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Introduction
Effective systems of support in school districts include the establishment of coaching capacity to sustain implementation (Sugai, 2011). Coaching can increase the likelihood of successful outcomes (Joyce & Showers, 2002; Joyce, et al., 1996) & increase sustainability of those outcomes (Fixsen & Blasd, 1993; Sugai & Simson, 2007; Kincaid & Dowhurst, n.d.).

Purpose
The purpose of this study is to investigate the influence of three coach/coordinator variables on school outcomes. These three variables are:
- Time allocated to provide support (Horner, n.d.; Southern Poverty Law Center, n.d.)
- Skill level of coach/coordinator (Scott & Martinke, 2006; Sugai, 2010; Lewis-Palmer, Barrett, & Lewis, 2004)
- Leadership style of PBIS district coach/coordinators (Avolio & Bass, 1999)

Materials & Methods
Participants
41 coach/coordinators participated in the survey. Their participation represented 32 school districts or 28% of North Carolina school districts.

Sample
The survey was distributed to district PBIS representatives by the NC PBIS Regional Coordinators via email. The invitation to participate specified that participants for the survey should be district leaders, rather than school-based PBIS coach/coordinators.

Measures
Coach/Coordinator
- Survey: A 117 item on-line survey was developed. The first 29 questions of the survey addressed the coach, the district, and time or other resources for support of PBIS.
- Coach’s Self-Assessment (Lewis-Palmer, Barrett, & Lewis, 2004): utilized to measure self-perception of coaching skills
- Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire (MLQ) Leader Form 5X (Avolio, B. & Bass, B., 1999): utilized to evaluate leadership styles of coach/coordinators

Time
Several significant differences were detected for the outcome variables based on district coach/coordinator direct or indirect time allocated for support of schools.
- less time was related to higher performance (Table A), the number of schools coordinated and the number of hours per week of direct support ($n=360$, $p=.021$, $r=.33$) and number of hours per month of indirect support ($n=482$, $p=.005$, $r=.39$) were positively correlated (Table B).

Results

Coach/Coordinator Data
41 coach/coordinators responded to the survey. Refer to: Fig. A and B for additional demographic data. Respondents time allocation is reported in Fig. C and D. The primary concerns regarding implementation are reported in Fig. E.

Time (continued)

Table C

Coach/Coordinator

Time

Mean

F

p

SET yes, $m=91.7$

SET no, $m=87.3$

Recognition

R
t

p

-3.62

.28

.010

Leadership Style
A negative correlation was found between Laissez-Faire Leadership and Implementation Inventory Scores ($r=-.39$, $p=.028$). Mean differences were found for transactional leadership style and the self perception of being a district leader ($t(38)=-.84$, $p=.42$).

Conclusions
- Less coaching time is associated with higher SET scores and School Recognition
- Coach/coordinators who attend regional meetings less often report higher SET and Implementation Inventory Scores
- Total Coach self-assessment scores are significantly related to Implementation Inventory Scores
- Time allocation is also significantly related to skills reflected on the Coaching Self-Assessment
- A hands-off approach to leadership was negatively correlated with Implementation Inventory Scores
- Transactional Leaders are more likely to perceive themselves as a leader of PBIS

Next steps
Further investigation is needed to determine if less contact with regional supports is resulting in score inflation. Other variables such as the presence of a district leadership team, the number of years as a coordinator, and the number of schools coordinated have a significant impact on school district outcomes. Based on these results, state and regional resources will be directed to support district coach/coordinators with: developing district leadership teams, ongoing skill development, management of multiple schools, and enhancing leadership capacity.
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Table D

Leadership Style
A negative correlation was found between Laissez-Faire Leadership and Implementation Inventory Scores ($r=-.39$, $p=.028$). Mean differences were found for transactional leadership style and the self perception of being a district leader ($t(38)=-.84$, $p=.42$).
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