt there was a good cop bad cop scenario, where administration is the good cop and teachers are the bad cop, they said, “We have people that are direct players in PBIS, administration, our interventionist, and

they're playing a different game. And I've said all along, the way we are doing it now firmly puts a black hat on classroom teachers and I don't appreciate that."

Several teachers mentioned that they don't feel directly supported by administration and feel like they are sometimes on an island, one teacher compared AMS to a previous school and said,

"When I wrote someone up, and it was on paper, I got a response to what happened and I liked that, I haven't gotten anything like that yet. At least, maybe eventually we will. I don't know but that part, I guess, kind of bothers me because I'd like to know, like what the consequence was for whatever that action is."

Discussion

The purpose of my study was to see how SWPBIS is being received by staff, after conducting the interviews all of the interview participants except for one agreed that there are behavior problems at our school and that we need a more effective way of dealing with them than what we have used in the past. Most of the teachers are willing to give SWPBIS a try but many of them said that they don't feel we are heading in the right direction. Inconsistency in the part of administration and fellow staff members was an overarching theme. Many of the people being interviewed felt that not everyone was following the new SWPBIS behavioral guidelines and that administration was either too overwhelmed or not appreciative of the fact that some kids are out of control and nothing is being done about it. Communication seems to be the key, in this case, lack of communication. The biggest complaint from the people I interviewed was that they felt they were rarely told what the student's consequence was once they were removed from their room,

this led to a feeling that nothing was being done. Some of them felt jaded because they recorded incidents and never heard back about what was being done with the student. A lot of the teachers interviewed felt that having different rules for different students had a very negative impact on everyone's perception of the initiative. There was some misunderstanding by staff about the implementation of tier one SWPBIS and how the program is actually run.

Limitations

One limitation of this study is that there are over 50 staff members at American Middle School, I interviewed only eight and they were all teachers. Administration, guidance counselors, and other members of the staff were not included. Also absent from this study were the voices of students. Of the eight teachers interviewed, two of the interviewees have been employed by the school between one and three years, one has been employed between four and six years, and five have been employed by the school greater than six years. If I had spoken with more people with different tenures I may have uncovered more themes, or may have spoken with people that backed the initiative 100%, or were against it 100%. Another potential factor to consider in my study is that I teach there. I can see this as a potential advantage and disadvantage. It may have been an advantage because they know me and may have felt more comfortable discussing SWPBIS than if they had been interviewed by a stranger, but this factor could have also had a negative impact. The fact that they know me may have biased their responses if they thought that I wanted a question answered a certain way. I tried very carefully to go into this with an open mind and remove all biases. I made sure to keep the interviews very formal. I did not interject

any of my own opinions and did not smile or nod during the interviews. I wanted to make sure that I wasn't leading the interviewee in any way.

Implications for Future Research

Similar studies may want to include a larger population of staff members and include other employees in the building. Having the students be a part of this survey might enrich this study.

This study was done during the initial year of implementing SWPBIS with fidelity, being able to go back and interview the same participants over time would be invaluable.

Implications for Practice Conclusion

After speaking to the participants, all of them except for one was willing to give SWPBIS a chance and most saw potential in the program. This is very important, as mentioned in the literature review, A study by Freeman, Simonsen, McCoach, Sugai, Lombardi, & Horner. (2015), reported the importance of staff buy-in and implementation of SWPBIS with fidelity. I was not able to get a SET of BoQ score for the school, but 88% of the people I interviewed saw value in SWPBIS, this could bode well towards long term sustainability. The biggest issue the interviewees had was the perceived lack of communication. Teachers felt that administration wasn't always following up on SWPBIS referrals and that they were not acknowledging or communicating what if any actions were taken with students when they were written up. There was also a lot of mistrust among staff members, some felt that not every teacher was holding up their end when it came to consistently following SWPBIS rules. Finally, there was a lot of misunderstanding about how SWPBIS is supposed to work. Several staff members felt that AMS

should be doing all three tiers during the initial year, a notion that was contradicted by a member of the SWPBIS leadership team (interestingly, another member of the leadership team was one of the people that brought up this point). Going forward to make SWPBIS more successful there needs to be more communication about the nuts and bolts of the program with a clear timetable of how the program will be implemented. Administration might consider how they can communicate with staff regarding behavioral incidents, and there should be a way to acknowledge staff members that are doing an exemplary job implementing the program. Abandonment of SWPBIS is a possibility that needs to be closely monitored. As mentioned earlier, A study by Nese, Mcintosh, Nese, Hoselton, Bloom, Johnson, & Ghemraoui (2016) conducted research about the abandonment of SWPBIS. The researchers stated that previous research on this issue indicates schools abandon SWPBIS if they are not doing it with fidelity in the first year of implementation, if they are in a high poverty area, and if they do not have state support. AMS is in a high poverty rate school, and although seven of the eight teachers I interviewed saw value in SWPBIS they did have reservations about the program. It is critical that AMS is doing SWPBIS with fidelity to avoid potential abandonment later on.

References

- Creswell, J. W., & Guetterman, T. C. (2019). *Educational research: Planning, conducting, and evaluating quantitative and qualitative research*. Pearson.
- Feuerborn, L. L., Tyre, A. D., & King, J. P. (2014, 10). The staff perceptions of behavior and discipline survey. *Journal of Positive Behavior Interventions, 17*(2), 116-126.
doi:10.1177/1098300714556675
- Freeman, J., Simonsen, B., Mccoach, D. B., Sugai, G., Lombardi, A., & Horner, R. (2015, 04). Relationship between school-wide positive behavior interventions and supports and academic, attendance, and behavior outcomes in high schools. *Journal of Positive Behavior Interventions, 18*(1), 41-51. doi:10.1177/1098300715580992
- Gage, N. A., Grasley-Boy, N., George, H. P., Childs, K., & Kincaid, D. (2018). A quasi-experimental design analysis of the effects of school-wide positive behavior interventions and supports on discipline in Florida. *Journal of Positive Behavior Interventions, 21*(1), 50-61. doi:10.1177/1098300718768208
- Lohrmann, S., Forman, S., Martin, S., & Palmieri, M. (2008, 06). Understanding school personnel's resistance to adopting schoolwide positive behavior support at a universal level of intervention. *Journal of Positive Behavior Interventions, 10*(4), 256-269.
doi:10.1177/1098300708318963
- Nese, R., Mcintosh, K., Nese, J., Hoselton, R., Bloom, J., Johnson, N., . . . Ghemraoui, A. (2016, 11). Predicting abandonment of school-wide positive behavioral interventions and

supports. *Behavioral Disorders*, 42(1), 261-270. doi:10.17988/bd-15-95.1

Nese, R. N., Nese, J. F., McIntosh, K., Mercer, S. H., & Kittelman, A. (2018, 07). Predicting latency of reaching adequate implementation of tier I school wide positive behavioral interventions and supports. *Journal of Positive Behavior Interventions*, 21(2), 106-116. doi:10.1177/1098300718783755

Appendix A

Participant Informed Consent

Thank you for agreeing to participate in my research study. The purpose of my study is to get a better understanding of how staff members feel about the new PBIS initiative at American Middle School.

What you will be asked to do: You will be asked to be interviewed for approximately 30 minutes, the questions will be related to your experience and attitudes towards SWPBIS at American Middle School. The interview will be recorded and your responses will be part of a report that the school and my professor will read. You are not obligated to answer any question you don't feel you want to answer, and you can request to end the interview at any time.

Potential Risks: Possible risks include loss of time to participants while completing the interview. Interviewees may also feel uncomfortable discussing potentially revealing details about how well, or not so well SWPBIS is working at their school, and may worry about administration or coworkers finding out what they specifically said.

Potential Benefits: The information gained from the interviews will be shared with administration, they will be able to read the perceptions of teachers' attitudes towards SWPBIS at

American Middle School. If there are issues that need to be addressed staff will have the opportunity to do so.

Confidentiality: This study is part of my Capstone Project at UMF. The interviews will be recorded and transcribed. The identifying information will not be shared with anyone, there will be no identifying information left in the transcripts or on the audio. The audio will be kept on my American School Department computer that is password protected. The audio and transcripts will be destroyed at the end of this class (May, 2020). Until they are destroyed the transcripts will be kept in a locked cabinet.

Please indicate whether you:

_____ Agree to participate and agree to have the interview recorded

_____ Agree to participate but do not agree to have the interview recorded

By signing below you are indicating that you have agreed to participate in this research study and you understand your rights as a research participant.

Appendix B

1. Which category best describes your tenure at American Middle School (AMS)? One to three years, four to six years. or greater than six years?

2. How does School Wide Positive Behavior Intervention Strategies (SWPBIS) compare to other behavioral models that you have used in the past?

3. What are your perceptions about the implementation of SWPBIS?

4. What has supported implementation or what barriers to implementation have existed?

5. What barriers to SWPBIS are you dealing with

6. What affect do you think SWPBIS is having at AMS?

7. What might you change about how SWPBIS is currently working at AMS?

