Remove, rehabilitate, return? The use and effectiveness of behaviour schools in New South Wales, Australia
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Research indicates that enrolments in separate special educational settings for students with disruptive behaviour have increased in a number of educational jurisdictions internationally. Recent analysis of school enrolment data has identified a similar increase in the New South Wales (NSW) government school sector; however, questions have been raised as to their use and effectiveness. To situate the NSW experiment with behaviour schools in a broader context, the paper begins with a review of the international research literature. This is followed by a discussion of the NSW experience with the aim of identifying parallels and gaps in the research. The paper concludes by outlining important questions and directions for research to better understand and improve the educational experiences and outcomes of disruptive disaffected students in Australia’s largest school system.
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Introduction
Despite the move towards the inclusion of students with special educational needs more generally (Slee, 2010), the exclusion of students categorised as emotionally or behaviourally disordered continues to increase (Bradley, Doolittle & Bartolotta, 2008; Jull, 2008; Graham, Sweller & Van Bergen, 2010). This does not necessarily equate to an increase in the number of students with a mental illness however, as there are other factors of influence at work in the schooling system that must be taken into consideration. For example, teachers participating in a three-year multi-school case study in the United States, in which rates of referral of students with learning and behavioural difficulties to special settings were rising, reported that they were finding it increasingly difficult to adequately support students in a policy landscape characterised by increased accountability and standards-based curricula and assessment (Furney, Clark-Keefe & Hartnett, 2003). Similar trends are noted by Wappett (2009) who has found that students with learning and behavioural difficulties were spending longer portions of the school day in resource rooms to better prepare them to participate in standardised assessments mandated by No Child Left Behind (NCLB) legislation.

Although such interventions are often couched in the compassionate language of providing targeted support for students with ‘special educational needs,’ researchers in the field of inclusive education have pointed to the function that separate special educational settings serve for the ‘general’ education system (Thomas & Glenny, 2000; Graham & Slee, 2008). For example, the exclusion of students with learning and behavioural difficulties from standardised assessments fulfils a number of objectives for mainstream schools in contemporary contexts:
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the first being a rise in average test scores (Figlio & Getzler, 2006). The second is that schools and teachers can then concentrate resources and effort on students who have the potential to make it over the minimum benchmark standard (Gillborn & Youdell, 2000). This is more common in systems characterised by competitive school markets (Graham & Jahnukainen, 2011), where it seems the exclusion of students with disruptive behaviour may also promise an end to the distraction of ‘good’ students, as well as provide a way to appease parents who have been sensitised by the rhetoric of school choice (Campbell, Proctor & Sherington, 2008).

It is important to note that additional support for learning is in many systems ring-fenced by categorical criteria based on disability classifications (Florian & McLaughlin, 2008), and it is through this process that disruptive and disaffected students acquire a ‘diagnosis’ of emotional disturbance or behaviour disorder. While these are internal administrative categories with criteria that bear little relation to those used in the field of mental health, such processes have significant implications, not the least of which is a potent rationale for schools to abdicate responsibility for students who are difficult to teach (Daniels, 2006; Graham, 2008).

Excluding outcomes...
Analysis of national longitudinal datasets in the United States has revealed that students labelled EBD ‘are excluded more than any other disability group’ (Bradley, Doolittle & Bartolotta, 2008, p. 11), and their outcomes ‘are among the worst - if not the worst - of all disability groups’ (p. 18). Meanwhile in the United Kingdom, Jull (2008) notes that ‘increasing exclusion rates remain a cause for alarm’ (p. 14); particularly in England, where student enrolments in Pupil Referral Units (PRUs) increased 53.8% from 2000 to 2004 (DfES, 2004).

Although their small size and specific focus allows for more intensive pastoral care and stronger teacher-student relationships (Jahnukainen, 2001), the international research literature suggests that a balanced curriculum is beyond the capacity of many such settings. Further, while researchers have noted that supports are mandatory for successful re-integration, no common core of validated practices or evidence-based policies exist (Gagnon and Leone, 2005). This can leave students lost when returning to the mainstream, particularly at the secondary school level. First, they often experience challenges adjusting and coping socially, and second, they are likely to have large gaps in their education which makes it even more difficult for them to access the academic school curriculum (Lane, Gresham, O’Shaughnessey, 2002; Bos, Coleman, & Vaughn, 2002; O’Shaughnessy, Lane, 2002). Such outcomes have implications for students both during and post-enrolment with similar findings emerging across systems internationally.

For example Lane, Wehby, Little and Cooley (2005) found that American students who were categorised as EBD and enrolled in special classes and special schools ‘made very little progress over the course of an academic year and, in some areas, fell further behind in the academic, social and behavioural domains’ (p. 371). Farrell, Critchley and Mills (1999) discovered that English children labelled SEBD are often not functionally literate when they leave the school system, while Whitley, Lupart and Beran (2009) have noted that Canadian students classified as EBD were at greater risk of dropping out. These findings correspond with a New Zealand study of a residential school for children with emotional and behavioural difficulties where over 90% of the students in the study (who averaged 10.6 years of age at enrolment in the special school) proceeded to leave the school education system early with no qualifications (Hornby & Witte, 2008).

Poor academic progress and early school leaving has serious implications. A 10-year follow-up comparison of North American students with disabilities indicated that of the students labelled as emotionally and behaviourally disordered (EBD) in Wave 2 of the National
Longitudinal Transition Study (NLTS-2) less than 37% were working for pay, and less than 22% were enrolled in any type of postsecondary education (Wagner, Newman, Cameto & Levine, 2005). Further, students who had been in the special education system and labelled as having SEBD demonstrated little to no improvement over time in the three domains of postsecondary education, employment, and interpersonal relationships while students in all other support categories did improve (National Longitudinal Transition Study, 2007).

The international research literature also suggests that students in this group have high rates of involvement with the justice system. The US National Adolescent and Child Treatment Study (NACTS) found that 43.3% of students aged 8-18 who were identified as having serious emotional disturbance (SED) and were in either a residential mental health setting or in a special education program for SED (n ~753) were arrested at least once and 65.5% had at least one contact with police in which the child was believed to be the perpetrator of a crime (Greenbaum et al., 1996). Contact with the justice system is often cumulative as reputation leads to increased suspicion and thus greater frequency of contact with police (see Gormally & Deuchar, this issue); all of which heighten the potential for these young people to be found doing something that they should not. As per their experiences in schools, this does not mean that they are the only ones engaging in suspect behaviours, simply that they are the ones most likely to be caught. A similar pattern is evident in Australia although there is very little published research available. Research from the field of criminology suggests that the enrolment of disaffected young people in separate special educational settings may compound rather than avert negative trajectories. For example, a 30 year archival analysis that traced student records from enrolment in a Brisbane behaviour school through the justice system in Queensland indicated that most students remained in the special school years longer than recommended and that they frequently ended up in ‘controlling and punishing institutions such as either a boys’ home or a youth detention centre’ (Bouhours & Bryer, 2004, p. 121).

_Treachorous routes…_

Just as the pathways out of special settings are a cause for concern, so is the fidelity of the identification and classification processes that direct students into them. Firstly, the diagnostic criteria and processes used to identify and refer children for emotional and behavioural disturbances are troubling. There is no standard test for SEBD or ED/BD as there is for gauging intelligence or academic achievement which leaves greater room for individual subjectivity and cultural bias (Toffaolo & Pederson, 2005; Lee & Jonson-Reid, 2009). Further, the perceptions of regular education teachers greatly influence whether a student is considered to have a behaviour problem since students are educated in regular education settings prior to being referred to special settings (Conway, 2006). It is important to note however that perceptions of student behaviour have been found to vary widely across districts, schools and even between classrooms, with teacher experience, socioeconomic status, gender and culture all operating as factors of influence (Hudley, Wakefield, Britch, Cho, Smith & DeMorat, 2001; Graham & Spandagou, 2011).

Not only can teachers in regular education be responsible for identifying ‘EBD’ but they also have been found to have low expectations of such students, despite the fact that cognitive ability is not part of the EBD diagnosis (Whitley et al., 2009). Furthermore, Maag (2004) has suggested that if a child’s social norms do not fit well with the culture or ecology of a school then that child can be at an increased risk of exclusion. These factors can affect eligibility for support services and may influence decisions on educational issues for students, both of which
have long term effects (VanDerHeyden, Witt & Naquin, 2003; Algozzine, 2008; Begeny, Krouse, Brown & Mann, 2011).

The lack of evidence-based criteria and explicit procedures in the identification and referral process is not the only troubling issue; indeed, of equal concern are the effects that they produce. Research over the last four decades has continued to find disproportionate identification and placement patterns in special educational settings with minority students of colour more likely to be overrepresented than White or Asian-Pacific Islander students; particularly if they live in a high-density urban area, are male, and come from a low socio-economic background (Hosp & Reschly, 2004; Oswald, Coutinho, Best & Nu, 2001; Oswald, Coutinho, Best & Singh, 1999; Skiba, Poloni-Staudinger, Gallini, Simmons, & Figgins-Azziz, 2006). The literature in this field is dominated by research from the United States where African American boys have been found to be markedly overrepresented (Coutinho & Oswald, 2000), and gender disproportionality has been found to increase with the restrictiveness of the setting (Skiba et al., 2006). Despite a significant gap in the Australian research literature, emerging research indicates that similar trends exist in the state of New South Wales.

The Special Case of New South Wales

New South Wales (NSW) is Australia’s largest state comprising one third of the national population. In 2010, there were 1,119,089 school-aged students, 33.8% of which attended non-government (Catholic and Independent) or ‘private’ schools (ABS, 2010). The government school sector educates 66.2% of the K-12 schooling population with 2230 schools and 742,141 students (DET, 2010). With 113 special schools and over 2000 separate support classes, the New South Wales government school sector also has the largest parallel special education system in Australia. Entry to special schools and support classes for students with disruptive behavior does not require a disability confirmation; however, a confirmed diagnosis in an eligible disability category is required for all other students (Graham, 2012). Recent analysis of government school enrolment data has identified significant increases in the enrolment of students in these settings (Dempsey, 2007; Graham & Sweller, 2011). These enrolment increases have coincided with the opening of ‘nearly 100 specialist facilities to support students with disruptive behaviour, including 35 behaviour schools, 22 suspension centres and 40 tutorial centres’ (Patty & Gilmore, 2009). Behaviour schools now account for more than one third of all special schools in the NSW government schooling sector (Graham, 2012); however, Dempsey (2007) suggests that they are becoming ‘holding areas for students that regular schools are either unable to or unprepared to work with’ (p. 76).

The operational model on which NSW behaviour schools were developed is similar in philosophy to that found in England and the United States with some minor differences. Students ‘whose behaviour can no longer be supported in their home schools’ (DEC, 2011, p. 1) are referred to schools specialising in intensive behaviour support for an intended maximum of 12 months. Unless the student has been expelled, their home school enrolment is maintained on a partial (or part-time) basis so that the student may spend four days in the behaviour school and one day back in their home school environment. Theoretically, as time goes by, the number of days spent attending the home school will increase as the student’s behaviour improves; however, some behaviour schools have or are in the process of retreating from the 4:1 model, opting either for a more intensive 5 day withdrawal program or a 4 day program with no reintegration component.

A recent review of NSW behaviour schools and learning centres found that 42% of students in one focus school had been enrolled for more than 12 months at the time of the
appraisal, and that enrolments of up to 4 years in duration were not uncommon (Inca Consulting, 2009). Not surprisingly, questions relating to the average length of enrolment in behaviour schools were posed during the 2010 NSW Parliamentary Inquiry into the Provision of Education to Students with a Disability or Special Needs. Submissions from mainstream schools referred to difficulty in obtaining places, while behaviour schools reported difficulty in finding schools willing to re-enrol students deemed ready to return to mainstream. Similar attitudes were reflected in a study investigating the views of primary school principals in NSW government schools. Graham and Spandagou (2011) reported that the majority of principals participating in their research said that they would refuse to take a child from a behaviour school; adding that many were ‘revolving doors’ because re-integrating students seldom survive in the mainstream environment. The result appears to be a clogged system with disruptive, disaffected young people spending large tracts of their school lives in separate special educational settings.

Recent analysis of government school enrolment trends suggests that rather than returning to mainstream schools, students with disruptive behaviour may be graduating from less to more restrictive settings; e.g., from mainstream schools to separate support classes in early primary, to behaviour schools in the middle years, to special school provision within juvenile detention centres in the early to middle years of secondary school (Graham, Sweller & Van Bergen, 2010). Similar indications can be found in surveys of young people in NSW juvenile detention centres which have found that 40% of inmates spent considerable time in special schools and support classes prior to being incarcerated (NSW Department of Juvenile Justice, 2003). These findings suggest not only that there is a parallel between the NSW experience with separate settings for students with disruptive behaviour and those noted internationally, but that the ‘remove, return, rehabilitate’ model on which they were first developed is failing. Further research is therefore necessary to make a judgement as to the effectiveness of behaviour schools as a response to disaffected young people in Australian schools.

Directions for future research
While NSW behaviour schools were initially established as a short-term intervention model (Conway, 2006), it is not yet understood whether the lack of students returning to mainstream schooling is due to a failure in the ability of behaviour schools to effectively rehabilitate disaffected students or the resistance of home schools to allow and support students’ return – or a combination of both. Added to this are other problems noted during the 2010 NSW Parliamentary Inquiry, including: (i) the small size of and funding model used for behaviour schools which precludes the provision of a broad secondary school curriculum; (ii) the high-turnover of and expertise of teaching staff; and (iii) the overall quality of teaching and learning experiences within these schools. It is important to note that the final report from the 2010 NSW Parliamentary Inquiry recommended that the then NSW Department of Education and Training, ‘conduct a comprehensive evaluation of behaviour schools with attention to curriculum, student/ teacher ratios, the impact on students of spending extended periods of time in behaviour schools, as well as the adequacy of places available to meet demand’ (p. xxii); however, the report of the appraisal (Inca Consulting, 2009) commissioned by the NSW government that we obtained under Freedom of Information did not report adequate response rates and did not employ a research methodology capable of fully answering these questions.

Since the development of the Australian government’s My School website (www.myschool.edu.au), which provides and compares data on all schools nationally, it is apparent that these settings cost considerably more to run ($56,412 per student annually) than
local primary and secondary schools (averaging $11,630 per student per year). Given that the report from the government's own commissioned appraisal notes extremely high levels of absenteeism in behaviour schools, as well as low mainstream reintegration rates (Inca Consulting, 2009), the effectiveness of separate special educational placements and the support of disruptive students in mainstream schools – both prior to and post referral to alternative settings – is an issue that requires urgent consideration.

While it has been suggested that students with emotional and behavioural difficulties are better off in separate special educational settings (Landrum, et al. 2003), such statements require careful qualification. In his follow-up study of 23 former students of special classes for students categorised as emotionally and behaviourally disordered, Jahnukainen (2001) found that students were more positive about their experiences in the special setting; however, it should be noted that this was relative to their unhappy experiences in mainstream classes. While supportive of small class intervention for some students with emotional and behavioural difficulties, Jahnukainen (2001) offers 'low-level irrelevant curriculum' as one explanation for the failure and dropping out common to former special education students. In his study, participant responses, like 'the bad things are... you didn’t learn anything there' (Jahnukainen, 2001, p. 163), suggest that there may be too great a gap between such special educational settings and the secondary school curriculum.

Similarly, preliminary findings from the study to which this doctoral project is aligned (Graham, Van Bergen, Sweller, 2011), which investigates the perspectives and experiences of students referred to NSW behaviour schools, suggest that a supportive classroom climate might exist at the expense of intellectual demand. Many of the students in their study report being happier in the behaviour school but when asked why, they refer to more breaks and shorter school hours, more relaxed teachers who have time to help them, fewer peers with whom to get into conflict, rewards for good behaviour, the number of excursions and trips they attend, more opportunities to do ‘hands on’ tasks such as craft and cooking, and much easier academic work. However, while students themselves ‘may direct teachers towards a less demanding curriculum’ (Webby, Lane & Faulk 2003, p. 195), low intellectual demand and decreased focus on academic learning in behaviour schools could in turn be contributing to a widening of the gap between these young people and the academic curriculum with far-reaching implications for re-entry to mainstream schools, opportunities for future study and gainful employment.

These preliminary findings resonate with those articulated in the international research literature, suggesting that there may be a number of core weaknesses in the NSW behaviour school model that militate against the successful ‘rehabilitation’ of disaffected young people. Firstly, there is concern as to whether students’ ability to access the academic school curriculum is being further compromised by a significantly modified curriculum that cannot adequately address areas of academic weakness; secondly, there appears to be a large question mark hanging over the quality, preparation, experience and turnover of teaching staff; thirdly, in seeking to avoid conflict and build a working relationship with volatile students, teachers may be inadvertently reinforcing an existing pattern of avoidance that is inconsistent with the culture in the students’ home schools; and finally, it is not clear whether teaching staff are aware of these issues and what barriers they have encountered in attempting to address them.

At the same time, it is important to note that research has raised questions as to the receptiveness of mainstream schools and other factors that work against the successful return of students once they have completed their behaviour school program. To date, the only Australian research that specifically investigates the re-integration of students enrolled in behaviour schools is a rather dated doctoral study that compared thirty primary school-aged
children in Victorian and NSW schools, with fieldwork completed between 1988 and 1991 (Bradshaw, 1994). This study reported that mainstream school staff viewed student reintegration as unsuccessful, however a lack of support for integrating children was also identified. Preliminary findings from the larger project to which this doctoral study is attached indicate that reintegrating students may be unfairly victimised in the mainstream setting, and that the lack of comprehensive support upon re-entering mainstream that Bradshaw noted in the late 1980s still exists (Graham et al., 2011).

To engage with this critical gap in the research knowledge, future research must examine the programming, pedagogy, practices and perspectives of staff within separate special educational settings for disaffected and disruptive young people. Attention must also be paid to the experiences of students reentering to mainstream to understand what pedagogical strategies are used in these students’ home schools, what supports are provided to enhance their learning and transition, what views are held by principals and teachers in the receiving school and what, if any, differences exist between settings.

Conclusion

The long-term placements of students in behaviour schools and the effects that these placements have on the students as well as the educational system have yet to be investigated in New South Wales. Despite this gap in the research knowledge, enrolments have been steadily increasing since the late 1990s at significant cost to the government school education budget. While NSW behaviour schools were initially established as a short-term intervention response, government reports note that enrolments of up to four years are not uncommon and that less than half of students referred to these settings return to their home school. It is not yet understood however whether students lack of return to mainstream schooling is due to a failure in the ability of behaviour schools to effectively rehabilitate disaffected students or the resistance of home schools to allow and support students’ return—or a combination of both. Neither is it clear whether students who do reintegrate remain at their home school or whether they subsequently drop out. Further investigation is warranted in order to identify how, and in what ways, referral to behaviour schools affects student educational experiences and outcomes. Better understanding of the differences and nature of transitions between settings will provide valuable insight into how each system operates, how students who return to their home schools might be better supported, and what can be done to facilitate greater success for those students who remain outside of their home schools.
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The NSW government provides a continuum of provision ranging from supported enrolment in a regular class in a regular school, enrolment in a support class in a regular school, through to enrolment in a separate special school (DET, 2011). These schools, termed ‘Schools for Specific Purposes’ (SSPs), form the most restrictive placement option in NSW.

There are 6 categories of disability eligible for support in NSW government schools: Physical Disability, Hearing Impairment, Vision Impairment, Intellectual Disability, Autism, and Mental Health Problems.