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FIGURE S1. FABI Model Overview

ARTICLE TITLE: Building Site-Level Capacity for Functional Assessment-based Interventions: Outcomes of a Professional Learning Series

|  |
| --- |
| A Systematic Approach to Functional Assessment-based Interventions: A Brief Overview Functional approaches to intervention frequently (a) teach functionally equivalent replacement behaviors (and, as appropriate, other skill deficits), and (b) make environmental adjustments such as adjusting the antecedents that occasion behavior and/or the consequences following a behavior. Umbreit et al. (2007) developed a systematic approach for conducting FABIs, which is practitioner friendly and particularly well-suited for being building capacity in an authentic school context. Using the FABI model, tools similar to graphic organizers are used to assist teams in determining function, intervention focus, and intervention build.  The *function matrix* is a graphic organizer used to analyze whether challenging behaviors are maintained by positive reinforcement (access) or negative reinforcement (escape/avoidance), with individuals seeking or avoiding attention, activities or tangibles, and/or sensory stimuli (Umbreit et al., 2007). Information gleaned from the functional assessment is analyzed, sorted by function, and entered in one or more of the six respective cells. The function matrix can be used to summarize a wide range of data to help develop a functional hypothesis statement by identifying which cell or cells within the function matrix holds the most functional assessment data. This tool helps link the results of the functional assessment to the intervention.  The function-based intervention decision modelis used to select the intervention focus. To appropriately select one of three intervention methods or one hybrid method, two key questions are asked: *Can the student perform the replacement behavior?* and *Do antecedent conditions represent effective practices?* These questions help identify which intervention method to focus on during the design and implementation of the BIP. *Method 1:* *Teach the replacement behavior* is used when the replacement behavior is not in the student’s repertoire (acquisition deficit). *Method 2:* *Improve the environment* is used when the student has the replacement behavior in his or her repertoire, yet the antecedent conditions preceding the behavior may not offer the most effective conditions for preventing the target behavior and/or eliciting the replacement behavior for this student. *Method 3: Adjust the contingencies* is used when the replacement behavior is in the student’s repertoire and antecedent conditions represent sufficiently effective practices. In this case, shifts in the contingencies following the behavior are implemented to decrease the rate of reinforcement for the target behavior and to increase the rate of reinforcement for the replacement behavior is needed. Finally, there is a combination of *Methods 1 and 2:* *Teaching the replacement behavior and improving the environment.*  Finally, A-R-E components are used in the intervention build by including antecedent (A) adjustments, reinforcement (R) adjustments, and extinction (E) procedures. Antecedent adjustments are programmed to target variables that occur in the environment to make the problem behavior less likely and make the replacement behavior more likely (Dunlap et al., 1991). Consequences following the target and/or replacement behavior are manipulated to reinforce the replacement behavior and extinguish the problem behavior. Extinction procedures are also programmed to withhold the consequence that previously reinforced the problem behavior when the problem behavior occurs (Janney et al., 2012). |
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TABLE S1. Participant Characteristics – Team Members.

ARTICLE TITLE: Building Site-Level Capacity for Functional Assessment-based Interventions: Outcomes of a Professional Learning Series

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Variable | Level | Total *n* = 342  *n* (%) |
| Gender | Male | 51 (15.18) |
|  | Female | 285 (84.82) |
| Highest Degree Obtained | Bachelor’s Degree | 62 (18.40) |
|  | Master’s Degree | 151 (44.81) |
|  | Master’s Degree + 30 credits | 95 (28.19) |
|  | Doctoral Degree/ Educational Specialist | 29 (8.61) |
| Role | General Education Teacher | 93 (27.35) |
|  | Special Education Teacher | 34 (10.00) |
|  | Administrator | 74 (21.76) |
|  | Related Service Provider | 134 (39.41) |
|  | Other | 5 (1.47) |
| Grade Levels Taught | Early Childhood | 1 (0.80) |
|  | Pre-kindergarten | 6 (4.80) |
|  | Kindergarten | 18 (14.40) |
|  | 1 | 18 (14.40) |
|  | 2 | 19 (15.20) |
|  | 3 | 22 (17.60) |
|  | 4 | 26 (20.80) |
|  | 5 | 22 (17.60) |
|  | 6 | 12 (9.60) |
|  | 7 | 17 (13.60) |
|  | 8 | 18 (14.40) |
|  | 9 | 8 (6.40) |
|  | 10 | 8 (6.40) |
|  | 11 | 9 (7.20) |
|  | 12 | 10 (8.0) |
| Education & Experience | Certification for Current Assignment | 125 (99.21) |
|  | Board Certified Behavior Analyst | 3 (0.92) |
|  | Years of Experience in Current Position | *M* = 10.73  (*SD* = 8.91; Range: 1-36) |
|  | Years of Experience in field | *M* = 15.44  (*SD* = 9.37; Range: 1-40) |
|  | Coursework in classroom management | 235 (71.65) |
|  | Coursework in functional assessment | 110 (34.16) |
|  | Training in academic screening | 261 (77.91) |
|  | Training in behavior screening | 177 (52.84) |
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TABLE S2. State Trainer and District Coach Characteristics.

ARTICLE TITLE: Building Site-Level Capacity for Functional Assessment-based Interventions: Outcomes of a Professional Learning Series

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Variable | Level | State Trainer | District Coach |
| Total *n* = 6 | Total *n* = 24 *n* (%) |
| Team Members |  |  |  |
| Gender *n* (%) | Male | 0 (0) | 2 (8.33) |
|  | Female | 6 (100) | 22 (91.67) |
| Highest Degree Obtained *n* (%) | Bachelor’s degree | 0 (0) | 3 (12.50) |
|  | Master’s degree | 2 (33.33) | 7 (29.17) |
|  | Master’s degree + 30 credits | 4 (66.67) | 11 (45.83) |
|  | Doctoral degree/Educational specialist | 0 (0) | 3 (12.50) |
| Role *n* (%) | State technical assistance provider | 6 (100) |  |
|  | Administrator | 0 (0) | 8 (33.33) |
|  | Related service provider | 0 (0) | 6 (25.00) |
|  | Other | 0 (0) | 10 (41.67) |
| Education & Experience | Years of experience in current position *M* (*SD*) | M = 3  (*SD* = 0) | M = 9.30  (*SD* = 7.78;  Range: 1-27) |
|  | Years of experience in field *M* (*SD*) | 20.50  (*SD* = 14.85) | M = 18.33  (*SD* = 6.98) |
|  | Coursework in classroom management *n* (%) | 5 (83.33) | 18 (75.00) |
|  | Coursework in functional assessment *n* (%) | 6 (100) | 10 (41.67) |
|  | PD in academic screening | 5 (83.33) | 24 (100) |
|  | PD in behavior screening screener *n* (%) | 6 (100) | 13 (54.17) |
|  |  |  |  |

*Note.* Information is representative of participants who completed the items on the demographic measure. BCBA = Board Certified Behavior Analyst, K = kindergarten, PK = prekindergarten, and PD = professional development.
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TABLE S3. Participant Characteristics – Student

ARTICLE TITLE: Building Site-Level Capacity for Functional Assessment-based Interventions: Outcomes of a Professional Learning Series

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Variable | Level | Total *n* = 67  *n* (%) |
| Students receiving FABI |  |  |
| Gender | Male | 53 (81.54) |
|  | Female | 12 (18.46) |
| Grade level | PK | 0 (0) |
|  | K | 5 (7.69) |
|  | 1 | 8 (12.31) |
|  | 2 | 9 (13.85) |
|  | 3 | 10 (15.38) |
|  | 4 | 8 (12.31) |
|  | 5 | 7 (10.77) |
|  | 6 | 0 (0) |
|  | 7 | 6 (9.23) |
|  | 8 | 5 (7.69) |
|  | 9 | 1 (1.54) |
|  | 10 | 2 (3.08) |
|  | 11 | 2 (3.08) |
|  | 12 | 2 (3.08) |
|  | Other | 0 (0) |
| Student status | General education | 38 (59.38) |
|  | Special education | 26 (40.63) |
| Primary eligibility category for Special education services | Autism | 3 (4.69) |
|  | Emotional disturbance | 5 (7.81) |
|  | Intellectual disability | 2 (3.13) |
|  | Other health impairment | 6 (9.38) |
|  | Specific learning disability | 4 (6.25) |
|  | Speech or language impairment | 3 (4.69) |
|  | Gifted | 2 (3.13) |
|  | Not specified | 1 (1.56) |

*Note.* Information is representative of information completed by teams during the FABI process; not total sample. FABI = functional assessment-based intervention, K = Kindergarten, PK = Prekindergarten.
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TABLE S4. FABI Case Characteristics of student participants

ARTICLE TITLE: Building Site-Level Capacity for Functional Assessment-based Interventions: Outcomes of a Professional Learning Series

| Variable | Level | Total *n* = 67 |
| --- | --- | --- |
|  |  | *n* (*%*) |
| Target behavior | Defiance | 1 (1.56) |
| (missing data = 3) | Disruption | 10 (15.63) |
|  | Inappropriate talking in class | 2 (3.13) |
|  | Negative social interactions | 3 (4.69) |
|  | Noncompliance | 9 (14.06) |
|  | Nonengagement | 1 (1.56) |
|  | Off-task | 33 (51.56) |
|  | Off-task/Disruptive | 1 (1.56) |
|  | Rapid pressure vocalization | 1 (1.56) |
|  | Tardiness | 1 (1.56) |
|  | Temper tantrums | 1 (1.56) |
|  | Verbal aggression | 1 (1.56) |
| Number of hypothesized functions | One | 17 (27.42) |
| (missing data = 5) | Two | 28 (45.16) |
|  | Three | 16 (25.81) |
|  | Four | 1 (1.61) |
| Function of behavior | SR+ Attention | 52 (83.87) |
| (missing data = 5) | SR- Attention | 1 (1.61) |
|  | SR+ Tangibles/Activities | 1 (1.61) |
|  | SR- Tangibles/Activities | 37 (59.68) |
|  | SR+ Sensory | 18 (29.03) |
|  | SR- Sensory | 0 (0) |
| Replacement behavior | Academic engagement/on-task | 37 (57.81) |
| (missing data = 3) | Appropriate voice level | 2 (3.13) |
|  | Appropriately requesting for help | 3 (4.69) |
|  | Arriving on time | 1 (1.56) |
|  | Compliance | 11 (17.19) |
|  | Hands to self | 1 (1.56) |
|  | List of functions\* | 1 (1.56) |
|  | Pro-social verbal behavior | 2 (3.13) |
|  | Socially acceptable (pro-social) behaviors | 4 (6.24) |
|  | Typical babbling | 1 (1.56) |
|  | Sensory tool use | 1 (1.56) |
| Targeted dimension of behavior | Frequency | 8 (44.44) |
| (missing data = 49) | Rate | 8 (44.44) |
|  | Duration | 1 (5.56) |
|  | Latency | 0 (0) |
|  | Topography | 0 (0) |
|  | Locus | 0 (0) |
|  | Force | 0 (0) |
|  | Other (e.g., non-behavior dimension) | 1 (5.56) |
| Selected measurement system | Event recording | 29 (53.70) |
| (missing data = 13) | Partial interval recording | 0 (0) |
|  | Whole interval recording | 0 (0) |
|  | Momentary time sampling | 25 (46.30) |
| Dimension and measurement system alignment | Did not align | 8 (42.11) |
| (missing data = 48) | Aligned | 11 (57.89) |
| Intervention method | Method 1: Teach the replacement behavior | 2 (3.77) |
| (missing data = 14) | Method 2: Improve the environment | 27 (50.94) |
|  | Method 3: Adjust the Contingencies | 18 (33.96) |
|  | Combination of Method 1 and 2 | 6 (11.32) |
| Function and intervention alignment | Did not align | 8 (15.38) |
| (missing data = 15) | Aligned | 44 (84.62) |
| Social validity *M* (SD): Range | Teacher perspective: Pre (missing data = 12) | 79.49 (11.85):  15-90 |
|  | Teacher perspective: Post (missing data = 24) | 77.33 (11.40):  34-90 |
|  | Child perspective: Pre (missing data = 16) | 36.49 (5.33):  15-42 |
|  | Child perspective: Post (missing data = 26) | 36.17 (6.12):  15-42 |
| Established a functional relation | Did not establish functional relation | 35 (79.55) |
| (missing data = 23) | Established functional relation | 9 (20.45) |

*Note*. Information is representative of information completed by teams during the FABI process.

Social validity parent = Intervention Rating Profile-15 (IRP-15; Witt & Elliott, 1985; range = 15 - 90); social validity student = Children’s Intervention Rating Profile (CIRP; Witt & Elliott, 1985; range = 7 - 42) with higher scores suggesting higher social validity. SR+ refers to positive reinforcement. SR- negative reinforcement (Cooper, Heron, Heward, 2020). \*indicates incorrect label for replacement behavior.
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TABLE S5. Results of Multiple Regression from Pooled Multiply Imputed Sets on Formative Assessment, Sessions 1-5: Difference and Post Scores.

ARTICLE TITLE: Building Site-Level Capacity for Functional Assessment-based Interventions: Outcomes of a Professional Learning Series

Table 14 Results of Multiple Regression from Pooled Multiply Imputed Sets on Formative Assessment, Sessions 1-5: Difference and Post Scores.

| Construct | Est | SE | *t* | df | *p* | 95 CI |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Difference Day 1 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Reference group (Intercept) | 1.81 | 0.64 | 2.84 | 214.88 | 0.01 | 0.55 - 3.06 |
| Cohort B | 0.21 | 0.29 | 0.73 | 208.88 | 0.47 | -0.36 - 0.78 |
| Cohort C | -0.12 | 0.30 | -0.41 | 195.12 | 0.68 | -0.71 - 0.47 |
| Special educator | 0.37 | 0.40 | 0.92 | 232.36 | 0.36 | -0.42 - 1.17 |
| Administrator | 0.06 | 0.40 | 0.15 | 239.45 | 0.88 | -0.72 - 0.84 |
| Related Service provider | -0.09 | 0.36 | -0.24 | 254.46 | 0.81 | -0.8 - 0.62 |
| Staff | -0.23 | 1.12 | -0.21 | 122.93 | 0.84 | -2.45 - 1.98 |
| Teacher of student | 0.06 | 0.35 | 0.16 | 181.58 | 0.87 | -0.63 - 0.74 |
| Years’ experience | <0.01 | 0.02 | 0.22 | 191.92 | 0.83 | -0.04 - 0.04 |
| Master's degree | -0.02 | 0.38 | -0.05 | 221.40 | 0.96 | -0.76 - 0.72 |
| Master's+30 units | 0.30 | 0.43 | 0.69 | 212.07 | 0.49 | -0.55 - 1.15 |
| Doctoral degree | -0.30 | 0.54 | -0.54 | 243.37 | 0.59 | -1.37 - 0.78 |
| Age | -0.01 | 0.02 | -0.44 | 215.37 | 0.66 | -0.04 - 0.03 |
| Difference Day 2 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Reference group (Intercept) | 0.55 | 0.77 | 0.72 | 175.47 | 0.47 | -0.96 - 2.06 |
| Cohort B | -0.35 | 0.33 | -1.08 | 204.71 | 0.28 | -1 - 0.29 |
| Cohort C | 0.01 | 0.35 | 0.02 | 174.24 | 0.98 | -0.68 - 0.70 |
| Special educator | -0.89 | 0.47 | -1.88 | 208.35 | 0.06 | -1.82 - 0.04 |
| Administrator | -0.53 | 0.53 | -0.99 | 137.62 | 0.32 | -1.58 - 0.53 |
| Related service provider | -0.44 | 0.44 | -0.99 | 192.47 | 0.32 | -1.31 - 0.43 |
| Staff | -1.88 | 1.17 | -1.60 | 151.54 | 0.11 | -4.19 - 0.44 |
| Teacher of student | 0.47 | 0.41 | 1.15 | 161.89 | 0.25 | -0.34 - 1.28 |
| Years’ experience | -0.02 | 0.02 | -0.80 | 142.64 | 0.42 | -0.07 - 0.03 |
| Master's degree | 0.14 | 0.43 | 0.32 | 205.76 | 0.75 | -0.72 - 0.99 |
| Master's+30 units | -0.37 | 0.48 | -0.77 | 225.79 | 0.44 | -1.31 - 0.57 |
| Doctoral degree | -0.29 | 0.65 | -0.44 | 206.51 | 0.66 | -1.56 - 0.99 |
| Age | 0.04 | 0.02 | 1.74 | 145.86 | 0.08 | -0.01 - 0.08 |
| Difference Day 3 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Reference group (Intercept) | -0.04 | 1.56 | -0.02 | 93.20 | 0.98 | -3.13 - 3.06 |
| Cohort B | -0.90 | 1.26 | -0.71 | 31.60 | 0.48 | -3.46 - 1.67 |
| Cohort C | 0.87 | 0.65 | 1.33 | 114.86 | 0.18 | -0.42 - 2.16 |
| Special educator | -0.89 | 0.94 | -0.95 | 112.50 | 0.35 | -2.74 - 0.97 |
| Administrator | -0.60 | 0.91 | -0.66 | 118.32 | 0.51 | -2.4 - 1.2 |
| Related Service provider | -0.39 | 0.88 | -0.45 | 106.94 | 0.66 | -2.13 - 1.34 |
| Staff | -1.08 | 1.99 | -0.55 | 130.53 | 0.59 | -5.02 - 2.85 |
| Teacher of student | 0.33 | 0.74 | 0.45 | 114.82 | 0.66 | -1.14 - 1.8 |
| Years’ experience | 0.01 | 0.04 | 0.27 | 150.90 | 0.79 | -0.07 - 0.09 |
| Master's degree | 0.49 | 0.98 | 0.49 | 81.61 | 0.62 | -1.47 - 2.44 |
| Master's+30 units | 0.44 | 1.11 | 0.39 | 81.24 | 0.70 | -1.78 - 2.65 |
| Doctoral degree | 0.11 | 1.35 | 0.08 | 97.96 | 0.93 | -2.57 - 2.79 |
| Age | 0.01 | 0.04 | 0.33 | 100.30 | 0.74 | -0.06 - 0.09 |
| Difference Day 4 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Reference group (Intercept) | 1.43 | 1.10 | 1.31 | 125.16 | 0.19 | -0.74 - 3.6 |
| Cohort B | 0.32 | 0.54 | 0.60 | 99.44 | 0.55 | -0.75 - 1.38 |
| Cohort C | 0.46 | 0.51 | 0.91 | 117.77 | 0.37 | -0.55 - 1.48 |
| Special educator | 0.05 | 0.69 | 0.08 | 135.92 | 0.94 | -1.31 - 1.42 |
| Administrator | 0.60 | 0.72 | 0.83 | 118.53 | 0.41 | -0.82 - 2.03 |
| Related service provider | -0.16 | 0.62 | -0.26 | 142.57 | 0.79 | -1.39 - 1.07 |
| Staff | 0.04 | 1.49 | 0.03 | 154.41 | 0.98 | -2.9 - 2.97 |
| Teacher of student | 0.04 | 0.55 | 0.07 | 135.19 | 0.95 | -1.06 - 1.13 |
| Years’ experience | -0.02 | 0.03 | -0.62 | 112.08 | 0.54 | -0.09 - 0.05 |
| Master's degree | -0.20 | 0.61 | -0.34 | 153.43 | 0.74 | -1.4 - 0.99 |
| Master's+30 units | 0.26 | 0.71 | 0.37 | 136.37 | 0.71 | -1.15 - 1.68 |
| Doctoral degree | -0.02 | 1.01 | -0.02 | 113.64 | 0.98 | -2.02 - 1.97 |
| Age | 0.02 | 0.03 | 0.63 | 137.78 | 0.53 | -0.04 - 0.07 |
| Difference Day 5 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Reference group (Intercept) | 1.33 | 1.25 | 1.06 | 87.14 | 0.29 | -1.15 - 3.8 |
| Cohort B | 0.05 | 0.57 | 0.09 | 84.16 | 0.93 | -1.07 - 1.18 |
| Cohort C | -0.02 | 0.57 | -0.03 | 85.12 | 0.98 | -1.16 - 1.13 |
| Special educator | -1.85 | 0.77 | -2.41 | 98.14 | 0.02 | -3.37 - -0.32 |
| Administrator | -0.78 | 0.85 | -0.92 | 76.49 | 0.36 | -2.48 - 0.92 |
| Related service provider | -1.28 | 0.78 | -1.64 | 79.10 | 0.10 | -2.82 - 0.27 |
| Staff | -0.82 | 1.54 | -0.53 | 132.33 | 0.60 | -3.85 - 2.22 |
| Teacher of student | -0.12 | 0.68 | -0.17 | 78.12 | 0.86 | -1.48 - 1.24 |
| Years’ experience | -0.03 | 0.04 | -0.80 | 103.80 | 0.43 | -0.1 - 0.04 |
| Master's degree | 0.12 | 0.66 | 0.18 | 112.41 | 0.86 | -1.2 - 1.44 |
| Master's+30 units | -0.23 | 0.77 | -0.29 | 106.44 | 0.77 | -1.75 - 1.3 |
| Doctoral degree | -0.22 | 0.98 | -0.22 | 115.85 | 0.83 | -2.16 - 1.73 |
| Age | 0.03 | 0.03 | 1.03 | 99.76 | 0.30 | -0.03 - 0.09 |

*Note*. Reference group refers to team members in Cohort A, who are general educators, with a bachelor’s degree. Cohort A led by University Trainer. Cohorts B and C led by State Trainers. 95 CI = 95% confidence interval, and Est. = *beta* estimate
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TABLE S6. Results of Multiple Regression from Pooled Multiply Imputed Sets on Knowledge, Confidence, and Use Pre: Difference and Post Scores.

ARTICLE TITLE: Building Site-Level Capacity for Functional Assessment-based Interventions: Outcomes of a Professional Learning Series

| Construct | Est | SE | *t* | df | *p* | 95 CI |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Perceived Knowledge (Difference) |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Reference group (Intercept) | 26.01 | 3.46 | 7.53 | 232.19 | <0.01 | 19.2 - 32.82 |
| Cohort B | -1.72 | 1.50 | -1.14 | 256.44 | 0.25 | -4.67 - 1.24 |
| Cohort C | -1.38 | 1.58 | -0.87 | 228.86 | 0.39 | -4.5 - 1.75 |
| Special educator | -5.74 | 2.24 | -2.56 | 233.75 | 0.01 | -10.15 - -1.33 |
| Administrator | -5.37 | 2.26 | -2.38 | 221.03 | 0.02 | -9.82 - -0.92 |
| Related service provider | -6.39 | 2.02 | -3.16 | 246.01 | <0.01 | -10.37 - -2.4 |
| Staff | 3.31 | 5.52 | 0.60 | 173.05 | 0.55 | -7.57 - 14.2 |
| Teacher of student | 1.50 | 1.77 | 0.84 | 242.35 | 0.40 | -2 - 4.99 |
| Years’ experience | 0.10 | 0.11 | 0.94 | 204.05 | 0.35 | -0.11 - 0.32 |
| Master's degree | -0.52 | 1.97 | -0.27 | 264.77 | 0.79 | -4.41 - 3.36 |
| Master's+30 units | -2.66 | 2.22 | -1.20 | 270.67 | 0.23 | -7.02 - 1.7 |
| Doctoral degree | -11.75 | 2.93 | -4.01 | 268.27 | 0.00 | -17.52 - -5.98 |
| Age | -0.08 | 0.09 | -0.86 | 220.50 | 0.39 | -0.26 - 0.1 |
| Perceived Confidence (Difference) |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Reference group (Intercept) | 24.61 | 3.67 | 6.71 | 233.45 | <0.01 | 17.39 - 31.84 |
| Cohort B | -3.96 | 1.60 | -2.47 | 251.42 | 0.01 | -7.12 - -0.8 |
| Cohort C | -3.10 | 1.65 | -1.88 | 243.37 | 0.06 | -6.36 - 0.15 |
| Special educator | -5.32 | 2.41 | -2.21 | 223.34 | 0.03 | -10.08 - -0.57 |
| Administrator | -5.72 | 2.44 | -2.34 | 208.91 | 0.02 | -10.53 - -0.91 |
| Related service provider | -5.64 | 2.21 | -2.56 | 226.10 | 0.01 | -9.99 - -1.29 |
| Staff | 1.01 | 5.79 | 0.17 | 179.75 | 0.86 | -10.43 - 12.44 |
| Teacher of student | 0.30 | 1.90 | 0.16 | 235.93 | 0.87 | -3.44 - 4.05 |
| Years’ experience | 0.14 | 0.12 | 1.16 | 185.61 | 0.25 | -0.1 - 0.37 |
| Master's degree | 1.68 | 2.13 | 0.79 | 252.26 | 0.43 | -2.52 - 5.87 |
| Master's+30 units | -0.94 | 2.37 | -0.40 | 263.86 | 0.69 | -5.61 - 3.74 |
| Doctoral degree | -10.00 | 3.19 | -3.13 | 247.28 | <0.01 | -16.29 - -3.7 |
| Age | -0.07 | 0.10 | -0.76 | 215.94 | 0.45 | -0.26 - 0.12 |
| Perceived Use (Difference) |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Reference group (Intercept) | 16.86 | 6.05 | 2.79 | 163.31 | 0.01 | 4.91 - 28.81 |
| Cohort B | -5.29 | 2.57 | -2.06 | 193.52 | 0.04 | -10.35 - -0.23 |
| Cohort C | -8.54 | 2.72 | -3.13 | 171.05 | <0.01 | -13.91 - -3.16 |
| Special educator | -0.94 | 3.67 | -0.26 | 204.09 | 0.80 | -8.17 - 6.29 |
| Administrator | -3.89 | 4.01 | -0.97 | 149.45 | 0.33 | -11.81 - 4.04 |
| Related service provider | -4.57 | 3.61 | -1.27 | 163.53 | 0.21 | -11.69 - 2.55 |
| Staff | -8.38 | 9.75 | -0.86 | 122.72 | 0.39 | -27.69 - 10.92 |
| Teacher of student | 0.41 | 3.08 | 0.13 | 175.78 | 0.89 | -5.66 - 6.48 |
| Years’ Experience | 0.14 | 0.19 | 0.75 | 159.98 | 0.45 | -0.23 - 0.51 |
| Master's Degree | 2.93 | 3.55 | 0.82 | 170.67 | 0.41 | -4.08 - 9.93 |
| Master's+30 units | -0.45 | 4.07 | -0.11 | 163.76 | 0.91 | -8.48 - 7.57 |
| Doctoral Degree | -4.97 | 5.09 | -0.98 | 193.70 | 0.33 | -15.01 - 5.06 |
| Age | -0.03 | 0.16 | -0.18 | 152.01 | 0.86 | -0.34 - 0.29 |
| Actual Knowledge (Difference) |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Reference group (Intercept) | 7.70 | 1.95 | 3.96 | 234.33 | <0.01 | 3.87 - 11.53 |
| Cohort B | -2.16 | 0.84 | -2.57 | 263.92 | 0.01 | -3.81 - -0.51 |
| Cohort C | 0.34 | 0.87 | 0.39 | 250.50 | 0.69 | -1.37 - 2.06 |
| Special educator | 0.69 | 1.24 | 0.55 | 248.13 | 0.58 | -1.76 - 3.13 |
| Administrator | 1.86 | 1.28 | 1.46 | 219.42 | 0.15 | -0.65 - 4.38 |
| Related service provider | 2.18 | 1.16 | 1.88 | 234.95 | 0.06 | -0.1 - 4.47 |
| Staff | 2.85 | 2.96 | 0.96 | 205.25 | 0.34 | -2.98 - 8.68 |
| Teacher of student | 0.01 | 1.01 | 0.01 | 232.51 | 0.99 | -1.98 - 2.01 |
| Years’ experience | 0.04 | 0.06 | 0.65 | 201.90 | 0.52 | -0.08 - 0.16 |
| Master's degree | -1.78 | 1.16 | -1.53 | 232.32 | 0.13 | -4.06 - 0.51 |
| Master's+30 units | -3.67 | 1.33 | -2.76 | 220.94 | 0.01 | -6.3 - -1.05 |
| Doctoral degree | -4.73 | 1.75 | -2.70 | 222.47 | 0.01 | -8.18 - -1.27 |
| Age | -0.05 | 0.05 | -0.93 | 244.85 | 0.35 | -0.14 - 0.05 |

*Note*. Reference group refers to team members in Cohort A, who are general educators, with a bachelor’s degree. Cohort A led by University Trainer. Cohorts B and C led by State Trainers. 95 CI = 95% confidence interval, and Est. = *beta* estimate.

*BEHAVIORAL DISORDERS* SUPPLEMENTAL FILE

TABLE S7. Results of Multiple Regression from Pooled Multiply Imputed Sets on Teams Demonstrating Functional Relation.

ARTICLE TITLE: Building Site-Level Capacity for Functional Assessment-based Interventions: Outcomes of a Professional Learning Series

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Demonstrate Functional Relation | Est | SE | *t* | df | *p* | 95 CI |
| Reference group (Intercept) | 0.30 | 0.17 | 1.75 | 160.22 | 0.08 | -0.04 - 0.65 |
| Cohort B | -0.03 | 0.12 | -0.24 | 61.92 | 0.81 | -0.26 - 0.2 |
| Cohort C | 0.04 | 0.12 | 0.34 | 62.35 | 0.73 | -0.2 - 0.28 |
| Special educator | -0.15 | 0.10 | -1.50 | 222.48 | 0.14 | -0.35 - 0.05 |
| Administrator | -0.09 | 0.09 | -0.97 | 273.96 | 0.33 | -0.28 - 0.09 |
| Related service provider | -0.09 | 0.09 | -1.01 | 225.40 | 0.31 | -0.28 - 0.09 |
| Staff | -0.07 | 0.22 | -0.31 | 251.66 | 0.75 | -0.5 - 0.37 |
| Teacher of student | -0.04 | 0.08 | -0.52 | 261.96 | 0.60 | -0.19 - 0.11 |
| Years’ experience | <0.01 | <0.01 | -0.55 | 255.44 | 0.58 | -0.01 - 0.01 |
| Master's degree | 0.13 | 0.10 | 1.35 | 188.65 | 0.18 | -0.06 - 0.33 |
| Master's+30 units | 0.02 | 0.11 | 0.17 | 180.38 | 0.86 | -0.2 - 0.24 |
| Doctoral degree | -0.02 | 0.15 | -0.16 | 190.08 | 0.87 | -0.31 - 0.26 |
| Age | <0.01 | <0.01 | -0.04 | 254.61 | 0.97 | -0.01 - 0.01 |

*Note*. Reference group refers to team members in Cohort A, who are general educators, with a bachelor’s degree. Cohort A led by University Trainer. Cohorts B and C led by State Trainers. 95 CI = 95% confidence interval, and Est. = *beta* estimate.