The BMAP process is described below in an newly edited , to better reference concepts, paper:

The FBA process described below uses a structured method of collecting information from a collaborative group into a visual depiction of the myriad of connections of antecedents, motivations, and program responses to misbehavior. This process can usually be completed in 75 minutes and is most applicable to students with complicated and multiple problem behaviors.

How To:

Assemble a collaborative team meeting in an area with a large white board or with sufficient poster boards. The meeting will need a leader, whose duty is to keep the group on task and to abide by a few simple rules:

1. Be descriptive of the behavior, not indicting. Use behavior terms.
2. The use of the word “because” is unallowable until the very end of the meeting. "Because" implies the function is already determined.
3. Group members are to speak up and make all points known.
4. Behaviorism is not judgmental; if in the course of the mapping a pattern of behavior by adults is shown to be prompting or maintaining the misbehavior, behaviorism suggests changing the behavior not assigning blame.

Steps

1. In the center of the board put the title, “misbehaviors of concern”
   1. List each misbehavior
   2. Define each
   3. Put down a frequency for each. It is helpful if the denominator is the same for each behavior, i.e. 5/wk & 8/wk & 15/wk. If data is available use it, but estimates are often as useful and may be more timely in regards to keeping the length of the meeting manageable.
   4. Try to put the behaviors in order of occurrence if they are a part of a response chain ( see Cooper, Heron & Heward, 2007). Usually high frequency misbehaviors are the beginning of the chain, and low frequency are the terminal behaviors. Sometimes the beginning behavior in a chain is not seen as a misbehavior but is important to note especially for the intervention i.e. asking every adult in the class to explain a classroom rule.
   5. If there are response classes ( Cooper et al, 2007 define a response class as when different behaviors serve the same purpose), note that with parentheses around them. This might be if for one antecedent there are three equally likely misbehavior, e.g. asked to complete math homework leads to throwing books, or leaving classroom, or self-injury at equal probabilities.
2. At this point there should be a consensus on the misbehaviors and their definitions. There are a few intervention ideas that may be noticeable by this point.
   1. If there is a chain of escalating misbehavior, finding a better intervention for the primary or “keystone” behavior is advisable.
      1. From the example above, if a student keeps asking all of the adults in the classroom about a class rule, it may be better to keep the student engaged in asking behavior, than to ignore them and see the pattern escalate.
   2. If the misbehavior frequencies are listed using the same denominator, then you can quickly figure the probable rate of reinforcement ( there will be a more detailed version of this later). If all of the misbehaviors in a week total 40, and there are 1600 school minutes in a week, then contrived and natural reinforcers for appropriate behavior would likely need to be more often than every 40 minutes (1600/40 = 40). LaVigna and Donnellan (1985) recommend that reinforcers be scheduled at 80% of the inter-trial interval, which would be every 32 minutes in the above example.
   3. In general high frequency misbehaviors are easier to intervene upon as the frequency allows more observation of the pattern and more opportunities to use an alternate taught behavior.
3. ANTECEDENTS

The antecedents used in this model are from adapted from William Gardener, and renamed the relatively user friendly terms of “stable, dynamic, and triggering.” Although for the staunch behaviorists, these terms are similar to “learning history, setting conditions, and discriminative stimuli.” If one takes a behavioral bent, it also allows the use of the terms “establishing operations and S delta.”

Establishing operations in most basic terms are conditions that effect reinforcer values; being hungry makes edibles more valuable, and conversely edibles after lunch are usually less effective. Even seasonal allergies can be an establishing operation. S delta is stimuli that is NOT associated with the misbehavior occurring. If David tells a student to go to class and the student becomes loud and this happens consistently, then David is a Sd (discriminative stimuli) for misbehavior, but is Denise tells the same student to go the class and the student obeys, she is an S delta for misbehavior (and at the same time a Sd for compliance)

1. On the far left, label a column “**Stable Antecedent**s”
   1. Stable antecedents are things that have happened and are not likely to change such as moving 10 times, family make-up (although it can be a part of the dynamic as well), diagnoses of autism, ADHD, history of abuse, past school performance, cognitive abilities, etc.
2. Begin listing the stable antecedents
3. For the specific diagnoses, break them down further. The DSM-IV has checklist pages, use them unless someone know the criteria.
   1. E.g. for ASD
      1. Communication
         1. How does the student express themselves?
         2. How does the student receive communication
      2. Social
         1. What are the social skills of the student?
         2. Does the student have friends?
         3. Any other social information
      3. Restricted interests
         1. What are the specific interests or repetitive behavior of the student?
      4. Sensory issues (not from the DSM-IV)
         1. Does sound, light, touch, taste, or movement have an impact on the student
      5. For some students, mentioning rule-governed behavior as a characteristic of the disorder is appropriate.
4. When the stable antecedents seem to be exhausted, you can always add more later, see if there is a connection between the misbehaviors of concern and the stable antecedents. If there is a direct path, draw a connecting line. If there appears to be an intermediate step, wait until the dynamic and triggers are listed.
5. (Optional) for ED students with internalizing behaviors, you can add a cognitive component in the Stable area. Aaron Beck would call it a “world view”, but Young offers a more detailed list of “schemas” such as the “abandoned” schema, one common to children with reactive attachment disorder.
6. “**Dynamic Antecedents**” are those that may change over time, or have recently changed. Upcoming holidays or school ending are dynamic. Having been in one classroom and then moving to another is dynamic. Having the members of the household change is dynamic. Having a change in assistants in the classroom is a dynamic antecedent. Current grade level and academic requirements can be dynamic when compared to past testing. Ongoing puberty is dynamic. Changes in medical status are dynamic as are changes in medications and the medications potential side effects, i.e. risperidone and increased appetite. Some professionals prefer to put a few of the diagnoses in the dynamic section; indicating that certain disorders can improve.
7. After all dynamic antecedent that can be listed in the reasonable amount of time are on the board, check if there are links between the dynamic and the misbehaviors.
8. Interventions that focus on the dynamic antecedents , or behaviorally the setting conditions and establishing operations, are most likely to be Positive Behavior Support compliant, and are most likely to be effective in the long run.
9. (Optional) if using Young’s schema, elaborate on how you can tell if the student is “surrendering, avoiding, or overcompensating” for their schemas
10. **“Triggering Antecedents”** are those that occur immediately before the misbehaviors.
11. List the triggers
12. If there are connections between the stable or dynamic antecedents and the triggers that lead to the misbehaviors, draw the lines between them. This line helps all participants to start to "see" the connections.
13. (Optional) list the persons, places, times, or events that are least likely to be present before or during a misbehavior (S delta). Examine the characteristics of these events for patterns that may be useful. If a student is showing all the signs of an impending “meltdown”, getting the student to the place where it is less likely with the person for whom it is less likely is a better option than seeing the misbehavior. You should also begin planning on expanding the power of this intervention so that it does not become a major negative reinforcer.
14. Behavioral intervention plans that are predicated on avoiding triggers at all costs are labor intensive. Never saying “no” in the presence of a student is difficult, and it is likely that there is a stable or dynamic cause for the word “no” being a trigger; addressing the root cause is more fruitful. A more cognitive example of this might be a student with PTSD due to chronic sexual abuse. The abuse is a stable antecedent, the student’s view of the abuse and their victim status is the dynamic, and the random conditions that occurred at the moments of abuse are the likely triggers. The triggers can be addressed one by one, or the student’s cognitive state can be addressed and nearly all of the triggers diffused at once.
15. (Optional) if ED student, list the rationalizations, and attributions of the student. Identify if the student has a hostile attributional bias a la Dodge. This will usually link back to stable or dynamic environmental and familial factors.
16. “**Maintaining Factors”** is the section where the “because” is finally allowed. This is the perceived reinforcers that the student receives for each misbehavior
17. For each listed misbehavior, list the possible maintaining factors.
18. Check to see if the maintaining factors are related to any of the stable, dynamic, or triggering antecedents.
19. **“Program Responses”** are the planned and sometimes unplanned responses to the student misbehavior.
20. List the positive and negative consequences for the student’s behavior in the school.
21. Check to see if any of the negative consequences do not appear appropriate given the stable and dynamic antecedents.
22. Review the entire visual or concept map looking for areas where a skill could be taught, a reinforcer changed, the reactive steps of a program could be altered to be more in alignment with the bigger picture, or a little more tolerance of a small misbehavior prevents a bigger misbehavior.
23. The internet makes many things quickly available. If a staff person with internet access can help facilitate, greater knowledge and clarification can be added to the process.

In summary, while the typed out process may look cumbersome, the actual event is a much more fluid event that creates “aha” moments along the way. The visual process seems more compatible with our thinking abilities as noted by Fesmire (2003). This process has been very helpful in making partners of parents, and even in getting information that had been unknown. This method does require a facilitator with a reservoir of knowledge.