SubJournal

For Personnel Responsible for Substitute Teaching

Volume 5, Number 2
Fall 2004

Geoffrey G. Smith
Publisher/Executive Editor

Zach Tippetts
Managing Editor

SubJournal

***SubJournal*: For Personnel Responsible for Substitute Teaching**

ISSN 1527-9014 is published semiannually (Spring and Fall) by the Substitute Teaching Institute of the College of Education at Utah State University (STI/USU), 6516 Old Main Hill, Logan, UT 84322-6516, to revolutionize the role of substitute teachers into an opportunity for educational excellence. Postage paid at Logan, UT.

Ordering Information

Members of the SubManagers' Association receive the *SubJournal* as part of their membership of $79. Nonmembers may purchase individual issues for $22 each. Subscribers may arrange for first-class or airmail delivery of publication by paying the additional postage (rates available upon request).

Change of Address

Claims for missing or undelivered issues will be considered only if received at the STI/USU within six calendar months of the issue. Requests for change of address must be received at least one month before the publication date of the first issue to be affected by the request. Undelivered issues resulting from changes of address cannot be replaced without charge; subscribers should notify the post office that they guarantee periodicals' forwarding postage. Postmaster: Send address changes to Substitute Teaching Institute, 6516 Old Main Hill, Logan, UT 84322-6516.

Copyright and Permissions

Copyright © 2004 by Utah State University. No written or oral permission is necessary to reproduce a table, figure, or excerpt of fewer than 200 words. Authors are granted permission, without fee, to photocopy their own material. Copies must include a full and accurate bibliographic citation and the following credit line:

> "*SubJournal*, title, author, volume, issue, pages, date. Reprinted with permission of the Substitute Teaching Institute at Utah State University. Published by the Substitute Teaching Institute, 6516 Old Main Hill, Logan, UT 84322-6516. Copyright © (year)."

Written permission must be obtained to reproduce or reprint material in circumstances other than those just described. Materials may not be redistributed without written permission. Please direct requests for permission or for further information on policies and fees to STI/USU.

Advertising

All inquiries regarding advertising in the *SubJournal* should be directed to STI/USU, 6516 Old Main Hill, Logan, UT 84322-6516. Telephone: 800-922-4693. Rates available upon request.

SubJournal Contents

Volume 5, Number 2—Fall 2004

SubJournal Contents 3

Book Review List 4

SubManagers' Association Membership Information 5

Letter from the Editor 7

No Substitute for Quality: A Time Series Quasi-Experimental Study of the Effects of a Pay for Performance Remedy for Teacher Absenteeism
Susan Lugo 9

SubManager Survey 2004 Report
Substitute Teaching Institute 20

SmartSTART Final Summary Report
Allegheny Intermediate Unit.....32

Analyzing the Effects of Direct Behavioral Consultation on Teachers: Generalization Across Settings
Jennifer T. Freeland.....39

Book Reviews 55

SubSolutions Conference 64

Book Review List

Designs for Learning
by Paul V. Bredeson
Reviewed by STI Staff 55

Harnessing the Power of Resistance: A Guide for Educators
by Jared Scherz
Reviewed by STI Staff 57

Feeling Great!
by Todd Whitaker and Jason Winkle
Reviewed by STI Staff 58

The Ethics of Teaching
by Kenneth Strike and Jonas F. Soltis
Reviewed by STI Staff 60

10 Traits of Highly Effective Teachers: How to Hire, Coach, and Mentor Successful Teachers
by Elaine K. McEwan
Reviewed by STI Staff 61

Call For Manuscripts

The *SubJournal* invites you to submit articles for publication

The *SubJournal* is a professional, academic, peer-reviewed publication. The specifically targeted audience for the *SubJournal* includes individuals and organizations that deal with issues germane to substitute teaching. Articles should not exceed 3,000 words and should be submitted both in hard copy, double spaced, using Microsoft Word™. Articles citing references should use APA format with complete bibliographic references. For returns, submissions must include a self-address, stamped envelope. All submitted manuscripts will be acknowledged within two weeks of receipt. Articles selected for review will receive notice in four to six weeks. All manuscripts accepted for publication become the property of STI/USU. The *SubJournal* reserves the right to edit or otherwise modify articles to facilitate formatting and publication requisites. Address manuscripts, books for review, advertising inquiries, and correspondence to: Substitute Teaching Institute, *SubJournal*, 6516 Old Main Hill, Logan, UT 84322-6516.

Sub Managers' ASSOCIATION

For Personnel Responsible for Substitute Teaching

The only association that deals specifically with substitute teaching.

Join *now* and receive:

SubJournal

Semiannual national publication featuring field and research-based articles from educational experts around the world.

SubExchange

Quarterly newsletter with expert advice for supervisors and practical tips that can be passed on to substitutes.

Reduced Conference Rates

The annual *SubSolutions Conference* focusses on "best practices" for those that manage substitute teachers. SubManagers' Association members receive discounted registration rates.

Online Benefits

"Member status" access to the Substitute Teaching Institute's Web page with full access to the *SubGuide* and research findings.

SUBSTITUTE TEACHING INSTITUTE
UtahState UNIVERSITY

SubManagers' Association Membership Application

Name: _____

Title: _____

District/Organization: _____

Email: _____

Address: _____

City: _____ State: _____ Zip: _____

Phone: _____ Fax: _____

SUBSTITUTE TEACHING INSTITUTE | UtahState UNIVERSITY

6516 Old Main Hill, Logan, UT 84322-6516
1-800-922-4693 • Fax: 435-797-0944
http://subed.usu.edu

Includes:
SubJournal (Semiannually)
SubExchange (Quarterly)
Reduced **SubSolutions Conference** Rates
Online access to the **SubGuide**

- ❑ $73 for one year
- ❑ $139 for two years
- ❑ $210 for three years

Substitute Teaching Institute/Utah State University
FEIN #876000528
❑ Purchase Order #_____
❑ Check (Make payable to Utah State University)
❑ VISA ❑ MasterCard

_____

Exp. (mm/y): _____/_____

Letter from the Editor

Welcome to the Fall 2004 issue of the *SubJournal*. This issue focuses on research and reports relating to substitute teaching, teacher absenteeism, and classroom management. You will appreciate the insight offered by these articles.

Our first article comes from Principal Susan Lugo, administrator at Loma Linda Elementary School in Creighton School District, Arizona. Her work looks at a program, Pay for Performance, put in place to manage teacher absenteeism. The successes and failures of this program are documented in this article and will provide district administrators insight into this difficult topic.

Next we present the findings from the SubManager Survey conducted in May and June of 2004. This study, conducted by the Substitute Teaching Institute, attempts to profile managers of substitute teachers. It looks at substitute manager demographics and issues regarding pay, calling systems, interviewing, and training.

Allegheny School District has been implementing a substitute management and training program in their district for the past three years. We present the most current report of their progress and findings. Examining this report provides substitute managers with ideas of how they can plan, implement, and measure improvements to substitute programs.

Finally, we present an article by Dr. Jennifer Freeland from the University of Indiana. Dr. Freeland has looked at one of the central premises of classroom management found in the Substitute Teacher Handbook, positive reinforcement. She has examined how to successfully train teachers in improving their performance in this area.

As always, we review some interesting and pertinent literature for substitute managers and other administrators. In this issue we offer analysis of *Designs for Learning,* which looks at how to implement great professional development programs, and *Harnessing the Power of Resistance,* which looks at how to work with people who do not share your point of view. *Feeling Great, The Ethics of Teaching,* and *10 Traits of Highly Effective Teachers* are three additional books reviewed in this issue.

Zach Tippetts

Does SubFinder place the best substitutes in your classroom?

Yes it does!

With SubFinder, enjoy the benefits of:

- Placing the most qualified educator in the classroom, using your district's selection criteria and through the use of SubFinder's skills matching and dynamic selection process.
- Achieving maximum fill rates through preference lists and skill lists.
- Comprehensive reporting of both front- and back-end analysis unmatched by any other system.
- Reporting and tracking job activity of employees and substitutes.
- Back-office integration with your existing payroll system with add-on modules, such as SubPay.

CRS Incorporated recognizes that every school district's needs are unique. That's why we created SubFinder, the most comprehensive substitute placement and employee absence management system in the industry. Contact one of our experienced representatives today, at 800.782.3463, ext. 6762, to discuss your district's substitute placement and employee

subfinder *The closer you look, the better it is!*

CRS INCORPORATED

CRS INCORPORATED · 500 Arch Street · Williamsport, PA 17701
800.782.3463, ext.6762 · subfinder@crsinc.com · www.crsinc.com

No Substitute for Quality: A Time Series Quasi-Experimental Study of the Effects of a Pay for Performance Remedy for Teacher Absenteeism

Susan Lugo

Daily across America, children are faced with a stranger in their classroom: a substitute teacher. The financial impact of employee absenteeism is a challenge faced by all types of businesses everywhere. Our nations school districts are not immune to employee absenteeism. The shortage of qualified substitute teachers and declining unemployment rates has compounded this challenge among school administrators. The budgetary cost of paying for both absent teachers and their substitutes increases each year with higher salaries, substitute pay, and incentive plans (Norton, 1998). This study came about due to the growing concerns with teacher absenteeism in the nation (Norton, 1998) specifically Creighton School District in Phoenix, Arizona.

Creighton School District was experiencing a steadily increasing trend in teacher absenteeism, especially over the three-year period prior to the 2001 school year. The concerns over teacher absenteeism were magnified by a corresponding decrease in the number of qualified substitute teachers available to cover the classes of absentee teachers.

Adding to the frustration of parents and administrators, the students of the district were performing below the state average on the annual state-mandated, norm-referenced assessments. During this same period of time, the voters of Arizona approved Proposition 301, a referendum with the stated purpose of improving student achievement and increasing teacher salaries (Bayless, 2000). Proposition 301 called for each school district to develop a Pay for Performance (PFP) plan. In response, Creighton School District developed a PFP plan that centered on an incentive intended to decrease teacher absenteeism throughout the district. The purpose of this study was to analyze the effects of the PFP plan on teacher absenteeism and on the distribution of Proposition 301 funding intended for teacher salaries.

The Creighton Pay for Performance Plan

The section of the PFP plan related to teacher attendance set forth guidelines for which individual teachers might be eligible for incentive monies. It showed that 10% of the PFP fund was available to teachers based on their individual staff attendance coded from budget line 001, "earned leave illness," or budget line 002, "earned leave other." Teachers who took two or fewer leave days would be paid 100% of the monies, distributed equitably, or $190 per teacher, for the 2001-2002 school year. Those who took three to four days of leave would receive 60% of the monies, or $114 per individual, for the 2001-2002 school year. The plan specified that days counted as leave excluded disability, chronic illness, and FMLA. These exemptions, when added to the plan, created heightened difficulty and confusion when calculating the PFP.

Study Method

This study utilized a Time-Series Quasi-Experimental Method to determine the effects of the PFP plan on teacher absenteeism. An important part of preparation for the analysis included graphing teacher absentee rates for each of the three-years prior to the PFP plan and for one year following the implementation to determine if an abrupt shift in direction or level in the number of leave days taken by teachers occurred as a result of the intervention. Results of using the time-series method included descriptive analyses of the responses to the PFP incentive plan exhibited by various subgroups of the population of teachers (n=462). Additionally, findings described how those teacher populations faired in the distribution of incentive monies to the eligible teachers.

Summary of Findings and Conclusions

Unexpected findings appeared during the analysis and description of the Creighton School District policies and the rules and regulations governing the design, development, and implementation of the PFP incentive plan. The analysis illuminated an obscured association between the policy and practices that govern teacher absenteeism. What emerged was a conclusion that the combined effect of policy and practice may have served as a contributing factor to the high teacher absentee rates in the district. Although these findings did not offer a direct solution to the primary question of the effect of the PFP intervention on teacher absenteeism, such important unintended findings were too poignant to be overlooked, and excluding them

from the report would have restricted a full understanding of the complexity of the issue.

Findings: Policy Snarls

When written, the goals of the personnel policy were to attract teachers of the highest quality. In order to meet these policy goals, the district became ensnarled in the trap of providing attractive compensation and benefit packages to lure teachers to work for Creighton School District and then getting the most in productivity (days of work) from all teachers. As noted in the review of the literature, Kaiser (1996) illustrated that employers create policies with the intent of attracting the best and brightest by offering work disincentives such as leave packages. As Kaiser noted, there existed a correlation between the number of sick days allotted and the number of days used by employees; that is, the more days offered as part of a benefit package, the higher the absentee rate. This conflict of intended results appeared to be exactly the trap into which Creighton School District fell when adopting the General Leave Policy, which offered a competitive package allowing up to 12 leave days per year.

District policy requires teachers to report absences to their immediate supervisors and, following that, to validate the leave request with a personal call to the automated system. Nonetheless, a common practice in direct violation of the policy gradually developed among teachers. Instead of contacting their immediate supervisors, teachers called only the automated system to report an upcoming absence and the need for a substitute. Pitkoff (1993) noted that schools that did not require teachers to speak personally to their immediate supervisors experienced increased absentee rates. Thus, within Creighton School District, the result of tacit permission for teachers to move from adherence to policy to informal practices that violated policy appeared to have contributed to inflated absentee rates.

The use of verbiage found in the policy and in everyday practice may be causing confusion, serving as an additional contributing factor to the high rate of absenteeism among district teachers. The policy states that teachers may “accrue” and “earn” up to 12 days per year. Moreover, the automated system categorized and reported leave days as “earned” leave. The use of the word “earned” implies ownership and, ultimately, a sense of availability “at will,” subject only to the discretion of the teacher rather than consideration of the

total context of employee responsibilities, supervisory approval, or contractual obligations to deliver instruction for the academic year. In a previous case study involving Creighton School District, Spiller (2002) found that the term "earned" was defined informally as "whatever the teacher chooses to do with the time," rather than as an "earned privilege" resulting from conditions of employment that operated on a "good faith" basis by permitting absences. As a result, that definition of policy language had become part of the culture within the district, and served to contribute to the trend of increased teacher absenteeism.

Another powerful contributor to increased teacher absenteeism was identified during the description and analysis of the policy governing termination benefits. Although the language of the policy that defined termination benefits was revised to better serve the teachers of Creighton School District, the actual outcome served to reinforce the use of leave days, especially by teachers approaching retirement payoff eligibility. Teachers approaching retirement understood that the "reward" for saving leave days for payoff at retirement was to be reimbursed for those days (i.e., "paid off") at a rate *lower* than the current daily rate. This fact provided powerful support and incentive for the prevalent "use it or lose it" culture demonstrated by teachers in Creighton School District.

Findings: Communication Confusion

A thorough review of the correspondence between district administration and teachers revealed that both parties experienced confusion regarding the PFP plan and its implementation guidelines. Because evidence of miscommunication or misunderstanding of the PFP plan permeated the communication among administration and teachers, many hours of work that could have been avoided were instead invested in what the district administration believed was necessary to ensure fairness in PFP implementation.

Findings: Research Question Responses

The findings of the Time-Series Quasi-Experimental Method addressed the specific questions asked in the study. They revealed that the PFP plan decreased the number of leave days taken by teachers in Creighton School District by an average of 1.29 days per teacher in the year immediately following the intervention. This decline resulted in savings of over $45,000 to the district. More significant to students and parents than district monetary rewards,

were the nearly 600 additional days of instruction delivered by regular teachers rather than substitute teachers, which added to the continuity of instruction for students of Creighton School District.

When considering patterns of circumstance, or characteristics of teacher subgroups, the data showed that not all subgroups were affected by the PFP in the same way. The data established that women were more likely to respond to the PFP incentive than men. Following the intervention, data showed that teachers between the ages of 31-40 years old were more likely to take fewer leave days than teachers of other ages. Moreover, teachers assigned to primary grades demonstrated the most positive response to the PFP incentive. In another subgroup analysis, data showed that teachers with more than four years experience in the district were more affected by the PFP plan than were teachers new to the district. Surprisingly, however, the analysis revealed no significant difference in effect among teachers of different ethnic subgroups.

In order to address the question regarding the equitable distribution of Proposition 301 monies, the percentage of teachers who qualified for the PFP reward was calculated for each subgroup to determine whether or not the plan established a clearly defined element of fairness for all teachers. The district awarded incentive monies to approximately 40% of the teachers based on improved rates of teacher absenteeism. All subgroups, with the exception of teachers with 10-20 years of experience, received nearly the same percentage of incentive monies.

In an important deviation, only 30% of the teachers who had 10-20 years of experience were able to qualify for the PFP plan. No specific information was available to explain this phenomenon. However, inferential connections between age and normal child-rearing periods of life might permit speculation regarding at least one plausible explanation about why these teachers requested more leave days. For example, they may have children at home who require extra attention or supervision.

Recommendations

This study permitted insight into several areas of importance related to pay for performance incentive plans, regardless of the district being studied. Furthermore, the findings indicated the importance of considering policy, rules, and regulations, in combination with attendance behavior, when analyzing the effectiveness of any intervention. The study also identified several

topics that need further investigation. Finally, expanding the data gathering to allow follow-up questions could be important additions to future studies.

Recommendations for Practice

Governing Boards and district leaders may find it in the best interest of the district, the teachers, and the students to carefully review all policies and practices that govern teacher absenteeism. In the development of teacher benefits and compensation packages, policies guiding leave days should contain specific language and clarify operational definitions for terms such as "accrued" and "earned." As noted in Spiller's (2002) work, clarity in the communication of benefits associated with saving days for catastrophic illness and emergencies is essential both to absentee reduction and to long-term advantages for teachers.

Another recommendation for change is for principals to enforce policies requiring teachers to call them personally in case of an illness or emergency. District administration should insist that policies approved by the Governing Board are implemented as intended. Although intensive effort and commitment would be required to reverse the "use it or lose it" culture that promotes the use of leave days as they are earned, principals are the "gatekeepers" for adherence to this policy and are responsible for enforcing it effectively.

To reduce the conflict between intention and outcomes of policies, a review and revision of teacher attendance and absenteeism policies should be completed considering the findings of this study. Also included in the review should be policies that pertain to termination benefits so that all policies related to leave days are meaningful and motivational for teachers to decrease absenteeism. Enlightened approaches to absenteeism reduction efforts, coordinated with other policies affecting teacher attendance and incentives, should prove beneficial to all parties.

Recommendations for the administration of a PFP plan similar to the one developed in Creighton School District may be summed up using Odden's (2001) work on school-based performance award programs. He addressed six areas essential to the creation of effective school-based performance award programs:

1. Communication,
2. Professional development activities linked to goals,

3. Keep it simple,
4. Make it reachable,
5. Involve all employees, and
6. Refine and modify as needed (Odden, p.1).

For the section in the Creighton School District PFP plan that addresses teacher eligibility, more work needs to be done in the areas of communication, staff development, and keeping it simple. For example, one suggestion is to exclude the "chronic" illness exemption from the plan. Not only did very few people fall into this exemption, but teacher eligibility for the exemption took many hours to calculate. Thus, the cost effectiveness of keeping the exemption is questionable.

In efforts to assist in keeping the eligibility for teachers simple, and the information about the plan easily understood, the district should consider dropping the eligibility criteria to four or fewer days for 100% pay out of the incentive monies. Professional development sessions should outline the framework of the plan and should reinforce the value of teachers in the classroom by highlighting that teacher absences negatively affect students by disrupting not only the continuity of instruction, but also by interrupting the rapport between students and teacher.

Recommendations for Future Research

This study offers many possibilities for future research. First, to determine the long-term effects of a PFP plan on teacher absenteeism, future researchers are encouraged to extend the Time-Series Quasi-Experimental Method over a longer period of time following the initial implementation of the plan. Additional research might discover why a variety of subgroups responded affirmatively to the PFP incentive, while some did not. Another opportunity for research would be to determine whether or not the amount of PFP monies available to eligible teachers is related to the number of leave days taken. Additionally, to extend this research to the matter of improved student achievement, the study of whether or not a relationship exists between a decrease in teacher absenteeism and an increase in student achievement would prove universally valuable.

Implications

The intent of this study was to determine the effects of a Pay for Performance plan on teacher absenteeism. According to Russo's

(2001) article entitled, *No Substitute for Quality*, "on average, a student is taught by substitutes teachers for 187 days—more than a full year of school—from kindergarten through 12th grade" (p. 6). Findings from this Time Series Quasi-Experimental analysis showed that the Creighton School District PFP plan made a difference by reducing the number of days that teachers requested substitutes.

Russo (2001) also argued that improving the quality of substitute teachers would improve the quality of our children's education. He described a day when "2,000 teachers in Hillsborough County, Florida, called in sick to take advantage of the beautiful weather and the possibility of a long weekend," leaving almost 400 classes unfilled by teachers, certified or otherwise (p. 6). Russo's ideas are good, but they are focused on the symptom, substitute teachers, rather than on the root of the problem, teacher absenteeism.

School leaders should view Russo's suggestions in light of teacher absenteeism rather than as they relate to substitute teachers. Russo's *Strategy 5: Look at Systemic Issues* posed the question, "Why are teachers absent?" Russo questioned the perspective by noting that we should "rethink the fundamental assumptions surrounding substitute teachers and making far-reaching changes to the way things are done at a district level" (p. 10). Also, Russo's *Strategy 4: Bring in Outside Expertise* posed the question, "What do the experts say about teacher absenteeism?" According to Russo, "Given the size and complexity of the challenge, school leaders increasing turn to external expertise for help" (p. 9) rather than searching for creative and innovate ways to address the concerns of all parties. In another section, *Strategy 3: Collaborate Rather than Compete*, Russo challenged the reader in this way, "Why not work with the teachers by asking real questions about how the absentee rate may be reduced?" Continuing in his reasoning, Russo's *Strategy 2: Increase the Pool of Potential Candidates* queried, "When recruiting teachers why not ask probing questions about work ethic?"

Strategy 1: Make the Job More Attractive (Russo, 2001) represents a way to get to the heart of the intent that drives PFP planning because it is one more tool an employer might use to support organizational rhetoric about how important it is for students to have all teachers in their classrooms every day that is scheduled for instruction. If attendance is that important, then school districts, as employers, should be willing to offer bonuses, at least in the short term, to teachers with exemplary attendance in order to reestablish a district culture that endorses teacher commitment to the primary job

responsibility—the instruction of children. Such a commitment on the part of the district would prove to teachers that their presence in their classrooms is both expected and valued, and not just with words, but in the form of something tangible, money.

This study explored one way to assist districts in combating the prevalence of absenteeism in the teaching profession. Plans such as the PFP incentive described in this study may benefit organizations within other professions that are dealing with employee absenteeism. The implementation of a "pay for performance plan" should not be viewed as a panacea for the world's woes related to absenteeism. However, PFP incentives represent an additional tool available for districts to use to convince teachers that there is *no substitute for* ***their*** *qualities*.

References

Bayless, Betsy. (2000) Elements of Senate Bill 1007. Ballot Format: Proposition 301. [Pamphlet]. Retrieved March 8, 2002, http://www.ade.state.az.us/standards/aims/PerformanceStandars/hsreadingdescrip.asp.

Ehrenberg, Ronald G., Ehrenberg, Randy A., Reese, Daniel I. and Ehrenberg, Eric L. (1991). School District Leave Policies, Teacher Absenteeism and Student Achievement. *Journal of Human Resources*, Winter, V26N1,pp72-105.

Fraenkel, Jack R., & Wallen, Norman E., (2000). *How to Design & Evaluate Research in Education* (5th ed.). New York: McGraw Hill.

Glass, Gene V. (1975). *Design and Analysis of Time-Series Experiments*, Boulder Colorado, Colorado Associated Universtiy Press

Glass, Gene V. (1988). Interrupted Time-Series Quasi-Experiments. In Richard M. Jaeger, *Methods for Research in Education (2nd ed.)*(pp.589-607). Washington DC: American Educational Research Association.

Hall, Donna R. (1998). *Teacher Absenteeism: Its Relationship to Student Attendance, Student Discipline, and Student Productivity*. Doctoral Dissertation, Wilmington College, Delaware, *UMI Microform*, 9916539.

Jacobson, Stephen L. (1989). The Effects of Pay Incentives on Teacher Absenteeism. *Journal of Human Resources*, Spr, V24n2, pp280-286.

Jacobson, Stephen L. (1990) Attendance Incentives and Teacher Absenteeism. *Planning and Changing*. Sum,V21n2pp78-93.

Jacobson, Stephen L. (1993). Toward a Reconception of Absence in the School Workplace: Teacher Absenteeism as Invention and Social Exchange, Paper presented at Annual Meeting of the American Education Finance Association, Albuquerque, NM March.

Jaeger, Richard M. (1988). Survey Research Methods in Education. In Richard M. Jaeger, *Methods for Research in Education (2nd ed.)*(pp.449-487). Washington DC: American Educational Research Association.

Kaiser, C. (1996). Employee absence incentives in the welfare state: Toward explaining cross-national differences. *Journal of Socio-Economics*, Jan/Feb, V25I1.p.11.

Madden, H.D., Flanigan J. L., Richardson, M.D. (1991). Teacher Absences: Are There Implications for Educational Restructuring? A Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the Mid-South Educational Research Association, Lexington, KY. Nov.

Norton, M. Scott (1998). Teacher Absenteeism: A Growing Dielmma in Education. *Contemporary Education*, V48N2, pp95-99.

Odden, Allen (2001). Compensation Design Process. Retrieved July 22, 2002. http://www.wcer.wisc.edu/cpre/tcomp/research/strategy/design.aspx

Pitkoff, Evan (1981). In Search of Ways to Reduce Unnecessary Teacher Absenteeism. Eric Document207180. New York.

Pitkoff, Evan (1993). Teacher Absenteeism: What Administrators Can Do. *NASSP Bulletin*, March V77N551, pp39-45.

Ruesso, Alexander (2001). No Substitute for Quality. *The School Administrator*. January V58N1, pp 6-15.

Scott, K. Dow, Winbush, James C. (1991). Teacher Absenteeism in Secondary Education. *Educational Administration Quarterly*, Nov. V27N4, pp506-529.

Skidmore, Donald E. (1987). We Cut Teacher Absenteeism in Half. *The American School Board Journal*, March V17N3, pp40-41

Smith, M. & Glass, G. (1987). *Research and Evaluation in Education and the Social Sciences*, Boston: Allyn and Bacon

Spiller, Lynne (2002). *Arizona Proposition 301 Pay for Performance: A Case Study*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Arizona State University, Arizona.

Zirkel, Perry A., Gluckman, Ivan B. (1995). Teacher Absenteeism: Misuse of Sick Leave, *NASSP Bulletin*, March, V79,pp93-96.

Susan Lugo attended Arizona State University and graduated Summa Cum Laude with her Bachelor of Arts in Education in 1991, then with her Masters in Education in 1998. Susan began her teaching career in Roosevelt School District as a Kindergarten teacher. She also taught in Litchfield Park and Washington School Districts in a number of grades before finding a home in Creighton School District, where she serves as principal of Loma Linda Elementary School.

SubManager Survey 2004 Report

Substitute Teaching Institute at Utah State University

The Substitute Teaching Institute at Utah State University conducted a study in May and June of 2004 to obtain descriptive data about the state of substitute teaching management in the United States. This article represents the results of this study.

Method

This was a stratified random survey. The school district population was divided into six sections as outlined in Table 1: Participant Description, with their total sample size and response rate noted. The survey had an overall response rate of 41%. The highest response rate came from districts with more than 20,000 students. The lowest came from districts with 5,000-7,500 students.

Districts were contacted by telephone. Interviewers asked to speak with the person responsible for substitute teaching in the district. After asking if they would be willing to participate in the study, the interviewer then asked the survey questions. Participants were offered the opportunity to receive a copy of the final report. Some districts elected to respond to the survey via e-mail.

Instrument

The survey instrument was based on previous survey instruments used by the Substitute Teaching Institute at Utah State University, as shown in Appendix A.

Results

The focus of the survey was organizational and management structure. The following tables and analysis represent survey results.

Submanager Position

Only in large districts was the SubCoordinator position likely to be a stand-alone position. For other districts, it was more likely that substitute responsibilities would be combined with other duties at the district. Clerical and secretarial duties were the assignments most often combined with substitute teaching management (Table 2: Position Title).

Table 1: Participant Description

District Size	Population	Responded	Sample	Percentage
Level 1	Greater than 20,000	52	80	65%
Level 2	10,000-19,999	40	79	51%
Level 3	7,500-9,999	32	79	41%
Level 4	5,000-7,499	11	79	14%
Level 5	2,500-4,999	27	79	34%
Level 6	0-2,499	52	125	42%

Table 2: Position Title

Enrollment Level	Analyst	Clerical	HR Admin	HR/ Personnel Dir.	Secretary/ Support Staff	SubCoordinator/ Placement Specialist	Technician	Other
>20,000	2	8	2	3	8	24	5	2
10,000-19,999	0	6	3	1	5	7	4	4
7,500-9,999	0	0	1	3	14	9	1	5
5,000-7,499	0	1	0	0	4	4	1	1
2,500-4,999	0	2	0	2	8	1	1	5
0-2,499	0	4	0	0	30	1	1	16

Submanager Reporting Line

Survey respondents reported to a number of different positions within the district. In smaller districts, it was likely that the person over substitute teaching reported directly to the superintendent. In all districts with populations greater than 7,500 students, it was more likely that the person over substitute teaching reported to someone other than the superintendent. In the largest districts, someone other than the superintendent, the HR director, or staff development was responsible for substitute teachers. Among the other common positions were assistant superintendents or assistant human resource directors (see Table 3: Reporting Line).

Overwhelmingly, among those who responded to the survey, people over substitute teaching are employed full time, even if their duties are combined with other duties in the district. The average tenure varied by district size, but was generally smaller in the larger districts and larger in the smaller districts. In larger districts tenure averaged a little over six years. In smaller districts (less than 10,000 enrollment), the average was over eight years.

Calling Systems

Possessing a calling system is related to district population, with larger districts typically using calling systems and smaller districts handling their calling manually (although some of the largest districts still do not use calling systems). eSchool solutions was the most widely-used system (51%), followed by CRS SubFinder (28.7%) (see Table 4: Calling System).

Daily Fill Rate

The average fill rate was close to 94%. Average pay for short-term substitutes is $80.29 per day. Substitute-to-student ratios seem to range between 1:156 (for districts with over 20,000 students and based on an average of 40,000 students) to 1:440 (districts with less than 2,500 students). The best estimate comes from the middle districts, which had ratios of 1:100 to 1:136. Further research is needed to know how many substitutes are needed per 100 students to bring the fill rates up to 99%-100% (see Table 5: Daily Fill Rate).

Substitute Interviews

In terms of interview time for substitute teacher hires, 40% of substitutes received interviews of less than 10 minutes, 41% received interviews lasting from 10-20 minutes, and 19% received interviews

Table 3: Reporting Line

Enrollment Level	Superintendent	HR Director	Staff Development Department	Other
>20,000	1	9	2	42
10,000-19,999	5	6	0	18
7,500-9,999	8	12	1	12
5,000-7,499	1	2	0	8
2,500-4,999	14	1	0	4
0-2,499	33	1	0	17

Table 4: Calling System

Enrollment Level	Yes	No	AESOP	SubFinder/ CRS	eSchool Solutions/ SEMS/TSSI	District Owned	Other
>20,000	45	8	2	14	24	1	4
10,000-19,999	23	5	1	8	13	0	1
7,500-9,999	17	16	4	3	8	1	0
5,000-7,499	5	7	1	2	2	0	1
2,500-4,999	3	16	0	0	1	0	2
0-2,499	1	50	0	0	0	0	1

Table 5: Daily Fill Rate

Placement and Pay	Avg. # of Substitutes Placed Per Day	Avg. Fill Rate	Avg. Short Term Certified Pay Rate Per Day	Avg. Long Term Certified Pay Rate Per Day	Avg. Short Term Uncertified Pay Rate Per Day	Avg. Long Term Uncertified Pay Rate Per Day
>20,000	287.5	93.50%	$79.36	$110.02	$80.65	$93.05
10,000-19,999	100.35	95.32%	$95.67	$93.93	$97.29	$89.72
7,500-9,999	54.8	92.28%	$87.39	$113.65	$80.35	$86.33
5,000-7,499	47.1	97.25%	$99.33	n/a	$84.20	$116.50
2,500-4,999	23.6	89.57%	$65.00	$93.80	$73.05	$89.07
0-2,499	6	95.06%	$63.83	$121.16	$66.17	$50.00

Table 6: Interview Time (Time spent in face-to-face interviews with an individual substitute in minutes)

Enrollment Level	0	1 to 10	11 to 20	21 to 30	31 to 40	41 to 50	51 to 60
>20,000	8	0	3	7	1	0	2
10,000-19,999	4	1	8	0	1	1	3
7,500-9,999	2	2	1	7	0	2	2
5,000-7,499	1	1	2	1	0	1	0
2,500-4,999	6	2	2	1	0	2	1
0-2,499	9	8	5	9	0	2	3

lasting from 30 minutes to an hour. Many districts in this last category presented training at the time of interview. Substitute teacher interviews are a category that is still not well defined because all interviews are not the same (see Table 6: Substitute Interview).

Training Time

The larger districts' training time was significantly greater overall than any of the other districts. Table 7: Training Time shows the average training time for the major districts and the average of the other districts' averages in minutes for each area of training. Among the possible reasons why training is such a big issue in larger districts is that the quality of the substitute teacher pool is more varied than in smaller districts, personnel have more narrowly defined job responsibilities and training can, therefore, be conducted with existing staff. Smaller school districts are better able to include substitute teachers in school activities and network with faculty better. Finding a better list of reasons why more training is conducted in larger districts would be an important area of further research.

Conclusions

This survey provides insight into the current state of substitute teacher management. There are a few highlights that are worth mentioning. First, it appears that substitute teacher management is typically not regarded as an educational function. Management of substitute teachers is often secretarial in nature, with few ties to teaching or curriculum in its organizational structure. In the largest school districts, this is not always the case, however, and is occasionally not the case in smaller districts.

The most telling item found in this survey was the difference in training between the largest school districts and the rest of the districts surveyed. It is unknown why the larger districts are able to invest more time to training than other districts, but that is definitely the case. Also, data regarding the percentages of districts using various calling systems was interesting in that there seems to be a value threshold for such systems. Finally, it appears that most submanagers do not come from teaching or school administrations in districts. This indicates that there is a need for training of submanagers, as well as substitute teachers.

Table 7: Training Time (in minutes)

Enrollment Level	Payroll Policies	District Procedures	Health and Safety	Parking	Teaching Strategies	Classroom Management	Basic Daily Preparation	SubPack	Remediation	Totals
<20,000	10.5	25.3	14	1.8	19.5	16.5	6	4.4	5.6	1 Hr., 43 Min.
20,000+	14.6	56.3	21.2	2.7	80.7	71.4	33.4	28.3	10.9	5 Hr., 19 Min.
Average	11.2	30.4	15	2	30	25.6	10.7	8.4	6.5	2 Hr., 19 Min.

APPENDIX A

Dear SubManager,

Here is the survey from the Substitute Teaching Institute that you kindly said you would fill out for us. Thank you for being willing to help us out with this research. To fill out this information, hit the reply button on your e-mail browser, then answer the questions in the body of the new message. Hit send to submit the survey. If your browser doesn't automatically copy the questions from this message into the reply message, copy the survey from this message to a new message and the return e-mail address to the TO field of the new message. Then answer the questions and hit the send button.

Please answer the following questions:

District:
State:

What percentage of your district qualifies for free or reduced lunch?

What is your position title?

To whom do you report:
Superintendent, HR Director, Other _____

How long have you worked in your position?

What was your previous position?

Is your position full or part time?

Do you use a calling system?
Which one?

How many substitutes do you place per day?

What is your fill rate?

How many substitutes do you place per day?

How much time (in minutes) do you spend in face-to-face interviews with substitute teachers prior to their hiring?

For the following topics, please indicate if you offer orientation (O) or training (T) in that area and how long you spend covering that topic (Example: Payroll Policies: 0—20 minutes):
Payroll Policies
District Procedures
Health and Safety
Parking for Substitutes
Teaching Strategies
Classroom Management
Basic daily preparation
Substitute Bag of Tricks
Remediation Procedures

How much do you pay substitute teachers (if you only have one rate, fill in the top line only)?
Short-Term Uncertified ($) per ( )
Short-Term Certified
Long-Term Uncertified
Long-Term Certified

What do you know about the Substitute Teaching Institute at Utah State University?

Would you like to receive a copy of the survey results via e-mail?.

Thank you very much for participating in our survey today. If you have any questions about the Substitute Teaching Institute, you can call us at 1-800-022-4693 or visit us on the Internet at http://subed.usu.edu.

SmartSTART Final Summary Report

Allegheny Intermediate Unit, Homestead, Pennsylvania

Allegheny Intermediate Unit has implemented the SmartSTART program for the past three years. Each year implementation of the program has been fine-tuned. This final summary report provides an overview of the program's background and implementation. It also highlights trends that have emerged, and concludes with areas that still need improvement.

SmartSTART Background

In April 2001, the Pittsburgh Foundation invited Allegheny Intermediate Unit (AIU) staff together with Pennsylvania State Education Association (PSEA) representatives to participate in a focus group to brainstorm possible solutions to the substitute teacher shortage problem in regional school districts. This group developed a menu of approaches to address the shortage and encouraged the AIU to develop SmartSTART as a pilot program to specifically address the needs of the Act 16 Empowerment school districts[1].

SmartSTART: Substitute Teachers Accountable, Responsible, Teaching is a program designed to recruit, select, and train persons who hold a Bachelor's degree, but are not certified teachers, to become emergency certified substitute teachers. SmartSTART is a joint effort between the Human Resources and Staff Development departments at the Allegheny Intermediate Unit. Initially the "Guest Teacher" concept of recruiting and training non-certified substitutes began in two Pennsylvania intermediate units in the late 1990s. SmartSTART Training is based on a program developed by the Substitute Teaching Institute at Utah State University[2]. AIU

[1] Prior to the April 2001 collaboration, the AIU spent time assessing district need in terms of classroom coverage and the ability for districts to recruit and retain substitute teachers. AIU staff also explored various programs designed to meet coverage and substitute needs. This groundwork helped the collaboration select a model and pilot schools. Act 16 Empowerment districts are those designated as "low-acheiving," as a result of a combined average of 50 percent or more of the students in the district scoring in the bottom quartile (as defined in 1996) in math and reading on the Pennsylvania System of Schools Assessment Test (the "PSSA") in the most recent two years. To be removed from the List and to qualify for the base annual grant provided for in the Act, the district must transmit to the Department an Improvement Plan that sets forth the manner in which the district will, within three to four years, improve PSSA scores such that it can be removed from the List.

implemented SmartSTART for the first time during the 2001-2002 school year with Empowerment school districts and other districts served by the AIU that expressed an interest and were willing to commit to the program. AIU continued to implement the program in the 2002-2003 and 2003-2004 school years. AIU added a "Train the Trainer" model in the 2002-2003 school year for districts that wanted to conduct their own training.

The Pittsburgh Foundation, the Grable Foundation, the Howard Heinz Endowments, and the Eden Hall Foundation provided full funding for the program for the 2001-2002 school year; local school district funds supported the 2002-2003 school year and beyond.

Program Implementation

AIU fine-tuned the recruitment, selection, and training processes by the third year. Word of mouth, interest generated by the program, and returning substitutes all contributed to a successful application process after the first year of implementation, which included extensive advertising—local newspapers, news coverage on cable television, and the AIU Web site. AIU also sent flyers to local businesses, churches, universities, and all AIU Head Start Centers.

Interested applicants completed the SmartSTART application at the PA-Educator.net Web site. After completing the application, applicants participated in the SmartSTART Orientation at AIU. The full-day orientation gave participants an overview of the program, and AIU Human Resources conducted a final screening to determine if applicants had completed all necessary paperwork. Participating districts' representatives made presentations to the applicants and applicants signed up for interviews, which were conducted at the school sites.

After successful completion of the interviews, applicants were eligible to submit applications for an Emergency Permit. This permit enabled them to substitute every day with one exception: they could not substitute for the same teacher more than 15 days. Applicants were not eligible to substitute in a district without the Emergency Permit. In Year One, AIU recommended applicants observe classrooms while waiting for their permits. The greatest

---

[2] The Substitute Teaching Institute at Utah State University has an eight-hour substitute teacher training program available. It includes a *SubTrainer Manual* and *Substitute Teacher Handbooks,* which provide proven professional management skills and teaching strategies. A *SubInstructor CD* and *Classroom Management* 2-Audio CD set, as well as other materials, are also available.

improvement that occurred between Year One and Year Two was that the Emergency Permit was available online, greatly expediting this process. The SmartSTART Program recommended applicants observe eight hours in an elementary building and eight hours in a secondary building prior to beginning their substitute experience.

In addition to the daylong orientation, SmartSTART substitutes received three and one-half days of training. After the first round of training, the AIU mandated training for each new round of applicants.

Program Outcomes

- Three districts that began with the pilot program have continued to use SmartSTART-trained substitutes. Three new districts joined the program in Year Two, and one new district chose to participate in the Train the Trainer model. In Year Three, no new districts were added, and one district chose to switch to the Train the Trainer model. (Key: ✓= SmartSTART participating district; **T**=Train the Trainer model district.)

District	2001-2002	2002-2003	2003-2004
Allegheny Valley		✓	**T**
Duquesne	✓	✓	✓
Cornell	✓		
Fox Chapel		**T**	**T**
Highlands		✓	✓
Moon		✓	✓
Sto-Rox	✓	✓	✓
West Allegheny	✓		
Wilkinsburg	✓	✓	✓

- Each year approximately 40% of people who initially submitted applications went on to submit a complete application for the SmartSTART program and participate in training.

	Attended Orientation Training	**Attended Training Day 1**	**Attended Training Day 2**	**Attended Training Day 3 (opt. first 2 years)**
Year One	88	79	69	47
Year Two	60	51	50	26
Year Three	40	40	40	40

- 90% or more of survey respondents every year, for every training session, either "agreed" or "strongly agreed" that 1) presentations were clear and easy to understand, 2) content was useful and informative, and 3) training materials were useful and informative.
- Not all applicants who started the training went on to apply for an Emergency Permit.

	Emergency Permits Issued	**Applicants with Education Degree (Bachelor or Master level)**	**Applicants with Teaching Certificate or in Certification Program**
Year One	59	25%	4
Year Two	70 (36 new)	33%	6
Year Three	43 (27 new)	10%	3

- Each year over 90% of Emergency Permit recipients actually worked in schools.
- Each year substitutes reported working an average of 2-3 days per week, some substitutes reported working 5 days per week.

- Each year there has been a cadre of returning substitutes.

	Year One Substitutes	Year Two Substitutes
Worked Year Two	16	
Worked Year Three	7	15

- One district reported saving $26,000 per year. No other district provided this information.

Emerging Program Themes

By the end of the second year of implementation, key trends emerged from opened-ended survey questions, focus group discussions, or district meetings. They included:

- Applicants who apply for and receive their Emergency Permits are more likely to have a background in education or in fields related to education.
- Those substitutes who return are more likely to enter into/or are already in teacher certification programs.
- Substitutes who spend a great deal of time in the classroom tend to do so either because they are more reliable or have a good reputation regarding their classroom management skills or instructional strategies.
- Returning substitutes reported that they did much better their second year and reported that experience was the best teacher.
- Districts noted that they had a hard time obtaining SmartSTART substitutes on Mondays, Fridays, around holidays, and in May.
- Substitutes requested more:
  - District participation/knowledge of the district during the orientation session.
  - Classroom management skills, including setting expectations, transitioning between activities, and dealing with unmotivated and failing students.
  - Hands-on/real-life experiences, more interaction with veteran substitutes, more time to share, and more AIU support or follow-through at the district level.

  - Knowledge of discipline guidance, support, and follow-through; readable lesson plans to follow; inclusion in district orientation, training, or in-service meetings; and communication of policy or schedule changes.
- These requests were again reiterated by substitutes in Year 3.

In response to the same requests arising after three years, the evaluator met with the project coordinator to discuss the extent to which the pervious year's recommendations were addressed and also to determine a plan of action for future program implementation.

Several recommendations were followed-up with and implemented on behalf of the SmartSTART Program with the most important being:

- Emergency Permit applications for substitutes were not submitted unless all trainings were attended, at least one observation was conducted, and clearances were granted.
- A minimal processing fee was added to increase "buy in" of the participants.
- Classroom observations became a mandatory activity between the first and second training, with time allocated during the second training to discuss the observations.
- Increased contact between the project coordinator and the district occurred via phone contact and email. On-site visits occurred with some districts.
- Substitutes in some districts developed a network with other substitutes and teachers for needed support.

Additionally, the following recommendations will be addressed during the 2004-05 school year:

- Including a few select veteran SmartSTART substitutes to participate in the training so they can share tips and experiences.
- Inviting all returning substitutes to participate in training as a refresher and a way to meet/mentor new substitutes.

Finally, there are recommendations that districts still need to address. Those include:

- Having a realistic expectation of what the SmartSTART substitutes can do and provide. They are not and will not become teachers in three and one-half days of training.

- Providing the following information to either substitutes or the SmartSTART program: 1) what to do when teachers do not leave appropriate work, lessons, student rosters, and IEP information; 2) where to get equipment and supplies (or help when equipment doesn't work); 3) the district's discipline policies and procedures; and 4) any changes in the district's policies or procedures.

In closing, although substitutes had trying times, especially in their first year, they had many wonderful stories to tell. Furthermore, many of the trying times are simply because being trained and observing are not the same as doing. The substitutes reported that experience is the best teacher. Most promising is the cadre of returning teachers that participate in this program.

For more information on the SmartSTART Program or previous reports, contact:

Jacqueline M. Territo, Ph.D., Director of Human Resources,
Phone: 412- 394-5957 E-mail: jacky.territo@aiu3.net

Mary Beth Colvill, Human Resources Specialist,
Phone: 412-394-5995 Email: marybeth.colvill@aiu3.net

Robert Gevaudan, Assistant Director for Educational Services and Support, Phone: 412-394-5838
E-mail: robert.gevaudan@aiu3.net

Analyzing the Effects of Direct Behavioral Consultation on Teachers: Generalization Across Settings

Jennifer T. Freeland

Direct behavioral consultation (DBC) utilizes elements of applied behavior analysis such as modeling, feedback, and practice to train teachers to implement behavioral interventions in the classroom for children exhibiting behavior and/or academic problems. The use of direct instruction techniques makes it more likely that a teacher's newly acquired skills will generalize to other settings, behaviors, or students. If a behavioral intervention decreases an inappropriate behavior, the teacher may be more likely to utilize these new skills across other contexts. This type of generalization is known as contacting natural contingencies of reinforcement.

This study examined the effects of the DBC model as applied to teaching teachers to increase their rate of praise to problematic students in the classroom. This study also examined whether or not a teacher's rate of praise generalized to other settings. Three teachers and students in Head Start programs participated in this study. Teachers were taught to use praise statements for students exhibiting appropriate behavior. The results of this study indicated that when teacher praise increased, student's inappropriate behavior decreased. Rate of praise and appropriate behavior generalized to a second setting for each participant. However, generalization was not found to occur in a third setting. Discussion focuses on the importance of using the DCB model and generalization. Limitations of the study such as teacher absenteeism, time constraints, and directions for future research are also addressed.

Behavioral consultation was first described by Bergan (1977) as a means of delivering psychological services to individuals within the school system. Bergan developed the behavioral consultation model to address the growing demand to deliver services to students in the school system and to move away from the test-and-place model that dominated psychological and educational service delivery in the schools. Bergan and Kratochwill (1990) defined several key features of behavioral consultation: 1) consultation as an indirect service; 2) an equal relationship exists between the consultant and the consultee;

3) the consultant's specific knowledge is passed on to the consultee; and 4) there is a clear separation between consultation and counseling.

Well designed research has been difficult to obtain on behavioral consultation. What has been obtained has shown that simply telling (either verbally or written) a consultee what to do has not been effective in getting teachers to accurately implement interventions (Lloyd, 1994; Noell, et al., 1997). Witt (1997) suggests three reasons why verbalizations should not be the sole mechanism in which behavioral consultation is conducted: 1) evidence does not support correspondence between what we say we will do and what we actually do; 2) merely talking to a teacher does not produce behavior change; and 3) the consultee's responses to consultant questions may not always be reliable or accurate.

Because of the lack of empirical evidence supporting the efficacy of behavioral consultation, several authors have called for changes to the model that must be considered for behavioral consultation to be effective (c.f., Noell, Gresham, & Duhon, 1998; Noell & Witt, 1996; Watson, Sterling, McDade, 1997; Witt, 1997). More specifically, direct training of certain skills should be conducted by the consultant so that the consultee acquires the skills necessary to conduct the intervention. Not only should verbal skills be incorporated into behavioral consultation, but also procedures derived from applied behavioral analysis that call for the direct measurement of target behaviors and the direct involvement of the consultant should be included.

Direct Behavioral Consultation (DBC)

Watson and Robinson (1996) discussed using DBC as opposed to traditional behavioral consultation to work directly with the teacher and student to produce behavioral change. The consultant first instructs the consultee on a certain skill, teaches the skill to the consultee, models the skill with the client in the presence of the consultee, prompts the consultee to practice the skill, and then gives the consultee direct feedback on his/her performance (Watson & Robinson, 1996).

Generalization of Consultation Skills

Generalization of behavior change is an important component of any behavioral treatment program (Baer, Wolf, & Risely, 1968). Generalization refers to the presence of a previously taught skill emerging in untrained and different contexts (Stokes & Osnes, 1989).

Once a skill has been acquired and has become fluent, the next step is to determine whether or not the skill will generalize across participants, settings, behaviors, or time (Hering & Eaton, 1978). Watson and Robinson (1996) hypothesized that the use of DBC should increase the chance of generalization of skills because of its reliance on direct skills training.

In a study conducted by Watson, Watkins, and Shriver (2002), the authors found that the use of DBC was sufficient in promoting generalization of skills from a morning teaching session to an afternoon teaching session. However, the mechanisms for this occurrence of generalization were not examined. The purpose of this study was to determine if: 1) the use of the DBC as a service delivery model will be effective in increasing teacher rate of praise statements; 2) an increase in teacher praise will produce an increase in student on-task behavior and compliance; 3) student's inappropriate behavior will decrease as an effect of increased teacher praise; and 4) because of student behavior change, teacher's rate of praise statements will generalize to other settings.

Method

Participants and Settings

Participants in this study were three teacher-student dyads in local area Head Start classes. The dyads consisted of Ms. Brenda and Lynn, Ms. Catherine and Kris, and Ms. Lisa and Adam. The primary experimenter worked as part of a team that contracted to the Head Start program as behavioral consultants. Teachers were asked to refer students to the team who exhibited behavior problems in their classroom. If the student was exhibiting behaviors such as off-task behavior or hitting and kicking others, the referred student and teacher were considered for the study. Ms. Brenda and Ms. Lynn worked at one center and taught in full-day classrooms. Ms. Lynn was a teacher's assistant and was chosen because she had more frequent contact (e.g., provided praise and administered punishment) with the referred student. The final teacher participant, Ms. Catherine, was from a Head Start that had part-time classes (a morning and an afternoon class).

So that student outcome data could be obtained, the students who were determined by the consultant and the teacher to be most problematic for each teacher were observed for the target inappropriate behaviors (e.g., off-task, not listening, hitting other

students, etc.). Lynn and Alex were three-year-olds who were referred by Ms. Brenda and Ms. Lisa for general noncompliance. Both students were African American. Kris was a four-year-old Hispanic student whose second language was English. Kris was referred by Ms. Catherine for noncompliance and aggressive behavior toward other students in the classroom.

Prior to the beginning of the study, the experimenter met with each teacher to determine a target behavior for the referred student. Observations of the target behavior were then conducted by the experimenter to determine the frequency and intensity of the behaviors and to hypothesize a function of the behavior. The functional behavior assessment was conducted to ensure that the referred students would respond to adult praise. Each referred student responded positively to adult attention and praise.

The experiment took place in the teachers' classrooms in local area Head Starts in a large Midwestern school district. A teacher and teacher's aide were present in each classroom. Each class contained 16-20 students. Each activity observed in the study was already part of the daily lesson plan. A typical daily schedule consisted of greeting/wash hands, breakfast/brush teeth, large group time, planning time, center time, clean up time, recall time, gross motor/outside, small group time, and story time. Recess and nap time typically occurred in the early afternoon.

The setting in which the student displayed the most disruptive behavior was selected as the first setting targeted for intervention. Generalization settings used in this study were selected because of their proximity to the first setting (i.e., the next two settings/activities in the classroom). Kris was observed during center time (setting 1), clean up time (setting 2), and recall time (setting 3). Adam and Lynn were observed during art (setting 1), center time (setting 2), and large group (setting 3). Art was typically a structured activity in which the children were instructed to follow the directions of the teacher in making a project.

Procedure

Teachers were not told that their behavior was being observed and recorded in order to reduce reactivity associated with being monitored. Teachers were told by the primary experimenter that she was studying procedures for implementing DBC in the classrooms.

Baseline: During this phase of the study, teachers were observed by the primary experimenter for the number of praise and command

statements emitted during three different activities throughout the student's day. No feedback regarding teacher performance was given by the experimenter who was observing the classroom or the observer taking reliability data. Additionally, behaviors exhibited by students as described above were observed and recorded using a 10 second partial interval recording system. Student behavior was coded for a total of ten minutes.

Direct Behavioral Consultation Sessions: During this phase, the teacher was instructed in emitting praise statements for appropriate behavior. The intervention, including the importance of using praise, was first explained to each teacher. The teacher was instructed in the appropriate times to emit praise statements and given examples of labeled praise statements (e.g., "I like the way you are playing quietly"). Teachers were asked to emit praise statements contingent upon appropriate behavior exhibited by the students and/or the class. Giving praise statements for appropriate student behavior was then modeled by the experimenter in the classroom. Next, the teacher was instructed to practice praise statements in the presence of the experimenter for appropriate behavior exhibited by individual students and/or the class. Teachers received corrective feedback for any errors exhibited and praise for accuracy in emitting praise statements. Teachers were instructed to provide, at a minimum, at least twenty praise statements during the ten minute interval. (cf: Anderson, Delaney, Slay, & Watson, 2002). After this training session, experimenters only used coaching and performance feedback to prompt the teachers to emit praise statements.

DBC2 Sessions: During the coaching phase of this study, the teachers (consultees) gave praise statements to students regarding their appropriate behavior while receiving feedback from the experimenter (consultant). Opportunity for feedback from the experimenter was given during the coaching session by the experimenter, who was standing nearby and observing. If a teacher did not give a praise statement for appropriate on-task behavior, the experimenter prompted the teacher to do so. Conversely, if a teacher gave a praise statement when it was not appropriate, the experimenter also provided corrective feedback. Praise was provided to the teachers for correct praise statements given contingent on appropriate behavior.

Generalization Phase: This phase was conducted following the direct behavioral consultation phase in setting 2 and setting 3 to

determine if the new skills that the teacher had acquired generalized to other settings in the classroom.

Results—Dyad 1

Kris

Results for the first teacher-student dyad are as follows. In center time, during the baseline phase, Kris's on-task behavior was stable (mean=78%) with a slight decrease before the implementation of the coaching session. When teacher praise was coached during center time, Kris's on-task behavior increased to higher levels then previously exhibited during baseline (mean=99%). During clean-up, although teacher praise was not coached, Kris's on-task behavior increased steadily to 100% on-task. In recall, during the baseline condition, there was also a gradual increase of on-task behavior exhibited by Kris.

Kris's off-task behavior ranged from 13% to 31%. Not keeping hands and feet to self ranged from 0% to 3%. Inappropriate vocalizations ranged from 0% to 8%. When the coaching condition was implemented in center time, Kris's off-task behavior decreased to 0% levels (range, 0%-3%). During this same phase, not keeping hands and feet to self decreased from to 0% and inappropriate vocalizations also decreased from to 0%.

During clean-up, Kris's aberrant behavior during the baseline phase showed a decrease once the teacher praise was implemented in center time. During the baseline phase in clean-up, Kris, off-task behavior exhibited during this baseline was 66% (range, 5%-76%). Once coaching was implemented during center time, Kris's off-task behavior gradually decreased to an average of 5%. Not keeping hands and feet to self increased to 21% during clean-up, then decreased back to 0% levels. Not keeping hands and feet to self reached 0% levels before teacher praise was implemented during center time. Inappropriate vocalizations occurred in center time an average of 7% of the intervals observed. Inappropriate vocalizations were stable until reaching a final level of 0% on the last session after teacher praise was implemented in center time.

During recall, all of Kris's aberrant behavior demonstrated a gradual decrease. Off-task behavior increased during session 2 and then gradually decreased to 0%. Although Kris's off-task behavior began decreasing before coaching was implemented during session 1, it decreased from 39% off-task to 7% and 0% off-task once coaching

was implemented in center time. Not keeping hands and feet to self also demonstrated a gradual decrease to 0% once the coaching intervention was implemented in center time. Inappropriate vocalizations also decreased in recall. However it was at 0% before coaching was implemented in session 1. After teacher praise was implemented in center time, inappropriate vocalizations remained at 0%.

Teacher Praise

Ms. Catherine, the teacher in the teacher-student dyad with Kris, was also observed by the experimenters in order to record the frequency of praise delivered to the target student or the whole class.

In center time, during the baseline phase, Ms. Catherine's rate of praise was delivered on average .5% of the time. Once the training/coaching portion was implemented, Ms. Catherine's rate of praise increased to an average of 16%. During clean-up, praise was delivered by Ms. Catherine in 6% of the intervals observed. However, when coaching was implemented in center time, Ms. Catherine's rate of praise increased above levels demonstrated in the beginning of the baseline condition. During recall, teacher praise remained at an average of 2% (range, 0%-7%), even after coaching was implemented in center time. A slight increase was noted during session 6 (7%) after coaching was implemented in center time.

Commands/Compliance

Finally, the frequency of commands given by Ms. Catherine to Kris or the whole class was recorded for the 10 minute interval. The number of times Kris complied with Ms. Catherine's commands was also recorded. A percentage of Kris's compliance was then calculated by dividing Kris's compliance by the number of commands issued by Ms. Catherine. During center time, in the baseline condition, only during session 2 did Ms. Catherine issue commands to Kris. Kris' compliance was 100%. After coaching was implemented, Kris' compliance to Ms. Catherine's commands remained at 100% across all sessions in which commands were issued. During clean-up, in the sessions before coaching was implemented in session 1, Kris's compliance to commands averaged 72.5%. Once the coaching intervention was implemented in session 1, Kris's compliance to commands increased to an average of 91.1%. During baseline in recall, Kris's compliance with commands averaged 57.1%. However, once coaching was implemented in center time, Kris's compliance

with teacher commands increased to 100% for sessions 5 and 6 (commands were not given by Ms. Catherine during session 4).

Results—Dyad 2

Adam

In the next teacher-student dyad, Adam and Ms. Lisa, art was the only setting in which coaching was implemented. During the baseline phase in art, Adam was on-task for 0% of the intervals for all sessions. With the implementation of coaching, Adam's on-task behavior rose to higher levels than exhibited during baseline (mean= 90%). During center time, Adam exhibited on-task behavior that was at first very low and stable. After the fourth session, Adam's on-task behavior increased to levels similar to that observed in art (mean= 34%). This increase occurred after coaching was implemented. During large group, Adam's on-task behavior was variable, showing a decrease during the last sessions (mean= 44%). There appeared to be no effect on Adam's on-task behavior in large group with the implementation of coaching in art.

During the baseline phase in art, Adam's off-task behavior was at 100% for all three baseline data points. With the implementation of coaching, Adam's off-task behavior decreased to near 0%. Not keeping his hands and feet to himself and inappropriate vocalizations remained at near 0% levels during both the baseline phase and during coaching.

In center time, Adam's off-task behavior was initially steady, averaging 92%, until there was a gradual decrease during the fifth session (once coaching was implemented during session 1). Neither not keeping hands and feet to self nor inappropriate vocalizations were affected by the implementation of coaching in art. Not keeping hands and feet to self averaged 15%. The highest point (43%) occurred before coaching was implemented in art. In large group, none of the aberrant behaviors appeared to be affected by the implementation of coaching in art. Adam's off-task behavior averaged 44%. Not keeping hands and feet to self remained steady and averaged 5% while inappropriate vocalizations averaged 2%.

Teacher Praise

In art, during the baseline phase, Ms. Lisa's rate of praise was 0% for all three sessions observed. Coaching was then implemented after the third session. When Ms. Lisa was coached to increase her rate of

praise statements, this behavior immediately showed an increase to 33% and remained at this level until the sixth session, in which there was another increase to 55%. In center time, there was no indication that coaching implemented in art demonstrated any effect on Ms. Lisa's rate of praise in center time. Her rate of praise was stable at 0%, excluding one session in which her rate of praise was 2%. This slight increase occurred after coaching was implemented during session 1. In large group, Ms Lisa's rate of praise remained at 0%, indicating that generalization did not occur from the implementation of coaching implemented in art.

Commands/Compliance

Only during one session of the baseline phase in art did Ms. Lisa administer commands to Adam. On this occasion, he complied with 35% of the commands issued. During the second session of the coaching condition, Adam complied with 50% of the commands given to him by Ms. Lisa. In center time, Adam's compliance to commands was variable. During the sessions in which commands were issued, Adam complied with these commands 38%, 22%, and 33% of the time, respectively. Therefore, it appeared that there was no effect of coaching implemented in art on Adam's compliance with commands in center time. In large group, during the sessions in which commands were issued, Adam's compliance was 23% and 100%. However, commands were not issued after session 3.

Results—Dyad 3

Lynn

In art during the baseline phase, Lynn's on-task behavior demonstrated a slight increase in session 2, but then decreased to 13% on-task (mean = 52%). In center time, Lynn's on-task behavior was variable with a decrease demonstrated during the last session (mean = 33.2%). There did not appear to be an effect of the coaching implemented in art on Lynn's on-task behavior in center time. During large group, Lynn's on-task behavior also did not appear to be affected by the coaching intervention implemented in art. Lynn's on-task behavior was stable with a slight decrease exhibited during session 4.

During the baseline condition, Lynn's off-task behavior averaged 48% showing an increase during session 4. Once coaching was implemented after session 4, Lynn's off-task behavior decreased to

0%. Not keeping hands and feet to self was observed to occur during the baseline condition an average of 2.75% of the observed intervals, showing the biggest increase during session 4. Once the intervention was implemented, not keeping hands and feet to self decreased to 0%. Lynn's inappropriate vocalizations during the baseline condition were observed to occur an average of 4.75% with the greatest increase occurring during session 3. Once the intervention was implemented after session 4, inappropriate vocalizations decreased to 0%.

In center time, Lynn's off-task behavior was observed to occur an average of 67%. Her off-task behavior was variable with a decrease demonstrated during session 5 after the coaching intervention was implemented in art. However, Lynn's off-task behavior increased to 86% (the second highest percentage) during the sixth session. Not keeping hands and feet to self was observed to occur an average of 4.83%. Once the intervention was implemented in session 1, not keeping hands and feet to self decreased to 0% for session 5. However, during session 6, Lynn's behavior slightly increased to 5%. Inappropriate vocalizations were observed to occur an average of 13.75%. The highest increase in inappropriate vocalizations occurred during session 3 (37%). Once coaching was implemented in art, inappropriate vocalizations decreased to 0% during center time demonstrating that there may have been a small effect (generalization) from the intervention implemented in art to center time.

During large group, none of the aberrant behaviors seemed to be affected by the intervention implemented in art. Off-task behavior, not keeping hands and feet to self, and inappropriate vocalizations were all relatively stable across five sessions. Off-task behavior was observed to occur an average of 77%. Not keeping hands and feet to self was observed to occur an average of 8.6% with a slight increase in sessions 4 and 5. Inappropriate vocalizations were observed to occur an average of 4.2% of the intervals.

Teacher Praise

In art, during baseline, Ms. Brenda's rate of praise was 0% across all four sessions observed. Once coaching was implemented, Ms. Brenda's rate of praise increased to 25% and 26% of the sessions respectively. In center time, Ms. Brenda's rate of praise was stable at near zero levels and then increased to 17% and 5% during sessions 5 and 6. This may have occurred as the result of carry over effects from

the coaching intervention implemented in art. In large group, there appeared to be no effect of the intervention implemented in art on Ms. Brenda's rate of praise. Rate of praise was at 0%, except for in session 4 when her rate of praise increased slightly to 3%.

Commands/Compliance

During baseline in art, Lynn complied with Ms. Brenda's commands 100%, 50%, and 50% of the sessions respectively (there were no commands given in session 2). After the implementation of the coaching intervention, Lynn followed Ms. Brenda's commands 50% and 100% of the intervals observed, indicating that there did not appear to be a clear difference in Lynn's compliance during the baseline and intervention phases. In center time, Lynn complied with Ms. Brenda's commands 100%, 75%, 14%, 33% 55% and 100% of the observed intervals. There was an increase in compliance when the intervention was implemented in art. In large group, Lynn complied with Ms. Brenda's commands 71%, 50%, and 25% of the observed intervals (commands were not given in sessions 1 or 2). There does not appear to be an effect from the coaching intervention implemented in art on Lynn's compliance in center time.

Conclusion

The results of the current study demonstrated that increasing teacher rate of praise increased students' on-task behavior and decreased students' aberrant behavior in the settings in which the intervention was implemented. All three teacher-student dyads demonstrated increases in on-task behavior, rate of praise, and a decrease in aberrant behavior once the intervention was implemented in the first setting. This study provides evidence that direct training of skills using modeling, coaching, and performance feedback from a consultant to a consultee increased the consultee's use of the skills and increased student on-task behavior in the classroom (c.f., Sterling-Turner, Watson, & Moore, 2002). Each student demonstrated increases in on-task behavior once teacher rate of praise was increased.

Many teachers focus only on the inappropriate behaviors that students are exhibiting, while ignoring appropriate behavior the same student exhibits in the classroom. This lack of teacher praise in the classroom may teach students that the most effective means for obtaining teacher attention is by engaging in problematic behaviors. Additionally, the students who are only issued negative feedback are

not given sufficient opportunities to learn what is appropriate classroom behavior or what is an appropriate replacement behavior. Thus, when teachers increase their rate of praise for student appropriate behavior, this teaches the student an alternative behavior to recruit teacher attention. In effect, this should increase the student's rate of appropriate responses if they are receiving reinforcement for appropriate behavior. In this study, teachers were given several examples of behaviors that they could praise in the classroom.

Generalization and Student Behavior

Generalization across settings was somewhat demonstrated in this study, particularly with the teacher-student dyad of Ms. Catherine and Kris. Once the intervention was implemented in setting 1, Kris's on-task behavior also increased during setting 2. Additionally, increases in Kris's on-task behavior were also demonstrated in setting 3 when the intervention was implemented in setting 1, therefore showing some effects of generalization of the behavior change across settings. However, for the other two teacher-student dyads, generalization across settings was not demonstrated in setting 2 or setting 3. This lack of generalization of students' behavior (Adam and Lynn) may have occurred because teachers' rate of praise statements was not coached in either setting 2 or setting 3. Thus, because the teachers were not trained to issue praise statements in setting 2 or setting 3, they did not issue praise statements, and therefore the students may have exhibited inappropriate behavior to elicit teacher attention.

Generalization and Teacher Praise

It was hypothesized that contacting natural contingencies of reinforcement would prompt generalization of teacher praise and student on-task behavior across settings. If there was an improvement in student behavior due to the effects of an increase in teacher rate of praise, this may be reinforcing to the teachers. Thus, teachers may be more inclined to continue praising students in other situations to continue to increase appropriate behaviors.

Across the three teachers, some generalization of the intervention was demonstrated in setting 2, but generalization was not found in setting 3 for any of the teachers. This may have occurred because the teachers were never coached to give praise in these settings, which may have served as a cue for being observed. Thus, they did not report that they knew they were being observed in setting 2 or setting

3. The slight increase of teacher praise in setting 2 but not setting 3 may be due to the proximity of these settings to setting 1. setting 3 was more removed in time than setting 2, which may have contributed to the lack of generalization demonstrated in setting 3. If the coaching intervention had occurred in setting 2, a consequence of this training may have been increased generalization demonstrated in setting 3 (i.e., setting 2 is in close proximity to setting 3).

Generalization and Compliance

For the teacher-student dyad of Kris and Ms. Catherine, it did not appear that Kris' compliance with Ms. Catherine's commands was affected by the intervention in setting 1. In setting 2, Kris' compliance to commands was variable, but stabilized to near 100% after session 4. Therefore, it is uncertain if the DBC implemented in setting 1 had any effect on Kris's compliance in setting 2. In setting 3, Kris's compliance decreased to 0% during session 4. However, compliance increased to 100% in sessions 6 and 7. This may have been a result of the implementation of coaching in Setting 1. For the teacher-student dyads of Ms. Brenda and Lynn, and Ms. Lisa and Adam, it does not appear that the intervention affected compliance, nor was generalization of compliance demonstrated in setting 2 and setting 3.

Most studies described in school psychology literature have focused on the process of behavioral consultation and not the outcome of behavioral consultation on the client's (student) behavior. Such focus on the process of behavioral consultation renders it unclear whether or not behavioral consultation is sufficient in training teachers to implement interventions that decrease inappropriate behavior. The current studies in the consultation literature focus on the verbal behavior of the consultee (teacher) and the consultee's acceptability of the proposed intervention. It does not demonstrate whether or not the client's behavior is affected.

This study extends the current research by providing student outcome data as the result of direct behavioral consultation with the teacher. Although the process of behavioral consultation and interactions with the consultee/teacher may be important (teachers should implement interventions with treatment integrity), one of the most important variables of the consultation process should be whether or not it affects a change in the client's/student's behavior. The teacher/consultee may verbally report on changes in the target behavior and that s/he is implementing the treatment. Without

outcome measures of the client/student, however, it is unclear whether or not the client is benefitting from the behavioral consultation and resulting intervention.

This study supports the use of direct behavioral consultation as a training model to teach teachers new skills. It also supports increasing the use of teacher praise to increase appropriate student behavior. These three students with problems in the classroom had the opportunity to receive reinforcement for doing something appropriate, rather than receiving punishment for inappropriate behavior. Often in classrooms, teachers focus their time on reprimanding negative behaviors. Using praise with problematic students may have taught these alternative behaviors to gain access to teacher attention. Generalization of the intervention was demonstrated across one setting that occurred directly after the training setting. This may have implications for programming techniques to generalize behaviors across settings. However, future research should address increasing generalization through programming techniques before the intervention is implemented.

Jennifer Freeland is an assistant professor in the Department of Educational and School Psychology at Indiana State University. Her research interests include generalization and maintenance of behavior change, direct behavior consultation and academic assessment and interventions.

References

Anderson, M., Delaney, A., Slay, L., & Watson, T.S. (2002). *The effects of teacher command and praise on inappropriate student behavior in an alternative classroom setting*. Manuscript submitted for publication.

Baer, D. M., Wolf, M. M., & Risley, T. R. (1968). Some current dimensions of applied behavior analysis. *Journal of Applied Behavior Analysis, 1,* 91-97.

Bergan, J. R. (1977). *Behavioral consultation*. Columbus, OH: Charles E. Merrill.

Bergan, J. R., & Kratochwill, T. R., (1990). *Behavioral consultation and therapy.* New York: Plenum.

Kratochwill, T. R., Bergan, J. R., Sheridan, S. M., & Elliot, S. N. (1998). Assumptions of behavioral consultation: After all is said and done more has been done than said. *School Psychology Quarterly, 13,* 63-80.

Kratochwill, T. R. & Bergan, J. R. (1990). *Behavioral consultation in applied settings: An individual guide*. New York: Plenum Press.

Kratochwill, T. R., Elliot, S. N., & Rotto, P. C. (1995). Best practices in school-based behavioral consultation. In A. Thomas & J. Grimes (Eds.), *Best practices in school psychology—III* (pp. 519-535). Washington, DC: National Association of School Psychologists.

Lloyd, K. E. (1994). Do as I say, not as I do. *The Behavior Analyst, 17,* 131-140

Noell, G. H., Witt, J. C., LaFleur, L. H., Mortenson, B. P., Ranier, D. D., & LeVelle, J., (2000). Increasing intervention implementation in general education following consultation: A comparison of two follow-up strategies. *Journal of Applied Behavior Analysis, 33,* 271-284.

Noell, G. H., Gresham, F. M., & Duhon, G. (1998). Fundamental agreements and epistemological differences in differentiating what was said from what was done in behavioral consultation. *School Psychology Quarterly, 13,* 81-88.

Noell, G. H., & Witt, J. C. (1996). A critical re-evaluation of five fundamental assumptions underlying behavioral consultation. *School Psychology Quarterly, 11,* 189-203.

Office of Special Education Programs (OSEP) memorandum, 26 IDELR 923 (OSEP, 1997).

Sterling-Turner, H.E., Watson, T.S., & Moore, J.W. (2002). Effects of training on treatment integrity and treatment outcomes in school-based consultation. *School Psychology Quarterly, 17,* 47-77.

Sterling-Turner, H.E., Watson, T.S., Wildmon, M., Watkins, C., & Little, E. (2001). Investigating the empirical relationship between training type and treatment integrity. *School Psychology Quarterly, 16,* 56-67.

Stokes, T. F. & Osnes, P. G. (1989). An operant pursuit of generalization. *Behavior Therapy, 20,* 337-355.

Watkins-Emonet, C., Watson, T.S., & Shriver, M.H. (2002). Acquisition and generalization of teacher skills following direct behavioral consultation. *Manuscript submitted to School Psychology Review, 6-18-02*.

Watson, T. S., & Kramer, J. J. (1995). Teaching problem solving skills to teacher-in-training: An analogue experimental analysis of three methods. *Journal of Behavioral Education, 5,* 281-294.

Watson, T. S., & Robinson, S. L. (1996). Direct behavioral consultation: An alternative to traditional behavioral consultation. *School Psychology Quarterly, 11,* 267-278.

Watson, T. S., Sterling, H. E., & McDade, A. (1997). Demythifying behavioral consultation. *School Psychology Review, 26,* 467-474.

Wickstrom, K. F., Jones, K. M., LaFleur, L. H., & Witt, J. C. (1998). An analysis of treatment integrity in school-based behavioral consultation. *School Psychology Quarterly, 13,* 141-167.

Witt, J. C. (1997). Talk is not cheap. *School Psychology Quarterly, 12,* 281-292.

Witt, J. C., Gresham, F. M., & Noell, G. H. (1996a). What's behavioral about behavioral consultation?. *Journal of Educational and Psychological Consultation, 7,* 327-344.

Witt, J. C., & Gresham, F. M., & Noell, G. H. (1996b). The effectiveness and efficiency of behavioral consultation: Differing perspectives about epistemology and what we know. *Journal of Educational and Psychological Consultation, 7,* 355-360

Designs for Learning

By Paul V. Bredeson

Reviewed by STI Staff

In *Designs for Learning*, the author has gone to great lengths to create a metaphor between architecture and professional development for teachers' and principals' growth and improvement. His goal is to help one create and evaluate "learning spaces" housed in appropriate structure, function and beauty. There is no one model but rather a detailed discussion of the components of effective professional development.

As the author addresses the need for professional development he reminds us that it is "not an indictment of teacher professional, but rather recognition that the academic and social needs of today's children require highly skilled teachers."

In the past, educational outcomes have been based on nature and quality of inputs into educational system (e.g., the dollar amount spent per pupil, the breadth and depth of curriculum offerings, the degree level and field of staff, and the physical space and equipment available). Now "the demand for greater accountability for student learning outcomes has become the new organizer for the assessment of educational outcomes." It requires time and money, as well as an action plan that charts the course, coordinates the logistics, and evaluates progress toward goals along the way.

Like simple geometric shapes found in buildings, "the new architecture for professional development in education has design themes that draw on familiar and ordinary features, but ones used in different and novel ways." The six themes discussed in *Designs for Learning* are 1) professional development is about learning, 2) professional development is work, 3) professional expertise is a journey not a credential, 4) opportunities for professional learning and improved practice are unbounded, 5) student learning, professional development, and organizational mission are intimately related, and 6) professional development is about people, not programs.

In the second section the author describes some of the challenges that confront policy makers and practitioners. Specifically, it focuses on how to move development from a

peripheral activity to the central focus.

This 160 page paperback can easily be perused. The preface gives summaries by chapter numbers. The last chapter summarizes the author's in-depth analysis of five central elements that shape this paradigm. In fact, "Reviewing the Landscape of Professional Development" would be a good place to begin with this book due to the extent of details and repetition of ideas. Listings of site visits (web site references) and supplementary readings are plentiful; and the tables and figures are helpful if you prefer not to dwell on the architectural comparisons.

Determining the evaluation process of professional development is also an important part of the book. There are two major considerations for the planning stages: the purposes of the evaluation; and the contexts of use of the evaluation. The author suggests four key questions to guide the design of professional development evaluations in order to assess each learning experience:

Purpose—What do we want to know?

Value—Why is the evaluation information important?

Methods—how will we gather & analyze evaluation data?

Utility—How will the evaluation data be used?

If the reader is looking for a laid-out model for professional development, s/he will be disappointed in *Designs for Learning*. The "new architecture for learning" espoused in the book is about building the personal and professional capacities of people "by bringing together the sometimes fragmented worlds of educators' work, life, and identity."

Designs for Learning, Paul V. Bredeson, Corwin Press, 2455 Teller Road, Thousand Oaks, CA, www.corwinpress.com

Harnessing the Power of Resistance: A Guide for Educators

By Jared Scherz

Reviewed by STI Staff

Educators desiring to improve their relationship with colleagues or engage their students with greater ease, as well as administrators wanting to decrease the tensions within the hierarchy of the school, will benefit greatly from this book.

Scherz initially focuses on appreciating resistance through understanding its causes and ways of being expressed. Typical ways of dealing with resistance include overpowering, avoiding, and circumventing it. Scherz points out the flaws of these approaches. Instead, he proposes three methods of working with resistance. First, he offers the Paradoxical Theory of Change, which breaks down resistance by experiencing the present state, exploring the objections first, setting aside investment in the outcome, and not reinforcing opposition. Second, resistance can be dealt with by reframing multidirectional energy as acceptable, malleable and time-sensitive, or as informative. Third, valuing resisters who protect the systems' integrity and core values, who see unanticipated threats, or who view it as reducing the self-esteem, competence, or autonomy of individuals within the system provides an avenue for helping resisters join your team.

To accomplish these strategies, Scherz illustrates the use of some "primary" and "secondary" tools. Primary tools include empathizing with the individual or group, describing your own experience when appropriate, and modeling healthy adaptations. Secondary tools include drawing out resistance into the open where it can be addressed, identifying the source and nature of resistance, matching the level of intensity, and stating one's appreciation for the way others experience change.

Some of the benefits of dealing with resistance may seem obvious. Sherz points out that the benefits and effects of working with resistance include moving fragmentation to cohesion, dissension to commitment, inefficiency to productivity, and solitariness to

teamwork.

In conclusion, Sherz describes ways to put change into practice. He explains the nature of change, common areas of resistance, and ways of making additional adaptations to these strategies.

Many good ideas and better practices are eliminated because of the resistance to change. *Harnessing the Power of Resistance: A Guide for Educator*s helps to minimize the pain, yet maximize the benefits of change.

Eye on Education, 6 Depot Way West, Suite 106, Larchmont, NY 10538, (914) 833-0551, www.eyeoneeducation.com

Feeling Great! The Educator's Guide for Eating Better, Exercising Smarter, and Feeling Your Best

By Todd Whitaker and Jason Winkle

Reviewed by STI Staff

This is a mediocre book. It has a few good tips amidst the mumbo jumbo of generalized statements, poor recommendations concerning nutrition, and grammatical errors resulting in very low author validity.

The strength of this book is its motivating beginning. The first seven chapters give reasons why you deserve a healthier you. One of the main points of the book is that educators are in a "giving" profession. This means they give their time and energy primarily to others. The idea is that he who is constantly giving to others needs to take care of himself. The day I read these seven chapters, I went home and after a very long absence from my gym shoes, I exercised. The motivation worked! If that is what you are

after, read these chapters and stop. Go no further!

Suggested exercises are provided in the "Taking Control" section of the book. These exercises are designed to use time efficiently. Simple changes such as taking the stairs instead of the elevator or parking your car in the furthest stall from the entrance of the school are some of the ideas given to help a person become more active in his/her regular routine. Some of the suggestions made for exercising in the car seemed okay until I tried doing them. In order for me to be a safe driver I had to stop doing exercises. The pictures included with the exercises were great and made it easier to understand the exercises being explained. However, it was unnecessary for the authors to include duplicate, word-for-word explanations of some of the same exercises.

In the nutrition section of the book, Whitaker and Winkle provide tricks on how to make healthier choices in one's diet. One of the suggestions made was to substitute a healthier food for one that is "bad." For example, eating cereal instead of a candy bar. Under this cereal suggestion was the following, "Not only does cereal come in many tastes and types, generally it is also very filling. Even two or three bowls typically do not have a great deal of calories and fat." I have yet to find a cereal that fits all of these descriptions!

The list goes on. Whitaker and Winkle claim that most breads are a poor health choice for carbohydrates. When justifying the use of fad diets, they say, "Many fad diets do not provide the balanced nutrition we need. But then, neither does many of the daily diets that so many of us regularly eat." Not only is their call for making a healthy change weakened, but notice the grammatical error in that last sentence. Also, generalized comments, such as, "For most educators . . .," "Most people are anxious to see . . .," "The problem with most diets . . .," "Almost any magazine . . .," are splattered throughout *Feeling Great!* without any documentation of research to backup those statements. In the information about the authors, a lack of expertise is revealed, "Todd Whitaker is an average athlete who is pretty much self-taught . . ."

I do not recommend *Feeling Great!* for anyone who has serious weight or health issues. Furthermore, with only suggestions from self-taught authorities, I would use this

book as nothing more than a seven-chapter motivator.

Feeling Great!, Todd Whitaker and Jason Winkle, Eye on Education, 6 Depot Way West, Larchmont, NY 10538, 914-833-0551, www.eyeoneducation.com

The Ethics of Teaching

By Kenneth Strike and Jonas F. Soltis

Reviewed by STI Staff

Ethical dilemmas occur every day in education. For example, do teachers sacrifice the one for the many and ignore individual differences, or do they sacrifice the many for the one and try to resolve the most glaring differences in skill and need? This noteworthy book looks at ethics and teaching in a detailed and serious way worthy of the dilemmas faced by educators in and out of the classroom.

The purpose of this book is to help teachers understand what comprises ethical dilemmas and how to engage in productive dialogue when ethical dilemmas occur. It is a work designed for pre-service teacher education, but can serve as a foundation for continuing staff development and teacher and administrator training.

The framework for this work is the Code of Ethics of the Education Profession adopted by NEA in 1975. The areas outlined in the Code and covered in the book include: punishment and due process; intellectual freedom; equal treatment of students; dealing with diversity: multiculturalism and religion; and democracy, professionalism, and teaching with integrity. Each of these areas can be a source of ethical discomfort for educators and provides an excellent starting point for discussion.

Each section of the book is comprised of a case study, analysis of the ethics and larger ethical dialogues contributing to understanding the case, and supplementary case studies. These chapters are self-contained for the most part, but do rely on the concepts of consequential or inconsequential ethical analysis presented in the first chapter.

The idea of consequential or inconsequential ethical analysis helps jump start each case analysis. This dichotomous frame looks at how ignoring or embracing consequences makes a difference in how a situation might be resolved.

Consequential ethics bases

the ethical decision on the known results of a given action. For example, if I verbally abuse student A knowing that student A will improve academically as a consequence of my action, this ethical viewpoint would permit such action; results trump other considerations.

Inconsequential ethics are based on a code of behavior that doesn't look at consequences. Instead, it simply looks at whether or not an action violates a stated ethic. For example, the Code states that a teacher "shall not assist a noneducator in the unauthorized practice of teaching." Does a teacher, therefore, leave no lesson plan for a substitute teacher because district policies permit the hiring of persons with only a high school diploma? Inconsequential analysis would say that the teacher should follow the Code without looking at whether or not the students would be better off without a lesson plan.

The case studies provided in the book are interesting and potentially volatile. They include the topics of celebrating holidays such as Christmas and Hanukah, implementation of standards in the classroom, and group vs. individual consequences for behavior. Each of the topics has both timely and timeless elements.

Overall, this is a useful book. Anyone who must face ethical decisions on a regular basis would be well-rewarded for reading it. New teachers or substitute teachers would do well to become familiar with the content. Teacher trainers could use this material to help open a dialogue about difficult issues faced by schools and teachers.

The Ethics of Teaching, Kenneth Strike & Jonas F. Soltis, Teachers College Press, 1234 Amsterdam Ave., New York, NY 10027, www.teacherscollegepress.com

10 Traits of Highly Effective Teachers: How to Hire, Coach, and Mentor Successful Teachers

By Elaine K. McEwan

Reviewed by STI Staff

The degree to which a student succeeds in the classroom is determined by how well they learn the materials/information. There are many factors that determine

this success; from the physical classroom environment to how the teacher manages the classroom environment to what strategies teachers use to teach the lessons. So what makes a successful teacher? Is it the knowledge of the subject matter? Their passion for teaching? Can they effectively motivate students to learn? What does good teaching look like? Are there common threads effective teachers possess? All are important questions, especially in our environment where No Child Left Behind (NCLB) legislation mandates "highly qualified teachers" in the classroom. This reviewer believes the writer has presented powerful information that, when carefully studied and applied, will assist school administrators in making sure they have "on board" teachers that can be both effective and qualified.

As foundation for this work, the author has identified ten traits she believes characterize effective teachers, which fall into three distinct categories: 1) personal traits that signify character, 2) teaching traits that get results, and 3) intellectual traits that demonstrate knowledge, curiosity, and awareness. Through real life examples and experiences and reflections from students, parents, and educators, the author shares practical insights into these ten traits. Throughout the book there are several concept maps that effectively illustrate the interconnectedness of the traits. Each one further assists the reader to understand the traits and their relationship to each other.

A good example of the book's content comes from chapter 6, "Intellectual Traits that Demonstrate Knowledge, Curiosity, and Awareness." In this chapter, the author discusses the deep content knowledge that sets apart great teachers from the rest. The three areas associated with what a teacher knows are book learning, street smarts, and a mental life. These areas, notes the author, provide content knowledge that enables the teacher to teach the content and understand misunderstanding, student understanding that allows the teacher to bring the content to the student, and an example of learning that helps the student love the process as well as the content.

One of the strengths of the work is the help for teachers who don't possess all ten traits of effective teachers. For them, as well as for principals or district personnel seeking ways to assist staff where teaching

issues or lack of skills persist, there are dozens of exercises to use. These exercises will energize veteran teachers and assist first-year teachers. To the extent the reader understands the ten traits, his/her ability to bring the best and brightest to employment will be enhanced.

The book is simple to understand and "just what the doctor ordered" if you are looking to improve upon teacher skills and the teachers' ability to become more effective. It is definitely worth the time it takes to read and understand its principles.

10 Traits of Highly Effective Teachers: How to Hire, Coach, and Mentor Successful Teachers, Elaine K. McEwan Corwin Press, A Sage Publications Company, 2455 Teller Road, Thousand Oaks, CA, www.corwinpress.com

SubJournal

The *SubJournal* wants what YOU have.

We are looking for papers (or topics for papers) to include in the next *SubJournal*.

Submit ideas to editor@subed.usu.edu

SubSolutions Conference

Presented by the Substitute Teaching Institute at Utah State University

SUBSTITUTE TEACHING INSTITUTE

Best Practices for Screening and Interviewing Substitute Teachers

Park City, Utah

July 14-16, 2005

Ready-Set-Go!
Preconference Workshop

July 13, 2005

"I had an invaluable experience. I am planning on returning to the conference with additional members of my staff."
— C. Hansen, CA
Director of Professional Development

Powerful keynote speakers, practitioners **from across the country,** & experts from STI/USU share the latest solutions on all aspects of substitute teaching. **Innovative strategies enable districts to not only save thousands of dollars** but hours of management problems as well.

UtahState UNIVERSITY