ABSTRACT
Check-In/Check-Out (CICO) is a popular intervention for students with problem behaviors. This study seeks to evaluate a Ross Greene Collaborative and Proactive Solutions (CPS) focused CICO program. This change to CICO focuses on fixing the unsolved problem using the voices of both the adults and students. By incorporating the student’s perspective and voice to solving the problem, more unsolved problems will be solved, creating fewer behavior problems.

LITERATURE REVIEW
• Check-In/Check-Out has been found to reduce behavior problems, but little research has continued to seek how to improve this intervention. (Majekia et al., 2019; Miller et al., 2014)
• Check-In/Check-Out has five key components: morning check-in, a daily feedback form, behavior feedback throughout the school day, afternoon check-out, and parent feedback of behavior feedback. (Maggin et al., 2015)
• To increase the effectiveness of CICO, research-based models can be layered with traditional CICO, but there is little research to determine which models are successful (Klingbeil et al., 2018).
• Ross Greene’s Collaborative and Proactive Solutions (CPS) focuses on why the behavior is happening in order to fix the problem, instead of the behavior itself (Greene 2018).
• Polacek et al. (2021) described a model that incorporated CPS with traditional CICO and the current study aims to test the effectiveness of the model.
• Plan B collaborative discussions that are part of this model help “[t]each students valuable skills, including considering the likely outcomes or consequences of one’s actions; considering a range of solutions to a problem; shifting from one’s original plan, idea, or solution; and taking into account situational factors that would suggest the need to adjust a plan of action” (Greene, 2016, pg. 186).

PURPOSE
This study evaluated a Collaborative and Proactive Solutions (CPS) focused Check-In/Check-Out intervention implemented to improve the effects of Check-In/Check-Out on student behavior.

MEASURES
Participants:
• 5-year-old White male kindergarten student
• 34-year-old White female School Psychologist/Special Education Director with her Ed.S. in school psychology.
• School District: K4-12 school district supporting around 630 students. 46.9% are economically disadvantaged, 18.4% are students with disabilities, 90% are White, 6.4% are Hispanic or Latino, 2.9% are Two or More Races. (Wisconsin Department of Public Instruction, 2021-22)

Measures:
• Assessment of Lagging Skills and Unsolved Problems (ALSUP): discussion guide to identify specific lagging skills and unsolved problems of a student
• Plan B: collaborative discussion to gain information and understanding of what’s making it hard for a student to meet a given expectation, define adult concerns, and generate a solution that is realistic and mutually satisfactory.
• Daily CICO with a goal of 80% or higher.
• Unsolved Problem: Difficulty persisting independently on difficult tasks (i.e., difficulty meeting an expectation)
• Solution: If the student independently initiated their work, the teacher would offer encouragement within the first few minutes

Procedures:

RESULTS
• The graph shows the daily percent CICO points earned for 13 weeks of baseline data, 3 weeks after the Plan B discussion was conducted, and 2 weeks after the Plan B solution was implemented.

Data Analysis:
• Independent samples t-tests found that both the Plan B discussion alone (t=-2.32, p<.05) and the Plan B solution alone (t=-2.57, p<.05) had a significant impact on the daily percent of total points earned through CICO.

No Assumptions Effect Size (NAES):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ES</th>
<th>Mean Base</th>
<th>Mean Trend</th>
<th>Mean Plan B</th>
<th>Mean Solution</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0.91</td>
<td>80.02</td>
<td>88.33</td>
<td>9.10</td>
<td>Baseline</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.03</td>
<td>80.02</td>
<td>89.39</td>
<td>9.10</td>
<td>Plan B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Solution</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

• The No Assumptions Effect Size (NAES) for both mean differences fell in the “large” range (Plan B solution implementation ES=1.03; Plan B discussion alone prior to Plan B solution implementation ES=.91).

School psychologist responses to qualitative results:

What, if any, change did you see after the implementation of the new system?
• “Behaviors lessened after the change in the system. More 80% or higher days.”

Do you have any suggestions on things to change or add about the new systems?
• “I noticed that the teacher was making sad faces on days without 80% and check marks on days over 80%. I suggested not doing either, but also increasing praise to the child.”

DISCUSSION
• The CPS CICO program resulted in increased daily total percent CICO points earned for the student. This research suggests that the CPS CICO program is effective in improving the effects of Check-In/Check-Out on student behavior.
• Not only does Plan B solution implementation impact student behavior but simply having the Plan B discussion can help students develop lagging skills and improve student behavior, consistent with Greene (2016).

Implications for School Psychologists:
• School psychologists should advocate for a Collaborative and Proactive Solutions Check-In/Check-Out system at their school to improve students’ outcomes.
• School psychologists should advocate for funding to be spent on ongoing Collaborative and Proactive Solutions professional development opportunities.

Future Directions:
• Due to the size of the school, one limitation was the number of students who needed CICO. Future studies should aim to increase participants and include students with a range of intersecting minoritized identities.
• Future studies should also aim to gather more data to test the long-term impact of Collaborative and Proactive Solutions Check-In/Check-Out
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