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Purpose

Over the past decade, state organizations supporting implementation of school-wide positive behavior interventions and supports (SW-PBIS) have provided evaluation reports to address key questions established by the National Technical Center on Positive Behavior Intervention and Supports (PBIS). While not an exhaustive list of state reports, Illinois, Maryland, and Pennsylvania have provided validity to the science of implementation as described in the Evaluation Blueprint for Schoolwide Positive Behavior Support (Algozine, Horner, Sugai, Barret, Dickey, Eber, Kincaid, Lewis, & Tobin, 2010). This report will include California to the growing list of states that are committed to implementing positive behavioral supports and sharing outcomes as advised by the National Technical Assistance Center on PBIS.

The California Technical Assistance Center on Positive Behavior Interventions and Supports, Inc. (CalTAC-PBIS, Inc.) in collaboration with the National Technical Assistance Center on Positive Behavior Interventions and Supports, University of Oregon and California’s regional offices of education, provide technical assistance and training to meet three important outcomes: to obtain academic achievement gains, to increase behavior and social-emotional development, and increase cultural equity for all stakeholders. For the purposes of this report, CA data is collected through PBIS Assessment and the School-Wide Information System (SWIS) to evaluate results on the implementation fidelity of SW-PBIS (e.g., establishment of school teams) and students’ behavioral outcomes (e.g., office discipline referrals).

This first annual report aims to facilitate the development of an organization’s internal capacity to: identify, adopt, and sustain effective systemic change creating positive pro-social school and community environments through professional development opportunities and technical assistance. Using the PBIS Blueprints as a guide, CalTAC-PBIS, Inc., California’s County Offices of Education, and Special Education Local Plan Areas (SELPA; a consortium of school districts and county offices of education, designed to provide for the special education service needs of children living within a specific geographical region in California), as partners in the California PBIS Coalition (CPC) are working collaboratively in scaling-up PBIS as an integrated multi-tiered system of support (MTSS; Algozine, B., et.al., 2010). This report is intended to guide California’s implementers in sustaining and improving their SW-PBIS implementation, as well as provide relevant and meaningful information to practitioners, researchers, and policymakers.

The purpose of this report is to “tell the story” of the states journey in scaling-up SW-PBIS. The report will focus on five essential data features relating to effective implementation on a large scale: Context (who is participating), input (professional development themes), fidelity (implementation), impact (outcomes), and replication, sustainability, and improvement (systemic change).
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Introduction

Educators, parents, and community stakeholders have a vested interest in improving education in California (CA). While initiatives may come and go along with the political changes at the federal and state level, providing supports to students within a prevention framework is grounded in decades of research from multiple domains in academia. As each year passes, the stakes continuously get higher, both socially and financially for CA citizens.

From 2012 to 2014, out of school suspension (OSS) rates for all ethnicities have steadily decreased (CA Department of Education [CDE], 2014). In particular, recent CDE data reported a decrease in outcome disparities across diverse student sub-groups, with some exception (Losen, Martinez, & Okeloda, 2014). In CA, there has been a significant shift in discipline policy at the local and state levels to address: high rates of out-of-school suspensions for minor problem behaviors, the “school-to-jail” pipeline effect of one-size-fits all discipline policy, and the cultural disparities noted above. This change has resulted in schools identifying and supporting alternative discipline practices to correct student misbehavior. More recently, the shift in CA legislation, the increase in awareness of behavior science, and the commitment from educational leaders to implement evidence-based discipline practices have influenced the scaling-up of SW-PBIS.

School Wide-Positive Behavior Interventions and Supports (SW-PBIS) is often defined as a multi-tiered framework to provide a rich learning environment to support students’ academic and behavioral outcomes. The tiers are structured to provide targeted approaches to address students’ increasingly unique learning needs. Tier 1 provides universal supports for all students. Tier 2 is designed to provide targeted interventions to students whose needs are not met by Tier 1 supports. Lastly, Tier 3 implements individualized, intensive supports for students with the most complex academic, social, mental health, and behavior needs. In CA, like so many other states across the nation, SW-PBIS is garnering significant attention from diverse stakeholders (e.g., educators, policymakers, judicial system, mental health, & researchers) as a means for delivering culturally responsive and equitable disciplinary systems to promote opportunities for student success (e.g., academic, behavioral).

Unlike other states, which have established infrastructure to provide SW-PBIS technical assistance on a large scale, CA has been primarily a grassroots movement in scaling-up SW-PBIS. This evaluation report seeks to provide diverse stakeholders information on the implementation of SW-PBIS across CA schools. In particular, it aims to provide relevant and meaningful information to guide stakeholder decisions on the implementation and evaluation of SW-PBIS practices across CA schools. Data is reported for the academic years of: 2010-11, 2011-12, 2012-13, and, 2013-14.

The School-wide Positive Behavior Interventions and Supports in CA: Past, Present and Future

This evaluation report serves as an inaugural summary on the implementation fidelity of SW-PBIS practices across CA schools for the academic years 2010-11 to 2013-2014. It serves as a
reference for monitoring the progress of implementation fidelity and the scaling-up of PBIS practices in CA. At the local level, it can be used by district and regional leadership teams as they implement and scale-up integrated tiered learning support systems. At regional, state, and national levels, it can support the decision-making efforts of diverse educators, researchers, and policymakers in CA.

How did CA arrive at the current level of implementing SW-PBIS without a formal state sponsored technical assistance center or centralized CA research institute? Past legislation from the state and federal special education sector has encouraged the development, adoption, and implementation of positive behavior support practices to address the specific needs of diverse student populations. For instance, the Hughes Bill of 1993 was adopted by the CA legislature to ensure students with exceptional needs received a functional analysis assessment (FAA) to address serious behaviors impeding progress towards goals and objectives on their individualized education plans (CA Department of Education, 2011). California was the only state to pass this legislation requiring additional procedures beyond a functional behavior assessment (FBA) as noted in the reauthorization of IDEA. The Hughes Bill required each of the state’s regional special education local plan areas (SELPAs) to become responsible for identifying and training behavior intervention case managers (BICM’s) to coordinate and conduct the FAA process. Recently, Governor Jerry Brown has signed legislation (e.g., AB420, AB 1729, AB1909, & AB 2537) to encourage schools to support school discipline practices that emphasize alternatives to out-of-school suspensions.

As indicated, the state encompasses a variety of professional development and technical assistance to support scaling-up of SW-PBIS. The early adopters for scaling-up SW-PBIS in CA began in 1998. Over the past six years, CA has observed a tremendous increase in the number of schools adopting and implementing SW-PBS practices.

**Informal State PBIS Implementation Structure**

Unlike other states having an established infrastructure to provide SW-PBIS technical assistance on a large scale, CA has been primarily a grassroots movement in scaling-up SW-PBIS. In 1998, SW-PBIS formally began scaling-up in Orange County, CA, with fifteen schools from five school districts sharing resources and expertise for implementing PBIS as a three-tiered evidence-based practice. During that same time several school districts in California began exploring PBIS as a schoolwide approach to discipline.

The goal for early adopters of SW-PBIS was to address educational outcomes for students with severe emotional and behavioral disabilities by: increasing the behavior competency of all teachers and parents; creating positive and safe climates at school; using data-based decision making; and research-validated educational practices. In 2009, additional legislation known as the Mental Health Services Act, allowed schools to receive funding to support prevention efforts in schools. SW-PBIS was seen as the bridge between the science of prevention and directly with the general education classroom in order to provide services to all students within general education and special education environments. Without a formal state funded scaling-up model, county offices, districts and schools developed various models of technical assistance to
implement SW-PBIS, many without the required structure for scaling-up PBIS as an evidence-based framework.

Today, the CA Technical Assistance Center on Positive Behavioral Interventions and Supports, Inc. (CalTAC-PBIS, Inc.), the CA PBIS Coalition (CPC), and the National Technical Assistance Center on PBIS are coordinating efforts to establish a formal statewide plan for training schools on an ongoing basis and to promote the fidelity and sustainability of SW-PBIS implementation. The formal statewide trainings are precipitated by the state’s efforts to address and reduce disproportionality in the rates of suspensions and expulsion for students of color and for students with disabilities, and the sense of urgency in responding to the increases in school violence and overall behavior concerns.

On March 31, 2011 at the end of the first statewide PBIS Conference sponsored by the Orange County Department of Education, a group of individuals representing counties from Northern, Central and Southern California met at the first CA PBIS Regional Summit. Outcomes for what became the first of many meetings were 1) to better understand the current status of PBIS in CA, based on statewide data provided by Dr. Robert Horner, 2) establish some common PBIS components across the state, and 3) set up next steps for the group to develop a common vision and practice for PBIS implementation in CA. This group of early adopters matured and grew over the next several years from a CA Technical Assistance Network on PBIS (CalTAN) to what it is today – The CA PBIS Coalition (CPC). CPC formed in 2011 as an expert body of PBIS practitioners in CA. The Coalition subsequently agreed on the premise that all students thrive in safe and positive learning environments. The Coalition’s purpose is to promote safe and positive social cultures in all CA school communities by sharing effective and evidence-based academic, behavior and mental health practices, provide opportunities for networking and support learning of the PBIS implementation blueprint and sustainable practices.

The CPC leadership meets via video-conferencing one time per month with at least two face-to-face whole day summits each year with the members-at-large. The major accomplishments of the CPC include:

- Establishing recommendations for the statewide criteria defining a PBIS school
- A preliminary statewide structure for providing technical assistance, defining the core elements of training following the National Blueprints, collaboration, coaching network and communication for PBIS schools

This formal organizational infrastructure proposed by the CPC supports the contextual fit for professional development specific to regions in CA, while maintaining a cohesive approach to identify, adopt, and sustain PBIS as an integrated multi-tiered system of support. The formal statewide trainings are precipitated by 1) the state’s efforts to address and reduce disproportionality rates of suspensions and expulsion for students of color and for students with disabilities, 2) by the sense of urgency in responding to the increases in school violence and bullying, and 3) the ongoing achievement gap between students of color and their peers.

The purpose of this report is to indicate current trends supported by the five essential features, related to the initial phase of SW-PBIS implementation across CA schools for the academic years 2010-11 to 2013-2014.
Context

The goals, objectives, and activities of scaling-up SW-PBIS in CA are evaluated with the context in mind (Missouri Schoolwide Positive Behavior Support, Annual Report, 2013). The following questions assist in identifying capacity for implementation, assessing expected and actual implementation, and evaluating expected and achieved outcomes and evidence of performance (Algozzine, B., et.al., 2010, p3).

What are the goals and objective for CA SW-PBIS implementation?

The goals for implementing CA SW-PBIS are to: a) continue regional collaboration and integration with state/regional initiatives; b) establish a statewide multi-tiered data system to achieve positive student outcomes (Tiered Fidelity Inventory – TFI); c) integrate behavior, academic and social-emotional evidence-based practices; d) expand Tier III support models to include person-centered approaches and quality of life features and; e) emphasize the core elements of training and TA in alignment with the PBIS Blueprints for professional development, implementation and data for decision-making. The core elements of implementation are as follows:

- **Exploration and Installation**
  - **District and Regional Leadership Team**: establish District Leadership Team and develop District Implementation (school adoption, training and TA support, district trainers, coaches and evaluation personnel, and district development of behavioral expertise) and Evaluation Plans (fidelity and student outcome data for decision-making) using the **District Capacity Assessment** (Ward, C., St. Martin, K., Horner, R., Duda, M., Ingram-West, K., Tedesco, M., Putnam, D., Buenrostro, M., & Chaparro, E., 2015) as a planning tool
  - **School-based Team Training and Coaching**: administration and behavior specialists introduction to Multi-tiered Behavior Support Framework, school staff introduction and formal commitment from administration and faculty for integrated MTSS
  - **District and Regional Capacity**: funding, visibility, policy and political support addressed; assessment and planning for district capacity in training, coaching and on-going evaluation of MTSS behavior support content

- **Implementation**
  - **District and Regional Leadership Team**: follow up on action plans from the **District Capacity Assessment** supporting implementation plan, policy support and data systems required for team based decision making within an integrated MTSS
  - **School-based Team Training and Coaching**: 4-6 days of training at each tier for school-based expert teams and coaches (external/internal) with adaptations for high school and early childhood implementation
  - **District and Regional Capacity**: support training, coaching, TA and evaluation

- **Full Implementation and Elaboration**
  - **District and Regional Leadership Team**: trainers, coaches and evaluation personnel with behavioral expertise established
School-based team Training and Coaching: scaling up additional cohorts of schools/districts for district-wide/region-wide implementation

District and Regional Capacity: support sustainable integrated MTSS framework with data-based decision making teams and adjustments to shifts in social culture and demographics of the district/region

Who will provide support for CA SW-PBIS implementation?

School-wide PBIS trainings and technical assistance are being provided by the California Technical Assistance Center of PBIS, Inc. and the 8 Regional Leads within the CA K-12 School Mental Health Initiative through 24 County Offices of Education. These PBIS trainers/facilitators/coaches are supported by the CA PBIS Coalition (CPC) the CA Technical Assistance Center on PBIS, Inc., the OSEP Technical Assistance Center on PBIS, and various universities involved in scaling up PBIS across the nation. Below is the CA state scaling-up model agreed upon by the CPC:

- California County Superintendents Educational Services
  - Provide, coordinate, monitor and support PBIS as an integrative MTSS model addressing School Climate, Academic Achievement and Social Emotional Learning in Culturally Relevant Environments.

- California Department of Education
  - State Endorsement and Sponsorship of PBIS as an MTSS Model addressing School Climate, Academic Achievement and Social Emotional Learning in Culturally Relevant Environments.

- Region Implementation Teams
  - CCESA K-12 SMHI Region Coordinators & CalTAC-PBIS provide, Coaching, Coordination and Technical Support to County and District Teams following the PBIS Blueprints and focus on the Key Features of PBIS promoting a system of care in an integrative MTSS model.

- County Implementation Teams
  - County Implementation Teams provide training and technical support for District Implementation Teams following National Blueprints, the recognition of District model PBIS schools, support District internal and external coaches and District Trainers, and use county-wide data for decision making.

- District Implementation Team
  - District Implementation Teams provide systemic district structure required to scale-up PBIS as an integrative MTSS model addressing School Climate, Academic Achievement and Social Emotional Learning in Culturally Relevant Environments.

- School Implementation Team
  - School Implementation Teams implement the Core PBIS Features in a MTSS, using data for decision-making, evidenced based practices and systems to support the fidelity of implementation.

Feedback Loops
- Systems for Implementation/ Data Based Decision Making
- PBIS Evaluations (Pre K-High School)
- District Capacity Assessment
- PBIS Applications (Pre K-High School)
- Suspension/ Expulsion Data
- Data on Academic Progress
- Graduation Rates
- Special Education

Student Equity

Provide, coordinate, monitor and support PBIS as an integrative MTSS model addressing School Climate, Academic Achievement and Social Emotional Learning in Culturally Relevant Environments.
Who will receive support during SW-PBIS implementation?

Table 1 reports the number of schools adopting PBIS across school types across academic years 2010-11 to 2013-14, based on PBIS Assessments and SWIS.

Table 1
Running Total of SW-PBIS Schools across Academic Years 2010-11 to 2013-14

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School Type</th>
<th>2010-11</th>
<th>2011-12</th>
<th>2012-13</th>
<th>2013-14</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pre K-K</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pre K-8</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pre K-12</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elementary</td>
<td>185</td>
<td>271</td>
<td>321</td>
<td>415</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Middle</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>132</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alternative/Juvenile</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Justice</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Running Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>335</strong></td>
<td><strong>463</strong></td>
<td><strong>592</strong></td>
<td><strong>813</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Figure 1 reports the running total of school types implementing SW-PBIS across academic years 2010-11 to 2013-14. As shown, elementary schools represented more than half of the schools implementing SW-PBIS practices, followed by middle schools. From 2012-2013 to 2013-14, there has been an increase number of CA schools identified as Pre K-8, Pre K-12, Alternative/Juvenile Justice, and Others.

**Input**

*Input outlines the steps initiated to meet the needs, address the problems, and to obtain professional development outcomes on a continuous basis prior to full implementation (Algozine, B., et.al., 2010, p.8).*

**What professional development was part of CA SW-PBIS implementation support?**

A continuum of supports designed to increase knowledge, skill fluency, application and policy for PBIS leadership teams, implementation teams, trainers and coaches to implement SW-PBIS with fidelity in a culturally or contextually responsive manner maximizing academic, behavior, social-emotional and protective factors is being provided by state-wide collaborative TA Centers. These TA Centers (regional offices of education, SELPA’s, and the California Technical Assistance Center on PBIS) use the National PBIS Blueprints to provide multi-tiered TA to increase the LEA’s capacity to establish sustainable and scalable data driven, multi-tiered implementation systems for effective and efficient relevant behavior support practices.
The professional development provides 4-6 days of school-based expert PBIS team training plus an additional 2-4 days of coaches training and collaboration to meet Tier I critical elements outlined in the PBIS Implementation Blueprint. Team Initiated Problem Solving (TIPS II) is being used as the data-based decision-making model and schools are using PBIS Assessment Tools to measure fidelity of implementation. CA Schools/Districts use a variety of School Information Systems to progress monitor behavior and academic data with varying levels of efficacy.

As a common practice District and School Implementation teams use the District and School Readiness Surveys in the exploration phase of implementation and continue to evaluate progress and action plan using the Team Implementation Checklist (TIC), the Benchmark of Quality (BOQ), and the School-wide Evaluation Tool (SET). CA PBIS schools will be encouraged to use the newly developed Tiered Fidelity Inventory (TFI) and the District Capacity Assessment (DCA) to develop and sustain SW-PBIS implementation.

Tier II team trainings range from 2-4 days with an additional 2-3 meeting times for Coaches Networks and/or Communities of Practice. Tier II teams add the Benchmark of Advanced Tiers (BAT) and/or the newly designed TFI to their progress monitoring and action planning process. CICO-SWIS is encouraged for Tier II progress monitoring student outcomes. Tier III trainings represent an intensive behavior assessment and the development of an individual behavior support plan. Various Function-based models are being used by different TA Centers (i.e., Prevent-Teach-Reinforce, Dunlop et. al., 2010 & Loman, S., Strickland-Cohen, K., Borgmeier, C., & Horner, R. (2013). Basic FBA to BSP Training.) Tier III teams are introduced to and encouraged to use ISIS-SWIS for progress monitoring and decision-making of individual support plans.

Who participated in the professional development?

Currently, California does not have the infrastructure or centralized data system to identify participants by professional title. From a qualitative perspective, regional trainers emphasize team membership be diversified and representative of the school site. For example, a tier 1 teams is recommended to include an administrator, behavior expert, a PBIS coach, a general education teacher and special education teacher, a parent, classified staff, and other personnel relevant to the school site. As training becomes more contextualized to the function and role of the team at each tier, teams will be asked to expand the team membership (for example, mental health, security resource officers, and tier 2/3 coordinators.)

Fidelity

Fidelity is defined as the integrity of program implementation based on its original design and the resources allocated to it (Algozine, B., et.al., 2010, p 12; MO Schoolwide Positive Behavior Support, Annual Report, 2013).
Are CA schools implementing School-wide PBIS with Fidelity and to Criterion?

There are several measures associated with SW-PBIS that can be used to gauge implementation fidelity of PBIS practices. While the SET is the tool of choice for several states (e.g., Florida, Illinois) in measuring fidelity of implementation, CA has never had a formal centralized data arm to collect implementation data nor to influence criteria across the state. For the purposes of this report, data collected on the Self-Assessment Survey (SAS; Sugai, Horner, & Todd, 2003), the Team Implementation Checklist 3.1 (TIC; Rossetto-Dickey, Conley, & Cave, 2011), the Benchmark of Quality (BOQ; Kincaid, Childs, & George, 2010), and the School Evaluation Tool (SET; Sugai, Lewis-Palmer, Horner, and Todd, 2001) are presented.

Collectively, the purpose of these PBIS assessment tools is to provide schools actionable data for progress monitoring and guide decision making and action planning to improve student and school outcomes. The SAS is a PBIS-team based questionnaire completed annually, whereas the TIC is completed by individual PBIS team members 3-4 times per year, until reaching 80% fidelity over three consecutive assessments. As schools progress in their SW-PBIS implementation the BOQ is completed for schools to self-assess their implementation status of behavior support systems and identify areas of success and in need of improvement. The SET is designed to determine the extent to which schools are implementing SW-PBS practices, determine training and technical assistance needs, and identify association of implementation fidelity to changes in school outcomes (e.g., safety, social culture). Copies and descriptions of the SAS, TIC, BOQ, and SET are freely accessible online at https://www.pbisapps.org/Applications/Pages/PBIS-Assessment.aspx

Students’ behavior data also provides relevant information to examine the effectiveness of SW-PBIS practices. The School-wide Information System (SWIS) is a data management system for school use to track and monitor student outcome data. This data includes Office Discipline Referrals (ODRs), suspension, expulsion, and disproportionality of discipline referral data by race/ethnicity. Specifically, ODR data is reported in office referrals per day per month, by behavior type, by location, by time of day, by student, by day of the week, by motivation and by student sub-groups (e.g., gender, race/ethnicity). These basic summary reports are used to further “drill down” to obtain valuable comparison data, development of precise problem statements and solution development or intervention plans.

The framework to systematically assess SW-PBIS implementation fidelity using standardized procedures (i.e., SET) requires a cohesive, centralized state-level approach. A limitation to achieve this in CA is restricted by the fact that the state does not have a formal centralized consortium to conduct activities needed to gather and analyze data in establishing statewide practices for implementation fidelity of SW-PBIS. Therefore, for the purposes of this report, results are presented based on data collected on the following PBIS assessments: TIC, SAS, SET, and BOQ. As described below, each instrument assesses an aspect of the school-wide implementation of positive behavior supports. Notably, this data is not aggregated by year of implementation or any other “groupings” but combined for each year, thus not allowing for comparison or longitudinal interpretations and should be interpreted with caution. The data based on these assessments are reported for school types (e.g., elementary, middle and high school) across the academic years 2010-11 to 2013-14.
Team Implementation Checklist (TIC 3.1) TOTAL SCORE

The TIC.3 is a progress monitoring tool for school PBIS teams to track implementation fidelity of SW-PBIS practices. Specifically, the TIC assesses six (6) critical elements of SW-PBIS practices: Commitment; Establish and Maintain a Team; Self-Assessment; Establish School-wide Expectations; Classroom Behavior Support Systems; and Building Capacity for Function-Based Support. An overall total score and subscale scores are reported to assist school teams in decision-making activities. A TIC total score exceeding 80% over three consecutive administrations is considered meeting an acceptable level of implementation fidelity.

Figure 2 shows the TIC total scores of Pre K-8 schools across the academic years 2010-11 to 2014-15. From 2010 to 2013, the number of CA schools completing the TIC steadily increased. For the academic years of 2010-11 and 2011-12, the percentages of Pre K-8 schools exceeding criterion were 8.33% and 8.51%. For 2012-13 and 2013-14, it was 8.81% and 30.25%, respectively.

Figure 2. Total Number of Pre K-8 School TIC 3. Total Scores across the Academic Years of 2010-11 to 2014-15.
Figure 3 shows the TIC total scores of elementary schools across the academic years 2010-11 to 2013-2014. As reported, the number of CA schools completing the TIC steadily increased across academic years 2010-2011 to 2013-2014. For 2010-11, 2011-12, and 2012-13, the percentage of elementary schools exceeding criterion also steadily increased: 14.50%, 26.50%, and 36.20%. For 2013-14, 28.99% of schools reported scores above criterion.

![Figure 3. Total Number of Elementary School TIC 3. Total Scores across the Academic Years of 2010-11 to 2013-14.](image)

Figure 4 shows the TIC total scores of middle schools across the academic years 2010-2011 to 2013-14. As reported, the number of CA schools completing the TIC increased steadily across academic years 2010-2011 (N = 82) to 2013-2014 (N = 222). For the academic years of 2010-11, 2011-12, and 2012-13, the percentage of middle schools exceeding criterion steadily increased: 19.51%, 28.10%, and 34.93%, respectively. For 2013-14, 23.42% of schools reported scores above criterion.

![Figure 4. Total Number of Middle School TIC 3. Total Scores across the Academic Years of 2010-11 to 2014-15.](image)
Figure 5 shows the TIC total scores of high schools across academic years 2010-11 to 2013-14. The number of CA schools completing the TIC increased across academic years 2010-11 (N = 37) to 2013-14 (N = 118). The percentage of schools exceeding TIC criterion scores fluctuated across academic years. For example, for the academic years of 2010-11, 2011-12, and 2012-13, the percentage of schools exceeding criterion was: 8.11%, 7.02%, and 2.48%, respectively. For 2013-14, 16.95% of schools reported scores above criterion.

Figure 5. Total Number of High School TIC 3. Total Scores across the Academic Years of 2010-11 to 2014-15.

Figure 6 shows the TIC total scores of Alternative/Juvenile Justice schools across academic years 2010-2011 to 2013-2014. The number of CA schools completing the TIC increased steadily across academic years 2011-12 (N = 23) to 2013-14 (N = 58). For 2010-11, no schools (N=12) reached TIC criterion. For 2010-11, 2011-12, and 2012-13, the percentage of Alternative/Juvenile Justice schools exceeding criterion was: 17.39%, 14.63%, and 18.97%, respectively.

Figure 6. Total Number of Alternative/Juvenile Justice School TIC 3. Total Scores across the Academic Years of 2010-11 to 2013-14.
The School-wide Self-Assessment Survey (SAS)

The SAS is a measure completed annually by all staff to assess perception on the status and priority for school-wide improvement of PBIS features. Areas of focus include: school-wide discipline; non-classroom management systems; classroom management systems; and, systems for individual students engaging in chronic problem behaviors. Scores are reported as percentages indicating extent to which features are *In-Place* and areas of priority for improvement. SAS results are provided as the percent of overall school-wide features reported *In-Place*.

Figure 7 shows the SAS scores of Pre K-8 schools across academic years 2010-11 to 2013-14. The number of schools completing the SAS increased across academic years. In general, the percent of features identified as *In-Place* varied, and generally ranged between 31-40% and 61-70% while the N increased from 12 (2010) to 58 schools (2013).

*Figure 7. Pre K-8 School SAS scores across Academic Years from 2010-2011 to 2013-2014.*
Figure 8 shows the SAS scores of elementary schools across academic years 2010-11 to 2013-14. The number of schools completing the SAS increased across academic years of 2010 (N = 130) to 2013 (N = 276). In general, the percent of features identified as *In-Place* varied, with 79.78% of the total scores falling between 21-30% and 61-70%.

[Graph of Elementary School SAS scores across Academic Years from 2010-11 to 2013-14]

*Figure 8. Elementary School SAS scores across Academic Years from 2010-11 to 2013-14.*

Figure 9 shows the SAS scores of middle schools across academic years 2010-11 to 2013-14. The number of schools completing the SAS increased across academic years of 2010 (N = 50) to 2013 (N = 96). In general, the percent of features identified as *In-Place* fell within the low-to-middle score range, with 73.33% of the scores falling between 21-30% and 51-60%.

[Graph of Middle School SAS scores across Academic Years from 2010-11 to 2013-14]

*Figure 9. Middle School SAS scores across Academic Years from 2010-11 to 2013-14.*
Figure 10 shows the SAS scores of high schools across academic years 2010-11 to 2013-2014. The number of schools completing the SAS increased across academic years of 2010-11 (N = 25) to 2013-14 (N = 51). In general, the percent of features identified as In-Place fell within the middle score range, with 92.93% of the scores falling between 21-30% and 61-70%.

![Figure 10. High School SAS scores across Academic Years from 2010-2011 to 2013-2014.](image)

**School-wide Evaluation Tool (SET)**

The SET is an observational tool completed by an external, trained evaluator designed to assess the critical features of SW-PBIS. The seven (7) critical features include: Expectations Defined; Behavior Expectations Taught; Rewarding Expectations; System for Responding to Behavioral Violations; Decision-Making; Management; and, District-level Support. SET total and subscale scores are reported as percentages, with a criterion score equal to or exceeding 80% indicating acceptable implementation fidelity. SET total scores are reported for the following schools: Pre K-8, elementary, middle, and high school.
Figure 11 shows the SET scores of Pre K-8 schools across academic years 2010-11 to 2013-14. The number of schools completing the SAS increased across academic years of 2010-11 (N = 5) to 2013-14 (N = 12). Overall, SET scores fall at the upper end of the score scale, namely 71-80% and higher.

**Figure 11.** Pre K-8 school SET total scores across academic years 2010-11 to 2013-14.

Figure 12 shows the SET scores of elementary schools across academic years 2010-11 to 2013-14. The number of schools completing the SAS increased across academic years of 2010-11 (N = 97) to 2013-14 (N = 139). The percentage of SET scores that exceeded criterion ranged from 60.82% (2010-11) to 76.86% (2011-12), and was 75.54% for 2013-14.

**Figure 12.** Total number of PBIS elementary school SET total scores across academic years 2010-11 to 2013-14.
Figure 13 shows the SET scores of middle schools across the academic years of 2010-11 to 2013-14. The number of schools completing the SAS increased across academic years of 2010-11 (N = 97) to 2013-14 (N = 139). The percentage of SET scores that exceeded criterion ranged from 60.82% (2010-2011) to 76.86% (2011-2012).

Figure 13. Total number of PBIS middle school SET total scores across academic years 2010-11 to 2013-14.

Figure 14 shows the SET scores of high schools across academic years 2010-11 to 2013-14. The number of schools completing the SAS increased across academic years of 2010-11 (N = 13) to 2012-13 (N = 24). The percentage of SET scores that exceeded criterion ranged from 23.08% (2010-11) to 47.62% (2013-14).

Figure 14. Total number of PBIS high school SET total scores across academic years 2010-11 to 2013-14.
Benchmark of Quality (BOQ)

The BOQ is completed annually by school teams and their external PBIS coach to guide action planning and progress monitoring activities. The instrument assesses ten (10) areas related to the implementation of SW-PBIS: PBIS Team; Faculty Commitment; Discipline Procedures; Data Entry & Analysis; Expectations; Recognition; Teaching; Implementation Plan; Classroom Systems; and Evaluation. Total and subscale scores are reported as percentages, with scores exceeding 70% meeting criterion. Figure 15 reports the annual increase in the number of CA schools using the BOQ for self-assessment and action planning purposes.

![Figure 15](image)

**Figure 15.** Total number of CA schools reporting BOQ data by grade-level across academic years 2010-11 to 2013-14.

Figure 16 reports BOQ total scores across school types for the academic years 2010-11 to 2013-14. Among Pre K-8 schools, scores ranged from 65.98% (2012-13) to 81.46% (2013-14). The scores of elementary schools ranged from 71.96% (2010-11) to 73.83% (2011-12). For middle schools, scores ranged from 71.96% (2011-12) to 64.49% (2012-13). Last, high schools had total scores that ranged from 86.60% (2012-13) to 52.70% (2013-14).

![Figure 16](image)

**Figure 16.** Overall BOQ scores across school types and academic years 2010-11 to 2013-14.
Figure 17 shows the BOQ subscale scores of Pre K-8 schools across academic years 2011-12 to 2013-14. In general, criterion scores were met across multiple years for: PBIS Team, Discipline Procedures, Expectations Developed, and Classroom Plan. Overall lower scores were reported across years for Faculty Commitment, Data Analysis, and Lesson Plans.

![Bar chart showing BOQ element scores for Pre K-8 schools across academic years 2011-12 to 2013-14.](image)

**Figure 17.** Pre K-8 school BOQ element scores for academic years 2010-11 to 2013-14.

Figure 18 shows the BOQ subscale scores of elementary schools across the academic years 2010-11 to 2013-14. In general, criterion scores were met across multiple years for: PBIS Team, Expectations Developed, and Crisis Plan. Overall, lower scores were reported across years for: Faculty Commitment, Data Analysis, and Lesson Plans.

![Bar chart showing BOQ element scores for elementary schools across academic years 2010-11 to 2013-14.](image)

**Figure 18.** Elementary school BOQ element scores for academic years 2010-11 to 2013-14.
Figure 19 shows the BOQ subscale scores of middle schools across the academic years 2010-11 to 2013-14. In general, criterion scores were met across multiple years for: PBIS Team, Expectations Developed, and Crisis Plan. Overall, lower scores were reported across years for: Faculty Commitment, Reward Program, and Lesson Plans.

Figure 19. Middle school BOQ element scores for academic years 2010-11 to 2013-14.

Figure 20 shows the BOQ subscale scores of high schools across academic years 2010-11 to 2013-14. As shown, the number of schools completing the BOQ increased from 1 school in 2010-2011 to 20 for 2013-2014. Across years, PBIS Team scores met the criterion level of 70%, whereas scores across the other elements varied.

Figure 20. High School BOQ Element Scores for Academic Years 2010-2011 to 2013-2014.
Figure 21 shows the BOQ subscale scores of Alternative/JJ schools across the academic years 2011-2012 to 2013-2014. The number of schools completing the BOQ increased from 3 school in 2011-2012 to 13 for the 2013-2014 school year. Areas in which criterion scores were met across multiple years included: PBIS Team, Discipline Procedures, Expectations Developed, and Classroom Plan. As shown, scores across the other areas were more varied.

Figure 21. Alternative/Juvenile Justice School BOQ Element Scores for Academic Years 2010-2011 to 2013-2014.

To what Extent does implementation of SW-PBIS Result in Safer Schools?

School Safety Survey (SSS)

The SSS is completed annually by school personnel (e.g., principal, staff), students and parents to identify school-wide risk and protective factors. The scale includes distinct risk (17 items) and protective (16 items) subscales rated on a 4-point scale (Not at All to Extensive) with scores reported as percentages (range: 0 – 100%). Higher risk scores indicate higher levels of factors associated with school violence, whereas higher protective scores are associated with schools having mechanisms in place to address school violence. Risk and protective factor scores are designed to assist schools in identifying strategies to promote school safety and violence prevention. Risk and protective factor scores are reported for school types (e.g., Pre K-8, elementary) across the academic years 2010-2011 to 2013-2014.
Figure 22 reports the risk scores for Pre K-8 schools across the academic years 2010-11 to 2013-14. The number of schools completing the SSS has steadily increased across academic years. As shown, there are more schools with lower risk factors over time.

Figure 22. PBIS Pre K-8 School Safety Risk scores across Academic Years from 2010-11 to 2013-14.

Figure 23 reports the protective scores for Pre K-8 schools across the academic years 2010-11 to 2013-14. As reported, the number of schools completing the SSS has steadily increased across academic years. As shown, there is an increasing trend in protective factors over time.

Figure 23. PBIS Pre K-8 School Safety Protection scores across Academic Years from 2010-11 to 2013-14.
Figure 24 reports the risk scores for elementary schools across the academic years 2010-11 to 2013-14. The number of schools completing the SSS has steadily increased across academic years. As shown, risk scores varied and show a decreasing trend in risk indicators over time.
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**Figure 24.** PBIS Elementary School Safety Risk scores across Academic Years from 2010 - 2013

Figure 25 reports the protective scores for elementary schools across the academic years 2010-11 to 2013-14. The number of schools completing the SSS has generally remained steady across academic years, except for the noted increase for 2012-13. As shown, there is an increasing trend in protective factors over time.

![Protection Scores Chart]

**Figure 25.** PBIS Elementary School Safety Protection scores across Academic Years from 2010-11 to 2013-14.
Figure 26 reports the risk scores for middle schools across the academic years 2010-11 to 2013-14. The number of schools completing the SSS ranged between 24 (2011-2012) to 44 (2012-2013). As shown, risk factors decrease over time.

![Figure 26. PBIS Middle School Safety Risk scores across Academic Years from 2010-11 to 2013-14.](image)

Figure 27 reports the protective scores for middle schools across the academic years 2010-11 to 2013-14. Protective scores show an increasing trend over time.

![Figure 27. PBIS Middle School Safety Protection scores across Academic Years from 2010-11 to 2013-14.](image)
Figure 28 reports the risk scores for high schools across the academic years 2010-11 to 2013-14. The number of schools completing the instrument ranged between 14 (2011-12) to 34 (2012-13). In general, risk scores vary and show a decreasing trend in risk factors.

Figure 28. PBIS High School Safety Risk scores across Academic Years from 2010 to 2013-14.

Figure 29 reports the protective scores for high schools across the academic years 2010-11 to 2013-14. For any given year, protective scores generally exceeded 51-60%, with most scores falling within the interval of 71-80% demonstrating an increasing trend in protective factors over time.

Figure 29. PBIS High School Safety Protection scores across Academic Years from 2010-11 to 2013-14.
Impact

Office Discipline Referrals (ODRs), are defined as indicators for this report to specify the intended and unintended outcomes and provide rationale for maintaining implementation activities, making revisions, and improvements (Algozzine, B., et.al, 2010, p.23).

Office Discipline Referral Rates

This section reports ODR data for the academic years 2010-11 to 2013-14. Results are reported by school types (e.g., Pre K-8, elementary, middle and high), problem behavior (e.g., disruption, defiance), and demographics (i.e., gender, race/ethnicity). *Importantly, as with all data in this report, schools are not aggregated by cohort, or, by phase of implementation status. Therefore, the data should be viewed with caution as it may not reflect the true outcomes by school types according to the implementation level. As previously reported, behavior data was obtained from the SWIS data management system.

Figure 30 reports major ODRs across school types and the academic years 2010-11 to 2013-14. Overall, the average ODR rate for Pre K-8, elementary, middle, and Alternative/Juvenile Justices schools varied across academic years. However, among high schools, the average rate showed a steady decline from .333 (2010-11) to .18 (2013-14). Note that these data are only from schools implementing PBIS and using SWIS for one full year.

Figure 30. Major ODRs across School Types and Academics Years 2010-11 to 2013-14.
ODRs by Gender

Figure 31 reports major ODRs by gender among Pre K-8 schools for academic years 2010-11 to 2013-14. Males consistently had higher average percent of ODRs than females for each year, and ranged from 77.60% (2010-11) to 80.70% (2012-13) and 78.90% in 2013-14.

Figure 31. ODRs by Gender for Pre K-8 Schools across Academics Years 2010-11 to 2013-14.

Figure 32 reports major ODRs by gender among elementary schools for academic years 2010-11 to 2013-14. Males consistently had higher average percent of ODRs than females for each year with values above 80%.

Figure 32. ODRs by gender for elementary school across academics years 2010-11 to 2013-14.
Figure 3.3 reports major ODRs by gender among middle schools for academic years 2010-11 to 2013-14. As shown, males consistently had higher average percent of ODRs, comprising slightly more than 70% compared to about 30% for females.

Figure 3.3. ODRs by gender for middle schools across academics years 2010-11 to 2013-14.

Figure 3.4 reports major ODRs by gender among high schools for academic years 2010-11 to 2013-14. As shown, males consistently had higher average percent of ODRs than females for each year, with values ranging in the low 60%; while females were in the mid 30% range.

Figure 3.4. ODRs by gender for high schools across academics years 2010-11 to 2013-14.
Figure 35 reports major ODRs by gender among alternative/Juvenile Justice schools for academic years 2010-11 to 2013-14. Males comprised approximately 80% of the ODRs for any given academic year, compared to approximately 20% for females.

**Figure 35** ODRs by gender for Alternative/Juvenile Justice schools across academics years 2010-11 to 2013-14.

**ODR by Problem Behavior**

This section reports the average percent of ODR by problem behavior across academic years.

Figure 36 reports major ODRs by problem behavior among Pre K-8 schools for academic years 2010 to 2014. As shown, ODRs due to defiance/insubordination/non-compliance were highest for the 2010-11, but declined each subsequent year. ODRs due to physical aggression increased. ODRs due to disruption comprised the third highest rate of ODRs, with increasing rates.

**Figure 36.** ODRs by problem behavior for Pre K-8 schools across academics years 2010-11 to 2013-14.
Figure 37 reports major ODRs by problem behavior among elementary schools for academic years 2010-11 to 2013-14. ODRs due to physical aggression comprised the highest percent across years, with rates steadily increasing. ODRs due to defiance/insubordination/non-compliance comprised the second highest rate, with values decreasing over years. The third highest percent of ODRs was due to fighting with decreasing trend across years.

Figure 37. ODRs by problem behavior for elementary schools across academics years 2010-11 to 2013-14.

Figure 38 reports major ODRs by problem behavior among middle schools for academic years 2010-11 to 2013-14. ODRs due to defiance/insubordination/non-compliance comprised the highest percent across years with a significant decreasing trend. ODRs due to disruption were the second highest also with a decreasing trend. There is an increase in tardiness for the 2013-14.

Figure 38. ODRs by problem behavior for middle schools across academics years 2010-11 to 2013-14.
Figure 39 reports major ODRs by problem behavior among high schools for academic years 2010-11 to 2013-14. ODRs due to defiance/insubordination/non-compliance and truancy increased steadily across years, with a noticeable drop in the rates of truancy for 2013-14. ODRs attributed to skipping class and tardy were also notable but more varied across years.

Figure 39. ODRs by problem behavior for high schools across academics years 2010-11 to 2013-14.

Figure 40 reports major ODRs by problem behavior among alternative/Juvenile Justice schools for academic years 2010-11 to 2013-14. ODRs due to defiance/insubordination/non-compliance were the highest across years. An increase in ODRs due to language/inappropriate language/profanity across years was reported, whereas those attributed to physical aggression decreased.

Figure 40. ODRs by problem behavior for Alternative/Juvenile Justice schools across academics years 2010-11 to 2013-14.
**Students with Referrals by Race/ethnicity**

This section reports the percent of student ODRs by race/ethnicity across academic years 2010-11 to 2013-14. In particular, the data reports the percent of student school enrollment by race/ethnicity and referrals. Information provides a basis to identify the extent to which specific student ethnic groups may be overrepresented in referrals as compared to their enrollment.

Figure 41 reports percent of student race/ethnicity enrollment and referrals for Pre K-8 schools across academics years 2010-11 to 2013-14. Across years, Hispanic/Latino students comprised an average of 44.83% of school enrollment and 38.10% of referrals. White students comprised 31.38% of school enrollment and 41.18% of referrals, whereas African American students comprised 7.05% of school enrollment and 13.20% of referrals. Lastly, Asian students represented 7.30% of enrollment and 2.55% of referrals.

*Figure 41*. Percent of student race/ethnicity enrollment and referrals for Pre K-8 schools across academics years 2010-11 to 2013-14.
Figure 42 reports percent of student race/ethnicity enrollment and referrals for elementary schools across academics years 2010-11 to 2013-14. Across years, Hispanic/Latino students comprised an average of 54.83% of school enrollment and 54.12% of referrals. White students comprised 23.10% of school enrollment and 27.64% of referrals, whereas African Americans comprised 5.30% of school enrollment and 10.84% of referrals. Lastly, Asian students represented 9.15% of enrollment and 4.32% of referrals.

Figure 42. Percent of student race/ethnicity enrollment and referrals for elementary schools across academics years 2010-11 to 2013-14.
Figure 43 reports percent of student race/ethnicity enrollment and referrals for middle schools across academics years 2010-11 to 2013-14. Across years, Hispanic/Latino students comprised an average of 48.65% of the total school enrollment and 58.43% of referrals. African Americans comprised 4.85% of school enrollment and, on average, comprised 8.33% of referrals. Comparatively, white students represented 29.33% of enrollment and 25.63% of referrals, whereas Asian students comprised 12.35% of enrollment and 4.60% of referrals, respectively.

*Figure 43. Percent of student race/ethnicity enrollment and referrals for middle schools across academics years 2010-11 to 2013-14.*
Figure 44 reports percent of student race/ethnicity enrollment and referrals for high schools across academics years 2010-11 to 2013-14. Across years, Hispanic/Latino students comprised an average of 59.58% of school enrollment and 63.35% of referrals. White students comprised 23.38% of school enrollment and 25.78% of referrals, whereas African Americans comprised 4.40% of school enrollment and 5.43% of referrals. Lastly, Asian students represented 9.58% of enrollment and 3.83% of referrals.

Figure 44. Percent of student race/ethnicity enrollment and referrals for high schools across academics years 2010-11 to 2013-14.
Figure 45 reports percent of student race/ethnicity enrollment and referrals for alternative/Juvenile Justice schools across academics years 2010-11 to 2013-14. Across years, Hispanic/Latino students comprised an average of 63.83% of school enrollment and 58.53% of referrals. White students comprised 24.68% of school enrollment and 24.50% of referrals. African Americans comprised 5.23% of school enrollment and 13.30% of referrals. Lastly, Asian students represented 2% of enrollment and 2.15% of referrals.

![Bar chart showing enrollment and referrals by race/ethnicity across academic years.]

Figure 46. Percent of student race/ethnicity enrollment and referrals for Alternative/Juvenile Justice schools across academics years 2010-11 to 2013-14.

**Major ODRs by Location**

This section reports the percent of ODRs according to the location in which they occurred. Data is reported across school type (e.g., Pre K-8, elementary) and academic years 2010-11 to 2013-14.
Figure 46 reports the percent of ODRs referrals assigned by location for Pre K-8 schools for the academic years 2010-11 to 2013-14. Approximately half of ODRs originated in the classroom, followed by about 25% on the playground. Areas in which ODRs are increasingly occurring is the cafeteria and the hallway/breezeway.

![Figure 46. ODRs by location for Pre K-8 schools across academics years 2010-2011 to 2013-14.](image)

Figure 47 reports the percent of ODRs referrals assigned by location for elementary schools for the academic years 2010-11 to 2013-14. Across years, slightly more than 40% of ODRs originated in the classroom, followed by less than 35% on the playground. Areas in which ODRs are increasingly occurring is the cafeteria and the hallway/breezeway, with slight decreases with those reported in the bathroom/restroom and bus.

![Figure 47. ODRs by location for elementary schools across academics years 2010-11 to 2013-14.](image)
Figure 48 reports the percent of ODRs referrals assigned by location for middle schools for the academic years 2010-11 to 2013-14. The majority of ODRs originated in the classroom and ranged between 66.50% (2011-12) and 54.80% (2013-14). The remaining areas each accounted for less than 10% of the areas in which ODRs occurred.

Figure 48. ODRs by location for middle schools across academics years 2010-11 to 2013-14.

Figure 49 reports the percent of ODRs referrals assigned by location for high schools for the academic years 2010-11 to 2013-14. Across years, the majority of ODRs originated in the classroom and ranged between 79.90% (2012-13) and 57.20% (2013-14). The remaining areas each accounted for less than 20% of the areas in which ODRs occurred.

Figure 49. ODRs by location for high schools across academics years 2010-11 to 2013-14
Figure 50 reports the percent of ODRs referrals assigned by location for alternative/Juvenile Justice schools for the academic years 2010-11 to 2013-14. Across years, the majority of ODRs originated in the classroom and ranged between 56.60% (2010-11) and 69.60% (2013-14). The remaining areas each accounted for less than 10% of the areas in which ODRs occurred.

![Figure 50](image)

**Figure 50.** Alternative/Juvenile Justice school office discipline referrals by location for academic years 2010-11 to 2013-14.

**Average Out-of School-Suspension Days Per 100 Students Report**

This section reports out-of-school (OSS) suspension data across school types for the academic years 2010-11 to 2013-14. Specifically, suspension data is reported for: OSS students per 100 students, OSS events per 100 students, and OSS days per 100 students.

Figure 51 reports Pre K-8 school average OSS students per 100 Students, events per 100 students, and OSS days per 100 students for academic years 2010-11 to 2013-14. The average number of OSS students per 100 students ranged between 3.82 (2010-11) to 3.67 (2013-14). The average OSS events per 100 students ranged between 5.39 (2010-11) to 7.75 (2013-14). Last, the average OSS days per 100 students ranged from 8.57 (2010-11) to 10.74 (2013-14).
Figure 51. Pre K-8 school average OSS students per 100 students, events per 100 students, and OSS Days per 100 students for academic years 2010-11 to 2013-14.

Figure 52 reports elementary school average OSS students per 100 students, events per 100 students, and OSS days per 100 students for academic years 2010-11 to 2013-14. The average number of OSS students per 100 students ranged between 1.94 (2010-11) to 1.63 (2013-14). The average OSS events per 100 students ranged between 2.92 (2010-11) to 2.95 (2013-14). Last, the average OSS days per 100 students ranged from 4.51 (2010-11) to 3.64 (2013-14).

Figure 52. Elementary school average OSS students per 100 students, events per 100 students, and OSS days per 100 students for academic years 2010-11 to 2013-14. Figure 53 reports middle
Middle school average OSS students per 100 Students, events per 100 students, and OSS days per 100 students for academic years 2010-11 to 2013-14.

The average number of OSS students per 100 students ranged between 6.39 (2010-11) to 5.37 (2013-14).

The average OSS events per 100 students ranged between 10.15 (2010-11) to 9.56 (2013-14).

Last, the average OSS days per 100 students ranged from 21.34 (2010-11) to 17.67 (2013-14).

*Figure 53.* Middle school average OSS students per 100 students, events per 100 students, and OSS days per 100 students for academic years 2010-2011 to 13-14.
Figure 54 reports high school average OSS students per 100 students, events per 100 students, and OSS days per 100 students for academic years 2010-11 to 2013-14.

The average number of OSS students per 100 students ranged between 2.01 (2010-11) to 4.59 (2013-14).

The average OSS events per 100 students ranged between 5.40 (2011-12) to 7.29 (2013-14).

Last, the average OSS days per 100 students ranged from 5.16 (2010-11) to 18.08 (2013-14).

Figure 54. High school average OSS students per 100 students, events per 100 students, and OSS days per 100 students for academic years 2010-11 to 2013-14.
Figure 55 reports alternative/Juvenile Justice school average OSS students per 100 students, events per 100 students, and OSS days per 100 students for academic years 2010-11 to 2013-14. The average number of OSS by students per 100 students ranged from 22.79 (2010-11) to 24.38 (2013-14). OSS events per 100 students ranged between 71.58 (2010-11) to 49.72 (2013-14). Last, the average OSS days per 100 students ranged from 148.55 (2010-11) to 80.64 (2013-14).

Figure 55. Alternative/Juvenile Justice school average OSS students per 100 students, events per 100 students, and OSS days per 100 students for academic years 2010-11 to 2013-14.

Is School-wide PBIS resulting in positive outcomes for CA students?

As schools scale-up multi-tiered frameworks, school staff are using office discipline referrals (ODRs) to support team-based decisions to provide students with appropriate levels of interventions. Analysis of ODRs indicates several salient features and utility for using ODRs as a means of improving student outcomes and the behavior climate in schools (Irvin, Tobin, Sprague, Sugai, & Vincent, 2004). Research supports the use of ODRs as an efficient and valid means of making effective decisions in elementary and middle schools (Irvin, Horner, Ingram, Todd, Sugai, Sampson, & Boland, 2006). The benefits of integrating academic and behavior prevention data systems, such as office discipline referrals has been found to be a viable and formidable evidence-based practice in producing student outcomes (McIntosh, Chard, Boland, &Horner, 2006). The following is a brief summary of the current status relating to the utility of ODRs in CA and student outcomes.

REPLICATION, SUSTAINABILITY, AND IMPROVEMENT

Replication, sustainability, and improvement emphasizes the need to replicate, sustain, and improve efforts to implement SW-PBIS with sustained impact (Algozzine, B., et.al., 2010, p. 32). California SW-PBIS evaluated the following questions to show evidence of replication, sustainability and improvement.
To what extent is SWPBS implemented throughout the state and once implemented with fidelity, to what extent do schools sustain SWPBS implementation?

Results noted below indicate that close to 1,000 schools received formal PBIS training since the 2010-11 school year. California currently does not have a systematic method for surveying schools who may not have re-committed to continuous implementation of SW-PBIS.

Table 2
*Number of CA PBIS adopting schools across academic years 2010-11 to 2014-15*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Academic Year</th>
<th>Schools Added</th>
<th>Yearly Totals</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2010-11</td>
<td>223</td>
<td>446</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011-12</td>
<td>180</td>
<td>527</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012-13</td>
<td>308</td>
<td>728</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013-14</td>
<td>366</td>
<td>958</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014-15 (Jan. 2015)</td>
<td>434</td>
<td>1173</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Figure 56 illustrates the cumulative number of SW-PBIS schools in CA from 2010 to 2014.*
The Benchmarks of Quality (BoQ) was used to evaluate the schools ability to sustain and duplicate SW-PBIS features between 2010 to 2014. Sustainability of CA SW-PBIS is observed for elementary and middle schools from 2010 to 2014. The percentage of elementary and middle schools that participated in Tier 1 fidelity evaluation and achieved a threshold for “MET” on criteria on the BoQ showed a favorable trend line since 2010. High schools did not have a large enough sample group during the five year period to establish conclusive assumptions regarding sustainability of SW-PBIS. While there was an increase in the number of high schools using the BoQ from 2010 (n=1) to 2014 (n=20), the high schools overall percentage was below the benchmark of 70% for meeting fidelity of implementation. Overall, results indicate that majority of schools using the BoQ where near, or, at criteria for fidelity of implementation from year to year. The graph below indicates that California is making progress in utilizing fidelity measurements to help assess the sustainability of SW-PBIS.

Figure 57 illustrates the overall BOQ scores from 2010-2013 for Elementary Middle, PreK-8 and High School.
To what extent does CA SW-PBIS implementation support changes in educational/discipline policy?

Recently, California’s education funding model has shifted from a state controlled entity to a district planned function. This new funding model, known as the Local Control Funding Formula (LCFF), is guided by eight priority indicators to support district policy and practices to guide outcomes for schools and student achievement. California school districts are explicitly including SW-PBIS in the priority indicators as part of their Local Control Action Plan (LCAP). Four of the eight priority indicators can directly support the LCAP alignment to SW-PBIS. The four indicators are:

- Parent Involvement: Including parents in the decision-making process in schools
- Pupil Engagement: How schools are addressing chronic absenteeism, dropout, high school graduation rates
- School Climate: How schools are addressing suspension and expulsion rates, safety and school connectedness
- Student Achievement: Addressing how schools are ensuring all students success

The CA SW-PBIS Coalition has been working to build awareness at the state level related to recent state legislation that has shifted how schools discipline students. Two key pieces of legislation to note are AB1729 and AB420. Assembly Bill 1729 (Ammiano, 2012), authorizes the superintendent of a school district or a principal to use alternatives to suspension or expulsion that are developmentally age appropriate and designed to specifically address the root cause of the youth’s misbehavior. Assembly Bill 420 (Dickinson, 2014), eliminates the authority to suspend a pupil enrolled in kindergarten through third grade, and the authority to recommend for expulsion a pupil enrolled in kindergarten through 12 grade, for willful defiance or disrupting school activities. While out of school suspensions in PBIS schools included in this report show a gradual decline in number of students suspended in elementary and middle schools (Figures 53 and 54) the disproportionality ODR data in elementary and middle schools indicate Black students are still twice as likely to be suspended (Figures 42, 43, & 44). As noted previously, this data needs to be interpreted with caution due to the conflicting variables in the data set.

School administrators, teachers and parents have increasingly realized the importance of establishing prevention models that support multi-tiered, evidence-based interventions to address the significant shift in discipline policy at the state level and the disproportionality in suspension and expulsion data. Once the state is able to bring clarity from the ODR data presented in the future, recommendations to improve disciplinary practices will require; (a) in-depth analysis of disproportionality to include a three point data collection with a risk index by ethnicity in relation to SW-PBIS outcome data, (b) examining the current training materials and evaluation tools to address cultural responsiveness, and (c) obtain input from students, parents, and school staff from diverse backgrounds (Vincent, Randall, Cartledge, Tobin, & Swain-Bradshaw, 2012).
SUMMARY

California has made remarkable strides in scaling-up SW-PBIS over the last decade, despite not having a formalized infrastructure. The level of interest to implement SW-PBIS to create safe learning environments has been well established in peer reviewed journals (Waasdorp, Bradshaw, Leaf, 2012). SW-PBIS implementation began as a grassroots efforts in a few schools across California in 1999. Since that time CA SW-PBIS schools have grown to over 818 schools across the state. PBIS High Schools double in size from 2013-2014, while elementary, middle, k-8 and alternative/jj schools continue a positive and consistent growth trajectory (Figure 1).

Currently, SW-PBIS trainings and TA is being provided by 8 Regional Leads within the CA-K-12 School Mental Health Initiative through 24 County Offices of Education and SELPA’s and the California Technical Assistance Center on PBIS, Inc. (Page 8). The CalTAC-PBIS, Inc. TA Center and County Offices of Education develop trainings following implementation and prevention science, use behavior analysis as the theory of action in a multi-tier approach, and support all trainings with coaching and data-based decision making at the classroom, school and district level.

This grassroots scaling up approach has provided Ca schools the opportunity to implement PBIS in direct response to individual school and district need following the National PBIS Blueprints. Ca has been able to develop several model k-12 schools and district-wide implementation sites across the state to support the sustainability and replication of SW-PBIS. PBIS has been successfully implemented with schools achieving criteria on PBIS Assessment fidelity tools (BOQ, TIC, SET) in elementary, middle, high and alternative/JJ settings. Successes in lowering office referrals, suspension, disproportionality and increases in academic achievement, graduation rates, teacher satisfaction and perception of school safety have been reported in school and district-wide outcome data. This same data statewide is not reliable and should be looked at with caution due to our current inability to separate the schools into cohorts based on years of implementation or level of implementation fidelity.

Based on the five essential data features associated with implementation of SW-PBIS on a large scale (e.g., Context, Input, Fidelity, Impact, Replication, Sustainability, Improvement), this report identified relative strengths and needs for implementing SW-PBIS in CA. While the infrastructure in CA is becoming more formalized through the collaboration of the CPC the following are recommended goals based on the 2015 annual report:

Goal 1: As professional development becomes increasingly targeted and efficient reflecting the sustainability research and the collaboration of multiple TA Centers it is important to consider a structure for state-wide coaching, training and evaluation.

Goal 2: This report demonstrates the need for a CA statewide evaluation system monitoring student and training outcomes of an integrated multi-tiered system of support to achieve important academic, social and equity outcomes for ALL students. This evaluation system must provide school personnel with the right data in the right format in a timely manner (within 30 seconds) for team based decision making. The introduction of the Tiered Fidelity Inventory (TFI) will allow CA to develop implementation cohorts for measurement in growth,
effectiveness and equity.

Goal 3: As the California PBIS Coalition and the California Technical Assistance Center on PBIS, Inc. further develop their collaborative partnerships with the California Department of Education, School Mental Health Agency, Probation, Department of Public Health, and Foster Youth Programs the opportunity for an effective statewide approach to improving important student and community outcomes will become a reality. It is the purpose of this report to propel such work and serve as a catalyst for California’s SW-PBIS implementation efforts.

Goal 4: The report identifies the CPC as a grassroots organization working to establish a formal infrastructure for scaling up PBIS in California is a systemic and equitable fashion. There has been very limited to no financial support to regional and state positions supporting the implementation of PBIS as a multi-tiered system of support (MTSS). The recommendation is to increase the political and financial contributions to sustain implementation of SW-PBIS on a large scale.

Goal 5: Increasing visibility is an important element to build awareness, increase cross collaboration within the state, and promote exemplary schools implementing with high fidelity. The creation of a state MTSS-PBIS website and a statewide PBIS Implementation Recognition System would help foster this collaboration and report outcomes on an ongoing basis.

Goal 6: Implementing PBIS with sustainability requires following the National Blueprints and the sustainability research which clearly indicates the need for on-going coaching and technical assistance as schools continue the work of required in an effective and efficient MTSS-PBIS system. Provide opportunities for coaching networks and skillbuilding opportunities is suggested.

Goal 7: There are world class research universities in CA. It is recommended that CA universities take advantage of the wealth of research available to academia and the ability to contribute to the science of SW-PBIS. In particular, the diversity in CA provides great promise for research associated with cultural issues and SW-PBIS.
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