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There is a need in Australian schools to replace child-excluding discipline of problem behaviour with more child-including approaches. Positive behavioural support (PBS) is a systematic, educative process for managing problem behaviour. This approach to assessment and intervention for students with special needs is firmly established in research and in practice, particularly in the USA and the UK. For a decade, formal training in PBS at Griffith University has enabled individual teachers to become competent coordinators of the intervention process for specific students. Some Griffith initiatives in PBS training have enabled graduates not only to effect individual case management in special education units but also to facilitate and lead school-wide interventions. Three projects in Queensland schools over several years have sought to build capacity within school communities through teamwork and university-school collaborations. Properties and issues in PBS implementation are discussed.

History of positive behavioural support

Within a brief period of approximately two decades, positive behavioural support (PBS) has emerged as a powerful, integrative tool for education. Peshak-George and Kincaid (2003) made an ambit claim that PBS principles and techniques can be embodied in all effective teaching practice. PBS has brought together a vision for education that is large in scope but detailed in action; values for educators that are positive and affirming; and a vehicle for implementation that is data driven (Bryer, Beamish, Hawke, Kitching, & Wilson, 2003). Translation of the PBS framework for intensive individual application into an inclusive environment confronts two sets of issues: (a) existing policy and disciplinary and child-excluding practice in schools and (b) the demand for child-including policy and practice equivalent to those embedded in intensive, individualised interventions.

The PBS movement arose in the USA in the 1980s. A small cadre of dedicated researchers working on individual cases developed the detailed technology and underlying principles. For example, Evans and Meyer (1985) mapped out a process that articulated core principles of respect and positive life-quality values. Similarly, LaVigna and Donnellan (1986) mapped out a complementary process with specific techniques that was strongly focused on long-term development of a personal future with life quality. Federal legislation around the 1997 US Congress’ reauthorisation of the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA) and large-scale American governmental funding throughout the 1990s advanced the interests of this movement.
Extensive publication, conferencing, and training programs have disseminated the approach vigorously, documented its effectiveness, and promoted its practical utility for teachers at all educational settings (Crone & Horner, 2003).

In 1990, Horner and colleagues drew on these earlier works to fashion a disability-oriented integrative framework with a nonaversive technology for problem behaviour (Horner et al., 1990). This framework brought cohesion to the technological gains made by researchers working with individuals with high support needs and, at the same time, affirmed core values for future research and practice. Horner et al. articulated the comprehensive nature of the shift in the approach to challenging behaviour from consequential (paired with reactive discipline) to antecedent (paired with proactive instruction). This framework encompassed a comprehensive approach to (a) assessment of the function of a behaviour, (b) planning of multicomponent supports, and (c) changes in outcomes. Anticipated outcomes ranged from not only reduced problem behaviour and increased adaptive skills but also long-term developmental change in lifestyle quality and inclusive maintenance.

Throughout the 1990s, the PBS movement spread its technology into larger scale operations within whole settings instead of its earlier emphasis on support for individuals in specialised settings. That is, PBS "went big" in schools, districts, and states with the USA. A train-the-trainer model amplified adoption and implementation of PBS practices in everyday contexts. The technological framework developed by Horner et al. enabled proactive intensive follow-through into the logistics of using PBS to change the lives of individuals and their families, teachers, schools, and support systems at local and state levels. Anderson, Albin, Mesaros, Dunlap, and Morelli-Robbins (1993) documented a PBS process for "going to scale" with its effective technologies. They documented the steps needed to transfer ownership of PBS from the narrow base of researcher-practitioner PBS specialists to many other people interacting with the individual with problem behaviour in different contexts. The seven-step process for systemic dissemination and training outlined by Anderson et al. (1993) has been used to introduce PBS technology into the full range of community settings where individuals with challenging behaviour live, go to school, work, and recreate.

Anderson, Russo, Dunlap, and Albin (1996) also concisely documented the planning process developed by earlier PBS researchers for this broader audience. The first step in building a PBS plan began with individual learners, the everyday contexts in which learners spent their time, and a developmental focus on the meaning and quality of their respective personal futures. Behaviour of concern was identified, operationalised, and baselined. During assessments, supports were introduced to enhance life, implement positive procedures through antecedent and consequent change practices, and manage behavioural crises. Assessments examined quality of life, ecology, function of target behaviours, and communicative and learning styles. Analysis of these assessments directed the generation of experimental hypotheses about antecedent and consequent variables, possible competing behaviour options, communicative skills and functions, and life quality (e.g., choices and preferences). A plan for ongoing assessment was articulated. Design of a PBS intervention plan for the individual incorporated nine component areas including instructional strategies and social skills training. Outcomes
were assessed (e.g., multiple indicators of instructional effectiveness). The final stage of planning was an ongoing process and schedule for PBS support, which would allow for cycling through the plan again in line with the lifelong perspective on the support process.

Snell (2005) revisited the comprehensive PBS guidelines articulated by Horner et al. in 1990 and reported that behavioural researchers and school-based teams were making many of the recommended changes. In particular, she observed evidence of several changes in studies of problem behaviour since 1990. First, school-wide application of functional behavioural assessment was introducing PBS assessment to a wider audience. Second, multicomponent rather than single-component interventions were combining—in order of frequency in research studies—positive consequences, antecedent reduction of events triggering problem behaviour, and some teaching of new skills to students and, to a lesser extent, to their parents and teachers. Third, a wide variety of problem-preventing antecedent changes were becoming as popular as consequence-based changes in supports for problem behaviour.

Fourth, in the extremely important PBS element of teaching adaptive behaviour, Snell reported some evidence of the spread of teaching from individuals with high support needs to other students in the class and to staff and community members working with them. She found extensive teaching to students with severe problem behaviour (e.g., communicative replacement instruction for students with autism). She also noted considerable teaching of other behaviours to other learners with problem behaviour. Furthermore, Snell (2005) reported "growing support for changing adults' behavior patterns by teaching them to recognize and respond to students' adaptive behaviours while not responding to their problem behavior" (p. 12). Fifth, Snell commented that intervention research was showing reduced, although continuing, use of punishment. Finally, school-wide studies showed good student response across whole school populations to building positive rules for the school environment, teaching those rules systematically inside and outside classrooms, and delivering positive consequences for meeting rule-based expectations.

Snell also observed that implementation of other PBS practices showed little improvement during the last 15 years. Finding ways to operationalise success and to deliver goals for the complex demands of lifestyle change remained a difficulty. Defining and manipulating distal rather than immediately preceding events to problem behaviour remained a difficult aspect of manipulation of setting events. Crisis management continued to be regarded as an intervention rather than the temporary stopgap clearly defined by Horner et al. (1990). Social validation and dignity continued to be honoured but remained neglected in terms of data collection and evaluation.

Snell concluded that assessment-based PBS interventions have achieved a stable record of evidence-based effectiveness in reducing problem behaviour. However, she identified two general challenges for use of PBS technology today. Specifically, she expressed concern about limited and setting-specific usage of these evidence-based practices. First, teachers and parents engaged in these practices for only 25% of the time (despite use producing improvements in behaviour). Second, typical classrooms and other everyday settings remain less involved than specialised settings.
Emergence of inclusive PBS
In the 5 years since the new millennium, the PBS movement has continued its drive into the regular school sector of education. Specifically, P.L. 105-17 in the 1997 IDEA amendments authorised PBS technology for any student whose behaviour interfered with learning success in school settings and also mandated functional behavioural assessment to develop a behavioural intervention plan or revise an existing plan. The major implications of this US law for regular education have yet to be absorbed into the general culture of Australian classroom practice. In 2000, the systematic educative framework of the PBS technology (OSEP et al., 2000) offered more authentic learning outcomes for students and staff, which was also consistent with the prevailing Zeitgeist about a more inclusive setting for learning. Yet again, Horner and colleagues had provided the integrative PBS statement that "signposted" this new behaviour-and-learning direction for PBS. However, Horner (1998) and other leaders in PBS pointed to the large gap between this research based movement and existing practice. "At this point, we have a better science than practice, better understanding than policy, better vision than reality" (Horner, 1998, as cited in Bradley & Horner, n.d., p. 1).

Figure 1 provides a model that displays the continuum of problem behaviour among students and the relevant continuum of PBS interventions and allied assessment procedures recommended in recent literature and adopted in most American schools using school-wide PBS. As PBS interventions have progressed from individual intervention in specialised environments into school-wide prevention within inclusive school environments, changes in the level of intervention and the level of staff involvement have required different kinds of adjustments to school culture and operations. In turn, wider issues have joined with the established issues of teaming, training, and time allocation identified in intensive PBS intervention (Beamish, Bryer, & Wilson, 2000).

With these changes in the level of intervention and the level of staff involvement came the need for new school-wide initiatives. These initiatives to improve the quality of behavioural interventions and behaviour support planning have sought to use PBS and its assessment tools (viz., functional behavioural assessment, or FBA) in building capacity. Through PBS, the capacity of the school to deliver quality education can be enhanced. Students with high support needs can access ongoing intervention, without the disruptions, hiatuses, and crises that they experience as they transition from activity to activity, classroom to classroom, teacher to teacher, and year to year. Members of staff who work with these students can draw on team structure to access available resources within a school. The primary PBS outcome of this move to inclusive settings has been improved support for individual students. However, meaningful training and staff development in behavioural support must accompany this expanded scale of operations from teacher-specific support to school-wide support (e.g., Jackson, 2004; Walker, 1997). At the same time, the impact of this expanded scale of operations has opened up the need for more systemic support processes (Anderson, 2003; Crone & Horner, 2003).
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Group A
Students with intense problem behaviour (3-7%)

Group intervention (Individual Student System)

Individual intervention (Individual Student System)

Functional analysis
based on
• interviews
• direct observations
• record review
• systematic experimental manipulations

• Build an accurate understanding of when, how, and why problem behaviour occurs and confirm understanding

• Includes gathering background information, building an operational definition of problem behaviour, completing ecological and ABC analyses, and building and testing hypothesis re function of problem behaviour

Group B
Students at risk for problem behaviours (15%)

Group intervention (At-Risk System)

Simple functional behavioural assessment
based on
• interview with teacher

• Build operational definition of problem behaviour

• Identify antecedents and consequences of problem behaviour

• Generate a testable hypothesis re function of problem behaviour

Group C
Students without serious problem behaviours (80-90%)

Universal interventions (School-wide and Classroom-wide Systems)

Simple behavioural assessment
based on
• general observations

• Build operational definition of problem behaviour

• Identify antecedents and consequences of problem behaviour

Figure 1.
Continuum of effective behavioural interventions (adapted from Crone & Horner, 2003, p. 19; see, previously, OSEP et al., 2000; Lewis & Sugai, 1999).

Most school communities in the USA seem to be resource-scarce in working with an increasingly heterogenous mix and severity of problem behaviours. "Many schools lack the capacity to identify, adopt, and sustain policies, practices, and systems that effectively and efficiently meet the needs of all students" (OSEP et al., 2000, p. 132). Horner and colleagues clearly recognised that regular schools have a series of endemic capacity-building problems. Specifically, OSEP et al. (2000) listed several problems that would challenge existing PBS technology. First, schools have relied on outside behavioural expertise. Second, lack of ongoing staff support has undermined teacher morale. Third, school-wide curriculum has not prioritised the social skills training needed by many students. Fourth, assessment data have not guided behavioural interventions (viz., evidence-based practice). Fifth, schools have lacked systems that identify, adopt, and make sustained use of research-validated practices.
Local research on inclusive PBS

The search for some answers to these significant and persistent problems about school capacity to support students with problem behaviour has begun. Bryer et al. (2003) argued that, in addition to the technology of "what" to do provided in the existing PBS framework, two other questions ("who" and "how") would need to be addressed, in order to broaden the school-wide support base. The "who" question is concerned about the extreme scarcity of PBS expertise in most school settings, and the "how" question is concerned about more effective use of the school community in order to spread the load of dealing with problem behaviour from one child, one teacher, and one classroom to include the whole school, all of its staff, and all students.

A school-wide PBS has redefined the learning context and the problem behaviour as a community who-and-how problem. The classic PBS approach has worked well for an individual in isolation within artificial boundaries around the individual student with the problem behaviour and the specialist miniteam working with that student. Inclusive support for individuals across the school has been mobilised by (a) using an organising team to coordinate miniteams typically used in specialised individual interventions and (b) empowering staff and students to support and train each other.

Some school-wide project initiatives in specialised and inclusive settings have been undertaken by Griffith staff and by graduates from the Griffith training program in PBS. Three projects examples applied a PBS process and tried to ensure a match between the quality of intervention and existing school resources. First, a formal project in a special school designed intensive PBS interventions for individual students in every classroom. Second, an informal project within a primary school teamed to provide case-by-case behavioural support for specific students in some classrooms. Third, a preliminary project in a secondary school built initial staff commitment to "universal" PBS supports for all students.

The first project involved an organising team headed by the principal and staffed by several PBS-trained teachers. The second project involved a PBS-trained head of special education services (HOSES) who developed PBS plans for individual students experiencing behaviour problems and their teachers. In the third project, a large but PBS-naïve teaching staff agreed to introduce a school-wide approach in order to prevent troubling behaviour across the general school population, to respond consistently to appropriate and inappropriate behaviour, and to recognise students who are meeting behavioural expectations and to resolve behavioural issues through positive supports (Rosenberg & Jackman, 2003).

Example 1

A special school in a provincial city provided educational programs for adolescents 12- to 19 years of age with high support needs stemming from intellectual or multiple impairments, including autism. An increasing number of students presented with complex and challenging behaviours. Single-parent household and foster care characterise the social support for most students. The school provided specialised services for 60 students. The school team comprised a principal, deputy principal, 12.5 teachers, and 15 full- and part-time teacher aides. A guidance officer and part-time
Several concurrent factors motivated school staff to introduce positive behaviour support processes. In particular, the increased intensity and frequency of challenging behaviours highlighted the ineffectiveness of traditional behaviour management strategies based on unpleasant consequences. Moreover, an alternative approach to behaviour management was being disseminated through professional activities. This PBS approach defined problem behaviour in a different way. The circumstances surrounding challenging behaviour were viewed as important to reaching an understanding of why the behaviour was occurring (i.e., its function). The solution to problem behaviour was to teach a socially appropriate alternative behaviour that served the same function as the problem behaviour. "By providing an alternative to traditional methods that often involve the use of punishment, the focus is more on support than on control or management" (Beamish, 2003, p. 1). The PBS approach, therefore, was educative and proactive.

School staff became aware in 1999 of the IABA approach to positive behaviour support (LaVigna & Willis, 1995). They decided to implement this approach in their school after they visited another school using the IABA approach. Knowledge of PBS became a priority in order to implement its processes and procedures. Therefore, five teachers, including the school principal and guidance officer, enrolled in a postgraduate training program offered at Griffith University (Beamish, 1996-2005). The school professional development fund provided financial support to pay the fees. The five staff formed a study group and collaborated to complete theoretical and practical course requirements. By the end of 1999, the school had a group of key staff who understood the theory of PBS and could provide technical leadership and assistance for problem behaviours across the school.

This PBS initiative featured technical leadership and PBS-trained administrative leadership. The principal established a PBS support committee that worked in tandem with whole-of-staff meetings. These general meetings provided the organisational venue for discussing problem behaviours. The support committee provided a formal structure for generating the course of action for specialised individual PBS interventions. The multicomponent plan used in these interventions made provision for proactive and reactive strategies.

Concurrently, the principal orchestrated changes to the school behaviour plan mandated by departmental policy, so that it incorporated PBS technology. In the development of this new document, the principal used the five members of the technical team to influence staff thinking about how to support and manage behaviour across the school. It took two years to implement and review the procedures in this document. Progressive reviewing of school documentation and intervention planning has occurred over the 4 years since the first plan was written in 2000.

In addition to the committee introducing PBS interventions and the new school plan, the administrative strategy included ongoing staff training. The emphasis at that time was to provide as many training opportunities as possible to assist staff to understand PBS and to develop and implement a whole school approach to positive behaviour support. Some staff attended external conferences and workshops to improve skills. All staff
attended internal training during pupil-free days in order to establish a sound understanding of PBS.

Since 1999, this whole-school PBS initiative has made it easier to implement individual behaviour support plans involving functional analysis for students with intense problem behaviours. A PBS plan for an individual student requires a very high commitment of staff time to hold meetings, analyse the functions of the individual student's behaviour, and document intervention strategies. Financial considerations entered into decisions to reallocate finite resources in order to release staff from class duties. In this school, the principal has released a teacher for a day to develop a plan with the technical assistance of a PBS-trained teacher and that of the principal. In 2003, provision was made for five new individual PBS plans.

This school-wide initiative has incorporated training into the school philosophy. In order for PBS skills to maintain currency, teachers need to use them regularly. In order to maintain the PBS momentum in the school, existing training needs to be extended. In the last 2 years, Griffith trained teachers who have transferred into the school community have subsequently undertaken Intensive Behaviour Intervention and Support (IBIS) training. These dual-trained teachers were asked to provide leadership to other mini-teams.

In summary, improvement in individual student support justified the substantial allocation of resources. The quality of plans that emerged out of this school-wide approach justified the time spent in training and team building. Environmental change and positive reinforcement strategies were being put into practice with increased frequency through the school. The whole school team regularly discussed changes to the school environment and embraced a range of positive reinforcement strategies to reinforce positive behaviours with all students at the school.

**Example 2**

A large, metropolitan primary school with an attached Special Education Unit (SEU) had students with identified disabilities and dangerous and chronic problem behaviours and other students with severe emotional and behavioural difficulties. Students with emotionally based problem behaviours represented a group at risk of further escalation. In a welfare dependent and multicultural community, they constituted an ongoing concern for individual teachers and for the school community as a whole. The circumstances outlined for this school have been recognised as common in Australian education.

When this project was initiated, the SEU provided specialised services for 30 students in a total school population of 600 students. The SEU team comprised a HOSES, 2.6 teachers, and several teacher aides (two full-time and 4 part-time). They were supported by a guidance officer and were able to access therapists on demand. The SEU staff constituted a miniteam for the majority of students with serious problem behaviour in the school. PBS interventions for these students were based on a comprehensive functional analysis of problem behaviour.

The school also had an advisory group, known as a special needs committee, which comprised deputy principal, HOSES, guidance officer, and allied therapists. This group was functioning as a quasi-PBS organising team, in that it responded to various student
issues identified by individual teachers. In reviewing issues associated with problem behaviour, this group generated a solution for these behaviours by drawing on the HOSES' expertise in order to extend individual PBS interventions outside SEU boundaries into individual classrooms. Administrative support for this decision included some reallocation of clerical tasks to allow time to provide outreach into specific classrooms. This informal arrangement constituted the "school-wide" initiative.

In the initiative, the HOSES engaged in a strategy of training during the data gathering and planning with particular classroom teachers and provided a form of scaffolding for each teacher that drew on the PBS technology of assessment, analysis, and planning. In addition, the HOSES tailored these case-by-case interventions to situational classroom demands and teacher enthusiasm to support the student. The HOSES worked closely with each teacher to examine their student's problem. They discussed the actual behaviours, recorded data on behaviour frequency over a period of one to two weeks, worked out a function for the behaviour from these data, explored the data for triggers to episodes and reactions to the behaviour and the effects of the episode to the classroom environment, and located any patterns and consistencies worth noting in the data. Hence, PBS interventions for these students were based on a simple functional assessment of problem behaviour.

Once the problem behaviour was operationally defined and measured and antecedents and consequences were identified, the HOSES collaborated with each teacher to design a realistic support plan within existing resources. The teacher was responsible for implementation and for tracking behavioural episodes (e.g., unusual outburst). The special needs committee provided the mechanism for more formal review and monitoring of these cases. Cases were referred back to the committee if student withdrawal from the classroom again became a preferred option. The HOSES returned to the classroom to review the plan and make adaptations to ensure that the student could be maintained meaningfully in the classroom.

At minimum, this approach shifted classroom practice away from punitive management of students with problem behaviour. The popular technique of issuing detention tickets (e.g., to give up lunch recess time) failed to change students' behaviour. The PBS planning to return the student to classroom participation and active learning replaced such reactive measures.

This initiative achieved success in decreasing school suspensions for these at-risk cases in the general classroom. It also appears that teacher endorsement of these PBS principles and technology was strongest when the student's problems are more moderate in intensity. When behaviours were explosive and highly disruptive, some teachers felt overwhelmed by the extra workload involved in implementing strategies as documented in the plan on a consistent basis.

What this example illustrated is that an individual PBS-trained person, with administrative support, can extend PBS interventions into the general school setting on a serial basis. That is, this person can work with individual teachers on specific student cases and can incorporate some training of these teachers as the partners move through the PBS process. Finding capacity within the school was preferred to what might be referred to as a reflexive search for an outside expert. This approach employed a bottom-
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In comparison with the first example, this approach had fewer of the preliminary features of a school-wide approach (Lewis et al., 1998). This approach, however, was identified in the 1990s as a viable model for supporting behavioural interventions within Australian schools. Stephenson (1997) described the approach as "a school-based consultancy model where a teacher within a school takes responsibility for carrying out functional assessments in collaboration with classroom teachers, and then works with teachers to design, implement and monitor interventions" (p. 72).

Example 3

A large state high school in the outer suburbs served a disadvantaged community with over a thousand students. The school staff consisted of a principal, three deputy principals, 12 heads of department (HODs), 68 teachers, a HOSES for the SEU, and 1.6 guidance counsellors. Problem behaviour was an ongoing issue. A district review in 2002 indicated a patchwork of staffing and approaches to intervention in problem behaviour. A school review in 2003 identified behaviour as a management priority, and staff were concerned about increasing numbers of students with very difficult behaviours.

This project documented a collaborative process by which the school community agreed to engage in a school-wide approach to dealing with problem behaviour. The district guidance officer, a deputy principal of the school, and the HOSES provided local leadership for this initiative. Unlike the previous examples, this school was trying to put itself into a position to introduce a more positive approach to addressing challenging behaviour throughout the school rather than to provide support for individual students. Documented achievements of this project comprised assembling and informing a school-wide team, assessing the needs of the school, and setting goals and planning actions needed (Bryer et al., in press). These achievements can be aligned with the first three of eight elements of a model for introducing school-wide delivery procedures and practices proposed by Bloomquist and Schnell (2002).

The first step of assembling and informing a school-wide team engaged various structures and groups within the school in a discussion process. This process cycled from the executive through the leadership team, the school community, and the curriculum teams. The process then cycled these discussions back through the leadership team into an executively approved steering committee to the project (Bryer et al., in press). Two vital features of this process were administrative support for the "going to scale" initiative and sharing the broad PBS approach throughout the school community. An additional unfolding feature of this process was its slowness and the time needed to activate the mechanisms to reach consensus about moving forward, to avoid confrontation in introducing new behavioural practice, and to build on existing team structures.

The second step involved assessment of school preparedness for change. Two established American tools were used to conduct evaluations of school operations for behavioural support (Horner et al., 2004; Sugai, Horner, & Todd, 2000). These data management tools were developed to assess positive school climate, safety, and social culture in a school and to assess behavioural changes in school functioning before and
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after introduction of a PBS approach. The School-wide Evaluation Tool (SET) designed by Horner et al. was used to examine practices related to school rules (i.e., how they are defined, taught, rewarded, monitored, and supported at school and district levels). Data from individual interviews of a sample of teachers, students, and administrators were collated. The Effective Behavior Support (EBS) tool (Sugai et al., 2000) was used to survey staff and administrators about behavioural practices and procedures in four management areas (school-wide, nonclassroom, classroom, and individual student). Collated data from paper-based questionnaires were used to identify existing schools strengths and need for improvement in the four areas.

These tools served diagnostic and planning purposes, in that they both assessed current practice and pinpointed practice areas to be improved. As expected, the school practice "baseline" obtained from analysis of both surveys indicated a piecemeal system for supporting students (Rosenberg & Jackman, 2003). There was a school-wide emergency procedure, a set of school-wide rules, and referral to a deputy principal for serious and dangerous behaviour. However, classroom practices varied widely, students were unaware of rules, and there was no coherent comprehensive system shared by staff, students, and community.

The third step of setting goals and planning actions focused on making the school "ready" for school-wide universal intervention. The school decided to pay for an annual licence to use the internet-accessible School-Wide Information System (SWIS) of data management developed in Oregon. In order to obtain a licence, a staff-and-student team needed to develop a manual for a rules-focused curriculum and to plan to implement this curriculum across the whole school and its many contexts. Griffith University staff developed a CD for the school site, which provided specific resource materials for curriculum development and general resources for staff training. At the same time, the project team needed to prepare the school for formal SWIS accreditation by the only SWIS facilitator in the southern hemisphere. They engaged this SWIS facilitator from New Zealand to train deputy principals in SWIS software. The facilitator also conducted a day of professional development for all staff at the start of the 2005 school year and gave school-wide PBS examples from her own work in several New Zealand schools.

These three steps took 18 months to complete. The school was able to reposition itself from a traditional to a PBS-oriented approach, but these preliminaries took an inordinate amount of time and effort. In comparison to the team-train-time triad that marked individual and small group (at risk) interventions in the previous two examples, this school had yet to establish working PBS teams within the school and to train staff across the school in PBS technology. Moreover, the school recognised that teaming and training activities are essential before interventions can commence for the student population. This example confirmed that it takes approximately 5 years to operationalise universal practices and procedures within a school (Crone & Horner, 2003).

Conclusion
These three examples stepped down the PBS continuum (see Figure 1). Along the way, they provided some immediate insights into the real issues faced by schools when they attempt to support students with varying levels of problem behaviour in educational
settings. They also confirm some hard lessons about the resources in time, training, and teaming required to get outcomes and about how to manage those resources. These examples illustrate that, the further that explicit PBS technology travels down the continuum, the more diffused it becomes. Time, training, and teaming at a school-wide level mediate the PBS technology and its tools, making meaningful outcomes for students harder to obtain, as the emphasis shifts from individualised intervention to universal prevention.

For the most serious problem behaviours, Example 1 showed that staff training allowed widespread use of tools to be effective across every classroom team. Active administrative support was the key variable that enabled genuine outcomes to be achieved for all students. For less serious problem behaviours, Example 2 showed that one trained staff member allowed effective but restricted use of tools by selective teaming with particular class teachers and targeted individual students. Administrative support and friendly cooperation within the whole school were important variables that facilitated useful outcomes for a small number of at-risk students.

For the general prevention of problem behaviour, Example 3 showed that the starting point is not staff training and student intervention. Reaching consensus, assessing needs, and planning for school-wide action are social tasks of a different order and complexity that must be addressed. With administrative support and data management tools in place, the school is ready to face further demands of training staff and students and developing the core organising team to manage data and adapt the school curriculum in response to data trends. Implementation of PBS across the continuum is so multifaceted and so protracted that system support is essential. Going to scale may be beyond the capacity of most single schools acting to initiate practice change on its own. It is an endeavour that requires partnerships between system and settings.

Our examples confirm the two major challenges that Snell (2005) identified in her stocktake of current practice for individual interventions. Teachers did not have the training to maintain consistently supportive practice, and specialised settings continued to dominate effective practice. Our examples also align with five of seven challenges for the field of PBS identified when Michaels, Brown, and Mirabella (2005) surveyed a large sample of PBS experts. Our examples specifically align with (a) systemic changes at organisational and administrative level, (b) ideological changes in attitudes to behaviour, (c) training in behavioural technology to implement change in approach to "managing" behaviour, (d) collaboration among team members to share responsibility for change, and (e) resources in time and money to support change. Training and ideology, identified as the two most critical challenges for behaviour support (Michaels et al., 2005), can enable school-wide support for individual intervention (Example 1) but remain stumbling blocks to effective support for at-risk behaviours and preventable problem behaviour.
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