

Changes in Exclusionary and Nonexclusionary Discipline in Grades K–5 Following State Policy Reform in Oregon

Appendix A. About the study

Appendix B. Methods

Appendix C. Supporting analyses

See <https://go.usa.gov/xAHaY> for the full report.

Appendix A. About the study

Consequences of exclusionary discipline

Students in grades K–5 who receive exclusionary discipline are more likely to experience chronic absenteeism, academic failure, and disciplinary problems throughout their school career (Mitchell & Bradshaw, 2013; Yang et al., 2018). In the long term they are at greater risk of delinquency, substance abuse, and dropout (Balfanz et al., 2015; Fabelo et al., 2011; Hinze-Pifer & Sartain, 2018; Noltemeyer et al., 2015). Elementary school students in schools with higher rates of exclusionary discipline report lower ratings of classroom order, feelings of safety, and have lower academic achievement than students in schools that use positive behavioral supports (Carrell et al., 2018; Mitchell & Bradshaw, 2013). Further, removing students for minor disruptive behaviors does not improve academic outcomes for students in the school who are not suspended (Lacoe & Steinberg, 2019). These studies provide evidence that school discipline is an important concern. However, additional research is needed to determine whether exclusionary discipline causes these negative student outcomes.

Exclusionary discipline also disadvantages certain groups of students more than others—a student’s race/ethnicity is a stronger predictor that a student will receive exclusionary discipline than the student’s socioeconomic status, the type of behavioral infraction, or characteristics of the school (Anyon et al., 2014; Rocque et al., 2010; U.S. Government Accountability Office, 2018). Concerns about equity in the use of exclusionary discipline are based on disparities in the rates of suspension and in the “harshness” of the discipline (Fabelo et al., 2011). For example, for similar behavioral infractions American Indian/Alaska Native, Black, Hispanic, and multiracial students are more likely to be suspended than their White peers, and they often receive more suspension days (Burke & Nishioka, 2014; Losen & Gillespie, 2012; Vincent et al., 2012; Yang et al., 2018).

Research on the reasons for such disparities and potential solutions is still emerging. There is evidence that educators’ different perceptions of the behavior of students of color and that of White students may play a role. Educators are more likely to assign exclusionary discipline to students of color for behavioral infractions that are subjective (those that are commonly labeled disruptive, disorderly, or uncooperative) and that require the educator to determine whether the students’ behavior warrants an office discipline referral (Bradshaw et al., 2010; Shaw & Braden, 1990; Skiba et al., 2011). In contrast, White students are more likely to receive office discipline referrals for more objective behaviors such as leaving the classroom without permission, using obscene language, or vandalism (Skiba et al., 2002). Rigorous studies of interventions that have narrowed or eliminated racial/ethnic disparities in discipline point to the effectiveness of culturally responsive approaches to student

behaviors, particularly for minor and disruptive infractions (Acosta et al., 2019; Allen et al., 2011; Okonofu et al., 2016).

Oregon discipline policy

Oregon is one of several states that is reforming its school discipline policies, shifting from a zero-tolerance approach to one that emphasizes keeping students in the classroom. Oregon’s policy shift is based on concerns about the increased use of exclusionary discipline, which removes students from classroom instruction, for relatively minor behavioral issues.

Zero-tolerance policies in Oregon. The passage of the national Gun-Free Schools Act of 1994 ushered in the nationwide adoption of a zero-tolerance approach to the possession of firearms at school or in a school zone. Students who violated this rule were subject to mandatory expulsion for at least one year and immediate referral to the criminal justice system. Zero-tolerance discipline policies required school administrators to apply predetermined punitive measures in response to discipline incidents—regardless of the severity of the behavior, student characteristics, or extenuating circumstances (American Psychological Association, 2008).

In 1998 Oregon was one of the first states to experience a school shooting, which increased concerns about school safety. Lawmakers revised school discipline policies to allow school administrators to suspend or expel students for lesser, nonviolent offenses, including willful disobedience, defiance, and use of profane language.

The 2013 discipline policy for grades K–12. In 2013 Oregon enacted legislation requiring districts to implement school discipline practices that focus on preventing and reducing unnecessary suspensions and expulsions (H.R. 2192, Or. 2013). Below are the key provisions of the 2013 Oregon School Discipline Policy that the Oregon Department of Education sent to all superintendents and special education directors, which went into effect July 2013 (Drinkwater, 2014):

- Removes mandatory expulsion (zero-tolerance) language regarding “weapons” and refers instead to “firearms” to ensure consistency with the Gun-Free Schools Act of 1994.
- Limits expulsion to the following circumstances:
 - For conduct that poses a threat to the health or safety of students or school employees.
 - When other strategies to change a student’s behavior have been ineffective (such as restorative justice, individualized behavior support plans, increased supervision, or placement in an alternative education setting).
 - When the expulsion is required by law.
- Requires district school boards to adopt written policies for managing students who threaten violence or harm. The policies must include provisions that allow administrators to consider and implement any of the following options: (a) immediately remove from the classroom setting any student who has threatened to injure another person or to severely damage school property, (b) place the student in a setting where the behavior will receive immediate attention, or (c) require that a school obtain an evaluation of a student by a licensed mental health professional before allowing the student to return to the classroom.
- Requires districts to develop a student handbook, code of conduct, or other document that defines a respectful learning environment, acceptable behavior, and procedures for addressing challenging behavior by promoting positive alternative behavior.
- Requires district school boards to ensure that school discipline policies:
 - Protect students and staff from harm.

- Foster positive learning communities that keep students in school and provide opportunities for students to learn from their mistakes.
- Impose discipline without bias against students from protected classes.
- Respond to misconduct in a manner that is fair, nondiscriminatory, and proportional.
- Take into account the student’s developmental level and the circumstances of the incident.
- Propose alternative programs of instruction, where appropriate, using evidence-based approaches.
- Ensure compliance with federal and state law concerning students with disabilities.

The Oregon legislature directed districts to implement this school discipline policy in July 2013 for students in grades K–12.

The 2015 school discipline policy reform for grades K–5. In 2015 the Oregon legislature enacted a school discipline policy reform that limits the use of out-of-school suspensions and expulsions in grades K–5 to situations that present a direct threat to the safety of students or school employees (S. 553, Or. 2015). Below are the key provisions of the 2015 Oregon School Discipline Policy reform that the Oregon Department of Education sent to all superintendents and special education directors regarding the use of exclusionary discipline in grades K–5 (Drinkwater, 2016):

- For nonaccidental conduct causing serious physical harm to a student or school employee.
- When a school administrator determines, based on personal observation or a report from a school employee, that the student’s conduct poses a direct threat to the health or safety of students or school employees.
- When the suspension or expulsion is required by law.¹

The 2015 policy reform also requires school districts to establish discipline practices to prevent the recurrence of exclusionary discipline and facilitate the student’s return to classroom instruction.

The 2015 school discipline policy reform had three goals. First, it was intended to decrease overall rates of exclusionary discipline, as well as racial disparities in the application of exclusionary discipline. Such an intentional shift from exclusionary discipline might be expected to result in a corresponding rise in nonexclusionary discipline, or it could result in an overall decline in discipline problems, depending on which discipline practices and interventions schools adopted.

Second, the policy was intended to encourage a shift from exclusionary discipline to nonexclusionary discipline for students who received office discipline referrals. This shift would be expected to be greater for students of color, who often receive harsher punishment for subjective behavioral infractions (Burke & Nishioka, 2014; Oregon Department of Education, 2019; Vincent et al., 2012).

Third, the policy was intended to reduce “unnecessary” exclusionary discipline for infractions that are not a direct threat to the safety of students or adults. The shift from exclusionary to nonexclusionary discipline might be expected to have the greatest impact on subjective behavioral issues, such as minor infractions, disruptive infractions, and aggression. These types of behavior result in the highest number of office discipline referrals and are not considered to pose a risk to the personal safety of others (Drinkwater, 2014; 2016).

¹ Oregon school discipline policies and the federal Gun-Free Schools Act of 1994 require mandatory expulsion of not less than one year for any student who brings, possesses, or uses a firearm at school, on school district property, or at an activity sponsored by the school district (H.R. 1491, Or 2013; Gun-Free Schools Act, 1994).

References

- Acosta, J., Chinman, M., Ebener, P., Malone, P. S., Phillips, A., & Wilks, A. (2019). Evaluation of a whole-school change intervention: Findings from a two-year cluster-randomized trial of the restorative practices intervention. *Journal of Youth and Adolescence*, 48(5), 876–890.
- Allen, J. P., Pianta, R. C., Gregory, A., Mikami, A. Y., & Lun, J. (2011). An interaction-based approach to enhancing secondary school instruction and student achievement. *Science*, 333(6045), 1034–1037. <https://eric.ed.gov/?id=ED556046>.
- American Psychological Association, Zero Tolerance Task Force. (2008). Are zero tolerance policies effective in schools? An evidentiary review and recommendations. *American Psychologist*, 63(9), 852–862. <http://eric.ed.gov/?id=EJ824556>.
- Anyon, Y., Jenson, J. M., Altschul, I., Farrar, J., McQueen, J., Greer, E., et al. (2014). The persistent effect of race and the promise of alternatives to suspension in school discipline outcomes. *Children and Youth Services Review*, 44(1), 379–386.
- Balfanz, R., Byrnes, V., & Fox, J. (2015). Sent home and put off track: The antecedents, disproportionalities, and consequences of being suspended in the 9th grade. In D. J. Losen (Ed.), *Closing the school discipline gap: Equitable remedies for excessive exclusion* (pp. 17–30). Teachers College Press.
- Bradshaw, C. P., Mitchell, M. M., O'Brennan, L. M., & Leaf, P. J. (2010). Multilevel exploration of factors contributing to the overrepresentation of Black students in office disciplinary referrals. *Journal of Educational Psychology*, 102(2), 508–520. <http://eric.ed.gov/?id=EJ884851>.
- Burke, A., & Nishioka, V. (2014). *Suspension and expulsion patterns in six Oregon school districts* (REL 2014-028). U.S. Department of Education, Institute of Education Sciences, National Center for Education Evaluation and Regional Assistance, Regional Educational Laboratory Northwest. <http://eric.ed.gov/?id=ED544799>.
- Carrell, S. E., Hoekstra, M., & Kuka, E. (2018). The long-run effects of disruptive peers. *American Economic Review*, 108(11), 3377–3415. http://faculty.econ.ucdavis.edu/faculty/scarrell/DV_Long-run.pdf.
- Drinkwater, S. (2014, September 23). *Executive memo no. 002-2014-15, H.R. 2192, school discipline*. Oregon Department of Education. Retrieved June 12, 2019, from <http://www.ode.state.or.us/news/announcements/announcement.aspx?ID=10122&TypeID=4>.
- Drinkwater, S. (2016, January 27). *Executive memo no. 009-2015-16, reduced school days*. Oregon Department of Education. Retrieved June 12, 2019, from <https://www.oregon.gov/ode/rules-and-policies/StateRules/Documents/Executive%20Numbered%20Memorandum%20009-2015-16%20-%20Reduced%20School%20Days.pdf>.
- Fabelo, T., Thompson, M. D., Plotkin, M., Carmichael, D., Marchbanks, M. P., & Booth, E. A. (2011). *Breaking schools' rules: A statewide study of how school discipline relates to students' success and juvenile justice involvement*. Council of State Governments, Justice Center. http://csgjusticecenter.org/wp-content/uploads/2012/08/Breaking_Schools_Rules_Report_Final.pdf.
- Gun-Free Schools Act of 1994, 20 U.S.C. §§ 7151 et seq. (1994).
- Hinze-Pifer, R., & Sartain, L. (2018). Rethinking universal suspension for severe student behavior. *Peabody Journal of Education*, 93(2), 228–243. <http://eric.ed.gov/?id=EJ1179436>.
- H.R. 2192, 77th Leg., Reg. Sess. (Or. 2013). Retrieved June 12, 2019, from <https://olis.leg.state.or.us/liz/2013R1/Measures/Text/HB2192/Enrolled>.
- Lacoe, J., & Steinberg, M. P. (2019). Do suspensions affect student outcomes? *Educational Evaluation and Policy Analysis*, 41(1), 34–62. <https://eric.ed.gov/?id=EJ1204837>.
- Losen, D. J., & Gillespie, J. (2012). *Opportunities suspended: The disparate impact of disciplinary exclusion from school*. University of California, Los Angeles, Civil Rights Project/Proyecto Derechos Civiles, Center for Civil Rights Remedies. <http://eric.ed.gov/?id=ED534178>.
- Mitchell, M. M., & Bradshaw, C. P. (2013). Examining classroom influences on student perceptions of school climate: The role of classroom management and exclusionary discipline strategies. *Journal of School Psychology*, 51(5), 599–610.

- Noltemeyer, A. L., Ward, R. M., & Mcloughlin, C. (2015). Relationship between school suspension and student outcomes: A meta-analysis. *School Psychology Review, 44*(2), 224–240. <http://eric.ed.gov/?id=EJ1141532>.
- Okonofua, J. A., Paunesku, D., & Walton, G. M. (2016). Brief intervention to encourage empathic discipline cuts suspension rates in half among adolescents. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences of the United States of America, 113*(19), 5221–5226.
- Oregon Department of Education. (2019). *Oregon statewide report card, 2018–2019: An annual report to the legislature on Oregon public schools*. <https://www.oregon.gov/ode/schools-and-districts/reportcards/Documents/rptcard2019.pdf>.
- Rocque, M. (2010). Office discipline and student behavior: Does race matter? *American Journal of Education, 116*(4), 557–581. <http://eric.ed.gov/?id=EJ890463>
- S. 553, 78th Leg., Reg. Sess. (Or. 2015). Retrieved June 12, 2019, from <https://olis.leg.state.or.us/liz/2015R1/Downloads/MeasureDocument/SB0553/Enrolled>.
- Shaw, S. R., & Braden, J. B. (1990). Race and gender bias in the administration of corporal punishment. *School Psychology Review, 19*(3), 378–383. <http://eric.ed.gov/?id=EJ479086>.
- Skiba, R. J., Horner, R. H., Chung, C., Rausch, M. K., May, S. L., & Tobin, T. (2011). Race is not neutral: A national investigation of African American and Latino disproportionality in school discipline. *School Psychology Review, 40*(1), 85–107. <http://eric.ed.gov/?id=EJ921466>.
- Skiba, R. J., Michael, R. S., Nardo, A. C., & Peterson, R. L. (2002). The color of discipline: Sources of racial and gender disproportionality in school punishment. *Urban Review, 34*(4), 317–342. <http://eric.ed.gov/?id=EJ663870>.
- U.S. Government Accountability Office. (2018). *K–12 education: Discipline disparities for Black students, boys, and students with disabilities* (GAO-18-258). <https://www.gao.gov/products/GAO-18-258>.
- Vincent, C. G., Sprague, J. R., & Tobin, T. J. (2012). Exclusionary discipline practices across students' racial/ethnic backgrounds and disability status: Findings from the Pacific Northwest. *Education and Treatment of Children, 35*(4), 585–601. <http://eric.ed.gov/?id=EJ999358>.
- Yang, M., Harmeyer, E., Chen, Z., & Lofaso, B. M. (2018). Predictors of early elementary school suspension by gender: A longitudinal multilevel analysis. *Children and Youth Services Review, 93*(1), 331–338.

Appendix B. Methods

This appendix explains the study data, sample, outcome measures, and methodology.

Data

This study used University of Oregon Schoolwide Information System (SWIS) data to examine the use of exclusionary and nonexclusionary discipline practices in grade K–5 from 2011/12 through 2017/18 in a voluntary sample of schools implementing Positive Behavioral Interventions and Supports (PBIS). The data covered the four years before implementation of the 2015 school discipline policy change (2011/12–2014/15) and the three years following implementation (2015/16–2017/18). SWIS is an incident-level data collection that records each incident or office discipline referral issued by a teacher or school staff member. School administrators—not classroom teachers—assign disciplinary consequences to students who receive an office discipline referral. All office discipline referrals result in exclusionary or nonexclusionary discipline actions. The SWIS data include only students who received at least one discipline referral during a school year. Students who received more than one office discipline referral have multiple records—one record for each office discipline referral. SWIS is designed to collect school discipline data as an outcome measure for rigorous descriptive and experimental research studies on school discipline (Bradshaw et al., 2010; Horner et al., 2009; Skiba et al., 2014; Spaulding et al., 2010).

Since 2004 the use of SWIS has been available to both domestic and international schools that have committed to using PBIS, an approach to school discipline based on a multi-tiered system of support (<https://www.pbis.org/>). Schools that use SWIS must participate in a two-day workshop to ensure consistency in data collection, entry, and management. For schools using SWIS, the availability of credible office discipline referral data for informing classroom and school discipline improvement decisions is essential to implementing the PBIS framework (Horner et al., 2009; May et al., 2006; Sugai & Horner, 2006). PBIS has been implemented in more than 25,000 schools in the United States.

Advantages of SWIS data. The use of SWIS data for this study contributed to the scope and reliability of its findings. One advantage of SWIS data was consistency in the data variables and definitions across the seven-year study period. Teachers who refer students for office discipline must complete a standardized form that records the referring educator, student name, unique student identification number, date and time of the incident, school location of the incident, and type of behavioral infraction. The school administrator or designee assigns the discipline action for each office discipline referral and records the decision into SWIS. A second advantage is the inclusion of all exclusionary and nonexclusionary discipline actions that result from office discipline referrals. Most discipline incident data collections record exclusionary discipline actions only. Each office discipline referral record also includes school-level data from the National Center for Education Statistics, including student enrollment, locale, Title I status, percentage of male and female students, percentage of students eligible for the national school lunch program, and percentage of students by racial/ethnic group. Behavioral infraction categories are defined in box 1 in the main report, and table B1 lists the types of exclusionary and nonexclusionary discipline actions recorded in SWIS.

Table B1. Types of exclusionary and nonexclusionary discipline actions recorded in the Schoolwide Information System

Exclusionary discipline	Nonexclusionary discipline
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • In-school suspension • Out-of-school suspension • Expulsion • Removal to an alternative program 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Individualized instruction • Conference with student • Parent contact • Restitution • Community service • Time out/detention • Time in office • Loss of privileges, Saturday school, bus suspension • Other administrative decision • Unknown administrative decision^a

a. Office discipline referral records indicating discipline action was unknown or pending were excluded from the analysis.
 Source: University of Oregon, 2016.

Limitations of SWIS data. There were some limitations to the SWIS data available for this study. First, SWIS is a discipline incident data system that collects records and demographic information only on students who received an office discipline referral. SWIS does not collect records and demographic information on students who did not receive an office discipline referral; these data would be necessary to examine changes in discipline outcomes such as the percentages of enrolled students who were disciplined or differences in numbers of exclusions per enrolled student. To protect the confidentiality of participants, the University of Oregon replaced all identifiers with unique code numbers, so the names of participating schools and students were unknown to the study team. The inability to identify participating schools prevented linking the SWIS data to academic or other data collections or including students and schools that were not represented in the SWIS data.

Second, the study did not collect information about implementation of the state policy. For example, information was unavailable on the timing of district-level policy changes, evidence-based interventions, professional development offerings, behavioral supports, or educator attitudes. Thus, the findings cannot explain why an association exists or does not exist between the policy change and changes in office discipline referrals.

Third, the SWIS data could not be used to examine factors other than the state policy change that might be related to office discipline referrals (“competing interventions”), such as implementation of restorative justice practices, professional development on behavior management, and schoolwide systems of behavioral interventions and supports or factors associated with racial disparities in school discipline practices.

Finally, the available SWIS data might not include enough time points to understand the relationship between the state policy change and long-term changes in discipline practices.

Sample

The study included data from a voluntary sample of 401 Oregon public schools that served students in grades K–5, that were implementing PBIS, and that used SWIS for at least one year between 2011/12 and 2017/18. The 401 schools in the analytic sample represented 31–41 percent of Oregon’s 724 public elementary schools, depending on the study year. The number of schools participating in each study year ranged from 219 to 293 (table B2). Over

70 percent of schools in the sample were eligible for Title I,² and 58–61 percent of students were eligible for the national school lunch program. Although a majority of study schools were in cities and suburbs, a third or more were in towns or rural communities. Of 1,027,377 office discipline referral observations included in the original data set, the 127,887 observations (12 percent) that listed the discipline action as “unknown” or “pending” were omitted. Because the focus of the study was racial/ethnic differences in school discipline outcomes, the study also excluded the 109,728 observations (11 percent) in which student race/ethnicity data were missing or recorded as “not listed” or “unknown” and the 5,250 observations (0.5 percent) that were missing overall school enrollment or school enrollment by race/ethnicity. One school that agreed to participate in the study was dropped during this process because all its SWIS records lacked information on enrollment by race/ethnicity. After these adjustments the final sample included data on 784,512 office discipline referrals in 401 schools.

Table B2. Characteristics of the sample of Oregon public schools serving grade K–5 that used the Schoolwide Information System, 2011/12–2017/18

School characteristic	Pre-policy reform				Post-policy reform		
	2011/12	2012/13	2013/14	2014/15	2015/16	2016/17	2017/18
Schools (number)	293	281	219	245	281	284	289
Enrollment (number)	119,061	116,682	90,999	102,662	122,881	124,622	124,478
Students eligible for the national school lunch program (percent)	57.7	58.5	59.2	60.3	59.2	59.8	61.1
Title I school ^a (percent)	77.1	76.9	78.5	79.6	75.1	74.3	74.4
<i>Locale (percent)</i>							
City	22.8	28.4	28.2	29.6	32.2	34.3	35.8
Suburban	27.9	29.1	27.3	29.6	29.7	28.2	25.3
Town	29.7	26.3	27.8	25.4	22.8	21.8	22.5
Rural	19.7	16.2	16.7	15.4	15.2	15.7	16.5

Note: $n = 401$ public schools serving grades K–5 that implemented Positive Behavioral Interventions and Supports and used the Schoolwide Information System for at least one year. Percentages may not sum to 100 because of rounding.

a. Under Title I of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act schools with large concentrations of low-income students receive supplemental funds to assist in meeting student education needs.

Source: Authors’ analysis of University of Oregon Schoolwide Information System data for 2011/12–2017/18.

Because the study data were from a voluntary sample of schools that used SWIS, and because not all Oregon schools use SWIS, the generalizability of the study findings to Oregon schools that were not included in the study is unknown. The schools using SWIS were implementing PBIS, a multi-tiered system approach, to organize schoolwide and individualized strategies for achieving student behavioral outcomes (Office of Special Education Programs Technical Assistance Center on Positive Behavioral Interventions and Supports, n.d.). In 2018, the U.S. Department of Education’s Office of Special Education Programs Technical Assistance Center on PBIS supported implementation of the PBIS model in 25,911 schools across the United States (Sugai, 2018). Rigorous studies have indicated that elementary schools implementing schoolwide PBIS have lower office discipline referral rates and better academic outcomes than non-PBIS schools (Bradshaw et al., 2012; Horner et al., 2009).

Comparison of schools in the analytic sample and all public schools in Oregon. Enrollment in schools in the analytic sample rose from 119,061 students in 2011/12 to 124,478 students in 2017/18 (table B3) and from 253,774 to 266,456 for all schools in Oregon (table B4). Across study years the percentages of students who identified as male were similar in the analytic sample (51.3–51.7 percent; see table B3) and in all Oregon public schools (51.3–51.5 percent; see table B4). The percentage of White students was slightly lower in the analytic sample than in all Oregon public schools across study years. For both data sets the percentages of White students decreased over

² Under Title I of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act schools with large concentrations of low-income students receive supplemental funds to assist in meeting student education needs.

the study years: from 61.6 percent to 57.8 percent in the analytic sample and from 63.4 percent to 62.0 percent for all public schools in the state (Oregon Department of Education, 2019).

There were differences in the percentages of Black students and of Hispanic students in the analytic sample and in all Oregon public schools. For Black students the percentages were lower in the analytic sample than in all Oregon public schools during the pre-policy years but were similar in the post-policy years. Around the time of the 2015 policy reform, the percentage of Black students increased slightly in the analytic sample (from 1.9 percent in 2011/12 to 2.3 percent in 2014/15; see table B3) but decreased slightly for all Oregon public schools (from 2.4 percent in 2011/12 to 2.3 percent in 2014/15; see table B4). Across all the study years, the percentages of Hispanic students were higher in the analytic sample than in all Oregon public schools, and they rose in the analytic sample from 25.5 percent in 2011/12 to 29.4 percent in the second and third post-policy years (see table B3). The percentage of Hispanic students in the state enrollment data was relatively stable, ranging from 23 percent to 23.7 percent (see table B4).

Table B3. Characteristics of K–5 students in the sample of Oregon public schools in all study years, 2011/12–2017/18

Student characteristic	Pre-policy reform				Post-policy reform		
	2011/12	2012/13	2013/14	2014/15	2015/16	2016/17	2017/18
Schools (number)	293	281	219	245	281	284	289
Enrollment (number)	119,061	116,682	90,999	102,662	122,881	124,622	124,478
<i>Gender (percent)</i>							
Male	51.4	51.5	51.3	51.3	51.6	51.7	51.7
Female	48.6	48.5	48.7	48.7	48.4	48.3	48.3
<i>Racial/ethnic group (percent)</i>							
American Indian/Alaska Native	1.3	1.4	1.3	1.2	0.9	0.9	0.9
Asian	4.0	4.1	3.8	3.7	3.5	3.3	3.1
Black	1.9	1.9	1.9	2.3	2.3	2.2	2.2
Hawaiian/Pacific Islander	0.7	0.8	0.8	0.9	0.9	1.0	1.0
Hispanic	25.5	26.0	25.6	26.3	28.8	29.4	29.4
Multiracial	5.1	5.4	5.8	5.5	5.8	5.7	5.6
White	61.6	60.5	60.9	60.1	57.8	57.5	57.8
<i>Multiple discipline referrals (percent)</i>							
0–1 referrals	43.9	44.5	45.2	44.5	42.0	41.4	39.0
2–5 referrals	38.6	38.6	37.7	37.0	37.7	36.9	37.3
6 or more referrals	17.5	16.9	17.2	18.5	20.4	21.7	23.7

Note: $n = 401$ public schools serving grades K–5 that implemented Positive Behavioral Interventions and Supports and used the Schoolwide Information System for at least one year. Percentages may not sum to 100 because of rounding.

Source: Authors' analysis of University of Oregon Schoolwide Information System data for 2011/12–2017/18.

In the analytic sample the percentage of students who received multiple discipline referrals increased across the study years. In 2011/12, 56.1 percent of enrolled students received two or more discipline referrals, 38.6 percent received two to five referrals, and 17.5 percent received six or more referrals; in 2017/18, 61.0 percent received two or more discipline referrals, 37.3 percent received two to five referrals, and 23.7 percent received six or more referrals (see table B3).

Table B4. Characteristics of K–5 students enrolled in all Oregon public schools, 2011/12–2017/18

Student characteristic	Pre-policy reform				Post-policy reform		
	2011/12	2012/13	2013/14	2014/15	2015/16	2016/17	2017/18
Schools (number)	864	861	863	863	887	875	883
Enrollment (number)	253,774	255,684	259,330	261,831	264,465	266,496	266,456
<i>Gender (percent)</i>							
Male	51.3	51.3	51.3	51.3	51.4	51.4	51.5
Female	48.7	48.7	48.7	48.7	48.6	48.6	48.5
<i>Racial/ethnic group (percent)</i>							
American Indian/Alaska Native	1.7	1.6	1.5	1.4	1.3	1.3	1.2
Asian	3.9	3.8	3.8	3.8	3.8	3.8	3.8
Black	2.4	2.3	2.3	2.3	2.3	2.3	2.3
Hawaiian/Pacific Islander	0.7	0.7	0.7	0.7	0.7	0.7	0.7
Hispanic	23.0	23.3	23.5	23.7	23.5	23.5	23.5
Multiracial	5.0	5.2	5.5	5.7	5.9	6.2	6.4
White	63.4	63.0	62.6	62.3	62.4	62.2	62.0

Note: Percentages may not sum to 100 because of rounding.

Source: Authors' analysis of University of Oregon Schoolwide Information System data for 2011/12–2017/18.

Missing data. Of the 784,512 office discipline referral records over the seven years of data used in the analysis, 1.3 percent or less of data were missing for five variables (table B5). No other variables were missing data. The analysis used listwise deletion due to the low percentage of missing data.

Table B5. Number of total observations, number of missing observations, and percentage of missing data for K–5 students in the sample of Oregon public schools serving grades K–5, 2011/12–2017/18

School characteristic	Number of observations		Percentage of missing data
	Total observations	Missing observations	
Female enrollment	784,512	9,203	1.17
Male enrollment	784,512	9,203	1.17
Eligibility for national school lunch program	784,512	10,222	1.30
Title I ^a	784,512	8,174	1.04
Locale	784,512	8,108	1.03

Note: $n = 401$ public schools serving grades K–5 that implemented Positive Behavioral Interventions and Supports and used the Schoolwide Information System for at least one year.

a. Under Title I of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act schools with large concentrations of low-income students receive supplemental funds to assist in meeting student education needs.

Source: Authors' analysis of University of Oregon Schoolwide Information System data for 2011/12–2017/18.

Analysis

The study used descriptive analyses to examine annual statewide discipline trends and multilevel mixed regression methods to examine the association between the 2015 school discipline policy reform and changes in the likelihood that office discipline referrals resulted in exclusionary discipline rather than nonexclusionary discipline.

Descriptive analyses. For research question 1 the study team calculated the annual statewide trends separately for exclusionary and nonexclusionary discipline for students overall and for the following racial/ethnic groups: American Indian/Alaska Native, Asian, Black, Hispanic, Hawaiian/Pacific Islander, multiracial, and White. For each student racial/ethnic group the rate (number of discipline actions per 100 students) was calculated by dividing the number of discipline actions in the sample for each student racial/ethnic group by the total number of enrolled

students in the same racial/ethnic group during a given year multiplied by 100. Based on a review of the results, the study team determined a change in the number of discipline actions per 100 students of 0–30 to be small, a change of 31–60 to be moderate, and a change of 61 and higher to be large. The change in the number of exclusionary discipline actions per 100 students is the 2017/18 outcome minus the 2014/15 outcome (the year before the 2015 policy reform). Because the averages were calculated for the entire sample, smaller schools were not over-represented. Finally, the study team calculated relative rate ratios by dividing the number of exclusionary discipline actions per 100 students of a particular racial/ethnic group by the number of exclusionary discipline actions per 100 students for all students.

Regression analyses. For research question 2 the study team used multilevel longitudinal regression analysis with a random intercept at the school level (Rabe-Hesketh & Skrondal, 2012) to examine the association between the 2015 school discipline policy reform and changes in the likelihood that office discipline referrals became less likely to result in exclusionary discipline and therefore more likely to result in nonexclusionary discipline in the form of:

$$y_{ij} = \beta_0 + \beta_1(\text{Year}_{ij}) + \beta_2(\text{YearIndicators}_{ij}) + \beta_3(\text{Student}_{ij}) + \beta_4(\text{School}_j) + \beta_5(\text{Behavior}_{ij}) + \zeta_j + \varepsilon_{ij}$$

where y_{ij} is the probability that exclusionary (rather than nonexclusionary) discipline occurred for each office discipline referral i in each school j given an intercept β_0 ; β_1 represents a coefficient on the time trend (Year_{ij}); β_2 represents coefficients on a set of three post-policy year indicators for 2015/16, 2016/17, and 2017/18 ($\text{YearIndicators}_{ij}$); β_3 represents the coefficients on a set of student characteristics (Student_{ij}), including a categorical indicator for student race, with White students as the comparison category; β_4 represents the coefficients on a set of school-level characteristics (School_j); β_5 represents a set of coefficients on incident-level variables (Behavior_{ij}); ζ_j is a random intercept at the school level; and ε_{ij} represents the residual error. The regression model included indicators for each post-policy year (2015/16 through 2017/18); a continuous school year variable; and control variables for the behavioral infraction category, as well as students' grade level, eligibility for the national school lunch program, race/ethnicity, gender, special education status, and a multireferral category (up to one office discipline referral, two to five office discipline referrals, or six or more office discipline referrals). The model also controlled for school-level variables, including student enrollment, Title I status, percentage of students eligible for the national school lunch program, percentage of White students, and locale. The regression analysis was repeated for students in each racial/ethnic group, with controls for race/ethnicity removed from the model.

For research question 3 the study team used the same regression approach to estimate associations by behavioral infraction category for all students and by racial/ethnic group between the 2015 state policy reform and changes in the likelihood that office discipline referrals became less likely to result in exclusionary discipline and therefore more likely to result in nonexclusionary discipline. First, the study sample of each behavioral infraction was entered into the model, and then it was restricted to infractions involving each student racial/ethnic group separately. Binary post-policy indicators (β_2) isolated the association of exclusionary discipline for each post-policy year (or treatment year) separately, enabling the description of a post-policy trend that is not restricted to linearity. (A detailed description of the behavioral infraction categories is in box 1 in the main report.)

Sensitivity analysis. The study authors conducted a sensitivity analysis of all models to determine whether changes in the demographic makeup of the schools over time contributed to changes in the disciplinary outcomes described in the report. The results of the analytic sample were compared with those of a limited sample of 138 schools that served grades K–5, used the SWIS, had limited variation in student racial/ethnic composition over time (0–1.4 percent), and contributed data for all study years (table B6).

In the pre-policy years the percentages of Hispanic students were higher in the limited sample (see table B6) than in the analytic sample (see table B3) and the percentages of White students were lower.

Table B6. Characteristics of K–5 students in the limited analytic sample of Oregon public schools that contributed Schoolwide Information System data in all study years, 2011/12–2017/18

Student characteristic	Pre-policy reform				Post-policy reform		
	2011/12	2012/13	2013/14	2014/15	2015/16	2016/17	2017/18
Enrollment (number)	55,018	55,525	55,699	55,960	57,331	56,527	57,656
<i>Gender (percent)</i>							
Male	51.0	51.1	51.2	51.2	51.3	51.3	51.3
Female	49.0	48.9	48.8	48.8	48.7	48.7	48.7
<i>Racial/ethnic group (percent)</i>							
American Indian/Alaska Native	1.1	1.1	1.0	1.0	0.9	0.9	0.9
Asian	3.0	2.8	2.8	2.8	2.7	2.7	2.7
Black	1.9	2.0	2.1	2.1	2.1	2.1	2.1
Hawaiian/Pacific Islander	0.7	0.8	0.8	0.9	0.9	1.0	1.0
Hispanic	28.4	28.8	29.1	29.1	29.0	29.3	28.9
Multiracial	4.9	5.1	5.4	5.4	5.6	5.6	5.6
White	59.9	59.3	58.6	58.7	58.7	58.4	58.9

Note: $n = 138$ schools. Percentages may not sum to 100 because of rounding.

Source: Authors' analysis of University of Oregon Schoolwide Information System data for 2011/12–2017/18.

The descriptive results from the limited sample (see table B7) were consistent with those in the full analytic sample with regard to direction of percentage point changes between the pre- and post-policy years for all racial/ethnic groups (see table C3 in appendix C). For the regression analyses the results from the limited sample were also similar to those of the full analytic sample. In the full model—not disaggregated by race/ethnicity or behavioral category—all coefficients from the limited sample mirrored those from the full analytic sample in statistical significance and direction, although they were smaller. The same was true when the results were disaggregated by race. The findings for the limited sample by behavioral category and by combination of race/ethnicity and behavioral category generally followed those for the full sample: coefficients were generally in the same direction, although less likely to be significant, which is possibly an artifact of the smaller sample size. In one instance, in which the direction of the coefficients was opposite in the two samples, only one coefficient was statistically significant. There were no cases in which the coefficients in the two samples were in the opposite direction and statistically significant.

Because the results of the full analytic sample of 401 schools were fairly consistent with those of the limited sample of 138 schools with data for all study years, the main report describes the findings for the full sample.

Table B7. Office discipline referrals that resulted in exclusionary discipline or nonexclusionary discipline for K–5 students in the limited sample of Oregon public schools that contributed Schoolwide Information System data in all study years, by race and ethnicity and year, 2011/12–2017/18

Racial/ethnic group discipline type	Pre-policy reform				Post-policy reform		
	2011/12	2012/13	2013/14	2014/15	2015/16	2016/17	2017/18
Enrollment (number)	50,312	51,002	52,023	57,244	66,613	70,907	83,184
Exclusionary (percent)	7.9	6.9	6.5	6.3	4.9	5.1	5.2
Nonexclusionary (percent)	92.1	93.1	93.5	93.7	95.1	94.9	94.8
American Indian/Alaska Native (number)	633	622	591	660	454	617	762
Exclusionary (percent)	5.5	6.9	8.3	5.5	4.8	3.1	3.9
Nonexclusionary (percent)	94.5	93.1	91.7	94.5	95.2	96.9	96.1
Asian (number)	484	523	562	537	623	561	663
Exclusionary (percent)	5.2	5.9	7.1	3.9	5.3	4.1	2.3
Nonexclusionary (percent)	94.8	94.1	92.9	96.1	94.7	95.9	97.7
Black (number)	2,045	2,292	2,510	2,852	2,983	3,256	3,766
Exclusionary (percent)	11.5	9.8	6.9	5.6	6.5	5.4	7.0
Nonexclusionary (percent)	88.5	90.2	93.1	94.4	93.5	94.6	93.0
Hawaiian/Pacific Islander (number)	433	288	282	265	324	427	442
Exclusionary (percent)	4.6	11.1	6.4	5.3	5.6	6.3	4.1
Nonexclusionary (percent)	95.4	88.9	93.6	94.7	94.4	93.7	95.9
Hispanic (number)	12,812	12,384	12,238	13,172	14,556	15,340	16,945
Exclusionary (percent)	7.3	6.6	6.4	6.3	4.7	5.4	5.9
Nonexclusionary (percent)	92.7	93.4	93.6	93.7	95.3	94.6	94.1
Multiracial (number)	1,602	1,638	1,912	3,045	3,923	4,576	5,167
Exclusionary (percent)	10.5	7.6	6.2	8.0	6.3	5.9	5.3
Nonexclusionary (percent)	89.5	92.4	93.8	92.0	93.7	94.1	94.7
White (number)	32,303	33,255	33,928	36,713	43,750	46,130	55,439
Exclusionary (percent)	7.9	6.7	6.5	6.2	4.7	5.0	4.9
Nonexclusionary (percent)	92.1	93.3	93.5	93.8	95.3	95.0	95.1

Note: $n = 431,285$ office discipline referrals from 138 schools. The percentage of office discipline referrals that resulted in exclusionary or nonexclusionary discipline was calculated by dividing the total annual number of exclusionary or nonexclusionary discipline actions experienced by a student racial/ethnic group across in the limited sample of schools by the total annual number of office discipline referrals received by the racial/ethnic group across the limited sample of schools. The 2015 school discipline policy reform directed districts to limit exclusionary discipline for students in grades K–5 to situations that pose an immediate risk to the safety of others.

Source: Authors' analysis of University of Oregon Schoolwide Information System data for 2011/12–2017/18.

References

- Bradshaw, C. P., Mitchell, M. M., O'Brennan, L. M., & Leaf, P. J. (2010). Multilevel exploration of factors contributing to the overrepresentation of Black students in office disciplinary referrals. *Journal of Educational Psychology, 102*(2), 508–520.
- Horner, R. H., Sugai, G., Smolkowski, K., Eber, L., Nakasato, J., Todd, A. W., et al. (2009). A randomized, waitlist-controlled effectiveness trial assessing school-wide positive behavior support in elementary schools. *Journal of Positive Behavior Interventions, 11*(3), 133–144. <http://eric.ed.gov/?id=EJ842264>.
- May, S., Ard, W., Todd, A. W., Horner, R. H., Glasgow, A., Sugai, G., et al. (2006). *School-Wide Information System*. University of Oregon, Educational and Community Supports.

- Office of Special Education Programs Technical Assistance Center on Positive Behavioral Interventions and Supports (n.d.). *Positive Behavioral Interventions & Supports*. Retrieved December 5, 2018, from <https://www.pbis.org/>.
- Oregon Department of Education. (2019). *Discipline incidents collection manual*. <https://www.oregon.gov/ode/students-and-family/healthsafety/Documents/disciplinecollectionmanual.pdf>.
- Rabe-Hesketh, S., & Skrondal, A. (2012). *Multilevel and longitudinal modeling using Stata*. STATA Press.
- Skiba, R. J., Chung, C.-G., Trachok, M., Baker, T. L., Sheya, A., & Hughes, R. L. (2014). Parsing disciplinary disproportionality: Contributions of infraction, student, and school characteristics to out-of-school suspension and expulsion. *American Educational Research Journal*, 51(4), 640–670. <http://eric.ed.gov/?id=EJ1033160>.
- Spaulding, S. A., Irvin, L. K., Horner, R. H., May, S. L., Emeldi, M., Tobin, T. J., et al. (2010). Schoolwide social-behavioral climate, student problem behavior, and related administrative decisions: Empirical patterns from 1,510 schools nationwide. *Journal of Positive Behavior Interventions*, 12(2), 69–85. <http://eric.ed.gov/?id=EJ875294>.
- Sugai, G. (2018). *Positive Behavioral Interventions and Supports: Questions and answers*. Neag School of Education University of Connecticut. https://www.gadoe.org/Curriculum-Instruction-and-Assessment/Special-Education-Services/Documents/PBIS/2018-19/WhatisPBIS-QandADoc_Sugai2018.pdf.
- Sugai, G., & Horner, R. H. (2006). A promising approach for expanding and sustaining schoolwide positive behavior support. *School Psychology Review*, 35(2), 245–259. <http://eric.ed.gov/?id=EJ788249>.
- University of Oregon. (2016). *Schoolwide Information System (SWIS) Codebook, referral categories definitions*. Retrieved November 24, 2019, from <https://www.pbisapps.org/Resources/Pages/SWIS-Publications.aspx>.

Appendix C. Supporting analyses

This appendix provides the results of descriptive and regression analyses that are discussed in the main report. For research question 1 table C1 reports annual numbers of exclusionary and nonexclusionary discipline actions per 100 students for all students and for each student racial/ethnic group. For research question 2 tables C3–C4 report descriptive and regression results on the association between the 2015 policy change and changes in the likelihood that an office discipline referral became less likely to result in exclusionary discipline and therefore more likely to result in nonexclusionary discipline. For research question 3, tables C6–C17 report the descriptive and regression results for each category of behavioral infraction and student racial/ethnic group.

Detailed results for research question 1 (How did the numbers of exclusionary and of nonexclusionary discipline actions per 100 students differ before and after the 2015 policy reform?), overall and by student racial/ethnic group

Table C1. Office discipline referrals that resulted in exclusionary discipline or nonexclusionary discipline of K–5 students in the analytic sample of Oregon public schools, by student race/ethnicity, 2011/12–2017/18 (number of discipline actions per 100 students)

Type of discipline and student racial/ethnic group	Pre-policy reform				Post-policy reform			Change in number of discipline actions ^a
	2011/12	2012/13	2013/14	2014/15	2015/16	2016/17	2017/18	
<i>All discipline actions</i>								
All students	78.9	77.2	80.4	89.2	101.4	114.4	135.4	46.2
American Indian/Alaska Native	90.8	103.4	103.5	97.6	122.6	153.4	172.0	74.4
Asian	24.8	26.3	27.6	23.5	29.6	35.0	38.0	14.5
Black	180.4	182.3	193.8	180.8	211.8	232.7	273.6	92.8
Hawaiian/Pacific Islander	81.3	53.1	52.5	58.4	68.7	91.1	106.5	48.1
Hispanic	73.9	66.0	69.2	74.0	81.6	90.2	102.9	28.9
Multiracial	46.8	49.1	55.3	82.4	96.0	117.7	138.1	55.7
White	83.8	84.3	87.1	97.2	112.1	126.3	151.4	54.2
<i>Exclusionary discipline</i>								
All students	6.0	5.7	5.5	6.4	5.7	6.4	8.1	1.7
American Indian/Alaska Native	6.7	8.3	11.0	9.3	8.2	9.3	11.5	2.2
Asian	1.2	1.6	1.6	1.4	1.3	1.4	1.2	-0.2
Black	17.3	18.2	13.5	12.0	12.6	14.8	17.3	5.3
Hawaiian/Pacific Islander	4.5	4.8	3.1	3.7	3.7	4.2	8.4	4.7
Hispanic	5.2	4.6	4.4	4.8	4.6	5.1	6.8	2.0
Multiracial	4.7	4.2	3.7	6.5	5.7	6.7	7.5	1.0
White	6.5	6.1	6.0	7.1	6.2	6.9	8.8	1.7
<i>Nonexclusionary discipline</i>								
All students	72.9	71.5	74.9	82.8	95.8	108.1	127.2	44.4
American Indian/Alaska Native	84.1	95.1	92.5	88.3	114.4	144.1	160.5	72.2
Asian	23.6	24.7	26.0	22.1	28.3	33.6	36.9	14.8
Black	163.1	164.1	180.3	168.8	199.2	217.9	256.3	87.5
Hawaiian/Pacific Islander	76.9	48.3	49.4	54.7	64.9	86.8	98.1	43.4

Type of discipline and student racial/ethnic group	Pre-policy reform				Post-policy reform			Change in number of discipline actions ^a
	2011/12	2012/13	2013/14	2014/15	2015/16	2016/17	2017/18	
Hispanic	68.7	61.3	64.8	69.2	77.0	85.0	96.0	26.8
Multiracial	42.1	44.9	51.6	75.8	90.3	111.0	130.6	54.8
White	77.4	78.2	81.1	90.1	106.0	119.3	142.6	52.5

Note: $n = 784,512$ office discipline referrals from 401 public schools serving grades K–5 that implemented Positive Behavioral Interventions and Supports and used the Schoolwide Information System for at least one year. The number of schools providing data for the study ranged from 219 to 293 each year. The number of discipline actions per 100 students was calculated by dividing the total annual number of discipline actions experienced by a student racial/ethnic group across all sample schools by the total annual number of enrolled students in the racial/ethnic group across all sample schools and multiplying by 100. The 2015 school discipline policy reform directed districts to limit exclusionary discipline for students in grades K–5 to situations that pose an immediate risk to the safety of others.

a. The number of exclusionary discipline actions per 100 students in 2017/18 minus the number in 2014/15 (the year before the 2015 policy reform). Changes in the number of discipline actions per 100 students of 0–30 are considered small, changes of 31–60 are considered moderate, and changes of 61 or higher are considered large.

Source: Authors' analysis of University of Oregon Schoolwide Information System data for 2011/12–2017/18.

Table C2. The number of exclusionary discipline actions per 100 students for each student racial/ethnic group relative to the number of exclusionary discipline actions per 100 students for K–5 students in the analytic sample of Oregon public schools, by year, 2011/12–2017/18 (relative rate ratio)

Student racial/ethnic group	Pre-policy reform				Post-policy reform		
	2011/12	2012/13	2013/14	2014/15	2015/16	2016/17	2017/18
All students	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0
American Indian/Alaska Native	1.1	1.5	2.0	1.5	1.4	1.5	1.4
Asian	0.2	0.3	0.3	0.2	0.2	0.2	0.1
Black	2.9	3.2	2.5	1.9	2.2	2.3	2.1
Hawaiian/Pacific Islander	0.8	0.8	0.6	0.6	0.6	0.7	1.0
Hispanic	0.9	0.8	0.8	0.8	0.8	0.8	0.8
Multiracial	0.8	0.7	0.7	1.0	1.0	1.0	0.9
White	1.1	1.1	1.1	1.1	1.1	1.1	1.1

Note: $n = 784,512$ office discipline referrals from 401 public schools serving grades K–5 that implemented Positive Behavioral Interventions and Supports and used the Schoolwide Information System for at least one year. The number of schools providing data for the study ranged from 219 to 293 each year. Relative rate ratio is calculated by dividing the number of exclusionary discipline actions per 100 students of a particular racial/ethnic group by the number of exclusionary discipline actions per 100 students for all students. A relative rate ratio greater than 1.0 indicates that the number of exclusions per 100 students for the racial/ethnic group was higher than the number of exclusions per 100 students for all students, while a ratio less than 1.0 indicates that the number of exclusions per 100 students for the racial/ethnic group was lower than the number of exclusions for all students. The 2015 school discipline policy reform directed districts to limit exclusionary discipline for students in grades K–5 to situations that pose an immediate risk to the safety of others.

Source: Authors' analysis of University of Oregon Schoolwide Information System data for 2011/12–2017/18.

Detailed results for research question 2 (Were office discipline referrals issued after the 2015 policy reform less likely to result in exclusionary discipline, and therefore more likely to result in nonexclusionary discipline, than referrals issued before the reform, after pre-policy trends, student characteristics, and school characteristics were adjusted for?)

Table C3. The number and percentage of office discipline referrals that resulted in exclusionary discipline or nonexclusionary discipline for K–5 students in the analytic sample of Oregon public schools, by student race/ethnicity and year, 2011/12–2017/18

Student racial/ethnic group and discipline type	Pre-policy reform				Post-policy reform		
	2011/12	2012/13	2013/14	2014/15	2015/16	2016/17	2017/18
All students (number)	93,954	90,091	73,186	91,530	124,641	142,617	168,493
Exclusionary (percent)	7.6	7.4	6.8	7.1	5.6	5.6	6.0
Nonexclusionary (percent)	92.4	92.6	93.2	92.9	94.4	94.4	94.0
American Indian/Alaska Native (number)	1,445	1,695	1,190	1,191	1,329	1,729	1,995
Exclusionary (percent)	7.3	8.0	10.6	9.6	6.7	6.1	6.7
Nonexclusionary (percent)	92.7	92.0	89.4	90.4	93.3	93.9	93.3
Asian (number)	1,180	1,256	947	889	1,286	1,454	1,447
Exclusionary (percent)	4.7	6.1	5.8	6.0	4.3	4.0	3.0
Nonexclusionary	95.3	93.9	94.2	94.0	95.7	96.0	97.0
Black (number)	3,977	4,104	3,364	4,306	5,921	6,512	7,459
Exclusionary	9.6	10.0	7.0	6.6	6.0	6.4	6.3
Nonexclusionary (percent)	90.4	90.0	93.0	93.4	94.0	93.6	93.7
Hawaiian/Pacific Islander (number)	675	467	373	524	771	1,080	1,265
Exclusionary (percent)	5.5	9.0	5.9	6.3	5.4	4.6	7.9
Nonexclusionary (percent)	94.5	91.0	94.1	93.7	94.6	95.4	92.1
Hispanic (number)	22,431	20,009	16,108	19,990	28,911	32,995	37,641
Exclusionary (percent)	7.0	7.0	6.4	6.5	5.6	5.7	6.6
Nonexclusionary (percent)	93.0	93.0	93.6	93.5	94.4	94.3	93.4
Multiracial (number)	2,825	3,082	2,907	4,684	6,795	8,321	9,689
Exclusionary (percent)	10.0	8.6	6.7	7.9	6.0	5.7	5.5
Nonexclusionary (percent)	90.0	91.4	93.3	92.1	94.0	94.3	94.5
White (number)	61,421	59,478	48,297	59,946	79,628	90,526	108,997
Exclusionary (percent)	7.7	7.3	6.9	7.3	5.5	5.5	5.8
Nonexclusionary (percent)	92.3	92.7	93.1	92.7	94.5	94.5	94.2

Note: $n = 784,512$ office discipline referrals from 401 public schools serving grades K–5 that implemented Positive Behavioral Interventions and Supports and used the Schoolwide Information System for at least one year. The number of schools providing data for the study ranged from 219 to 293 each year. The percentage of office discipline referrals that resulted in exclusionary or nonexclusionary discipline was calculated by dividing the total annual number of nonexclusionary or exclusionary discipline actions experienced by a student racial/ethnic group across all sample schools by the total annual number of office discipline referrals received by the racial/ethnic group across all sample schools. The 2015 school discipline policy reform directed districts to limit exclusionary discipline for students in grades K–5 to situations that pose an immediate risk to the safety of others.

Source: Authors' analysis of University of Oregon Schoolwide Information System data for 2011/12–2017/18.

Table C4. Association between the 2015 policy reform and changes in the likelihood that office discipline referrals became less likely to result in exclusionary discipline and therefore more likely to result in nonexclusionary discipline for K–5 students in the analytic sample of Oregon public schools, by student race/ethnicity (percentage point difference)

Student racial/ethnic group	One year post-policy (2015/16)		Two years post-policy (2016/17)		Three years post-policy (2017/18)	
	Percentage point difference ^a	Standard error	Percentage point difference	Standard error	Percentage point difference	Standard error
All students	-1.54***	0.12	-1.72***	0.15	-1.49***	0.18
American Indian/Alaska Native	-2.68*	1.22	-4.61**	1.46	-6.43***	1.75
Asian ^a	-1.27	1.05	-2.19	1.30	-2.82	1.58
Black	0.20	0.61	1.27	0.75	1.81*	0.92
Hawaiian/Pacific Islander ^a	-2.98	1.65	-2.42	2.02	-2.49	2.43
Hispanic	-1.56***	0.25	-1.31***	0.31	-0.50	0.38
Multiracial	-1.55**	0.56	-2.28**	0.72	-2.29*	0.90
White	-1.71***	0.15	-2.03***	0.19	-1.96***	0.23

*Significant at $p = .05$, ** significant at $p = .01$, *** significant at $p = .001$.

Note: $n = 774,290$ office discipline referrals from 401 public schools serving grades K–5 that implemented Positive Behavioral Interventions and Supports and used the Schoolwide Information System for at least one year. The number of schools providing data for the study ranged from 219 to 293 each year. Percentage point difference examines whether the likelihood that office discipline referrals resulted in exclusionary discipline rather than nonexclusionary discipline differed in the first, second, or third post-policy year from the likelihood in the pre-policy years. A positive percentage point difference indicates that office discipline referrals became more likely to result in (shifted toward) exclusionary discipline and therefore became less likely to result in nonexclusionary discipline after the 2015 policy reform. A negative percentage point difference indicates that office discipline referrals became less likely to result in (shifted away from) exclusionary discipline and therefore became more likely to result in nonexclusionary discipline. Regression models were run separately for each student racial/ethnic group and included student-level controls for grade level, eligibility for the national school lunch program, race/ethnicity, gender, special education status, and a multireferral category (up to one office discipline referral, two to five office discipline referrals, or six or more office discipline referrals), as well as school-level controls for student enrollment, Title I status, percentage of students eligible for the national school lunch program, percentage of White students, and locale. The 2015 school discipline policy reform directed districts to limit exclusionary discipline for students in grades K–5 to situations that pose an immediate risk to the safety of others. Detailed descriptive findings are in table C3.

a. The percentage point differences must be interpreted with caution, as the results could be imprecise because of the low number of office discipline referrals for this student group.

Source: Authors' analysis of University of Oregon Schoolwide Information System data for 2011/12–2017/18.

Detailed results for research question 3 (Were office discipline referrals for minor, disruptive, and aggressive infractions that were not a school safety concern that were issued after the 2015 policy reform less likely to result in exclusionary discipline and therefore more likely to result in nonexclusionary discipline than referrals issued before the reform, after pre-policy trends, student characteristics, and school characteristics were adjusted for?)

Table C5. The number and percentage of office discipline referrals for minor, disruptive, aggressive, and all other infractions for K–5 students in the analytic sample of Oregon public schools, 2011/12–2017/18

Year	Number of office discipline referrals	Percent of total			
		Minor	Disruptive	Aggressive	All other ^a
<i>Pre-policy reform</i>					
2011/12	93,954	61.8	13.4	20.2	4.5
2012/13	90,091	60.9	14.4	20.4	4.3
2013/14	73,187	62.1	14.0	19.4	4.5
2014/15	91,530	60.3	15.4	19.9	4.4
<i>Post-policy reform</i>					
2015/16	124,641	62.0	14.4	19.6	4.1
2016/17	132,617	63.2	17.2	14.7	4.9
2017/18	168,493	56.1	17.5	22.2	4.1
All years	774,513	60.6	15.5	19.5	4.4

Note: $n = 401$ public schools serving grades K–5 that implemented Positive Behavioral Interventions and Supports and used the Schoolwide Information System for at least one year. The number of schools providing data for the study ranged from 219 to 293 each year. Percentages may not sum to 100 because of rounding. For each behavioral category the percentage of office discipline referrals was calculated by dividing the number of office discipline referrals issued for the behavioral infraction category by the total number of office discipline referrals in a given year. The 2015 school discipline policy reform directed districts to limit exclusionary discipline for students in grades K–5 to situations that pose an immediate risk to the safety of others.

a. Includes school safety, property, and other behavioral infractions.

Source: Authors' analysis of University of Oregon Schoolwide Information System data for 2011/12–2017/18.

Table C6. For minor infractions, the number and percent of office discipline referrals that resulted in exclusionary discipline or nonexclusionary discipline for K–5 students in the analytic sample of Oregon public schools, by student race/ethnicity and year, 2011/12–2017/18

Student racial/ethnic group and discipline type	Pre-policy reform				Post-policy reform		
	2011/12	2012/13	2013/14	2014/15	2015/16	2016/17	2017/18
All students (number)	58,094	54,868	45,463	55,186	77,305	83,777	94,532
Exclusionary (percent)	0.2	0.2	0.5	1.5	1.3	1.7	2.1
Nonexclusionary (percent)	99.8	99.8	99.5	98.5	98.7	98.3	97.9
American Indian/Alaska Native (number)	909	1,054	699	668	780	1,034	963
Exclusionary (percent)	a	a	a	2.2	1.3	2.6	2.0
Nonexclusionary (percent)	a	a	a	97.8	98.7	97.4	98.0
Asian (number)	768	829	621	511	827	959	933
Exclusionary (percent)	0	a	0	a	a	a	a
Nonexclusionary (percent)	100.0	a	100.0	a	a	a	a
Black (number)	2,134	2,182	1,754	2,188	3,175	3,179	3,523
Exclusionary (percent)	a	a	a	a	1.2	1.6	0.2
Nonexclusionary (percent)	a	a	a	a	98.8	93.4	99.8
Hawaiian/Pacific Islander (number)	463	265	201	313	469	636	720
Exclusionary (percent)	0	0	a	a	a	a	a
Nonexclusionary (percent)	100.0	100.0	a	a	a	a	a
Hispanic (number)	14,676	11,791	10,084	12,380	18,336	19,289	21,733
Exclusionary (percent)	0.1	0.3	0.4	1.2	1.7	1.8	2.7
Nonexclusionary (percent)	99.9	99.7	99.6	98.8	98.3	98.2	97.3
Multiracial (number)	1,606	1,793	1,767	2,778	4,024	4,628	5,244
Exclusionary (percent)	a	a	a	1.5	0.7	1.2	0.9
Nonexclusionary (percent)	a	a	a	98.5	99.3	98.8	99.1
White (number)	37,538	36,954	30,337	36,348	49,694	54,052	61,416
Exclusionary (percent)	0.2	0.2	0.6	1.6	1.6	1.3	1.7
Nonexclusionary (percent)	99.8	99.8	99.4	98.4	98.4	98.7	98.3

Note: $n = 469,225$ office discipline referrals from 401 public schools serving grades K–5 that implemented Positive Behavioral Interventions and Supports and used the Schoolwide Information System for at least one year. The number of schools providing data for the study ranged from 219 to 293 each year. The percentage of office discipline referrals was calculated by dividing the total annual number of nonexclusionary or exclusionary discipline actions experienced by a student racial/ethnic group across all sample schools by the total annual number of office discipline referrals received by the racial/ethnic group across all sample schools. The 2015 school discipline policy reform directed districts to limit exclusionary discipline for students in grades K–5 to situations that pose an immediate risk to the safety of others.

a. Data were suppressed to maintain confidentiality because fewer than 10 exclusionary discipline actions were reported.

Source: Authors' analysis of University of Oregon Schoolwide Information System data for 2011/12–2017/18.

Table C7. For minor infractions, the association between the 2015 policy reform and changes in the likelihood that office discipline referrals became less likely to result in exclusionary discipline and therefore more likely to result in nonexclusionary discipline for K–5 students in the analytic sample of Oregon public schools, by student race/ethnicity and post-policy reform year, 2015/16–2017/18

Student racial/ethnic group	One year post-policy (2015/16)		Two years post-policy (2016/17)		Three years post-policy (2017/18)	
	Percentage point difference	Standard error	Percentage point difference	Standard error	Percentage point difference	Standard error
All students	-0.87***	0.07	-0.92***	0.09	-0.61***	0.11
American Indian/Alaska Native ^a	-0.37	0.71	-0.51	0.86	-1.60	1.03
Asian	-0.45	0.44	0.13	0.55	0.18	0.68
Black	0.34	0.32	0.08	0.41	0.62	0.49
Hawaiian/Pacific Islander ^a	-1.35	1.31	-0.96	1.62	1.80	1.94
Hispanic	-1.05***	0.15	-0.78***	0.19	-0.12	0.23
Multiracial	-1.17***	0.29	-1.50***	0.38	-1.83***	0.47
White	-0.85***	0.09	-0.96***	0.11	-0.70***	0.13

* Significant at $p = .05$, ** significant at $p = 0.01$, *** significant at $p = .001$.

Note: $n = 463,320$ office discipline referrals from 401 public schools serving grades K–5 that implemented Positive Behavioral Interventions and Supports and used the Schoolwide Information System for at least one year. The number of schools providing data for the study ranged from 219 to 293 each year. Percentage point difference examines whether the likelihood that office discipline referrals resulted in exclusionary discipline rather than nonexclusionary discipline differed in the first, second, or third post-policy year from the likelihood in the pre-policy years. A positive percentage point difference indicates that office discipline referrals became more likely to result in (shifted toward) exclusionary discipline and therefore less likely to result in nonexclusionary discipline after the 2015 policy reform. A negative percentage point difference indicates that office discipline referrals became less likely to result in (shifted away from) exclusionary discipline and therefore more likely to result in nonexclusionary discipline. Regression models were run separately for each racial/ethnic group and included student-level controls for grade level, eligibility for the national school lunch program, race/ethnicity, gender, special education status, and a multireferral category (up to one office discipline referral, two to five office discipline referrals, or six or more office discipline referrals), as well as school-level controls for student enrollment, Title I status, percentage of students eligible for the national school lunch program, percentage of White students, and locale. The 2015 school discipline policy reform directed districts to limit exclusionary discipline for students in grades K–5 to situations that pose an immediate risk to the safety of others. Detailed descriptive findings are in table C6.

a. The percentage point differences must be interpreted with caution, as the results could be imprecise because of the low number of office discipline referrals for this student group.

Source: Authors' analysis of University of Oregon Schoolwide Information System data for 2011/12–2017/18.

Table C8. For disruptive behavior infractions, the number and percent of office discipline referrals that resulted in exclusionary discipline or nonexclusionary discipline for K–5 students in the analytic sample of Oregon public schools, by student race/ethnicity and year, 2011/12–2017/18

Student racial/ethnic group and type of discipline	Pre-policy reform				Post-policy reform		
	2011/12	2012/13	2013/14	2014/15	2015/16	2016/17	2017/18
All students (number)	12,594	12,982	10,225	14,099	17,904	22,831	29,489
Exclusionary (percent)	15.7	14.8	13.9	12.8	9.8	8.1	7.7
Nonexclusionary (percent)	84.3	85.2	86.1	87.2	90.2	91.9	92.3
American Indian/Alaska Native (number)	203	222	146	244	228	252	418
Exclusionary (percent)	12.3	16.2	21.9	14.3	15.8	5.6	7.7
Nonexclusionary (percent)	87.7	83.8	78.1	85.7	84.2	94.4	92.3
Asian (number)	113	137	106	114	161	167	151
Exclusionary (percent)	a	13.1	13.2	12.3	8.1	6.0	a
Nonexclusionary (percent)	a	86.9	86.8	87.7	91.9	94.0	a
Black (number)	670	735	666	826	1,078	1,394	1,695
Exclusionary (percent)	16.4	18.2	10.4	8.4	8.3	7.6	5.3
Nonexclusionary (percent)	83.6	81.8	89.6	91.6	91.7	92.4	94.7
Hawaiian/Pacific Islander (number)	62	59	44	69	97	140	205
Exclusionary (percent)	a	22.0	a	a	a	7.1	4.9
Nonexclusionary (percent)	a	78.0	a	a	a	92.9	95.1
Hispanic (number)	2,441	2,978	2,043	2,726	3,695	4,961	5,905
Exclusionary (percent)	14.0	10.6	12.4	12.6	10.2	7.2	9.0
Nonexclusionary (percent)	86.0	89.4	87.6	87.4	89.8	92.8	91.0
Multiracial (number)	487	495	452	723	1,075	1,438	1,680
Exclusionary (percent)	19.7	19.2	13.5	13.0	13.0	9.9	7.0
Nonexclusionary (percent)	80.3	80.8	86.5	87.0	87.0	90.1	93.0
White (number)	8,617	8,356	6,768	9,397	11,570	14,479	19,435
Exclusionary (percent)	16.1	15.7	14.7	13.2	9.8	8.6	7.7
Nonexclusionary (percent)	83.9	84.3	85.3	86.8	90.2	91.4	92.3

Note: $n = 120,123$ office discipline referrals from 401 public schools serving grades K–5 that implemented Positive Behavioral Interventions and Supports and used the Schoolwide Information System for at least one year. The number of schools providing data for the study ranged from 219 to 293 each year. The number of discipline actions per 100 office discipline referrals was calculated by dividing the total annual number of nonexclusionary or exclusionary discipline actions experienced by a student racial/ethnic group across all sample schools by the total annual number of office discipline referrals received by the racial/ethnic group across all sample schools. The 2015 school discipline policy reform directed districts to limit exclusionary discipline for students in grades K–5 to situations that pose an immediate risk to the safety of others.

a. Data were suppressed to maintain confidentiality because fewer than 10 exclusionary discipline actions were reported.

Source: Authors' analysis of University of Oregon Schoolwide Information System data for 2011/12–2017/18.

Table C9. For disruptive behavior infractions, the association between the 2015 policy reform and differences in the likelihood that office discipline referrals became less likely to result in exclusionary discipline and therefore more likely to result in nonexclusionary discipline for K–5 students in the analytic sample of Oregon public schools, by student race/ethnicity and post-policy reform year, 2015/16–2017/18

Student racial/ethnic group	One year post policy (2015/16)		Two years post policy (2016/17)		Three years post policy (2017/18)	
	Percentage point difference	Standard error	Percentage point difference	Standard error	Percentage point difference	Standard error
All students	-2.70***	0.40	-2.38***	0.50	-1.86**	0.61
American Indian/Alaska Native ^a	-4.34	3.76	-11.57*	4.66	-9.72	5.61
Asian ^a	-3.27	4.26	-8.52	5.31	-6.78	6.55
Black	1.12	1.65	5.63**	1.99	5.22*	2.47
Hawaiian/Pacific Islander ^a	-4.97	5.17	-2.56	6.50	-5.30	7.67
Hispanic	-2.55***	0.87	-2.28*	1.07	-0.07	1.31
Multiracial	-1.32	1.82	-2.52	2.33	-0.51	2.87
White	-3.46***	0.51	-3.18***	0.63	-3.40***	0.76

*Significant at $p = .05$, ** significant at $p = .01$, *** significant at $p = .001$.

Note: $n = 118,807$ office discipline referrals for disruptive infractions from 401 public schools serving grades K–5 that implemented Positive Behavioral Interventions and Supports and used the Schoolwide Information System for at least one year. The number of schools providing data for the study ranged from 221 to 297 each year. Percentage point difference examines whether the likelihood that office discipline referrals resulted in exclusionary discipline rather than nonexclusionary discipline differed in the first, second, or third post-policy year from the likelihood in the pre-policy years. A positive percentage point difference indicates that office discipline referrals became more likely to result in (shifted toward) exclusionary discipline and therefore became less likely to result in nonexclusionary discipline after the 2015 policy reform. A negative percentage point difference indicates that office discipline referrals became less likely to result in (shifted away from) exclusionary discipline and therefore became more likely to result in nonexclusionary discipline. Regression models were run separately for each racial/ethnic group and included student-level controls for grade level, eligibility for the national school lunch program, race/ethnicity, gender, special education status, and a multireferral category (up to one office discipline referral, two to five office discipline referrals, or six or more office discipline referrals), as well as school-level controls for student enrollment, Title I status, percentage of students eligible for the national school lunch program, percentage of White students, and locale. The 2015 school discipline policy reform directed districts to limit exclusionary discipline for students in grades K–5 to situations that pose an immediate risk to the safety of others. Detailed descriptive findings are in table C8.

a. The percentage point differences must be interpreted with caution, as the results may be imprecise due to the low number of office discipline referrals for this student group.

Source: Authors' analysis of University of Oregon Schoolwide Information System data for 2011/12–2017/18.

Table C10. For aggression, the number and percent of office discipline referrals that resulted in exclusionary discipline or nonexclusionary discipline for K–5 students in the analytic sample of Oregon public schools, by student race/ethnicity and year, 2011/12–2017/18

Student racial/ethnic group and discipline type	Pre-policy reform				Post-policy reform		
	2011/12	2012/13	2013/14	2014/15	2015/16	2016/17	2017/18
All students (number)	19,017	18,348	14,199	19,207	24,372	29,448	37,484
Exclusionary (percent)	21.9	20.3	19.2	17.8	14.5	13.2	13.7
Nonexclusionary (percent)	78.1	79.7	80.8	82.2	85.5	86.8	86.3
American Indian/Alaska Native (number)	268	350	284	227	281	371	508
Exclusionary (percent)	25.0	20.0	25.7	24.7	14.2	14.0	15.0
Nonexclusionary (percent)	75.0	80.0	74.3	75.3	85.8	86.0	85.0
Asian (number)	240	229	171	215	238	268	302
Exclusionary (percent)	12.9	17.9	19.3	13.5	14.7	14.2	7.9
Nonexclusionary (percent)	87.1	82.1	80.7	86.5	85.3	85.8	92.1
Black (number)	993	1,021	808	1,095	1,473	1,627	1,982
Exclusionary (percent)	22.7	22.8	17.1	16.3	13.7	13.3	14.9
Nonexclusionary (percent)	77.3	77.2	82.9	83.7	86.3	86.7	85.1
Hawaiian/Pacific Islander (number)	129	120	109	118	171	257	296
Exclusionary (percent)	19.4	19.2	11.9	16.9	12.9	10.5	10.1
Nonexclusionary (percent)	80.6	80.8	88.1	83.1	87.1	89.5	89.9
Hispanic (number)	4,306	4,304	3,239	3,995	5,806	7,217	8,470
Exclusionary (percent)	23.1	19.7	17.9	16.3	13.5	13.5	14.4
Nonexclusionary (percent)	76.9	80.3	82.1	83.7	86.5	86.5	85.6
Multiracial (number)	587	647	574	986	1,402	1,830	2,391
Exclusionary (percent)	22.8	19.6	17.9	20.2	16.5	14.1	13.6
Nonexclusionary (percent)	77.2	80.4	82.1	79.8	83.5	85.9	86.4
White (number)	12,494	11,677	9,014	11,571	15,001	17,878	23,535
Exclusionary (percent)	21.5	20.4	19.9	18.3	14.8	13.0	13.4
Nonexclusionary (percent)	78.5	79.6	80.1	81.7	85.2	87.0	86.6

Note: $n = 162,075$ office discipline referrals from 401 public schools serving grades K–5 that implemented Positive Behavioral Interventions and Supports and used the Schoolwide Information System for at least one year. The number of schools providing data for the study ranged from 219 to 293 each year. The percentage of office discipline referrals was calculated by dividing the total annual number of nonexclusionary or exclusionary discipline actions experienced by a student racial/ethnic group across all sample schools by the total annual number of office discipline referrals received by the racial/ethnic group across all sample schools. The 2015 school discipline policy reform directed districts to limit exclusionary discipline for students in grades K–5 to situations that pose an immediate risk to the safety of others.

Source: Authors' analysis of University of Oregon Schoolwide Information System data for 2011/12–2017/18.

Table C11. For aggression, the association between the 2015 policy reform and changes in the likelihood that office discipline referrals became less likely to result in exclusionary discipline and therefore more likely to result in nonexclusionary discipline for K–5 students in the analytic sample of Oregon public schools, by student race/ethnicity and post-policy reform year, 2015/16–2017/18

Student racial/ethnic group	One year post policy (2015/16)		Two years post policy (2016/17)		Three years post policy (2017/18)	
	Percentage point difference	Standard error	Percentage point difference	Standard error	Percentage point difference	Standard error
All students	-1.50***	0.42	-1.47**	0.52	0.09	0.63
American Indian/Alaska Native ^a	-4.62	4.26	-8.10	4.99	-6.78	5.87
Asian ^a	-1.40	3.80	-4.36	4.75	-6.34	5.61
Black	-1.02	1.77	0.28	2.19	3.42	2.66
Hawaiian/Pacific Islander ^a	-2.18	4.78	-1.37	5.83	-1.33	7.00
Hispanic	-1.03	0.87	0.84	1.07	2.92*	1.29
Multiracial ^a	-4.04*	1.91	-6.17*	2.46	-5.75	3.01
White	-1.88***	0.53	-2.58***	0.66	-1.25	0.79

*Significant at $p = .05$, ** significant at $p = .01$, *** significant at $p = .001$.

Note: $n = 158,508$ office discipline referrals for aggression from 401 public schools serving grades K–5 that implemented Positive Behavioral Interventions and Supports and used the Schoolwide Information System for at least one year. The number of schools providing data for the study ranged from 219 to 293 each year. Percentage point difference examines whether the likelihood that office discipline referrals resulted in exclusionary discipline rather than nonexclusionary discipline differed in the first, second, or third post-policy year from the likelihood in the pre-policy years. A positive percentage point difference indicates that office discipline referrals became more likely to result in (shifted toward) exclusionary discipline and therefore became less likely to result in nonexclusionary discipline after the 2015 policy reform. A negative percentage point difference indicates that office discipline referrals became less likely to result in (shifted away from) exclusionary discipline and therefore became more likely to result in nonexclusionary discipline. Regression models were run separately for each racial/ethnic group and included student-level controls for grade level, eligibility for the national school lunch program, race/ethnicity, gender, special education status, and a multireferral category (up to one office discipline referral, two to five office discipline referrals, or six or more office discipline referrals), as well as school-level controls for student enrollment, Title I status, percentage of students eligible for the national school lunch program, percentage of White students, and locale. The 2015 school discipline policy reform directed districts to limit exclusionary discipline for students in grades K–5 to situations that pose an immediate risk to the safety of others. Detailed descriptive findings are in table C10.

a. The percentage point differences must be interpreted with caution, as the results may be imprecise due to the low number of office discipline referrals for this student group.

Source: Authors' analysis of University of Oregon Schoolwide Information System data for 2011/12–2017/18.

Table C12. For school safety infractions, the number and percent of office discipline referrals that resulted in exclusionary discipline or nonexclusionary discipline for K–5 students in the analytic sample of Oregon public schools, by student race/ethnicity and year, 2011/12–2017/18

Student racial/ethnic group and discipline type	Pre-policy reform				Post-policy reform		
	2011/12	2012/13	2013/14	2014/15	2015/16	2016/17	2017/18
All students (number)	322	295	195	237	251	309	337
Exclusionary (percent)	29.5	27.1	36.4	37.6	48.2	49.5	55.2
Nonexclusionary (percent)	70.5	72.9	53.5	62.4	51.8	50.5	44.8
American Indian/Alaska Native (number)	a	a	a	a	a	a	a
Exclusionary (percent)	a	a	a	a	a	a	a
Nonexclusionary (percent)	a	a	a	a	a	a	a
Asian (number)	a	a	a	a	a	a	a
Exclusionary (percent)	a	a	a	a	a	a	a
Nonexclusionary (percent)	a	a	a	a	a	a	a
Black (number)	a	a	a	a	a	a	a
Exclusionary (percent)	a	a	a	a	a	a	a
Nonexclusionary (percent)	a	a	a	a	a	a	a
Hawaiian/Pacific Islander (number)	a	a	a	a	a	a	a
Exclusionary (percent)	a	a	a	a	a	a	a
Nonexclusionary (percent)	a	a	a	a	a	a	a
Hispanic (number)	89	69	51	63	68	90	87
Exclusionary (percent)	66.3	76.8	72.5	69.8	58.8	54.4	49.4
Nonexclusionary (percent)	33.7	23.2	27.5	30.2	41.2	45.6	50.6
Multiracial (number)	a	a	a	a	a	a	a
Exclusionary (percent)	a	a	a	a	a	a	a
Nonexclusionary (percent)	a	a	a	a	a	a	a
White (number)	186	186	123	148	155	168	198
Exclusionary (percent)	73.1	80.4	56.9	62.8	49.0	46.4	45.5
Nonexclusionary (percent)	26.9	29.6	43.1	37.2	51.0	53.6	53.5

Note: $n = 1,946$ office discipline referrals from 401 public schools serving grades K–5 that implemented Positive Behavioral Interventions and Supports and used the Schoolwide Information System for at least one year. The number of schools providing data for the study ranged from 219 to 293 each year. The percentage of office discipline referrals was calculated by dividing the total annual number of nonexclusionary or exclusionary discipline actions experienced by a racial/ethnic group across all sample schools by the total annual number of office discipline referrals received by the racial/ethnic group across all sample schools. The 2015 school discipline policy reform directed districts to limit exclusionary discipline for students in grades K–5 to situations that pose an immediate risk to the safety of others.

a. Data were suppressed to maintain confidentiality because fewer than 10 exclusionary discipline incidents were reported.

Source: Authors' analysis of University of Oregon Schoolwide Information System data for 2011/12–2017/18.

Table C13. For school safety infractions, the association between the 2015 policy reform and changes in the likelihood that office discipline referrals became less likely to result in exclusionary discipline and therefore more likely to result in nonexclusionary discipline for K–5 students in the analytic sample of Oregon public schools, by student race/ethnicity and post-policy reform year, 2015/16–2017/18

Student racial/ethnic group	One year post policy (2015/16)		Two years post policy (2016/17)		Three years post policy (2017/18)	
	Percentage point difference	Standard error	Percentage point difference	Standard error	Percentage point difference	Standard error
All students	-5.40	0.47	-7.35	5.64	-3.64	6.77
American Indian/Alaska Native ^a	a	a	-7.44	51.62	-1.50	60.90
Asian ^a	a	a	a	a	-37.29	51.54
Black ^a	13.62	26.50	45.08	29.31	27.23	34.97
Hawaiian/Pacific Islander	b	b	b	b	b	b
Hispanic ^a	-18.51*	8.93	-22.66*	10.61	-23.91	12.89
Multiracial ^a	34.34	21.27	2.59	24.15	-13.40	31.28
White	-3.97	6.13	-7.28	7.35	0.52	8.79

*Significant at p = .05, ** significant at p = .01, *** significant at p = .001.

Note: $n = 1,925$ office discipline referrals for school safety infractions from 401 public schools serving grades K–5 that implemented Positive Behavioral Interventions and Supports and used the Schoolwide Information System for at least one year. The number of schools providing data for the study ranged from 219 to 293 each year. Percentage point difference examines whether the likelihood that office discipline referrals resulted in exclusionary discipline rather than nonexclusionary discipline differed in the first, second, or third post-policy year from the likelihood in the pre-policy years. A positive percentage point difference indicates that office discipline referrals became more likely to result in (shifted toward) exclusionary discipline and therefore became less likely to result in nonexclusionary discipline after the 2015 policy reform. A negative percentage point difference indicates that office discipline referrals became less likely to result in (shifted away from) exclusionary discipline and therefore became more likely to result in nonexclusionary discipline. Regression models were run separately for each racial/ethnic group and included student-level controls for grade level, eligibility for the national school lunch program, race/ethnicity, gender, special education status, and a multireferral category (up to one office discipline referral, two to five office discipline referrals, or six or more office discipline referrals), as well as school-level controls for student enrollment, Title I status, percentage of students eligible for the national school lunch program, percentage of White students, and locale. The 2015 school discipline policy reform directed districts to limit exclusionary discipline for students in grades K–5 to situations that pose an immediate risk to the safety of others. Detailed descriptive findings are in table C12.

a. The percentage point differences must be interpreted with caution, as the results could be imprecise because of the low number of office discipline referrals for this student group.

b. Analysis could not be conducted because of the low number of office discipline referrals.

Source: Authors' analysis of University of Oregon Schoolwide Information System data for 2011/12–2017/18.

Table C14. For property infractions, the number and percent of office discipline referrals that resulted in exclusionary discipline or nonexclusionary discipline for K–5 students in the analytic sample of Oregon public schools, by student race/ethnicity and year, 2011/12–2017/18

Student racial/ethnic group and discipline type	Pre-policy reform				Post-policy reform		
	2011/12	2012/13	2013/14	2014/15	2015/16	2016/17	2017/18
All students (number)	2,210	2,085	1,614	1,979	2,520	2,652	3,128
Exclusionary (percent)	15.6	16.5	12.5	12.2	9.6	8.3	7.4
Nonexclusionary (percent)	84.4	83.6	87.5	87.8	91.4	91.7	92.6
American Indian/Alaska Native (number)	32	37	22	23	20	40	48
Exclusionary (percent)	a	a	a	a	a	a	a
Nonexclusionary (percent)	a	a	a	a	a	a	a
Asian (number)	29	36	24	19	29	26	20
Exclusionary (percent)	a	a	a	a	0	a	0
Nonexclusionary (percent)	a	a	a	a	100.0	a	100.0
Black (number)	99	106	80	118	104	130	144
Exclusionary (percent)	18.2	19.8	a	13.6	a	a	6.9
Nonexclusionary (percent)	81.8	80.2	a	86.4	a	a	93.1
Hawaiian/Pacific Islander (number)	13	13	9	16	17	20	59
Exclusionary (percent)	a	a	a	a	a	a	a
Nonexclusionary (percent)	a	a	a	a	a	a	a
Hispanic (number)	549	538	408	427	588	642	719
Exclusionary (percent)	14.9	14.9	12.3	11.2	9.5	7.5	6.8
Nonexclusionary (percent)	85.1	85.1	87.7	88.8	90.5	92.5	93.2
Multiracial (number)	59	81	58	101	148	146	172
Exclusionary (percent)	22.0	23.5	a	15.8	11.5	a	11.0
Nonexclusionary (percent)	78.0	76.5	a	84.2	88.5	a	89.0
White (number)	1,429	1,274	1,013	1,275	1,614	1,648	2,005
Exclusionary (percent)	15.4	16.1	13.0	12.2	8.3	9.0	7.5
Nonexclusionary (percent)	84.6	83.9	87.0	87.8	91.7	91.0	92.5

Note: $n = 16,188$ office discipline referrals from 401 public schools serving grades K–5 that implemented Positive Behavioral Interventions and Supports and used the Schoolwide Information System for at least one year. The number of schools providing data for the study ranged from 219 to 293 each year. The percentage of office discipline referrals was calculated by dividing the total annual number of nonexclusionary or exclusionary discipline actions experienced by a racial/ethnic group across all sample schools by the total annual number of office discipline referrals received by the racial/ethnic group across all sample schools. The 2015 school discipline policy reform directed districts to limit exclusionary discipline for students in grades K–5 to situations that pose an immediate risk to the safety of others.

a. Data were suppressed to maintain confidentiality because fewer than 10 exclusionary discipline actions were reported.

Source: Authors' analysis of University of Oregon Schoolwide Information System data for 2011/12–2017/18.

Table C15. For property infractions, the association between the 2015 policy reform and changes in the likelihood that office discipline referrals became less likely to result in exclusionary discipline and therefore more likely to result in nonexclusionary discipline for K–5 students in the analytic sample of Oregon public schools, by student race/ethnicity and post-policy reform year, 2015/16–2017/18

Student racial/ethnic group	One year post-policy (2015/16)		Two years post-policy (2016/17)		Three years post-policy (2017/18)	
	Percentage point difference	Standard error	Percentage point difference	Standard error	Percentage point difference	Standard error
All students	-2.51*	1.06	-2.77*	1.32	-1.82	1.58
American Indian/Alaska Native ^a	5.58	11.53	-0.68	12.64	-3.12	15.39
Asian ^a	-13.15	8.84	-15.52	11.49	-14.44	13.93
Black ^a	-0.13	4.77	-0.82	5.84	3.85	6.95
Hawaiian/Pacific Islander ^a	-17.83	14.50	-8.31	17.15	-5.68	20.46
Hispanic	-1.56	2.20	-3.42	2.71	-2.16	3.25
Multiracial ^a	-2.75	5.11	-6.93	6.55	1.67	8.04
White	-3.39*	1.33	-2.63	1.65	-2.12	1.97

*Significant at $p = .05$, ** significant at $p = .01$, *** significant at $p = .001$.

Note: $n = 15,954$ office discipline referrals for property infractions from 401 public schools serving grades K–5 that implemented Positive Behavioral Interventions and Supports and used the Schoolwide Information System for at least one year. The number of schools providing data for the study ranged from 219 to 293 each year. Percentage point difference examines whether the likelihood that office discipline referrals resulted in exclusionary discipline rather than nonexclusionary discipline differed in the first, second, or third post-policy year from the likelihood in the pre-policy years. A positive percentage point difference indicates that office discipline referrals became more likely to result in (shifted toward) exclusionary discipline and therefore became less likely to result in nonexclusionary discipline after the 2015 policy reform. A negative percentage point difference indicates that office discipline referrals became less likely to result in (shifted away from) exclusionary discipline and therefore became more likely to result in nonexclusionary discipline. Regression models were run separately for each racial/ethnic group and included student-level controls for grade level, eligibility for the national school lunch program, race/ethnicity, gender, special education status, and a multireferral category (up to one office discipline referral, two to five office discipline referrals, or six or more office discipline referrals), as well as school-level controls for student enrollment, Title I status, percentage of students eligible for the national school lunch program, percentage of White students, and locale. The 2015 school discipline policy reform directed districts to limit exclusionary discipline for students in grades K–5 to situations that pose an immediate risk to the safety of others. Detailed descriptive findings are in table C14.

a. The percentage point differences must be interpreted with caution, as the results may be imprecise because of the low number of office discipline referrals for this student group.

Source: Authors' analysis of University of Oregon Schoolwide Information System data for 2011/12–2017/18.

Table C16. For other infractions, the number and percent of office discipline referrals that resulted in exclusionary discipline and nonexclusionary discipline for K–5 students in the analytic sample of Oregon public schools, by student race/ethnicity and year, 2011/12–2017/18

Student racial/ethnic group and discipline type	Pre-policy reform				Post-policy reform		
	2011/12	2012/13	2013/14	2014/15	2015/16	2016/17	2017/18
All students (number)	1,687	1,482	1,459	1,797	2,252	3,556	3,481
Exclusionary (percent)	19.0	20.2	17.3	14.9	10.4	11.6	7.9
Nonexclusionary (percent)	81.0	79.8	82.7	85.1	89.6	88.4	92.1
American Indian/Alaska Native (number)	28	20	32	24	20	24	51
Exclusionary (percent)	a	a	a	a	a	a	a
Nonexclusionary (percent)	a	a	a	a	a	a	a
Asian (number)	19	19	24	25	27	34	37
Exclusionary (percent)	a	a	a	a	a	a	a
Nonexclusionary (percent)	a	a	a	a	a	a	a
Black (number)	64	50	49	73	74	166	102
Exclusionary (percent)	17.2	a	26.5	13.7	13.5	20.5	13.7
Nonexclusionary (percent)	82.8	a	73.5	86.3	86.5	79.5	86.3
Hawaiian/Pacific Islander (number)	7	8	10	6	15	22	17
Exclusionary (percent)	14.3	37.5	20.0	16.7	6.7	18.2	11.8
Nonexclusionary (percent)	85.7	62.5	80.0	83.3	93.3	81.8	88.2
Hispanic (number)	362	317	269	392	407	779	717
Exclusionary (percent)	a	a	a	a	a	a	a
Nonexclusionary (percent)	a	a	a	a	a	a	a
Multiracial (number)	72	54	46	85	133	250	177
Exclusionary (percent)	27.8	a	a	18.8	9.8	16.4	6.2
Nonexclusionary (percent)	72.2	a	a	81.2	90.2	83.6	93.8
White (number)	1,135	1,014	1,029	1,192	1,576	2,281	2,380
Exclusionary (percent)	17.8	20.0	16.4	14.8	10.8	10.2	7.6
Nonexclusionary (percent)	82.2	80.0	83.6	85.2	89.2	89.8	92.4

Note: $n = 15,714$ office discipline referrals from 401 public schools serving grades K–5 that implemented Positive Behavioral Interventions and Supports and used the Schoolwide Information System for at least one year. The number of schools providing data for the study ranged from 219 to 293 each year. The percentage of office discipline referrals was calculated by dividing the total annual number of nonexclusionary or exclusionary discipline actions experienced by a racial/ethnic group across all sample schools by the total annual number of office discipline referrals received by the racial/ethnic group across all sample schools. The 2015 school discipline policy reform directed districts to limit exclusionary discipline for students in grades K–5 to situations that pose an immediate risk to the safety of others.

a. Data were suppressed because fewer than 10 exclusionary discipline incidents were reported.

Source: Authors' analysis of University of Oregon Schoolwide Information System data for 2011/12–2017/18.

Table C17. For other infractions, the association between the 2015 policy reform and changes in the likelihood that office discipline referrals became less likely to result in exclusionary discipline and therefore more likely to result in nonexclusionary discipline of K–5 students in the analytic sample of Oregon public schools, by student race/ethnicity and post-reform policy year, 2015/16–2017/18

Student racial/ethnic group	One year post policy 2015/16		Two years post policy 2016/17		Three years post policy 2017/18	
	Percentage point difference	Standard error	Percentage point difference	Standard error	Percentage point difference	Standard error
All students	-3.23**	1.23	-2.19	1.53	-2.76	1.87
American Indian/Alaska Native	0.17	11.38	16.07	12.78	11.10	15.32
Asian	13.89	9.95	14.77	13.30	32.02*	15.59
Black	2.04	7.21	10.54	8.61	9.46	10.62
Hawaiian/Pacific Islander	-34.50*	18.50	-17.19	23.19	-31.42	28.99
Hispanic	-5.01	2.76	-1.75	3.31	-2.25	4.08
Multiracial	-5.17	6.07	1.87	7.57	-4.84	9.54
White	-3.40*	1.47	-4.11*	1.83	-4.38*	2.23

*Significant at $p = .05$ ** significant at $p = .01$, *** significant at $p = .001$.

Note: $n = 15,539$ office discipline referrals for other infractions from 401 public schools serving grades K–5 that implemented Positive Behavioral Interventions and Supports and used the Schoolwide Information System for at least one year. The number of schools providing data for the study ranged from 219 to 293 each year. Percentage point difference examines whether the likelihood that office discipline referrals resulted in exclusionary discipline rather than nonexclusionary discipline differed in the first, second, or third post-policy year from the likelihood in the pre-policy years. A positive percentage point difference indicates that office discipline referrals became more likely to result in (shifted toward) exclusionary discipline and therefore became less likely to result in nonexclusionary discipline after the 2015 policy reform. A negative percentage point difference indicates that office discipline referrals became less likely to result in (shifted away from) exclusionary discipline and therefore became more likely to result in nonexclusionary discipline. Regression models were run separately for each racial/ethnic group and included student-level controls for grade level, eligibility for the national school lunch program, race/ethnicity, gender, special education status, and a multireferral category (up to one office discipline referral, two to five office discipline referrals, or six or more office discipline referrals), as well as school-level controls for student enrollment, Title I status, percentage of students eligible for the national school lunch program, percentage of White students, and locale. The 2015 school discipline policy reform directed districts to limit exclusionary discipline for students in grades K–5 to situations that pose an immediate risk to the safety of others. Detailed descriptive findings are in table C16.

a. The percentage point differences must be interpreted with caution, as the results may be imprecise because of the low number of office discipline referrals for this student group.

Source: Authors' analysis of University of Oregon Schoolwide Information System data for 2011/12–2017/18.