

WENDY M. REINKE, PH.D.

Assistant Professor
University of Missouri
Educational, School, & Counseling Psychology
College of Education
16 Hill Hall
Columbia, MO 65211-2130
Phone: 573-882-7890
Fax: 573-884-5989
reinkew@missouri.edu

Personal Research Agenda – Wendy M. Reinke

As a new faculty at the University of Missouri I have had the opportunity to organize my research interests and efforts under the Missouri Prevention Center (MPC), which was founded by Dr. Keith Herman and myself upon our arrival last year. The purpose of the Center is to organize efforts toward reducing the societal burden of aggression and depression among youth. My primary interests lie with the prevention of disruptive behavior problems in youth (whereas Dr. Herman is interested in the prevention of depression). Over the years thru experience, training, and research, I have come to understand the difficulty in treating and remediating the problems of children displaying conduct problems. Further, I have noticed the disconnect between school-based interventions and family-based interventions in which the two systems lack communication, let alone collaboration. Given that many children displaying conduct problems at school also display these problems at home, my research agenda is focused on combining evidence-based interventions across both domains (home and family) to enable the greatest impact toward preventing and ameliorating early conduct problems in children. MPC has several research projects currently under my direction, including a pilot study of integrating a family-based intervention with PBIS for children displaying early signs of conduct problems in elementary school. Additionally, we are currently developing a survey to assess the current knowledge, attitudes, and adoption of evidence-based programs in schools for the prevention and treatment of mental health and behavior problems in children. The purpose of this study is to help school districts identify the current needs for training and adoption of evidence-based practices in schools. Lastly, a related, and important interest for which I recently submitted a proposal for external grant funding, includes supporting teachers in the use of effective classroom management practices. To summarize, my research agenda for the coming years includes continuing to conduct studies focused on integrating evidence-based family and school-based interventions, identifying and supporting the adoption and use of evidence-based practices in schools, and toward increasing the use of effective classroom management.

I have several studies that have been completed or are currently in progress related to my interest and that have guided my current research agenda. For instance, as part of her dissertation, I developed and implemented a classroom teacher consultation model aimed at decreasing disruptive behavior problems in children. The research manuscript associated with this study was recently published in *School Psychology Review* (Reinke, Merrill, & Lewis-Palmer, 2008). Additionally, I have consulting with researchers from the University of Kansas and have trained hundreds of instructional coaches in my consultation model, the Classroom Check-up (CCU). I have co-authored a book on the topic of coaching classroom management that includes the CCU (Sprick, Knight, Reinke, & McKale, 2007) and recently have a chapter on coaching using the CCU (Reinke, Sprick, & Knight, 2008). Further, during my prevention science postdoctoral training at Johns Hopkins University I had the opportunity to work closely and be trained by leaders in the field. I was trained by the developers of several evidence-based prevention and early intervention programs for disruptive behavior problems. During my postdoctoral fellowship I was actively involved in the planning and implementation of the indicated treatment interventions through the Johns Hopkins University Center for Prevention and Early Intervention. More recently, I conducted a study of the comorbid presentation of academic and behavior problems in children. I believe that these experiences make me an ideal candidate to attend and benefit from SPRCC.

As the field of School Psychology moves toward the use of a response-to-intervention model, helping schools to identify, adopt, and implement evidence-based programming for disruptive behavior problems is critical. My research focuses on helping school support students and families with the ultimate goal of improved academic and behavioral outcomes. As the role of the school psychologist expands to include prevention and intervention activities, I believe that my research will be relevant and have implications that will push the field forward.

Vision of a Collaborative Multi-site Research Program – Wendy M. Reinke

I propose to conduct a multi-site study of **PBIS Plus FCU**, an expanded version of Positive Behavioral Interventions & Supports (PBIS). The study will address the following aims:

Specific Aim 1: *Develop and implement a comprehensive prevention and early intervention combining PBIS and FCU in elementary schools that offers behavioral support to students and families at the universal, selective, and indicated levels of prevention intervention.*

Specific Aim 2: *Conduct an efficacy trial of the PBIS plus FCU, utilizing a randomized control study.*

Relevant Background and Literature. The prevention or reduction of early aggressive and disruptive behavior has important educational and mental health implications. Students who display a high degree of disruptive and aggressive behavior in elementary school are at greater risk for placement in special education programs and later school failure. Previous research has found that children identified as being aggressive at school entry are at higher risk for later conduct disorder, anxiety, depression, and antisocial behavior (Ialongo et al., 1999; 2001). Nationwide, disruptive and aggressive behaviors are the most common reasons for office discipline referrals, suspensions and expulsions (Walker, Horner, Sugai, & Bullis, 1996).

Research on the developmental pathways to antisocial behavior has identified a variety of ecological contributors such as family (Patterson, 1982), peers (Dishion, McCord, & Poulin, 1999), and community (Patterson, Reid, & Dishion, 1992;). Several promising prevention and intervention programs have been developed based on this literature. However, disruptive behavior problems are quite refractory to typical interventions (see Hinshaw, 1992). Successful programs tend to be multifaceted ecological models aimed at multiple domains, changing institutions and environments as well as individuals (see Greenberg, Domitrovich, & Bumbarger, 2001).

The proposed multi-site study plans to combine two school-based interventions which operate from the ecological perspective described above, School-wide PBIS (intervention targeting the school

environment) and The Family Check-up (intervention targeting the family context). Research findings provide evidence of the effectiveness for both interventions. Given that both school (see Reinke & Herman, 2002) and family factors (Banks, et al., 1993) contribute to behavior problems in children, combining interventions that target both the school environment and family context is expected to further improve outcomes for students exhibiting early signs of aggressive and disruptive behavior in school. The following provides a description of each intervention as well as evidence of the positive outcomes associated with each.

Overview and Hypothesis. The aim of the proposed study is to determine whether students in schools implementing PBIS Plus FCU will have improved rates of disciplinary referrals, improved academic performance, school attendance, and lower levels of disruptive behavior problems. Specifically, the proposed study will (1) establish Family Resource Centers within each school; (2) identify and recruit approximately 300 students and families (150 receiving intervention; 150 receiving care as usual) who would benefit from family supports; (3) provide the FCU and appropriate corresponding school and family-based interventions to intervention families; (4) monitor the fidelity of program implementation; (5) monitor child outcomes; (6) assess the impact of the FCU on family mechanisms hypothesized to contribute to child outcomes (parental attitudes toward school, home-school involvement, and parent management); and (7) assess social validity and feasibility of the combined intervention.

Methods & Procedures. Twenty elementary schools meeting the following criteria will be recruited across all sites: (1) has implemented PBIS for at least 1 school year, and reached 80% implementation fidelity on the SET (described below). This will ensure that schools have an intact model of PBIS prior to implementation of the FCU, (2) at least 10% of the students have either (a) received two or more disciplinary referrals during the previous academic year or (b) received a referral for special education evaluation. Participants will include students that either (1) received two or more office disciplinary referrals or (2) received a referral for special education evaluation for behavioral concerns.

Measures (300 subjects). Measures of Student School and Home Behavior [i.e., The Teacher Observation of Classroom Adaptation Revised (TOCA-Revised); Werthamer-Larsson, Kellam, & Wheeler, 1991) & Behavioral Assessment System for Children Parent and Teacher Report (2nd ed.) (BASC); Reynolds & Kamphaus, 2004] Academic Performance, School Attendance, and Parent Management and Home-School Communication, as well as measures of Fidelity and Social Validity will be collected multiple times across the study year.

Proposed Analyses. *Analysis of Intervention Effects on Disruptive Behavior at School.* I will conduct analyses using a mixed-model ANCOVA to compare the two conditions on teacher report of aggressive/disruptive behavior and academic performance as assessed by the TOCA-R in the spring with regression adjustment for teacher reports of aggressive/disruptive behavior and academic performance as assessed in the fall. These analyses assume that there are two sources of random variation: schools and children. The observations are assumed independent conditional upon these random effects. These assumptions are reasonable as the most likely sources of dependence are modeled through these random effects.

Use of a multi-site design will allow for several benefits. The most important benefits include the possibility for stronger external validity through a more diverse set of participants and a sufficient sample size for complex analyses.

<i>Budget</i>	Year 1 (implementation)	Year 2 (data analysis)
Personnel	\$120,000	\$120,000
Supplies	\$25,000	\$4,000
Travel	\$15,000	\$18,000
Participant Incentives	\$15,000	
<i>Grand Total</i>		\$317,000