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1) a  

NUMBER OF DISTRICTS ACTIVE IN PBS

Description of Data  The graph below depicts the total number of districts that were active with the FLPBS:MTSS Project during the 2011-2012 school year.

Explanation of Data During the 2011-2012 school year, Florida’s PBS:MTSS Project worked with 51 out of 67 school districts. This represents 76% of the school districts in Florida.
1) b

NUMBER OF FLORIDA SCHOOLS ACTIVE IN PBS

Description of Data The graph below depicts the total number of schools that received training in Tier 1 PBS through December 31, 2011. Of the 1340 schools, 1174 (88%) were active during the 2011-2012 school year. Note: this is the set of schools that could potentially have been implementing and part of the data illustrated in the remainder of this report. Additional schools were trained from January, 2012 through the summer, but data from those schools are not included in this report.

Florida Schools Trained in Tier 1 PBS
Trained by 1/1/12, those trained later are not included below
Description of Data The graph below depicts the number of schools receiving initial training in Tier 1 PBS for the school years 2001-2002 through 2011-2012. Each bar includes schools trained in a school year (defined as September 1 through August 31st). These numbers do not reflect the schools that were retrained, received booster training, or training at other levels of PBS (classroom, Tier 2: Supplemental or Tier 3: Intensive).

Explanation of Data The number of schools trained in Tier 1 decreased again this past year. However, Project activities expanded to include collaborations with PSRTI and additional state-wide trainings.

Tier 2 training During the 2011-2012 school year, 113 school teams completed Tier 2 training; 107 through on-site training and 6 through accessing our virtual training. Additionally, 45 school teams completed our Tier 2 orientation modules

Tier 3 The Project continued its training and support for Tier 3 with focus on district level systems assessment and planning prior to training individuals and/or schools. During the 2011-2012 school year, Project staff worked with 12 districts assessing processes, procedures and plans; developing action plans; and assisting them through reaching their unique Tier 3 goals.
**PBS Schools Implementing at Each Tier**

**Description of Data** The graph below depicts the number of schools *reporting* that they are implementing each Tier of PBS (Tier 1: Universal, Tier 2: Supplemental, and Tier 3: Intensive) according to the School Profile completed in the fall of 2011.

**Explanation of Data** During the 2011-2012 school year, approximately 54% of active PBS schools reported implementing at the Tier 2: Supplemental level and 45% of active schools reported implementing at the Tier 3: Intensive level.

**Explanation of the Data** Schools report tiers of implementation during the fall (mid-year) evaluation. It does not account for schools that initiate implementation at other tiers after November of the given school year.
Description of Data The map below represents the percent of total schools within each district that had been trained in Tier 1 PBS by Florida’s PBS:MTSS Project as of June 1, 2012.
Description of Data: The map below represents the percent of the total schools within each school district that were actively participating with Florida’s PBS:MTSS Project at some point during the 2011-2012 school year.
2) a

PERCENT OF TRAINEES INDICATING
Level of Satisfaction with Training

Description of Data: The graph below shows the average response to evaluation questions for all trainees participating in trainings provided by Florida’s PBS Project staff during this project evaluation period. The items were rated on a scale from 1 (not at all) to 6 (greatly), or from 1 (not effective) to 4 (very effective).

Level of Satisfaction

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>2010-2011 (n=1457)</th>
<th>2011-2012 (n=976)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Increase Knowledge</td>
<td>5.2</td>
<td>5.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meets Objectives</td>
<td>5.4</td>
<td>5.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Useful Information</td>
<td>5.5</td>
<td>5.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recommend Others</td>
<td>5.4</td>
<td>5.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Delivery Skill and General Satisfaction

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>2010-2011 (n=1457)</th>
<th>2011-2012 (n=976)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Skilled Delivery</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>3.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General Satisfaction</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>3.7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
PERCENT OF DISTRICT COORDINATORS INDICATING Level of Satisfaction w/Services

Description of Data The graph below shows the average response to Project performance evaluation questions by the 41 PBS District Coordinators who completed the questionnaire (70% of District Coordinators). These items are rated on a scale of 1 to 5 with 1 being “False” and 5 being “True.”

Rate the following statements regarding services provided by FLPBS:MTSS Project Staff

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Rating</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Staff were professional and respectful in their interactions with district and/or school staff</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staff provided valuable materials and resources to district and/or school staff</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staff provided good recommendations and technical assistance to help address district and/or school issues</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>When you presented issues/concerns to Staff, they were efficient and effective in responding to those issues</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Explanation of Data District Coordinators identified each area of satisfaction as “True.” The Project is pleased with return rate of the survey (41 districts reporting) and will consider the suggestions for improving TA & other comments reflected on the subsequent page.
2) b (continued)

Barriers to family engagement
- Lack of participation
- Time and personnel to plan for engagement
- Can’t contact parents of students with higher needs
- Lack of resources
- Communication
- Family beliefs about discipline

Beneficial aspects of FLPBS:MTSS support
- Training opportunities
- TA, support for RtIB
- Timely response to questions and requests
- On-line/web resources
- Planning
- On-going relationships
- Chats

Suggested Improvements
- Face to face DC meetings
- District Coordinator meetings more frequently
- Opportunities to interact/share with other DCs
- Surveying DC needs
- Training in progress monitoring behavior interventions
- Collaborative training to school leadership/coaches
- Continue to add to resources
- Merge data bases and websites

Challenges faced in implementing MTSS
- Resources ($ and personnel)
- Time
- Buy-in
- Administrative/staff turnover
- Understanding it is academics and behavior
- Implementation with fidelity
- Assist with data collection to compare peers and target student
- Upper level district support
3) a

BENCHMARKS OF QUALITY (BoQ) SCORES

Description of Data  The graph below depicts the average total BoQ scores for the schools that completed a Benchmarks of Quality for school years 2004-2005 through 2011-2012. It is important to note that the BoQ was created in 2005 and first used during the 2004-2005 school year. Furthermore, the BoQ was revised in 2010 (to reflect the 2009-2010 school year) with the most significant change being the removal of the crisis section items and addition of the classroom items.

Average BoQ Score by Academic Year

![Graph showing average BoQ scores by academic year with specific scores for each year from 2004-2005 to 2011-2012.]

Explanation of Data  In spite of a revision to the BoQ in 2009-2010, the average total score on the Benchmarks of Quality remained nearly constant from the 2008-2009 school year to the 2011-2012 school year with the average active school scoring 77% in each year except in 2009-2010 when the average score was 76% and 2010-2011 when it was 78%. A score of 70 or above indicates fidelity of implementation.

Project Response to Data  Implementation fidelity is of critical importance to the FLPBS:MTSS Project. We are dedicated to maintaining a high level of implementation fidelity among participating schools.
3) b

HIGH IMPLEMENTING SCHOOLS
% of Schools Implementing w/Fidelity and Average Score on Benchmarks of Quality

Description of Data  The graph below depicts the percent of Florida schools implementing Tier 1 with fidelity (total BoQ score of at least 70) for the schools that completed a Benchmarks of Quality for school years 2004-2005 through 2011-2012.

Explanation of Data  Nearly 7 out of every 10 active schools completing the BoQ were implementing with fidelity (scoring at least a 70 on the Benchmarks of Quality). This number is down slightly (2%) from the previous school year, but still remains significantly above the 2004-2005 through 2006-2007 school years when the percent of schools implementing with fidelity ranged from 52% to 58%.
3) c

BoQ CRITICAL ELEMENT SCORES
Average Score across School Years

Description of Data  The graph below depicts the average score of Florida schools on each of the critical element areas of the Benchmarks of Quality for school years 2004-2005 through 2011-2012.

Florida Tier 1 PBS:MTSS
Fidelity of Implementation

Explanation of Data  Three critical elements have been consistently low over the 8 years; Faculty Commitment, Lesson Plans and Implementation Plan. The highest scores are found on the PBS Team, Effective Procedures and Expectations. The trend over the years has been one of a slight increase, both overall and within critical elements.
FLORIDA’S PBS MODEL SCHOOLS
Number of Schools across School Years

**Description of Data** The chart below shows the percentage of active schools reaching model school status across eight school years from 2004-2005 through 2011-2012. It is important to note that submission of an application for model school status is voluntary. The data below depict the percentage of the eligible schools *that chose to apply* for model school.

**Percentage of Florida's Schools Reaching Model Status**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School Year</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2004-2005</td>
<td>18%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005-2006</td>
<td>21%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006-2007</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007-2008</td>
<td>33%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008-2009</td>
<td>32%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009-2010</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010-2011</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011-2012</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Explanation of Data** The percentage of model schools decreased by 48% from the 2009-2010 to the 2011-2012 school year. Initial investigation indicates that the decrease could be accounted for by the emphasis on an outcome criteria in the revised application. Schools applying for model school that had increases in office referrals or suspensions were required to provide a description of how they analyzed the problem and implemented or planned an intervention to address the increase.
Description of Data  The chart below shows the number of model schools by level of award from 2004-2005 (the first year that recognized differentiated levels of model schools was 2007-2008) through 2011-2012.

Explanation of Data  The requirement to document student outcomes and problem-solving produced an adjustment in the number of total model schools, as well as, gold and silver level model schools.
CHANGE IN DISCIPLINE OUTCOME DATA

**Description of Data**  The chart below depicts the percentage change in the average number of ODRs, days of ISS, and days of OSS per 100 students between the baseline year and Year 1 of PBS implementation across all participating schools for which these data were available (the number of schools for each category of data is provided).  *Note: The data were not specific to one particular school year.*

**Percentage Change in Discipline Outcomes**

**Baseline to Year 1**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description of Data</th>
<th>Percentage Change in Discipline Outcomes Baseline to Year 1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ODR/100 Students</td>
<td>-15.48%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(514 Schools)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ISS/100 Students</td>
<td>-18.12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(419 Schools)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OSS/100 Students</td>
<td>-8.19%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(491 Schools)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Explanation of Data**  The average school reporting baseline and year 1 outcome data realized a decrease in Office Discipline Referrals (ODRs), days of In School Suspension (ISS) and days of Out of School Suspension (OSS) after their first year of implementation.
4) b

CHANGE IN DISCIPLINE OUTCOME DATA
By School Type

**Description of Data**  The chart below depicts the percentage change in the average number of ODRs, days of ISS, and days of OSS per 100 students between the baseline year and Year 1 of PBS implementation across all participating schools for which these data were available (the number of schools for each category of data is provided). This information is displayed by school type (elementary, middle, high, and “other”). Note: Alternative/center schools are not included due to the variable nature of their data. “Other” schools include those with irregular grade ranges such as K-8.

**Change in Student Outcomes**
After 1 yr Implementation (by school type)

![Chart showing percentage change in disciplinary outcomes by school type]

**Explanation of Data**  All school types except “High” saw a decrease in each outcome area (ODRs, days of ISS, and days of OSS) after the first year of implementation. Schools categorized as “Other” realized the greatest reduction in office discipline referral (ODR) rates and days of OSS. Elementary schools realized the greatest reduction in days of In School Suspension (ISS).
OFFICE DISCIPLINE REFERRAL (ODR) DATA
With Baseline & 3 Years Outcome Data

Description of Data  The chart below provides a comparison of the rate of office discipline referrals before implementation and for 3 consecutive years of implementation. The Project has longitudinal data for 98 elementary, 30 middle schools, and 13 high schools. Note: The data were not specific to one particular school year.

ODR Rates for Project Schools
(With Baseline and 3 Years Data)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Baseline</th>
<th>Year 1</th>
<th>Year 2</th>
<th>Year 3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Elementary</td>
<td>203</td>
<td>167</td>
<td>146</td>
<td>166</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Middle</td>
<td>151</td>
<td>143</td>
<td>107</td>
<td>117</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Explanation of Data  Elementary, middle, and high schools reported an overall lower rate of ODRs after implementation of Tier 1 PBS. For elementary and high schools, the rate of ODRs over three years of implementation decreased slightly each year resulting in a 17% and 36% average decrease respectively by year 3. The rate for middle schools increased slightly in their third year still but remained 20% lower than baseline.
OFFICE DISCIPLINE REFERRAL (ODR) DATA
For High and Low Implementers

Description of Data  The chart below shows the average number of office discipline referrals reported by schools that are implementing with higher fidelity (score of 70+ on the Benchmarks of Quality) and those implementing with lower fidelity (less than 70 on the Benchmarks of Quality) across multiple school years.

ODR Rates by Implementation Level Across Years

Explanation of Data  Over the last five years, schools implementing Tier 1 PBS with higher fidelity reported a lower ODR rate than schools implementing with lower fidelity by an average of 24% over the 8-year span. The difference in rate of ODRs between lower and higher implementing schools was the highest during the recent 2011-2012 school year at 37%. Overall, across eight years of data, high implementing schools realize an average of 26% fewer ODRs than low implementing schools. For just the last four years, the difference was 32% fewer ODRs for higher implementing schools.
IN SCHOOL SUSPENSION (ISS) DATA
By School Type

Description of Data  The chart below shows a comparison of ISS rates between baseline year and the first year of Tier 1 PBS implementation for four different school types; elementary, middle, high, and “other.” Note: Alternative/center schools are not included due to the variable nature of their data. “Other” schools include those with irregular grade ranges such as K-8.

Average ISS Days Baseline/Year 1 by School Type

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School Type</th>
<th>Baseline</th>
<th>Year 1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Elementary</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>306 Schools</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Middle</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>91 Schools</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>57 Schools</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23 Schools</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Explanation of Data  Each school type reported a decrease in average days of ISS per 100 students during their first year of Tier 1 implementation when compared to the previous implementation year. The difference in average days of ISS after year 1 of implementation was 29% for Elementary, 8% for Middle, and 27% for High Schools, and 13% for “Other Schools.
**IN SCHOOL SUSPENSION (ISS) DATA**
For High and Low Implementing Schools

**Description of Data**  The chart below illustrates the difference in rate of days of ISS for schools implementing with higher fidelity and those implementing with lower fidelity across eight school years. The number of participating schools and their level of implementation vary by school year.

**ISS Rates by Implementation Level Across Years**

**Explanation of Data**  Schools implementing with higher fidelity report an overall lower rate of days of ISS than did lower implementing schools for each of the eight school years from 2004-2005 through 2011-2012. Overall, across eight years of data, high implementing schools realize an average of 38% fewer ISS than low implementing schools. That difference ranged from a low of 26% in 2009-2010 to a high of 54% in 2007-2008.
OUT OF SCHOOL SUSPENSION (OSS) DATA
By School Type

Description of Data  The chart below shows a comparison of OSS rates between baseline year and the first year of Tier 1 PBS implementation for four different school types; elementary, middle, high, and “other.” Note: Alternative/center schools are not included due to the variable nature of their data. “Other” schools include those with irregular grade ranges such as K-8.

OSS Rates Baseline/Year 1 by School Type

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School Type</th>
<th>Baseline</th>
<th>Year 1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Elementary</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Middle</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

School Type

Baseline  Year 1

Explanation of Data  Overall, middle schools report a higher rate of OSS than the other school types, whereas elementary schools report the lowest rate of OSS. All school types except high schools reported a lower rate of OSS after Tier 1 implementation. Schools categorized as “other” reported the greatest decrease (38%). High Schools reported an 8% increase in OSS rates between baseline and year 1.
7) OUT OF SCHOOL SUSPENSION (OSS) DATA
For High and Low Implementing Schools

Description of Data  The chart below illustrates the difference in rates of days of OSS for schools implementing with higher fidelity and those implementing with lower fidelity across eight school years. The number of participating schools and their level of implementation vary by school year. The number of schools represented is noted on each bar.

OSS Rates by Implementation Level Across Years

Explanation of Data  Schools implementing with higher fidelity reported a lower rate of days of OSS for each of the eight school years from 2004-2005 through 2011-2012. Overall, across eight years of data, high implementing schools realize an average of 44% fewer OSS days than low implementing schools. In the 2011-2012 school year, higher implementing schools reported 46% fewer days of OSS per 100 students.
SCHOOL ACADEMIC DATA
Level 3+ Reading by School Type

Description of Data
This chart provides a comparison of the average percentage of students reaching level 3 or above on FCAT Reading (indicating students reading with proficiency) for schools prior to and after implementation of Tier 1 PBS broken down by school type. Note: Alternative/center schools are not included due to the variable nature of their data. “Other” schools include those with irregular grade ranges such as K-8.

Average % FCAT Reading Level 3 by School Type

Explanation of Data
For elementary and middle school types, the rate of students reaching level 3 or above on FCAT decreased slightly by 3% and 2% respectively after the first year of tier 1 PBS implementation. For high school and other school types, the rate increased slightly by 2% and 3% respectively.
9) a

RTIB DATABASE USAGE

Description of Data  This chart displays baseline data for the first year of use of the RtIB Database.  Note:  The RtIB Database was piloted during the 2009-2010 school year with 15 schools in 2 school districts.

### SY 2010-11: RtIB Database Usage

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>User Type</th>
<th>Number of Users</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Districts</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Schools</td>
<td>143</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Individuals</td>
<td>460</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Explanation of Data  Multiple users at each school account for the large number of individuals.  During the 2011-2012 school year over a third of Florida’s school districts utilized the RtIB Database.
STATEWIDE CORE EFFECTIVENESS
(all school types)

Description of Data  For users of the RtB Database, this chart shows the percentage of students responding positively to core behavioral instruction. Nationally, the accepted rate of office discipline referrals (ODR) for core effectiveness is 0-1 referrals per year.

Statewide Core Effectiveness (all school Types)

Explanation of Data  Of the schools using the RtB Database, more than 91% of students received no more than one office referral during the year. This means that over 91% of students whose schools are using the RtB Database are responding effectively to the core for behavior instruction and support. Just over 6% students received between two and five referrals. Less than 2.5% of students had six or more office discipline referrals.
**SY 2011-12 RTIB DATABASE**

**User Satisfaction Survey**

**Description of Data**
This chart demonstrates the level of satisfaction for users of the RtIB database.

**Overall, the database meets my school’s needs for data-based problem solving for behavior at Tier 1 and Tier 2**

![Bar chart showing user satisfaction levels]

- **Number of Users:** N=106
- **Strongly Agree:** 21
- **Agree:** 65
- **Disagree:** 7
- **Strongly Disagree:** 2
- **I’m Not Sure:** 11

**USER COMMENTS:** these statements or ideas were endorsed by two or more people:

“I have been extremely pleased with the capacity of the database as well as the technical support provided from the database team. …The district level reports are also extremely helpful in problem solving and action planning at the district level. I look forward to the continued use of this database.”

“Very good tool.”

“The RtIB database is very easy to input data. The graphs are excellent tools for staff to use during meetings.”

“The overall system is efficient but you have to make several changes when entering data or moving/adding students to the roster.”

“Would like auto-fill to work faster. Also, when searching events for a student, it would be great if when you hit the back button, the name is still present. Overall, I am very pleased with the database!”

“Basically good. Hard to get certain graphs, charts, or data in certain forms.”

**Explanation of Data**
More than 81% of the respondents agreed or strongly agreed that the program met the school’s needs for data-based problem solving for Tier 1 and Tier 2 behaviors.