

# Prevent-Teach-Reinforce

---

## Randomized Trial of PBIS “Lite”

Phillip S. Strain, Ph.D.  
University of Colorado Denver

# Why P-T-R?

---

- We've known about functional assessment and assessment-based interventions for more than 20 years. And we've conducted many, many trainings on PBS for serious behavior problems for a long time. And this is well and good, however....
- We see optimal outcomes too rarely
- A big concern involves insufficient implementation of PBS procedures of assessment, intervention and data collection. A problem of implementation fidelity.

# Purpose of P-T-R

---

- To provide schools with a standardized, easy-to-use model with which to apply research-based, behavioral strategies for addressing the most serious problem behaviors of students.
  - For all students with serious problem behaviors --  
- special education, general education.
  - Intended for pre-K through high school
  - Most research to date has been conducted in grades K-8

# PTR Model

---

- Research-based Practices
  - Assessment and Intervention
- Team-driven decision-making
- Steps are scripted as much as possible
- Each step ends with self-evaluation (checklist)
- Selection of interventions is menu-driven
- Entire process is manualized

Glen Dunlap, Rose Iovannone, Donald Kincaid,  
Kelly Wilson, Kathy Christiansen,  
Phillip Strain, & Carie English

Foreword by George Sugai



PREVENT

TEACH

REINFORCE

THE SCHOOL-BASED MODEL OF  
INDIVIDUALIZED  
POSITIVE BEHAVIOR SUPPORT



# The PTR Model

---

- 5-Step Process
  - Developing a Team
  - Establishing clear goals (short and long term)
  - Functional Assessment
  - Designing and Implementing a Behavior Intervention Plan
  - Evaluation (ongoing) and Revision (as necessary)

# Step 1: Teaming

---

- Purpose: Establish group involved with developing and implementing intervention
  
- Members: Teacher(s), Para-educator(s), School professionals, Family members, etc.
  - 3-8 individuals
  - At least one administrator who can deliver resources and develop/interpret policies
  - At least one person knowledgeable in behavioral theory and principles and experienced in FA and BIP

# Step 2: Goal Setting and Data Collection

---

- Purpose: (1) to establish clear long and short-term objectives; (2) to establish a unified vision for desired outcomes; (3) establish feasible strategies for valid data collection
- Kinds of goals: (1) Reducing specified problem behaviors; (2) Develop academic competencies; (3) Improve social competencies, problem solving, and interpersonal relations/interactions

# Step 3: Functional Assessment

---

- Purpose: Identify function(s) and antecedent variables influencing target behavior(s)
- Strategy: (1) Detailed, structured questionnaires for each team member focused on antecedent variables, functions, and maintaining consequences. (2) Team meeting to produce consensus.
- Outcomes: Hypothesis statement(s) with each component specified.

# Step 4: Intervention Design and Implementation

---

- Purpose: To build a Behavior Intervention Plan (BIP) based on FA information
- Features:
  - (1) BIP must include *at least* one strategy from each of the 3 components: **Prevent, Teach, Reinforce**
  - (2) Menus of research-based strategies for each component; forms and templates to build plan
  - (3) Selection of strategies is made by team, based on FA and on team's ability/resources to implement

# Step 5: Evaluation

---

- Purpose: (1) Measure effects of intervention on problem behaviors and academic/social behaviors (progress monitoring); (2) Measure fidelity of implementation
- Features: Simple (easy-to-use) instruments --- behavior rating scales; checklists; etc.

# A Randomized Controlled Evaluation of PTR

---

Iovannone, Greenbaum, Wang, Kincaid,  
Dunlap, & Strain, (2009), *Journal of Emotional  
and Behavioral Disorders*, 17, 213-225

# Participants

---

- N = 245 students
  - Randomly assigned to PTR or Services as Usual
- Nominated as the students with the most serious problem behaviors in their class
- Grades K-8; from 5 school districts in FL and CO
- Ages 4-15 ( $X = 8.17$ )
- 48% had IEPs; 33% in self-contained special education programs
- Variety of Disability labels, including ASD (N = 25)
- 50% White; 29% Hispanic; 18% African American
- 38% on free or reduced-price lunch programs



# Procedures

---

- All Assessment and Intervention Steps Carried out by School-based Teams
  - Almost all interventions conducted by students' teachers
- Process facilitated by PTR research staff and implementation manual
- Data collected by Teachers and by PTR staff

# Principal Measures

---

- Social Skills Rating System (SSRS)
  - Problem Behavior subscale
  - Social Skills subscale
- Academic Engaged Time
- Social Validity (Treatment Acceptability Rating Form; Reimers and Wacker)
- Fidelity of Implementation

# Results

---

- Social Skills --- Difference in standard scores from baseline to post-test:
  - PTR = + 7.38; SAU = + 1.25 ( $p < .001$ )
- Problem Behavior --- Difference in standard scores from baseline to post-test:
  - PTR = - 5.30; SAU = - 0.76 ( $p < .001$ )
- Academic Engaged Time --- Difference in rates from baseline to post-test:
  - PTR = + 0.13; SAU = + .02 ( $p < .001$ )

- 
- 
- Fidelity: Data showed that almost all teachers (> 80%) were able to implement the intervention plans with high fidelity
  - Social Validity: Data on the TARF showed that teachers found the PTR process to be highly acceptable and efficacious. Teachers were very willing to use the PTR process in the future.