









































## **PRACTICAL EXAMPLES AND POTENTIAL PITFALLS**

In many schools across the United States, when PBIS or instructional coaches step in to assist a school with “behavior” or “discipline” challenges, the team will start with discussing what interventions and supports are available at each tier. The conversation will be guided by a coach who asks, “What does everyone get?”; “What do some students get?”; and “What do very few students get?” They will also discuss what data drives those decisions. In our experience, many schools implement Tier 1 PBIS well, and understand the importance of gathering and using schoolwide data. Often the special education teachers will step up and describe their available intensive, individualized supports. What is left is an empty space of what is available at Tier 2 for students with targeted needs. This gap can easily (and incorrectly) lead to an increased reliance on punitive, exclusionary discipline as the response to students with targeted needs, when no systematic approach is available.

Second, when schools have a Tier 2 process in place for identifying students and even a Tier 2 team that reviews student data, another common occurrence is that when the PBIS coach asks “what interventions do you have available at Tier 2,” the school will list a single intervention that all students who require Tier 2 receive, such as social skills training. This one-size-fits-all approach limits the ability to match intervention to specific Tier 2 needs, making it more likely that many students will not have their needs met by an intervention that was not designed for them.

Finally, many schools focus only or primarily on disruptive or defiant behaviors that interfere with instruction and lead to ODRs. In these schools, educators are utilizing a reactive approach and failing to address the social and emotional needs of students in their schools that may be less obvious or interfere less with instruction. The culture and climate in these schools may also reflect this focus. The culture may be punitive, with adults exerting and expecting control over students. The school may also have limited focus on strengths and positive behaviors.

Practitioners studying this framework and Tier 2 SEB needs should ensure that there is buy-in for Tier 2, a willingness to implement more than one intervention, and a focus on all three SEB areas of need. A school that is willing to move beyond a one-size-fits-all approach (given adequate support) is one that is likely to see positive changes. For additional considerations, make sure to read through Chapter 11 regarding avoiding deficit thinking, making contextual and culturally responsive adaptations, and building on strengths.

## **CONCLUSION**

In this chapter we detailed the rationale for using a multi-tiered framework to prevent and address SEB needs, focusing on the targeted, Tier 2 level. Additional details described the nuances of SEB areas of need in schools. Finally, we overviewed the four-step Tier 2 process for setting up the system, identifying and planning, and progress monitoring and adapting for effective, efficient Tier 2 intervention. These steps are described in more detail in the following chapters.