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Function-Based Support (FBS)

What is it?

-3 Consecutive Processes:
  (1) FBA, (2) BSP, (3) Implementation/Evaluation
  (e.g., Tobin, 2005)

Why use it?

- Effectively & efficiently Improves problem behavior
  (e.g., Newcomer & Lewis, 2004; Ingram, Lewis-Palmer, & Sugai, 2005)

- Efficacious with various populations
  (Umbreit, Ferro, Liaupsin, & Lane, 2007, e.g., Liaupsin, Umbreit, Ferro, Urso, & Upreti, 2006; Hughes, Alberto, & Fredrick, 2006; Gettinger & Stoiber, 2006; Dixon et al., 2004)
FBS, IDEIA, Needs, and Realities

Whom is it *mandated* for?

Whom is it *suggested* for?

Who *needs* it?

Who is *unlikely* to receive it?
Youth Without Disabilities…
…but still exhibiting problem behaviors!

Who are they?
-Failing to meet teacher’s expectations (Lane, Mahdavi, & Borthwick-Duffy, 2003)
-Less intense but more frequent problem behaviors
-At risk for several deleterious outcomes (e.g., Lane et al., 2003; Lane & Wehby, 2002; Edgar, 1992)

What about intervention?
-Prereferral Intervention (Lane et al., 2003)
-Typically non-function & non-evidence based (Lane et al., 2003, McDougal, Nastasi, & Chafouleas, 2006, Truscott et al.)
Solutions

What can be done?

- General Educators can provide FBS as a prereferral intervention!

Moore et al. (2002)
3 teachers
functional analysis
during classroom instruction

1 teacher
3 FBS processes ind.
2 students

Lane, Weisenbach, Little, Phillips, & Wehby (2006)
2 teachers
collaborated with “liaisons”
1 student each classroom
Aims of this study


2. Investigate a pragmatic, skills-based training methodology

3. Train teachers who were selected semi-randomly
Method

Setting
Suburban, Title I, elementary school

Students
- 868 students
- Ethnicity
  - 75% Caucasian
  - 20% Hispanic
  - 5% Other
- 18% with disabilities
- 15% ELL
- 40% free or reduced lunch

Faculty
- 30 general educators
- 4 special educators
- 1 part-time school psychologist
Method

Participants

Mrs. Anderson:
- 4 years experience
- 1st year, Kindergarten
- B.S., ESL endorsement
- 22 students

Mrs. Bailey:
- 3 years experience
- Second grade
- Master’s student
- 22 students

Mrs. Oliver:
- 15 years experience
- First grade
- B.S.
- 25 students

Mrs. Walker:
- 1st year
- First-grade
- B.S.
- 25 students
**Method**

**Participants**
Selected by each teacher

**Criteria:**
(a) exhibiting behavior disruptive to teaching-learning processes
(b) not receiving any behavioral intervention-related services
(c) does not have an IEP
(d) not receiving ELL services

Danny - Kindergarten
Andrew - 1st Grade
Dominic - 1st Grade
Landon - 2nd Grade
Method

Function-Based Support Training
(Adapted and modified from Umbreit, Ferro, Liaupsin, & Lane, 2007)

In-vivo training
• 4 one-hour sessions
• Interactive group setting

Independent reading and applied assignments
• 10 brief reading assignments (Umbreit et al., 2007)
• 10 independent applied activities

2 Individual consultations
• (1) after FBA completion, (2) after BSP completion
Method

Experimental Designs

4 AB designs (see Alberto & Troutman, 2006)
  • One for each student

1 modified multiple-baseline design
  • For FBS Knowledge Test scores
  • Based on Miller and Weaver’s (1972) multiple-baseline achievement test
Results

- **General Educators**
  - FBS Knowledge Test Scores (avg.)

- **Baseline**
  - Section 1: 62.5%
  - Section 2: 57.5%
  - Section 3: 62.5%

- **Training 1:**
  - Section 1: 89.4%
  - Section 2: 65.6%
  - Section 3: 62.5%

- **Trainings 2 & 3:**
  - Section 1: 96.9%
  - Section 2: 82.5%
  - Section 3: 65%

- **Training 4:**
  - Section 1: 96.9%
  - Section 2: 88.1%
  - Section 3: 82.5%
# FBA & BSP

**Teacher/Student:** Walker & Andrew

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FBA</th>
<th>BSP</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Target Behavior</strong></td>
<td><strong>Function</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inattentive Behavior: Humming</td>
<td>PR Attention</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inattentive Behavior: Clicking tongue</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inattentive Behavior: Touching, whispering to and making faces at peers</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attentive Behavior: Hands and feet to self</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attentive Behavior: Talking only to participate in class</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Results - Walker & Andrew
Results - Anderson & Danny

On-Task Behavior

Sessions
Results - Oliver & Dominic

Inattentive Behavior

Sessions

Observer
Teacher
Results - Bailey & Landon

On-Task Behavior

Sessions

Observer
Teacher
Method

Interobserver Agreement

44% of all observations

Anderson  95% (range 93-98%)

Walker    95% (range 85-100%)

Olsen     91% (range 85-100%)

Bailey    92% (range 86-92%)
Method

Social Validity

Questionnaire

• 11 agreement questions
  6 point Likert scale
  (strongly disagree – strongly agree)

• 4 free response questions
  3 rationale questions
  1 general opinion question
Results

• **Social Validity**
  
  – Intervention Evaluation
    
    • Despite mixed data, all teachers reported significant behavior change in their students

  – Social Validity Questionnaire results
    
    • Varying levels of agreement on all but one question
# Function-Based Support Training: Social Validity Questionnaire

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Slightly Disagree</th>
<th>Slightly Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I feel this training provided information that helped me improve my student’s problem behavior.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I feel this training provided information that would be beneficial for all teachers to learn.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I feel the most beneficial part of the training was . . .</td>
<td>Response: Learning effective problem behavior management; learning to identify function of problem behavior; learning to define target behaviors; learning how to design an intervention.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I feel I will apply these principles with other students, throughout my teaching career.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I feel the reading assignments helped me to gain a better understanding of the material.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I feel the applied assignments helped me to organize and apply the information I learned.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I feel the two brief consultation sessions helped me to better understand and apply the material.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I feel the time required to participate in the four after-school trainings was doable with my school schedule.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I agree/disagree with the above statement because . . .</td>
<td>Response: It was a stretch, but doable; the end of the year caused interference; it was a rough time of year.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I feel the time required to implement these principles in the classroom was doable with my school schedule.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I agree/disagree with the above statement because . . .</td>
<td>Response: It was difficult during testing— I had to stop testing and fell behind.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I feel the time required to complete the applied assignments was doable with my school schedule.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I agree/disagree with the above statement because . . .</td>
<td>Response: N/A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I feel I would have been willing to spend more time learning this material, if needed.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I feel that most teachers would be able to spend the time it takes to participate in this training.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Additional feedback: Collecting data conflicted with my teaching and made it “choppy”; ABC observations difficult to do during instruction; this time of year (end) wasn’t the best; would be more beneficial at the beginning of the year.
Discussion

Where do we go from here?
http://education.byu.edu/pbsi/

Tyler Renshaw: ty.renshaw@gmail.com
Tara Anderson: byu.pbsi@gmail.com
Lynnette Christensen: lynnette_christensen@byu.edu
Michelle Marchant: michelle_marchant@byu.edu

236 S 700 E
Provo, UT 84606
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