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## WHY FOCUS ON EBD?

- Teachers don't feel they have the skills to work with children with Emotional and Beha vioral Disorders (EBD)
- Special educators feel they have only a moderate grasp of the knowledge and skills to work with students with EBD



## UNIQUE FACTORS IMPACTING RURAL SCHOOLSFOR DEALNG WITH BEHAVIOR

- Over 9 million students a re served in rural public schools a c ross the U. S., a nd over 1.5 million of those students receive special education services (Snyder \& Dillow, 2015).
- In sma ller rural communities, students with disa bilities a re more likely to be served within more inclusive settings, with special education teachers providing services within the general education classroom (Jung \& Bradley, 2006).
- Administrators report diffic ulties filling openings for special educ ation tea chers (especially those who are qualified to teach students with EBD a nd retaining teachers in those positions (Bery, Petrin, Gravelle, \& Fa mer, 2011; Mitchem, Kossar, \& Ludlow, 2006).


## PURPOSE OF THIS STUDY

- Exa mine differences in teacher ratings of student beha viors between rural and urban settings


## STUDY CONTEXT

Completed as a part of national noming of two popular behavior rating scales: 1) Scale forAssessing Emotional Disturbance; 2)Behavioral and Emotional Rating Scale

## DEMOG RAPHICS OF STUDENTS RATED

$\left.\begin{array}{llllll}\begin{array}{l}\text { Geographic } \\ \text { Representation }\end{array} & & \text { Grade level } & & \text { Race/Ethnicity }\end{array}\right]$

## DEMOGRAPHIC S OF STUDENTS RATED

|  | Veninal |  |  |  | Rural |  |  |  | Urban |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Male | Female | UR | Total | Male | Female | UR | Total | Male | Female | UR Total |
| ED | 38 | 10 | 2 | 50 | 18 | 11 |  | 29 | 23 | 12 | 1 |
| 36 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| No Disability | 24 | 18 |  | 42 | 27 | 10 |  | 37 | 18 | 4 | 2 |


|  | Ven rural |  |  |  | Rural |  |  |  |  | Uiban |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | ES | MS | HS | Total | ES | MS | HS | Total | ES | MS | HS | Total |  |
| ED | 7 | 10 | 33 | 50 | 1 | 0 | 28 | 29 | 4 | 15 | 17 | 36 |  |
| No | 22 | 10 | 8 | 42 | 3 | 4 | 30 | 37 | 8 | 7 | 9 | 24 |  |

## SC ALE FOR ASSESSING EMOTIONAL DISTURBANCE (SAED-3)

IL- Inability to Leam
RP-Relationship Problems
IB - Inappropriate Behavior
UD - Unhappiness or
Depression
PF-Physic al Symptoms or
Fears


## EMOTIONALAND BEHAVIORAL RATING SCALE (BERS-3)

IS- Interpersonal Strength
IF- Involvement with
Family
SF-School Functioning
laS- Intrapersonal
Strength

Michael H. Epstein

## BERS

## Behavioral and Emotional <br> Rating Scale

Examiner's Manual

## RESULTS: SAED-3

|  | ILSS |  | RPSS |  | IBSS |  | UDSS |  | PFSS |  | Total Index |  | ANOVA |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | ED | No Dis | ED | No Dis | ED | No Dis | ED | No Dis | ED | No Dis | ED | No Dis | p-value |
| Very nural | $\begin{gathered} 11.34 \\ 3.22 \end{gathered}$ | $9.44$ | $\begin{gathered} 11.68 \\ 3.17 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 9.56 \\ & 2.29 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 10.92 \\ & 2.51 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} 10.47 \\ 2,21 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 10.24 \\ 3.59 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 9.25 \\ & 1.85 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} 11.44 \\ 1.49 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 9.78 \\ & 2.21 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} 107.38 \\ 19.21 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 97.94 \\ & 1273 \end{aligned}$ | . 016287 |
| Rural | $\begin{gathered} 10.72 \\ 2.90 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 10.46 \\ 2.09 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 10.69 \\ 2.48 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 9.68 \\ & 2.17 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} 11.10 \\ 3.03 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 10.62 \\ 2.77 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 10.14 \\ 3.30 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 9.51 \\ & 2.65 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} 11.24 \\ 3.24 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 10.43 \\ 2.69 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 105.14 \\ 16.74 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 100.70 \\ 13.67 \end{gathered}$ | . 240326 |
| Uiban | $\begin{gathered} 11.89 \\ 2.50 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 8.83 \\ & 3.20 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} 11.11 \\ 2.64 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 9.13 \\ & 2.56 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} 11.94 \\ 2.61 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 9.63 \\ & 2.39 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} 11.31 \\ 2.81 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 8.33 \\ & 2.28 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} 11.42 \\ 3.06 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 8.83 \\ & 2.43 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} 110.19 \\ 14.56 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 92.67 \\ & 16.28 \end{aligned}$ | . 000054 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | . 49654 | . 09847 |  |

## RESULTS: BERS-3

|  | ISSS |  | FLSS |  | lasss |  | S=SS |  | ASSS |  | Total Index |  | ANOVA |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | ED | No Dis | ED | No Dis | ED | No Dis | ED | No Dis | ED | No Dis | ED | No Dis | p -value |
| Very nual | 8.90 | 10.16 | 8.62 | 8.72 | 8.70 | 11.03 | 8.36 | 9.31 | 9.68 | 10.97 | 92.04 | 100.19 | . 172671 |
|  | 3.58 | 3.20 | 3.17 | 3.56 | 3.98 | 3.64 | 3.47 | 3.17 | 3.74 | 3.88 | 21.97 | 19.26 |  |
| Rural | 8.10 | 9.65 | 7.69 | 8.35 | 8.34 | 10.11 | 8.45 | 10.68 | 9.62 | 10.43 | 87.24 | 97.62 | . 045077 |
|  | 2.78 | 2.56 | 2.69 | 1.86 | 3.45 | 2.35 | 3.36 | 2.65 | 2.56 | 2.69 | 18.06 | 13.15 |  |
| Uroan | 8.39 | 11.67 | 7.58 | 9.08 | 8.49 | 11.75 | 7.67 | 10.42 | 8.14 | 11.46 | 84.86 | 105.00 | . 000108 |
|  | 3.16 | 3.62 | 2.61 | 3.05 | 2.84 | 3.48 | 3.27 | 3.68 | 3.12 | 3.75 | 13.97 | 22.30 |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | . 28264 | . 29811 |  |

## FINDINGS

- Ratings in rural schools weren't a s distinctly different for ED a nd non-ED students
- Lack of training/expertise =inability to detect differences in beha vior?
- BERS results indic a ted almost no difference in School Functioning between ED and Non-ed students
- How does this impact intervention planning?
- Similar ratings between the deficit-ba sed scale a nd the strengths-ba sed scale
- Why not focus on the strengths more?
- "Alwa ys play from a position of strength" - Rud Tumbullat his aftemoon session


## FUTURE RESEARCH NEEDS

- We would like to examine with more elementary-aged students
- Continue to examine the effectiveness of a ssessment tools to evaluate beha viors of students in rural schools
- Compare behavior rating scale data with teacher behavior observation data in rural schools

- jwery@elon.edu



## THANK YOU!

- Corey.pierce@unco.edu
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