INVESTIGATING THE SUSTAINABILITY OF THE SCHOOLS POSITIVE BEHAVIOUR MANAGEMENT PROGRAMME (SPBMP) IN BARBADIAN SCHOOLS

Ian Alwyn Marshall, Grace-Anne Jackman and Claudette Fongkong-Mungal

This study sought to investigate stakeholders' perceptions of the challenges encountered in the implementation of Schools Positive Behaviour Management Programme (SPBMP) in Barbados and the factors influencing its sustainability. A total of 137 teachers, 14 principals and 13 School Focal Points (SFPs) drawn from a sample of 16 primary and secondary schools were interviewed. A lack of resources, teacher/school buy-in and time were identified by all stakeholders as the main challenges faced in implementing SPBMP. In addition, the leaders (principals and SFPs) viewed themselves as contributing to sustainability of the programme by motivating their staff but failed to acknowledge their more important leadership roles as creators of the shared vision and conducive environments needed to support the sustainability of the SPBMP initiative.

Introduction

Education systems have been the recipients of foreign aid from international funding agencies, such as The United Nations Children's Fund (UNICEF), The Inter-American Development Bank (IDB), and The World Bank. These funds are used to drive educational reform initiatives ranging from teacher professional development, early childhood education, reading readiness, technical and vocational education to behaviour modification programmes. However, one common complaint from the beneficiaries of these aid packages is that after the international support and funding have ended, so too do the programmes. As a consequence, the recipient education systems experience a series of ebbs and flows of educational success characterised by well-intentioned innovations that start well but fade quickly, or are shunted aside in favour of newly-funded programmes. This state of affairs has led both the international funding agencies and policy makers in the recipient countries to question the sustainability of these school-based initiatives. Researchers have suggested that this practice of "policy churn" (Hess, 1999) can serve to undermine the educational gains that the recipient countries had realised on their own prior to the intervention of the international funding agencies. Therefore, it is critical, particularly in small-island developing states (SIDS), which rely heavily on funding from international agencies, that we explore and identify those factors most likely to enable sustainability or viability of innovations over time.

One such initiative that has been adopted and implemented world-wide with varying degrees of success is the School Wide Positive Behaviour Interventions and Supports (SWPBIS; Sugai & Horner, 2002, 2006, 2009), a multi-tiered framework consisting of intervention practices to address and minimise school-based problem behaviours. Effective implementation of SWPBIS has been linked to improved school climate, student behaviour, social and academic outcomes and improved teacher outcomes (Algozzine & Algozzine, 2009; Bradshaw, Mitchell, & Leaf, 2010; Horner, Sugai, & Anderson, 2010; Kelm & McIntosh, 2012; Scott & Barrett, 2004). According to Vincent, Sprague, and Gau (2013) this team-based, data-driven, systemic approach to behaviour modification, emphasises defining and teaching expected behaviours and providing clearly-defined rewards for compliance. and consequences for non-compliance. Research on this initiative suggests that, while these SWPBIS programmes may initially be well-implemented, long-term sustainability is a cause for concern (Handler et al., 2007; Sugai & Horner, 2006).

In 2007, UNICEF, in collaboration with the Barbados Ministry of Education, launched the Child Friendly School (CFS) framework, a version of the SWPBIS, in the Caribbean. The CFS initiative was implemented first as a pilot in one rural public primary school and then scaled-up in three successive phases. In 2009, CFS was introduced to eleven schools (1 secondary; 10 primary); by 2011, an additional 10 primary and 11 secondary schools were included; and by 2015, all public schools on the island (69 primary and 23 secondary) were implementing the CFS model. As a result of perceived negative connotation of the "Child Friendly" nomenclature, a decision was made to rebrand it as the Schools Positive Behaviour Management Programme (SPBMP).

The SPBMP framework, which was premised on the concept that education is the fundamental right of every child, was based on three key components: Inclusiveness, Child Centredness, and Democratic Participation (Chabbott, 2004). Inclusiveness has as its focus the creation of school environments that are welcoming for all children and families, irrespective of sex, colour, social status, academic or physical ability or any other characteristic that could be disadvantageous to a child. Therefore, principals and teachers are expected to recognise and accommodate students' differing learning needs. Child Centredness encourages school staff to prioritise students' emotional and physical well-being and build mutually respectful relationships with students with an emphasis on the use of positive behaviour management strategies, rather than the traditional corporal punishment.

Teachers were also to ensure that students owned their learning through the use of active rather than passive learning strategies. Democratic Participation promotes the active involvement of family and community members in the school, as well as the active engagement of students in decision making (Chabbott, 2004).

In Barbados, the SPBMP framework was implemented using the following five major strategies: (i) the use of the Colour Wheel Behavioural Chart, as a tool for positive behaviour management; (ii) an emphasis on the use of rewards and positive language to promote behaviour modification among students; (iii) an increased emphasis on parental and community involvement; (iv) increased student voice and participation; and (v) the preservation of safe school environments.

Prior to the implementation of SPBMP, the principals and members of staff at each school were exposed to training through a series of workshops delivered by UNICEF, on the principles of SPBMP. During the training, teachers were either selected, or volunteered to serve as School Focal Points (SFPs), i.e., the persons responsible, in collaboration with the principals, for facilitating, coordinating, and monitoring the roll-out of the programme in their respective schools.

As part of the monitoring of the implementation of the SPBMP in Barbadian schools, ongoing informal discussions were held with teachers and education stakeholders. In the initial stages of these discussions, teachers were generally enthusiastic about the novelty of the initiative, and feedback was positive. However, over time, as the initiative became more entrenched in schools, concerns emerged related to the long-term viability of the programme, particularly with respect to the availability of resources and decreasing levels of teacher buy-in and support. Stakeholders also questioned the continuation of the programme after the cessation of funding.

The concerns raised locally mirrored those reported from similar projects funded by global organisations. Chapman (2001), in reviewing some of these initiatives, concluded that little attention was paid to cost and efficiency or the successful scalability of such projects Similarly, Chabbot (2004), who conducted a desk review of CFS projects between 1999 and 2000, reported that the projects suffered from a lack of funding and a lack of advocacy to assist with scale-up efforts. A 2009 CFS global evaluation report on the initiative in Guyana, Nicaragua, Nigeria, Philippines, and Thailand identified insufficient resources for the support of instruction as one of the challenges to CFS viability, thus underscoring the importance of resource implications for sustainability (Child Friendly Schools Programming: Global Evaluation Report, 2009).

It was against this backdrop that UNICEF commissioned research to monitor the implementation of the SPBMP in Barbados. This paper provides an empirical analysis of the challenges associated with the implementation of the SPBMP and stakeholders' (i.e., teachers, SFPs, and principals) perceptions of the sustainability of this initiative in Barbados. The study also investigated the features of the programme which would have an enduring impact and which could be adduced as evidence of the overall school-wide impact of the programme after the cessation of external funding. More specifically, the research questions guiding this study were as follows:

1. What have been the main challenges to implementing the SPBMP in Barbadian schools?
2. What are the participants' perceived roles in the sustainability of the SPBMP?
3. What do participants believe will be the most enduring indicators of the SPBMP?

General Concepts of Sustainability

A cursory glance at sustainability literature indicates that there are myriad ways in which the construct has been defined, operationalised and measured (Adelman & Taylor, 2003; Altman, 1995; Brundtland, 1987; Greenhalgh et al., 2004; McIntosh, Horner & Sugai, 2009; Porter & Kramer, 2002; Steckler & Goodman, 1989). This may be partly due to the concept's wide usage and application within multiple disciplines. Adopting an environmental slant, Brundtland (1987) referred to it as supplying the needs of the present generation without placing at risk the capacity of future generations to meet their own needs. Other researchers have underscored the legacy effects in terms of the norms, enduring features and practices that subsequently become institutionalised. This view was endorsed by researchers, such as Altman (1995) who defined sustainability as the infrastructure that remains in a community after a project ends; Porter and Kramer (2002) who referred to it as the process of establishing relationships, practices and procedures that endure and become lasting features of the community; Greenhalgh et al. (2004) who maintain that sustainability of organisational innovations can be viewed as the point at which new ways of working become the norm and the underlying systems and ways of working become transformed to support the changes also referred to as routinisation (Yin, 1979); and McIntosh, Horner and Sugai (2009) who regard sustainability as the creation of a social norm and the point at which a practice moves from being a part of a project to being part of the modus operandi of an organisation.

Other organisations define sustainability from an economic perspective. Proponents of this view, such as The World Bank (1990), define it as the ability of a project to deliver its benefits over a long period of time, usually beyond the life cycle of the funding. Similarly, the United States Agency for International Development (USAID, 1988) suggests that sustainability occurs when a programme or intervention is able to deliver satisfactory benefits for an extended time after the cessation of financial, managerial and/or technical support from the external donor.

Joining the discourse on sustainability, researchers, such as Fullan (2010), Gordon and Patterson (2008), Hargreaves (2007), Hargreaves and Fink (2000), Hargreaves and Goodson (2006), who locate the debate of sustainability in the wider context of change theory, have pointed to the role of educational leaders in sustaining educational change. For Hargreaves and Fink (2000), the concept of sustainability focuses on how particular interventions can be developed without compromising the development of others in the surrounding environment at the current time and in the future. Fullan (2010) argues that the degree of success achieved by any change initiative is contingent on the ability of the principal to engage stakeholders, within and outside of the school system, such as teachers, parents and the community; a view endorsed earlier by Lambert (2007), who underscored the role of strong visionary leadership in sustaining change. Gordon and Patterson (2008) proposed that the real test of sustainability is evidenced when the change has become part of the new culture of the school.

This brief discourse highlights the complex, multifaceted nature of the construct of sustainability which can be defined in terms of time, continued delivery, behaviour change, evolution and adaptation, and continued benefits (Moore, Mascarenhas, Bain & Straus, 2017). However, for the purpose of this paper, the authors align with the perspective of Altman (1995) and McIntosh, Horner and Sugai (2009) and have viewed sustainability of the education initiative as the creation of norms that are part of the modus operandi of the organisation (school) after the cessation of funding and support.

Challenges with Implementation and Sustainability of Educational Initiatives

Research suggests that the success of school-wide educational initiatives, such as SWPBIS and SPBMP, is dependent on a combination of factors, for example: administrative support, leadership, communication, staff buy-in, ongoing resources, implementation fidelity and consistency across time

(Bambara, Nonnemacher, & Kern, 2009; Forman & Herbert, 2009; Handler et al., 2007; Kincaid, Childs, Blasé, & Wallace, 2007; Pinkelman et al., (2015); Sandford, DeRousie & Bierman, 2012); as well as training/ongoing professional development and programme monitoring (Lohrmann et al., 2008). Coffey and Horner (2012) emphasised eight critical features that influence the sustainability of innovations, namely, ongoing technical assistance, data-based decision-making, a shared vision and resources, staff buy-in, effective communication, administrative support, leadership from various levels, and regeneration. Others have highlighted the importance of fidelity of implementation, or how closely the programme has been implemented according to the original, intended design of the programme developers (Lee, Penfield, & Maerten-Rivera, 2009). In essence, if the educational initiative is poorly implemented deviating largely from the initial design, without having adequate resources, stakeholder buy-in and readiness, then sustainability is unlikely to be achieved (Adelman & Taylor, 2003; Henck, 2014; McIntosh et al., 2014; Horner et al., 2009; Horner, Sugai & Anderson, 2010). Adelman and Taylor (2003) have argued that if projects are to result in systemic change then there is a need for stakeholder readiness which involves getting them to overcome the "project mentality" of having a termination date that coincides with the cessation of project funding. Henck (2014) explored the question of sustainability as it related to the implementation of a CFS initiative in Nepal, and concluded that there was a "tempered optimism for sustainability" for the following reasons:

1. Approximately half of the teachers had a surface-level value of child rights but almost none of them had effectively incorporated the fundamental principles in their belief systems.
2. There was a lack of clarity on the role of the teachers and school management in ensuring that the program continued after the exit of the International Non-Governmental Organisations.
3. There was a lack of effective monitoring to evaluate progress, therefore the teachers were working in isolation (Henck, 2014).

The Role of Stakeholders in Sustainability
Research on the role of key stakeholders in sustaining school-wide behaviour modification initiatives, such as SWPBIS, CFS and SPBMP, point to the need for leaders that can drive the initiative and establish modes of behaviour that will extend beyond the cessation of funding (Barrett,

Bradshaw & Lewis-Palmer, 2008; Handler et al., 2007; Sugai & Horner, 2006). Similarly, Lambert (2007), Medels and Mitgang (2013), and Zhu (2016) also concluded that strong and visionary principal leadership is critical in determining whether school change is sustained. In addition, Morrison (2013) extended the role of leadership to encompass school-level leaders and teacher leaders, while Seo et al. (2012) suggested that the level of commitment to the initiative demonstrated by principals acts as a catalyst for teacher commitment to the initiative, and promotes sustainability.

In addressing the issue, Sugai and Horner (2006) emphasised the need for a team-based approach consisting of an effective leadership team and active administrator participation and support. Such a team which would include key school-level stakeholders who would operate under the train-the-trainer model and provide needed leadership throughout the process of implementation (Barret, Bradshaw, & Lewis-Palmer, 2008; Fullan, 2010; Handler et al., 2007). Also, in support of the leadership density angle are researchers, such as Reeves (2009) and Fullan (2011), who have argued that teacher buy-in and commitment, are key drivers of change and sustainability of educational initiatives.

The Present Study

As part of its mandate, the UNICEF Office for the Eastern Caribbean area has been supporting Ministries of Education to incorporate CFS principles in their schools. Work started on positive behaviour management in schools as a direct response to Caribbean governments' concerns about the violence and indiscipline in schools. This was strengthened under the broader CFS framework as countries sought to expand their work and build capacity in schools with an emphasis on:

    (i)   The use of positive behaviour management strategies and supports to teach and reinforce students' preferred behaviours;

    (ii)   Promotion of student-centred classrooms focused on students' learning needs, abilities, interests and learning styles with the teacher as the facilitator of learning;

    (iii)   A strengthened Health and Family Life Education (HFLE) programme to provide students with the needed life-skills to make more positive choices;

    (iv)   Enhanced student participation and parental involvement; and

    (v)   Improved protective environments in schools with an emphasis on the psycho-social environment addressing child protection, bullying, and child abuse.

The purpose of this research was to collect empirical data which focused on the monitoring of the SPBMP in Barbados, with a view to providing information on teachers', principals' and SFPs' perceptions of the challenges encountered and the factors influencing the sustainability of the programme.

Method

Research Design

This paper forms part of the larger study which used a mixed-method design that capitalised on the strengths of both qualitative and quantitative methods. The data collection included quantitative surveys which comprised closed- and open-ended questions and qualitative one-on-one interviews. For the purpose of this paper, data were analysed from two sources:

   (i) Interviews conducted with the principals and SFPs
   (ii) Open-ended questions on questionnaires completed by the teachers.

Given the sensitive nature of the data collected, all necessary steps were taken to ensure that confidentiality was maintained and that the participants could not be identified individually.

Research Instruments

The primary focus of the research was to gain an in-depth understanding of the functioning and sustainability of SPBMP. It was therefore imperative that the narrative of the principals and SFPs (that is, the persons tasked with the day-to-day responsibility for the implementation and roll-out in the schools) featured prominently in the study. The one-on-one interviews with these two focal groups elicited information about the internal and external factors that were more likely to impact the success, failure and longevity of the programme. The interviews lasted about ninety (90) minutes, the completed interviews were transcribed and a thematic analysis of the data was conducted to extract the relevant themes supplemented, when necessary, by verbatim quotations.

Participants

The study included 164 participants (see Table 1) purposively selected from a sample of 16 schools (10 primary, 6 secondary), demographically characterised as follows:

   • 137 teachers ranging in teaching experience from 4 weeks to 40 years, with a mean of 16 years

- 14 principals with 3 months to 10 years of principal experience and a mean of 3.5 years as principals
- 13 SFPs with 1 month to 8 years of SFP experience and a mean of 3.5 years as SFPs at their respective schools

Given that the open-ended questions yielded multiple responses, which were subsequently coded as multiple themes, the resulting number of responses exceeded the number of total participants.

Table 1. Qualitative data collected from the participants in the 16 schools

Data Sources	Teachers n = 137	Principals n = 14	SFPs n = 13	Total n = 164
Primary (n=10)	62	8	7	77
Secondary (n=6)	75	6	6	87

Results

Research Question #1: What have been the main challenges to implementing the SPBMP in Barbadian schools?

Teachers, principals and SFPs in the 16 schools were asked to discuss the three main challenges to implementing SPBMP in their schools. Following qualitative analysis of the two hundred and sixty-eight (268) responses, nine main categories of challenges emerged. These included 'lack of resources' with which to effectively implement SPBMP and 'lack of consistency/follow-through' by school personnel due to the other demands of school life (See Table 2).

Table 2. Participants' perceptions of challenges to the implementation of SPBMP

Challenges Identified	Teachers	SFPs	Principals	Total Responses
1. Lack of Resources	45 (22%)	10 (28%)	6 (21%)	61 (23%)
2. Lack of Teacher/ School buy-in	44 (21%)	6 (17%)	7 (25%)	57 (21%)
3. Lack of Time	17 (9%)	10 (28%)	3 (11%)	30 (11%)
4. Alternative Strategies not effective	25 (12%)	2 (6%)	0 (0%)	27 (10%)
5. Lack of Parent buy-in	21 (10%)	2 (6%)	4 (14%)	27 (10%)
6. Lack of Information & Training	18 (9%)	0 (0%)	5 (18%)	23 (9%)
7. Lack of Consistency/ Follow-through	16 (8%)	2 (6%)	0 (0%)	18 (7%)
8. Other	19 (9%)	3 (9%)	3 (11%)	25 (9%)

The most mentioned challenge to implementation was 'lack of resources'. This challenge was reported sixty-one (61) times across all respondents (23% of all challenges reported). The resources mentioned by respondents were of three types: Monetary, Human and Physical. Lack of monetary resources was most frequently mentioned. Participants reported that funding was needed to purchase rewards, to pay for signage, to buy or facilitate the creation of classroom materials to support child-centred pedagogies, and to pay for additional training. In supporting this view, one Primary teacher noted that,

> "On its own SPBMP is not sustainable if there is not a continual source of money for the roll out of the programme or for the rewards and benefits. We are being asked to roll out with no funds or resources and this is a big challenge. The Ministry of Education has not sent any funds to help with the programme and school funds are being used for essential things such as cleaning supplies, chalk, etc."

Human resources were needed to assign teachers to specifically manage the programme in the school and to provide "... the requisite personnel who would be effective in dealing with challenges students have that teachers are not best equipped to handle" (Primary school teacher). The main physical resource mentioned was greater classroom space within which to implement child-centred pedagogies e.g., activity centres for Early Childhood Education or to facilitate group work.

The second most frequently mentioned challenge was 'lack of teacher/school buy-in', which was identified 57 times or 21% of the total challenges reported. In this classification, a distinction was made between a 'lack of teacher/school buy-in', where teachers in the school were reluctant to adopt SPBMP and a 'lack of consistency and follow-through' where responses highlighted a lack of post-adoption implementation, i.e., a 'lack of 'teacher commitment' to follow-through with doing what was needed to implement the programme in a consistent and sustained way in their classrooms.

'Lack of time', 'lack of information and on-going professional development/training' and the perception that 'alternative behaviour strategies were not effective' were mentioned as 11%, 9%, and 10% of the total challenges reported, respectively. In addition to 'lack of resources', 'lack of time' was also the most mentioned challenge by the SFPs. Coordinating and managing the programme were seen as additional challenges to the SFPs teaching and other school-based responsibilities. Teachers also mentioned 'lack of time' for administrative record-keeping activities, such as the maintenance of behaviour tracking requirements. These frustrations are highlighted in the following comments:

- *The committee expects me as the Senior Teacher to do it all and I don't have the time to do it all. If I don't do anything, nothing gets done. The teachers are all saying the same thing - no time.* (Primary school SFP)
- *There's nothing I can do where time is concerned. They [Ministry of Education] said that each person [on the SPBMP team] should get at least 2 lessons free but that was not implemented. And anyhow, even if have lessons "free" they are not free e.g. we usually have to substitute or we're working on something in the school. This term was especially tough, we tried but were not able to meet this term: Independence Day, Speech Day etc.* (Secondary school SFP)

'Lack of information and on-going professional development/training' accounted for 9% of total challenges named. Teachers reported that there was a 'lack of information' on what SPBMP was about, on their role, on their students' role, as well as on how to implement the programme "practically" in their classrooms. A few teachers even reported little or no knowledge of

the programme. One primary school SFP who highlighted lack of training as a major challenge stressed the need for "…constant retooling to address the needs of new teachers. Training every 5 years is also insufficient. You need to expose to examples of best practices."

Interestingly, 10% of the main challenges identified 'alternative behaviour strategies' as being ineffective. Several reasons for this view were expressed, notably: some children do not respond to positive behaviour management strategies; some children "abuse the system"; teacher authority is undermined; and the use of rewards for good behaviour may cultivate an undesirable student behaviour-dependence on external motivation to do the right thing. One primary school teacher expressed that alternative strategies were not effective in producing "change in abnormal student behaviours" and that "students believe there are no real consequences for bad behaviour since the methods used do not prevent them from repeating the unacceptable behaviour."

Further, another primary school teacher stated that "some students suggested that 'beating' rather than the other strategies would make them do the right thing". Two secondary school teachers reported that the use of alternative behaviour strategies undermined the teachers' authority in the classroom and suggested that "pupils disregard teachers because they know we have no clout and they have to be sent to the principal." Another challenge was the ineffectiveness of reward, at both the primary and secondary levels:

- *Children seem more motivated by the rewards and there is no real change in behaviour. Also, the same children seem to be getting the rewards … but the programme does not seem to be changing behaviours of those who we really want to change. Children [are] no longer satisfied with stickers and pencils, [they're] now asking for Chefette (a fast food restaurant) vouchers and cell phones.* (Primary school SFP)
- *The rewards system makes teachers uncomfortable because it makes them feel like students are not being encouraged to be responsible for their own learning but rather needing a reward to do what is right and/or learn.* (Secondary school SFP)

Research Question #2: What are the participants' perceived roles in the sustainability of the SPBMP?

All participants were also asked to outline their roles in the sustainability of SPBMP in their schools. After content analysis, a total of 134 discrete roles were identified across the three groups of participants. In ensuring the longevity of the SPBMP, teachers believe that their role should be one in which they model and reinforce the best practices in the classroom (44% of teacher responses), both with respect to pedagogy and the use of alternative behavioural strategies. A comment, such as "*Within the classroom, using*

teaching strategies which engage the students in the learning process which gives them ownership to the material being taught and using strategies such as cooperative learning and discovery teaching", emphasises the teacher's commitment to using active, learning-centred strategies within the SPBMP classroom while responses, such as "*To adhere to the code of discipline and utilise alternative methods of discipline…reinforce positive behaviour*" and "*showing students the benefits of good behaviour, influencing good behaviour by introduction of rewards*", reiterate teachers' support for the use of alternative positive behavioural practices in their classrooms. Teachers also perceive their role in providing support, both technical and administrative (42% of teacher responses) as important in promoting the sustainability of the SPBMP initiative.

On the other hand, principals (47% of their responses) and SFPs (67% of their responses) believe that the role they play in motivating students, teachers and the SPBMP teams alike, will be integral to achieving the long-term sustainability of the project. One Primary SFP indicated that her role "…is to encourage and motivate my staff to engage with the SPBMP principles", while a Secondary SFP also lent support to this view and described her role as "to be a motivator, to believe in the programme, that it can work and to encourage others to believe that it will work if we all are on board" (See Table 3).

Table 3. Participants' perceptions of their roles in the sustainability of SPBMP

Perceived Roles	Teachers	SPFs	Principals	Total Responses
1. Modeling SPBMP Best Practices	45 (44%)	1 (5%)	1 (7%)	47 (35%)
2. Providing Support (Technical or Admin)	42 (42%)	3 (17%)	3 (20%)	48 (36%)
3. Motivating/ Team Building	14 (14%)	12 (67%)	7 (47%)	33 (25%)
4. Marketing/ Public Relations	0 (0%)	2 (11%)	2 (13%)	4 (3%)
5. Providing Leadership	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	2 (13%)	2 (1%)

Research Question #3: What do participants believe will be the most enduring school-wide indicators of the SPBMP?

School principals and SFPs and were asked to provide three pieces of enduring evidence that would suggest that the programme was still in existence after the funding period had ended. One- third (33%) of the responses from the SFPs pointed to an increase in positive school practices, such as improved student behaviour, reduced punitive measures; while twenty-one percent of their responses pointed to an improved physical environment (see Table 4).

Table 4. Principals' and SFP' perceptions of evidence of sustainability of SPBMP

Evidence Identified	SPFs	Principals	Total Responses
1. Positive School Practices	11 (33%)	7 (50%)	18 (38%)
2. Improved Physical Environment	7 (21%)	2 (14%)	9 (19%)
3. School-wide Adoption	6 (18%)	1 (7%)	7 (15%)
4. Increased Parental/Community Involvement	4 (12%)	1 (7%)	5 (11%)
5. Increased Student Participation	3 (9%)	0 (0%)	3 (6%)
6. Improved Instructional Practices	2 (6%)	1 (7%)	3 (6%)
7. Improved Educational Outcomes	0 (0%)	2 (14%)	2 (4%)

The first bit of evidence was captured in the following quote:
> *There should be more disciplined students who can self- manage and are responsible. You would notice how students carry themselves: their deportment in public or in the school; how they behave on buses, in town, good behaviour.* (Secondary school SFP)

An improved physical environment was the next significant bit of evidence identified:
> *…the school environment that clearly shows a belief system e.g., large mural or large sign so you would know for sure what this school stands for.* (Secondary school SFP)

For the principals, the three key pieces of evidence of sustainability were: positive school practices (50%), an improved physical environment (14%) and improved academic outcomes (14%).

> *There should be visible signage and rules.* (Secondary school Principal)
> *The atmosphere in the classroom should be different in a good way and the teacher attitudes should be more accommodating of things child friendly.* (Primary school Principal)
> *I should see students achieving their goals; students do at least 2 to 3 CVQs or CCSLC subjects.* (Secondary school Principal)

Discussion

The study focused on three primary areas associated with the implementation of the Schools Positive Behaviour Management Programme (SPBMP) in Barbados, namely, the challenges associated with implementation, the roles the stakeholders play and perceived enduring indicators of its sustainability. With respect to the challenges encountered with the implementation of SPBMP, the finding that lack of resources, (both human and physical), and lack of teacher buy-in emerged as the main constraints, is not surprising for several reasons. Firstly, SPBMP was grounded in a tangible reward system, yet schools were not provided with a budget that would adequately cover the cost of the rewards. Further, even if the schools were given a budget, it is dubious that the budget would have kept pace with the changing nature of student reward expectations as they grew older. As was pointed out by many of the teachers interviewed, as the students became older the reward of having one's name on a 'good' colour on the colour wheel or receiving a trinket such as a pencil or some other small token failed to motivate students to do well once the novelty of the reward waned. A similar phenomenon was also reported by Haywood, Kuespert, Madecky, and Nor (2008) who found that the gains or impact of extrinsic rewards were short lived and secondly, that the use of these rewards proved to be expensive for teachers to maintain. The reality of fiscal constraints was also underscored by Daniel, Evelyn, and Wood (2012) who reported that the use of the reward system in the implementation of UNICEF's Child-Friendly School (CFS) model placed excessive financial demands on teachers in Barbados and Dominica and therefore threatened the successful implementation of the programme.

Regarding challenges with human resources, this was also to be expected. Reports from the pilot phase of the SPBMP project in Barbados and Dominica (Daniel, Evelyn, & Wood, 2012) indicated that the pilot project in 2007 suggested that for the programme to work effectively, a critical ingredient would have been additional personnel, such as school psychologists, social workers, and teaching assistants; however, when the project was scaled-up

and there was full implementation in 2009, there was not the required level of psychosocial and technical support in the form of special needs teachers and part-time school counsellors. For the most part, the School Focal Point (SFP) was regarded as the person solely responsible for the success or failure of the programme. This issue of under-resourced initiatives and the associated challenges are also reported in the literature (Bambara, Nonnemacher, & Kern, 2009; Coffey & Horner, 2012; Kincaid, Childs, Blasé, & Wallace, 2007).

The challenge of teacher or stakeholder buy-in should have been anticipated, given the nature of the implementation. As with most educational initiatives, participants reported that a top-down implementation approach was used; that is, officials of the Ministry of Education, Science, Technology and Innovation, the agency responsible for education in the country, simply informed the principals that the SPBMP was being adopted by all schools in the country. The findings also indicated that there was little input from the teachers or principals as to how or why the policy shift was to be implemented. This is consistent with the findings of researchers, such as Adelman and Taylor (2003), Daniel, Evelyn and Wood (2012), Horner, Freeman, Nelson, and Sugai (2007), and Horner, Sugai, and Anderson (2010), who stressed the role of stakeholder buy-in as a critical component of the sustainable implementation of projects that involve systemic change.

The finding that teachers perceived their role in promoting the sustainability of SPBMP as mainly modeling best practices and providing technical and administrative support can be interpreted in two ways. On one hand, it could suggest that the teachers were of the view that the initiative was sufficiently entrenched and that it only had to be maintained by engaging in more of the same practices that existed prior to the implementation of the initiative. On the other hand, it could also suggest that the teachers were prepared to engage the SPBMP initiative only on a superficial level. This could also be symptomatic of what Henck (2014), in exploring the sustainability of the child-friendly school model in Nepal, referred to as tempered optimism characterised by superficial rather than deep understanding and adoption of the Child Friendly School principles.

A slightly different perspective emerged among the principals and the SFPs. They acknowledged themselves as having a motivational and team building role; however, that role was not grounded in the wider ambit of leadership. In other words, these stakeholders did not demonstrate by their comments that they owned the responsibility as leaders for the success or failure of the initiative. It seemed that they were prepared to be on the periphery of the initiative and offer words or gestures of encouragement and motivation when deemed necessary. Again, research on change and

educational innovation (Sugai & Horner, 2006; Zhu, 2016; Mendels & Mitgang, 2013) has consistently shown that school leaders must own the initiatives, and, as noted by Seo et al. (2012), must be catalysts for teacher commitment.

What was also significant was the finding that very few of the leaders, that is, principals and SFPs, mentioned their leadership role as being critical to sustainability of SPBMP. Researchers, such as Fullan (2010) and Lambert (2007), pointed to the role of strong visionary leadership as a precondition for systemic educational change.

The findings on the future indicators of sustainability were in accord with the literature which speaks to norms that form part of the modus operandi after the cessation of funding. The identification of positive school practices and the school-wide adoption of SPBMP approaches as two main indicators of sustainability suggest that the principals and SFPs are acutely aware from a theoretical level of how the programme should function in the long-term. However, once again, there was no direct or indirect references to any indicators that placed school leadership at the fore, or that underscored the role of school leadership in achieving and maintaining the viability of the programme. This is in direct contrast to the findings of Sugai and Horner (2006) and Handler et al. (2007) who argued that the indicators of sustainability should include team-based approaches and practices, which were driven by effective leadership. This failure to recognise and articulate the leadership connection on the part of the principals and SFPs could be a consequence of the previously-mentioned top-down nature of the SPBMP implementation and a lack of overall staff buy-in. Overall, these findings seem to suggest that the principals and SFPs have not taken full ownership, or put procedures in place to foster the sustainability of the programme, and may therefore still be depending on the original funding agency to spearhead the sustainability of the initiative.

Conclusions and Recommendations

Three primary findings emerged from this research. First, each of the three participating groups (principals, SFPs and teachers) acknowledged a lack of resources and a lack of teacher/school buy-in as the main challenges faced in implementing SPBMP in Barbadian schools. To increase the likelihood of the sustainability of the SPBMP, it is imperative that stakeholders, both at the Ministry of Education, Science, Technology, & Innovation (MESTI) and within the schools create ways to adequately provide resources for the schools particularly after external funding and assistance have ceased.

With respect to the excessive time commitment that is required of the SPBMP committees to properly implement and monitor the programme, our recommendation is, where possible, to adjust the timetabled obligations of the

team members, thereby reducing their in-class teaching loads and providing them with more time to successfully manage and sustain SPBMP practices. In schools where this may not be possible, an approach may be considered where some of the SPBMP responsibilities are rotated among all teaching staff so that the workload is shared and a select group is not expected to be solely responsible for initiating and executing SPBMP plans and activities.

Regarding the lack of teacher buy-in, this may have been due to the top-down manner in which the initiative was diffused. Researchers, such as Cuban (1986, 2013) and Fullan (2007), have considered the level of buy-in to be a key predictor of the quality of implementation and, by extension, a predictor of the sustainability of educational initiatives. Therefore, given the shortcoming of the top-down approach, it may now be necessary to adopt a more participative approach and incorporate more input and feedback from stakeholders at all levels to ensure that there is a mutual sense of ownership, community and voice with respect to SPBMP.

The second point of significance was the apparent disconnect between the school leadership and their acknowledgement of the importance of their role in achieving the sustainability of the SPBMP initiative. Both spoke, primarily, about their role in motivating teachers to complete the tasks and activities associated with the SPBMP; however, there was little acknowledgement of the leadership role that Rogers (2003) argued is critical to the diffusion of innovations and consequent sustainability. The comments provided by these leaders suggest that sustainability could be achieved by simply encouraging the teachers to follow the principles presented during the training sessions provided by the UNICEF facilitators. One recommendation that emerges from this finding is that SFPs and principals should undergo further training that would assist them in deconstructing and conceptualising their roles as change agents and would contribute to them developing a clear vision and strategy for the sustainability of SPBMP.

In examining the enduring features of sustainability, the three groups of stakeholders identified observable student behaviour modification outcomes and improved physical environment indicators; however, they neglected to mention the more enduring and critical indicators of the sustainability and institutionalisation of the SPBMP initiative, such as teacher leadership, democratic participation of students, and evidence of collaborative leadership. This failure to again acknowledge the enduring impact of leadership on sustainability may be as a result of the manner in which the initiative was introduced to the schools with the emphasis being primarily on the implementation and monitoring of SPBMP evidence-based behavioural practices.

A study of this nature would not be complete without a discussion of the implications for the external funders and technocrats in the education system.

The first major implication for the external funders relates to policy and legislative support, which is a critical part of the complex evolving nature of policy implementation (Viennet & Pont, 2017). If the goal of the external funders is to ensure that educational projects do not fall prey to "policy churn" (Hess, 1999), then they need to focus on ensuring that future educational initiatives are undergirded by entrenched educational policies, and legal infrastructural support. This would increase the likelihood that even after the cessation of funding, initiatives would thrive. For example, if the policy of Barbados' Ministry of Education was that SFPs who were charged with oversight and monitoring of the SPBMP were promoted to Senior Teachers, complete with the reduced teaching load and other perquisites, it would have made their remit more manageable. However, what obtained was that many of the SFPs had to grapple with a full teaching load, while trying to facilitate the monitoring and implementation of the SPBMP programme. In the absence of policy and legislative support, it was not surprising that many of them were unable to successfully discharge their responsibilities. A similar situation was also evident with principals, who were expected to assist with the monitoring of the SPBMP, while continuing to produce the deliverables relevant to their substantive posts. This result was an untenable position at best, and one that failed to take cognisance of the increased responsibilities for principals, that would have accompanied the institutional educational change envisaged by the SPBMP. The lesson to be learned from this, therefore, is that educational initiatives that are bereft of the appropriate policy and legislative support, are destined to have a short shelf life and sustainability deficits.

Another implication for the external funders is as it relates to piloting and scale-up expectations for educational initiatives. When the SPBMP project was piloted in Barbados, the external funders were generous in the provision of many forms of institutional support. This included, among other things, access to a school psychologist and social worker, as well as financial support for the purchase of rewards and other educational paraphernalia that would have contributed to a successful pilot of the programme (Daniel, Evelyn, & Wood, 2012). However, when the project was scaled-up across the school system, there was an absence of financial and personnel support as compared with that provided during the pilot phase. It was therefore not surprising that sustainability of the SPBMP was dubious. It is unrealistic for external funders to expect that the scale-up of educational initiatives, which require financial and other support, would continue apace, in countries like Barbados where there are so many other social services clamoring for the limited financial resources. Thus, external funders have to revise their expectations when it comes to the scale-up of projects. They would be better advised to focus on partial scale-ups over a longer period of time, thus increasing the probability

of full rather than partial implementation. As suggested by Hess (2013), if contextual implementation details are omitted or incomplete, the implementation process may be compromised. Therefore, it is prudent that external funders pay greater attention to implementation processes (Gurria, 2015).

There are also implications for educational technocrats in Caribbean countries who find themselves in an unflattering and disadvantageous position in relation to external funders for two main reasons. The first is that while they are included in the policy negotiation discussions, they are not equal partners. Secondly, external funders operate on the maxim, "he who pays the piper calls the tune", which means that the technocrats' role is reduced to that of facilitating the goals of the funders. Oftentimes, these goals are at variance with the goals of the recipient countries. It would be useful therefore for technocrats to be trained in the area of negotiation strategies and strategies for indigenising the educational initiatives that are foisted on them. This would allow them to more efficiently navigate the external funding environment and carve out educational initiatives that accord with the needs of the respective countries.

Generally, the findings confirm that the sustainability of SPBMP as implemented in Barbadian schools was challenged by resources, buy-in and an underdeveloped conceptualisation of the role of leadership in educational innovations. These types of challenges are not peculiar to the SPBMP, but to educational initiatives in general which are top down in nature and which fail to acknowledge the four key dimensions of effective educational policy implementation, namely smart policy design, inclusive stakeholder engagement, conducive context, and coherent implementation strategy (Viennet & Pont, 2017, p.44). If the region continues along the path of educational development on the strength of external funding, and if the goal is sustainable education interventions, then external funders and local educational stakeholders alike must rethink the policy implementation process. The successful scale-up is neither automatic nor guaranteed simply because there was a pilot phase. Full implementation of any educational project is an arduous and complex process which requires ongoing support from external funders. To do otherwise would be to continually expose Caribbean educational systems to ebbs and flows of success and a perpetual state of flux.

References

Adelman, H. & Taylor, L. (2003). On sustainability of project innovations as systemic change. *Journal of Educational and Psychological Consultation*, 14(1), 1-25.

Algozzine, B., & Algozzine, K. (2009). Facilitating academic achievement through schoolwide positive behavior support. In W. Sailor, G. Dunlap, G. Sugai, & R. Horner (Eds.). *Handbook of positive behavior support* (pp. 521-550). New York, NY: Springer.

Altman, D. (1995). Sustaining interventions in community systems: On the relationship between researchers and communities. *Health Psychology*, 14(6), 526-536.

Bambara, L. M., Nonnemacher, S., & Kern, L. (2009). Sustaining school-based individualized positive behavior support: Perceived barriers and enablers. *Journal of Positive Behavior Interventions*, 11(1), 161-178.

Barrett, S. B., Bradshaw, C. P., & Lewis-Palmer, T. (2008). Maryland statewide SW-PBIS initiative: Systems, evaluation, and next steps. *Journal of Positive Behavior Interventions*, 10(2), 105–114.

Bradshaw, C. P., Mitchell, M. M., & Leaf, P. J. (2010). Examining the effects of schoolwide positive behavioral interventions and supports on student outcomes: Results from a randomized controlled effectiveness trial in elementary schools. *Journal of Positive Behavior Interventions*, 12(3), 133-148. doi: 10.1177/1098300709334798

Brundtland, G. (1987). *Report of the World Commission on Environment and Development: Our Common Future*. Retrieved from http://www.un-documents.net/our-common-future.pdf

Chabbott, C. (2004). *UNICEF's child-friendly schools framework: A desk review*. New York, NY: United Nations Children's Fund.

Chapman, D. (2001). *A review of evaluations of UNICEF education activities* (1994-2000). New York, NY: UNICEF.

Child Friendly Schools Programming: Global Evaluation Report (2009). United Nations Children's Fund. New York.

Coffey, J., & Horner, R. H. (2012). The sustainability of school-wide positive behavioral interventions and supports. *Exceptional Children*, 78(4), 407-422.

Cuban, L. (1986). *Teachers and machines: The classroom use of technology since 1920.* New York, NY: Teachers College Press.

Cuban, L. (2013). *Inside the black box of classroom practices. Change without reform in American education*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard Education Press.

Daniel, P., Evelyn, V., & Wood, J. (2012). *UNICEF evaluation of the impact of the Child Friendly School approach in the Eastern Caribbean*. Final Report.

Forman, E. M., & Herbert, J. D. (2009). New directions in cognitive behavior therapy: Acceptance-based therapies. In W. O'Donohue & J. E. Fisher, (Eds.), *General principles and empirically supported techniques of cognitive behavior therapy* (pp. 102–114). Hoboken, NJ: Wiley.

Fullan, M. (2007) *The new meaning of educational change* (4th ed). New York, NY: Teachers College Press.

Fullan, M. (2010). *All systems go: The change imperative for whole system reform*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Corwin.

Fullan, M. (2011). *The moral imperative realized*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Corwin.

Gordon, J., & Patterson, J.A. (2008). "It's what we've always been doing." Exploring tensions between school culture and change. *Journal of Educational Change*, 9(1), 17-35.

Greenhalgh T., Robert, G., Macfarlane, F., Bate, P., & Kyriakidou, O. (2004). Diffusion of innovations in service organizations: Systematic review and recommendations. *Milbank Quarterly*, 82, 581–629.

Gurria, A. (2015). 21 for 21 A Proposal for Consolidation and Further Transformation of the OECD. Retrieved from https://www.oecd.org/about/sectretary-general/21-for-21-A-proposal-for-the-consolidation-and-further-transformation-of-the-OECD

Handler, M., Rey, J., Connell, J., Thier, K., Feinberg, A., & Putnam, R. (2007). Practical considerations in creating school-wide positive behavior support in public schools. *Psychology in the Schools*, 44(1), 29-39. doi:10.1002/pits.20203

Hargreaves, A. (2007). Sustainable leadership and development in education: Creating the future, conserving the past. *European Journal of Education*, 42(2), 223-233.

Hargreaves, A., & Fink, D. (2000). The three dimensions of reform. *Educational Leadership*, 57(7), 30-33.

Hargreaves, A., & Goodson, I. (2006). Educational change over time? The sustainability and nonsustainability of three decades of secondary school change and continuity. *Educational Administration Quarterly*, 42(1), 3-41.

Haywood, J., Kuespert, S., Madecky, D., & Nor, A. (2008). *Increasing elementary and high school student motivation through the use of intrinsic and extrinsic rewards*. (Unpublished Dissertation). Saint Xavier University & Pearson Achievement Solutions.

Henck, A. (2014). *INGOS, the global ideology of childhood and educational policy in Nepal*. (Unpublished Dissertation). Penn State University, University Park, PA, USA.

Hess, F. M. (1999). *Spinning wheels: The politics of urban school reform*. Washington, DC: Brookings Institution.

Hess, F. (2013). "The missing half of school reform", National Affairs, Fall, 19-35. Retrieved from http://www.nationalaffairs.com/publications/detail/the-missing-half-of-school-reform

Horner, R., Freeman, R., Nelson, C., & Sugai, G. (2007). Using information in state or district level implementation of school-wide PBIS. *Positive Behavioral Supports Newsletter*, 2(1), 1-3.

Horner, R. H., Sugai, G., & Anderson, C. M. (2010). Examining the evidence base for schoolwide positive behavior support. *Focus on Exceptional Children*, 42(8), 1-15.

Horner, R. H., Sugai, G., Smolkowski, K., Eber, L., Nakasato, J., Todd, A. W., & Esparanza, J.   (2009). A randomized, wait-list controlled effectiveness trial assessing school-wide positive behavior support in elementary schools. *Journal of Positive Behavior Interventions*,   11(1), 133-144.

Kelm, J. L., & McIntosh, K. (2012). Effects of school-wide positive behavior support on teacher self-efficacy. *Psychology in the Schools*, 49(2), 137-147. doi: 10.1002/pits.20624 412-424.

Kincaid, D., Childs, K., Blasé, K. A., & Wallace, F. (2007). Identifying barriers and facilitators in implementing school-wide positive behavior support. *Journal of Positive Behavior Interventions*, 9(3), 174-184.

Lambert, L. (2007). Lasting leadership: Toward sustainable school-improvement. *Journal of Educational Change*, 8, 311-322.

Lee, O., Penfield, R., & Maerten-Rivera, J. (2009). Effects of fidelity of implementation on science achievement gains among English language learners. *Journal of Research in Science Teaching*, 46(7), 836–859.

Lohrmann, S., Forman, S., Martin, S. D., & Palmieri, M. (2008). Understanding school personnel's resistance to adopting school-wide positive behavior support at a universal level of intervention. *Journal of Positive Behavior Interventions*, 10(4), 256-269.

McIntosh, K., Horner, R. H., & Sugai, G. (2009). Sustainability of systems-level evidence-based practices in schools: Current knowledge and future directions. In W. Sailor, G. Dunlap, G. Sugai, & R. H. Horner (Eds.), *Handbook of positive behavior support* (pp. 327-352). New York, NY: Springer.

McIntosh, K., Moniz, C., Craft, C. B., Golby, R., & Steinwand-Deschambeault, T. (2014). Implementing school-wide positive behavioral interventions and supports and supports to better meet the needs of indigenous students. *Canadian Journal of School Psychology*, 29(3), 236-257.

Marshall, I., Jackman, G., & Mungal-Fongkong, C. (2018). Monitoring the implementation of the schools positive behaviour management programme (SPBMP) in Barbados. *Journal of Education and Development in the Caribbean*, 17(1), 161-192.

Mendels, P. & Mitgang, L. (2013). Creating strong principals. *Educational Leadership*, 70(7), 22-29.

Moore, J., Mascarenhas, A., Bain, J., & Straus, S. (2017). Developing a comprehensive definition of sustainability. *Implementation Science*, 12(110), 1-8.

Morrison, A. R. (2013). Educational leadership and change: Structural challenges in the implementation of a shifting paradigm. School Leadership & Management, 33(4), 412-424.

Pinkelman, S., McIntosh, K., Rasplica, C., Berg, T., & Strickland-Cohen, M. (2015). Perceived enablers and barriers related to sustainability of school-

wide positive behavioral interventions and supports. *Behavioral Disorders*, 40(3), 171-183.

Porter, M. & Kramer, M. (2002). The competitive advantage of corporate philanthropy. *Harvard Business Review*, 80(12), 56-68.

Reeves, D. B. (2009). *Leading change in your school. How to conquer myths, build commitment, and get results*. Alexandria, VA: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development.

Rogers, E.M. (2003). *Diffusion of innovations* (5th ed.). New York: Free Press.

Sanford, DeRousie, R. M., & Bierman, K. L. (2012). Examining the sustainability of an evidence based preschool curriculum: The REDI program. *Early Childhood Research Quarterly*, 27, 56-65.

Scott, T. M., & Barrett, S. B. (2004). Using staff and student time engaged in disciplinary procedures to evaluate the impact of school-wide PBS. *Journal of Positive Behavior Interventions*, 6(1), 21-27.

Seo, M., Taylor, M. S., Hill, N. S., Zhang, X., Tesluk, P. E., & Lorinkova, N. M. (2012). The role of affect and leadership during the organizational change. *Personal Psychology*, 65(1), 121-165.

Steckler, A. and Goodman, R. M. (1989). How to institutionalize health promotion programs. *American Journal of Health Promotion*, 3, 34–44.

Sugai, G. & Horner, R. (2006). A promising approach for expanding and sustaining school-wide positive behavior support. *School Psychology Review*, 35(2), 245-259.

Sugai, G., & Horner, R. H. (2002). The evolution of discipline practices: School-wide positive behavior supports. *Child and Family Behavior Therapy*, 24, 23–50.

Sugai, G., & Horner, R. H. (2009). Defining and describing schoolwide positive behavior support. In W. Sailor, G. Dunlop, G. Sugai, & R. Horner (Eds.), Issues in clinical child psychology. *Handbook of positive behavior support* (pp. 307-326). New York, NY: Springer.

The World Bank (1990). World Development Report 1990. New York: Oxford University Press.

United States Agency for International Development (1988). *Sustainability of Development programs: A compendium of donor experience*. Washington, DC: USAID.

Vincent, C. G., Sprague, J. R., & Gau, J. (2013, January 10). *The effectiveness of school-wide positive behavior support in reducing disciplinary exclusions of students from non-White backgrounds in middle schools*. Paper presented at the Closing the School Discipline Gap Conference, Washington, DC. Retrieved from http://civilrightsproject.ucla.edu/events/2013/closing-the-school-discipline-gap-conferenceresearch-papers/closing-the-school-discipline-gap-research-to-practice

Viennet, R. & Pont, B. (2017). "Education policy implementation: A literature review and proposed framework", *OECD Education Working Papers*, No. 162, OECD Publishing, Paris. Retrieved from https://doi.org/10.1787/fc467a64-en.

Yin, R. K. (1979). *Changing urban bureaucracies: How new practices*

Sustainability of The Schools Positive Behaviour Management Programme become routinized. Lexington, MA: Lexington Books.

Zhu, L. (2016). *Administrative support by school leadership in relation to sustainable implementation of school-wide positive behaviour interventions and supports* (SWPBIS). (Unpublished Dissertation). Sage Graduate School, New York, USA.