Good Intentions Are Not Enough: Centering Equity in School Discipline Reform

Anne Gregory, David Osher, George G. Bear, Robert J. Jagers & Jeffrey R. Sprague

Published online: 24 Mar 2021.

Submit your article to this journal

View related articles

View Crossmark data

NASP

Check for updates

SPECIAL SERIES

Good Intentions Are Not Enough: Centering Equity in School Discipline Reform

Anne Gregory[a], David Osher[b], George G. Bear[c], Robert J. Jagers[d], and Jeffrey R. Sprague[e]

[a]Rutgers University; [b]American Institutes for Research; [c]University of Delaware; [d]Collaborative for Academic, Social, and Emotional Learning; [e]University of Oregon

ABSTRACT
Exclusionary discipline is commonly employed in U. S. schools and disproportionately affects students of color. This article describes current approaches to discipline and contextualizes these approaches historically with particular attention to racial dynamics and violence. We identify the harmful effects of exclusionary discipline and describe efforts to move schools away from exclusionary approaches through school-wide positive behavioral intervention supports, social emotional–learning, and restorative practices. We identify limitations of current discipline reform efforts that are hampering progress toward equitable schooling. We explicate the need for integrative and comprehensive culturally responsive approaches to positive student development that are equity oriented and identify implementation challenges and tools for addressing these challenges.

Challenging behavior in school and how it is perceived, reinforced, and addressed continues to be a systemic problem in our schools. In spite of their shortcomings, educators often rely on strategies of punishment and external control. These strategies typically include out-of-class and out-of-school suspensions which have iatrogenic impacts at school and the community that both reflect and reinforce marginalization and institutionalized racism (e.g., Mittleman, 2018). Moreover, the dual pandemics of COVID-19 and racism have underscored concern that racial disparities in school discipline and their sequelae will widen if schools disproportionately suspend students of color for absenteeism, trauma-related behaviors, or breaches in health safety protocols (Belsha, 2020).

Although many states and districts have reduced or restricted use of suspension, exclusionary discipline remains a "go to" response for many schools (Harper et al., 2019). The Civil Rights Data Collection (CRDC; U.S. Department of Education Office for Civil Rights, 2018) and local studies demonstrate the widespread and disproportionate use and harmful consequences of exclusion (e.g., increased risk for low achievement, drop-out, and arrest; Anderson et al., 2019; Mittleman, 2018; Noltemeyer et al., 2015; Owens & McLanahan, 2020). For example, approximately 2.7 million (5%–6%) of all K–12 students received one or more out-of-school suspensions during the 2015–2016 school year, and schools disproportionately suspended African American students and students

with disabilities. Specifically, that year, African American students were suspended at twice the rate (8%) of White students (3.8%) and Latinx students (3.5%). Students with disabilities (8.6%) were also suspended at rates twice as high as students without disabilities (4.1%; Harper et al., 2019). Moreover, American Indian and Alaska Native students, in 2015–2016, were 10 times more likely than White students to receive suspension (Whitford et al., 2019).

Reviews of the last several decades of research have shown that there are multiple contributors to the racial disparities in school discipline (Gregory et al., 2010; Welsh & Little, 2018). Yet, study after study has shown that when accounting for a range of student-, family-, and school-level contributors (e.g., student achievement; student socioeconomic status; teacher-, parent, and self-reported behavior), African American and White disparities in student receipt of exclusionary discipline remain significant (e.g., Bradshaw et al., 2010; Gopalan & Nelson, 2019; Owens & McLanahan, 2020). In other words, African American students remain overrepresented in school discipline sanctions after accounting for a range of potential explanatory factors. The collective findings point to the need for an equity and civil rights perspective on school discipline reform—a perspective that considers cultural, structural, and historical factors related to institutional racism, implicit racial bias, and punitive approaches to students of color.

Discipline processes can be designed to build an inclusive, equitable school community that places high value on maintaining academic engagement and achievement (Colombi et al., 2018; Gregory et al., 2014). Positive and relational disciplinary practices can build and sustain classroom and school community by leveraging student-adult connectedness. In fact, safety is important to student and adult well-being and to productive school environments. Approaches to school discipline and safety can undermine or contribute to individual and group well-being, engagement, and sense of safety. When students and teachers feel unsafe, they are more likely to experience health threatening levels of stress and less likely to attend to learning and the needs of others (Cantor et al., 2019). Safety involves more than physical safety; it includes emotional and identity safety (feeling safe to be yourself and as a member of a group and not experiencing prejudice; Gamarel et al., 2014; Steele et al., 2002), and is linked to the experience of belongingness and support, both of which can be undermined by punitive and exclusionary discipline (Anyon et al., 2016; Mitchell & Bradshaw, 2013).

Increasingly, implementation of three widely adopted practices for school discipline—school-wide positive behavioral interventions and supports (SWPBIS), social–emotional learning (SEL), and restorative practices (RP)—is being approached through an equity lens (Jagers, 2016; Jagers et al., 2018, 2019; Vincent et al., 2011; Winn, 2018). The goal is to improve school safety and academic performance while minimizing exclusion and improving conditions for learning (e.g., Osher et al., 2014). Yet, it remains a challenge to do so at scale with a focus on equity, particularly robust equity, which intentionally counters inequality, institutionalized privilege, and prejudice and intentionally promotes thriving across multiple domains for individuals experiencing inequity and injustice (Osher et al., 2020). In fact, despite overall reductions in exclusionary discipline for all groups, African American and White discipline gaps can remain substantial in schools implementing SWPBIS (McIntosh et al., 2018), SEL (Gregory & Fergus, 2017), and RP (Gregory & Evans, 2020).

In the current paper, we describe SWPBIS, SEL, and RP, their evidence base, and ways they can address equity. Then, we argue that school discipline reform, broadly speaking, is often implemented in a fragmented manner and often without sufficient attention to structural and cultural factors that undermine and contribute to the replication of inequity. Specifically, we point to limitations that are hampering equity-oriented implementation and progress toward equitable schooling. Too often school discipline reforms are implemented *without* (a) considering the sociohistorical and structural conditions of oppression; (b) increasing cultural relevancy/responsiveness, competence, and bias awareness; (c) complementary approaches to developing socioemotional and behavioral competencies; and (d) instructional reforms that address opportunity gaps. We offer promising ideas for school psychologists and educators to align and combine approaches in a culturally responsive and equity-driven manner. We posit future directions in equity efforts drawing on implementation research, the science of learning and development, and approaches to shifting mindsets.

SCHOOL-WIDE POSITIVE BEHAVIORAL INTERVENTIONS AND SUPPORTS

SWPBIS systems and practices are predicated on the theory that when all school staff members actively teach and consistently recognize and reinforce appropriate behavior, the number of students with serious behavior problems will be reduced and the school's overall climate will improve (Sprague & Horner, 2012). Grounded in applied behavioral analysis and social learning theory (Bandura, 1969; Sugai & Horner, 2010), SWPBIS schools aim to: (a) create a positive school climate, (b) establish and teach positive behavioral expectations school-wide, and (c) teach mastery of expected behaviors (e.g., safe and respectful peer to peer interactions) that will prevent the onset of risk behavior in typically developing children, and to some extent, alter the trajectory of children at-risk of destructive outcomes. SWPBIS targets *preventing* the onset and further development of problem behavior in schools (Sugai & Horner, 2010), offering a continuum of procedures for discouraging problem behavior, and implementing systems of support for more challenging students based on functional behavioral assessment (O'Neill et al., 2014). SWPBIS is based on a three-tiered public health approach, and suggests that a focus on systems (e.g., a school leadership team, teams for more intensive student support), data-based decision making (e.g., tracking the frequency, type, and location of office referrals and suspensions to support decision making), evidence-supported practices (behavioral, social–emotional, restorative, and trauma-informed), and monitoring outcomes (reduced disciplinary issues and improved school climate) will lead schools to sustainable and successful reform.

Evaluation reports, rigorous single-case studies, and randomized control trials demonstrate that high fidelity implementation of the primary prevention tier of SWPBIS (Tier 1; Horner et al., 2010) is feasible in a wide range of contexts and by typical implementation agents (e.g., administrators, teachers, paraprofessionals). Outcomes can include improved organizational health; reduction in reports of problem behavior, improved perception of school safety; and improved academic outcomes (promising but not definitive; Horner et al., 2010). Implementation of Tier 2 and 3 SWPBIS practices results

in improved student engagement and social and academic outcomes, and reduced likelihood of dropout (Anderson et al., 2004); reduced problem behavior (Dunlap et al., 2010; Hawken et al., 2007); and improved teacher ratings of student behavioral competence (Walker et al., 2009). Although SWPBIS systems and practices have been shown to reduce problem behavior, the evidence is less clear regarding impact on disciplinary inequity, with some studies showing mixed or even negative results related to racial disparities in exclusionary discipline (e.g., referrals, suspension; Skiba et al., 2011; Sprague et al., 2017; Vincent et al., 2015).

SWPBIS AND EQUITY

SWPBIS systems cannot not be considered effective until they are effective for all student groups. SWPBIS provides an ideal framework for reducing inequities in student outcomes. For example, focusing on positive behaviors (and reducing reprimands and aversive interactions) may reduce factors that weaken trust and relationships between educators and students from marginalized groups (e.g., Gion et al., 2020). In fact, research shows that schools implementing PBIS with fidelity can make in-roads toward greater equity in school discipline especially in reducing African American/White discipline gaps (McIntosh et al., 2018; Vincent et al., 2015). However, PBIS teams may need to include equity-focused strategies in their action plans to achieve equitable outcomes for all student groups (McIntosh et al., 2014). These practices are referred to as culturally responsive PBIS (CR-PBIS; Leverson et al., 2019).

Cultural responsiveness refers to the process of developing awareness of the significance of students' backgrounds (including historical context), then intentionally integrating their customs and values into the curriculum, instruction, and school environment (Rose et al., 2020). The goal of cultural responsiveness within the educational setting is to increase the ability to meet student needs to foster positive student-teacher relationships that maximize academic engagement. CR-PBIS cultural responsiveness consists of five components: Identity Awareness (i.e., practitioners learn about their own sociocultural lens and the sociocultural experiences of their students and families), Voice (i.e., practitioners engage students, staff, and families as partners), Supportive Environment (i.e., practitioners are proactive and instructive to prevent challenging behaviors), Data for Equity (i.e., practitioners critically examine disaggregated data by student group), and Situational Appropriateness (Leverson et al., 2019). Related to Situational Appropriateness, a sample classroom activity asks students to compare culturally based behaviors in the home, neighborhood, and school. Teachers affirm cultural differences and reinforce behavioral expectations appropriate to the school setting.

Leverson et al. (2019) make the case that cultural responsiveness should be a core part of all implementation efforts and will look different depending upon variations in any of the five elements, even if schools are within the same district.

SOCIAL–EMOTIONAL LEARNING

SEL is "the process by which children and adults acquire and apply core competencies to recognize and manage emotions, set and achieve positive goals, appreciate the perspectives of others, establish and maintain supportive relationships, make responsible decisions, and handle personal and interpersonal situations constructively" (Osher et al., 2016, p. 645). Many frameworks linked to SEL outline focal developmental competencies (Berg et al., 2017; Denham, 2018) and key learning contexts. The prominent framework of the Collaborative for Academic, Social, and Emotional Learning (CASEL) features five core social and emotional competencies: self-awareness, self-management, social awareness, relationship skills, and responsible decision-making that represent broad categories for facilitating a range of intra- and interpersonal knowledge, skills, and abilities identified by the field as being critical to student success. The SEL approach recognizes classrooms, schools, families, and communities as contexts in which all aspects academic, social, and emotional learning occur (CASEL, 2019; Durlak et al., 2011).

SEL is grounded in diverse theories/research that focus on the social, emotional, and cognitive development of children and promotion of mental wellness and other desirable life outcomes. These theories view children as active rather than passive learners. A combination of multiple individual factors (emotional, cognitive, and behavioral) and environmental factors (peer, home, classroom, school, community, and cultural factors) operate in a coactive dynamic manner in determining student behavior. This understanding translates into teachers and schools using a combination of teacher-centered and student-centered practices for improving school climate and developing SEL competencies as the relation between school climate and SEL is bidirectional (Bear, 2020; Osher & Berg, 2017). Although teacher-centered practices for managing student behavior, such as high behavioral expectations and the judicious and strategic use of praise and rewards are valued, there is much greater emphasis in SEL than in SWPBIS on strategies that target teacher and student social, cognitive, and emotional competencies, such as empathy, social perspective taking and problem solving, and managing emotions. Likewise, there is greater emphasis on teacher–student relationships. Developing educator as well as student social and emotional competencies and ensuring positive teacher–student relationships are viewed as critical to school safety (Jennings et al., 2019). Such emphasis is supported by

research linking each of CASEL's social and emotional competencies and the quality of teacher-student relationships to students' well-being (Bear, 2020).

Most current SEL programs are designed to be implemented at the universal level and many rely primarily on packaged curriculum lessons for teaching the above processes (e.g., labeling and expressing emotions, practicing steps for problem identification and resolution). Students also are provided ample opportunities for the application, reinforcement, and continued development of SEL competencies (Bear, 2010; Frey et al., 2019; Jones & Bouffard, 2012). This generally includes targeting multiple domains of school climate for improvement, particularly teacher–student relationships, peer relationships, home–school–community collaboration, student engagement, school safety, clear behavioral expectations, and fair rules and consequences (Bear, 2020). The strategies and supports used to address each of those domains, and the emphases placed on each domain, vary greatly across programs. For example, in developing SEL competencies some programs emphasize engaging instruction and curriculum (e.g., The Responsive Classroom; Center for Responsive Schools, 2019), that include promoting prosocial peer relationships (e.g., pair share, cooperative groups). Regardless of emphasis, building and maintaining positive, culturally responsive teacher–student and student–student relationships (including relationships in the context of mentoring, sports, and clubs) is recognized as important in nearly all SEL programs.

SEL approaches can be employed by school psychologists and other pupil service personnel both in their direct services, and when they serve as consultants to other educators. While SEL programs are often implemented by teachers, who should always incorporate them in their pedagogy and classroom practices, SEL programming can also be provided by pupil service personnel and outside providers. Although SEL programs are typically universal in nature, they can be made available to students for whom universal SEL programming is not sufficient. SEL can be incorporated in selective and indicated interventions (Dymnicki et al., 2012; Osher et al., 2008), and SEL language and approaches can be incorporated in mental health counseling and treatment, child welfare, and other child services.

Comprehensive meta-analyses support the effectiveness of school-based SEL intervention programs in producing important, valued outcomes in education. Durlak et al. (2011) meta-analysis of 213 programs found significant improvements in student academic achievement, attitudes (i.e., about the self, the school, and school safety), social and emotional skills (e.g., identifying emotions, perspective taking, social problem solving), and externalizing and internalizing behaviors (e.g., positive social behavior, conduct problems, emotional distress). Four practices, which moderated program effectiveness, were

captured by the acronym SAFE: *sequenced* activities, *active* forms of learning, a *focus* on developing social and emotional skills (with sufficient time to teach and practice those skills); and targeting *explicit* and specific social and emotional skills. Wigelsworth et al. (2016) meta-analysis of 89 SEL programs found similar effects on social–emotional competence, prosocial behavior, conduct problems, emotional distress, and academic achievement.

Taylor et al. (2017) examined the effects of 82 SEL intervention studies that were conducted internationally, which included over 97,000 students of all grade levels. They found positive outcomes, with the greatest effects among children age 5–11 (effect size = .27, 95% confidence interval = .19, .34) lasting from 6 months to 18 years postintervention in multiple areas, including SEL skills, attitudes, positive social behavior, conduct problems, emotional distress, drug use, academic performance, peer and family relationships, school attendance, graduation rates, college attendance, and arrests. Although only 34 and 26 of the 82 studies, respectively, reported specific data on ethnicity and socioeconomic status (SES), positive effects emerged regardless of the reported student background characteristics (e.g., race, ethnicity, SES).

Despite multiple meta-analyses reporting the effectiveness of SEL programs, several limitations of the research have been noted (Durlak et al., 2011; Taylor et al., 2017; Wigelsworth et al., 2016). First, as noted above, there is much heterogeneity in results across programs. Not all programs and interventions have been found to be effective, and effectiveness often depends on the outcome assessed. Relatedly, there is a lack of studies that have reported data on academic achievement. Second, most studies have relied entirely on students' self-reports. Teacher-reported data also are common. Both have inherent biases. Rarely have studies used outside, observer reports of student behavior, which could help reduce bias if the observers are culturally sensitive. Third, most programs do not meet the SAFE criteria above, and many studies have failed to adequately describe program components. Thus, it is unclear what specific features of SEL interventions are most and least effective. Finally, it remains unclear if SEL programs and interventions are more effective with certain populations than others (e.g., age, ethnicity, presence of risk factors).

SEL AND EQUITY

In recent years, there has been increased attention to the implications of SEL for issues of educational equity. Despite its origins in community mental health and wellness (Schlund et al., 2020), legitimate concerns had surfaced about the narrowing of SEL such that it would become yet another educational innovation used to benefit students

from well-resourced backgrounds and to highlight putative deficits and the need to remediate historically underserved students (DePaoli et al., 2019; Jagers et al., 2018). Disparities may worsen as report card ratings of students' SEL become another way of sorting and labeling students along racial/ethnic, gender, and social economic lines. Scholars have appropriately called for research that examines the degree to which improving schools depends on *both* adults as well as students developing their social awareness about diverse racial and cultural groups, increasing perspective-taking about how structural inequalities and everyday racism affect well-being, and fostering skills in building trusting relationship across identity lines (e.g., age, race/ethnicity, ability status, sexual/gender identity; Gregory & Fergus, 2017; Osher et al., 2018).

Toward this end, Jagers et al. (2018, 2019) offered equity-elaborations on SEL competencies to help broaden conceptions of SEL and illuminate how it might be a lever for equity and excellence. Each of the five competence clusters implies student and adult development and can subsume issues of equity and justice (Jagers et al., 2018). For example, as noted by Jagers et al. (2019), self-awareness is "foundational for equity," as it includes cultural values and orientations as well as self and collective identities. Likewise, relationship skills are critical to respecting diversity and cooperating with others.

Further, Jagers et al. (2019) posit that SEL can be operationalized in ways that position students and teachers as colearners engaged in the critical examination of inequities and the development of collaborative solutions that foster personal and collective well-being and thriving. They suggest that some programs (e.g., Facing History and Ourselves) and approaches (e.g., project-based learning) hold such promise and offer opportunities for meaningful, authentic student–student and student–teacher relationships.

RESTORATIVE PRACTICES

RP aims to build community, strengthen relationships, and repair harm (e.g., Morrison & Ristenberg, 2019). Roots of RP can be traced back to principles embedded in various Indigenous cultures around the world. Philosophies regarding community and justice amongst native communities generally emphasize repairing relationships over punishing offenders as a means to address wrongdoing (Tauri, 2019; Zehr, 2014).

RP involve transforming schools' cultures, not just changing practices (Riestenberg, 2012). Fundamental to the values of RP is that students share power with adults and engage in collective solution-seeking about challenges (Boyes-Watson & Pranis, 2014; Evans & Vaandering, 2016). Opportunities for student voice arise through each tier of an RP multitiered system of support model (Jain

et al., 2014). Universal school community-building practices include weekly circles for students in small groups or advisory periods. Circles are a "structured process of communication" (Boyes-Watson & Pranis, 2014, p. 3) in which students practice sharing and listening about personally relevant topics in a nonhierarchical format. Selective interventions include problem-solving circles, and informal restorative conversations. Students affected by discipline incidents have the opportunity to express how they were impacted and problem-solve with their peers. When "more-serious" harm occurs, intensive interventions include formal restorative conferences or reentry conferences, which are preplanned with a facilitator to bring together all parties involved in the harm when possible. Again, student voice is fundamental to the process. Those impacted by conflict and discipline incidents have the opportunity to express how they have harmed and what they need to repair the harm.

Accumulating U.S. studies demonstrate that when schools implement a restorative initiative, their out-of-school suspension rates tend to decrease (see Darling-Hammond et al., 2020; Fronius et al., 2019; Gregory & Evans, 2020). The evidence has been largely based on findings from single group pretest–posttest research designs (e.g., Mansfield et al., 2018). However, a recent experimental trial offered corroborating evidence: In 22 program schools and 22 comparison schools, Augustine et al. (2018) found that program schools' days lost to suspension declined by 36%, whereas this decline was only 18% in the comparison schools. They also showed that elementary schools, but not middle and high schools, had steeper declines in the suspension rates of African American students and low-income students. This corroborates other studies that suggest RP may have promise for reducing racial disparities in discipline (e.g., González, 2015). Whereas most RP research focuses on reduced exclusionary discipline, more studies have begun to examine whether engaging student voice, community-building, and problem-solving can foster positive school climate, intrapersonal benefits and interpersonal gains (Acosta et al., 2019; Bonell et al., 2018; Ortega et al., 2016; Schumacher, 2014).

RP AND EQUITY

Scholars have asserted that RP cannot be siloed from social and racial justice in a "colorblind, injustice-blind bubble" (Valandra & Wapȟáha Hokšíla, 2020, p. 31). RP in schools can be implemented with a commitment to transforming sociohistorical conditions and institutions (Davis, 2019; Winn, 2018). A mechanism to do so is through raising student and staff critical consciousness about how inequality is reproduced in communities. For example, Knight

and Wadhwa (2014) describe how they empower students as change makers through discussions about racism, oppression, and the school-to-prison pipeline during the RP circle process. In addition, some initiatives explicitly integrate programming to increase staff's critical consciousness and self-awareness of their own implicit bias while implementing a whole school racial equity, RP, and SEL initiative (e.g., Manassah et al., 2018).

LIMITATIONS OF CURRENT SCHOOL DISCIPLINE REFORM

As described above, there have been advancements in the conceptualization and implementation of equity-oriented discipline reform such as CR-PBIS (Leverson et al., 2019), equity-elaborations on SEL competencies (Jagers et al., 2019), and RP implemented through a racial justice lens (Manassah et al., 2018). Notwithstanding these advancements, many discipline reform efforts, we argue, will not substantially reduce disparities in discipline unless they address the following limitations: ignoring institutionalized oppression, professing cultural neutrality, neglecting social and emotional support, and failing to address opportunities to learn.

Ignoring Institutionalized Oppression

Too often school discipline reform is implemented without considering the sociohistorical and structural conditions of oppression. Disciplinary practices and related disparities reflect dynamically related cultural, structural, and historical factors (Osher et al., 2019; Spencer & Swanson, 2016). Cultural factors include an episteme of punishment, ethnocentrism and negative dispositions regarding children of color, economically disadvantaged students, and diverse learners. Structural factors include school design and the allocation of resources. Historical factors include institutionalized racism and the use of high stakes testing as a lever to promote school improvement. These forces come together when stressed and poorly supported teachers interact with equally stressed students in environments that promote student alienation and active resistance on the one hand and teacher reactivity and victim blaming on the other hand (e.g., Oberle & Schonert-Reichl, 2016).

Violence and racial exclusion are deeply woven into U.S. history and culture, and often rooted in a preoccupation with the self-interested pursuit of goods and power (Alexander, 2010; Goldenberg, 1978; Hofstadter & Wallace, 1970). International comparisons of rates of homicide and intimate partner violence, gun ownership, bullying, and incarceration illustrate the magnitude and relative ubiquity of violence in U.S. society (Institute of Medicine & National

Research Council, 2013). There is a continuing legacy of racialized violence that relies on racial/ethnic stereotypes to justify, normalize, and perpetuate exploitation and oppression in interpersonal and institutional relations (Alexander, 2010; Eberhardt et al., 2004; Williamson, 1984). Racism and economic inequity contribute to the use of negative racial/ethnic, gender, and class stereotypes to conjure the attributions (e.g., entitlement/privilege, victim blaming) and emotions (e.g., fear, anger) that help create and sustain school related disparities, which include access to enriched opportunities to learn (U.S. Department of Education, Office for Civil Rights CRDC, 2018). Stereotypes justify and normalize punitive and exclusionary approaches. Implicit bias, microaggressions, and stereotype threat undermine short- and long-term academic, social, and emotional development and outcomes (e.g., Keels et al., 2017; Yeager et al., 2017).

Racial threat theory (Blalock, 1967) can help explain micro- to macrolevel trends in racial attitudes and interactions. The theory offers that the White majority exerts social control to squelch a perceived power threat from racial minorities and preserve the status quo (Blalock, 1967). For example, communities with higher percentages of residents of color, relative to lower percentages, have more aggressive policing and surveillance, stringent sentencing, negative perceptions of African American students, and punitive disciplinary practices (Craig & Richeson, 2014; Goff et al., 2014). The greater the percentage of students of color, the more rigid the school policies and practices, the greater the use of punitive and exclusionary discipline practices, and the lower the likelihood of more prosocial approaches such as RP and community service (Payne & Welch, 2015). The resulting alienation and disengagement from school contributes to young people engaging in and being exposed to a cluster of risky contexts (e.g., negative peer affiliation, minimal adult supervision; Mittleman, 2018).

Given the prison–school nexus (Stovall, 2018), discipline reform initiatives can be understood as playing an essential role in disrupting the negative life trajectory imposed on too many young people. This trajectory is made more likely when young people's educational experiences do not affirm them or offer relevant skills to overcome perceived barriers to personal and collective thriving (Jagers et al., 2019).

Professing Cultural Neutrality

Too often school discipline reform is not linked to efforts to increase cultural relevancy/responsiveness, competence, and bias awareness. There is a general consensus that culturally informed content and instructional

processes reflect the best of the science of learning and development as they can promote cultural well-being and affordances that can result in fertile contexts for academic, social, and emotional learning for diverse student groups (Darling-Hammond et al., 2020; Immordino-Yang et al., 2019). Aronson and Laughter (2016) use the organizing concept of culturally relevant education to encompass efforts aimed at: (a) connecting students' cultural assets and references to academic concepts and skills, (b) employing curricula that encourages student reflection on their own lives and society, (c) supporting student cultural competence by facilitating learning about their own and other cultures, and (d) pursuing social justice through critiques of discourses of power. These approaches help address disconnects minoritized and marginalized students experience between their lived reality, cultural capital, needs, and funds of knowledge (e.g., Gay & Howard, 2000) and school culture and pedagogy which contribute to school-related transactions and outcomes. Culturally relevant education is associated with desirable student outcomes such as academic motivation and performance, school attendance, and college going as well as heightened awareness of the power of political movements and effects of racism (for a review, see Aronson & Laughter, 2016).

Cultural competence is necessary to systematically address the disadvantaging disconnects and adversities that culturally and linguistically diverse students and their families routinely face. These include rituals, policies, institutionalized processes, and routinized behaviors that privilege some students while placing others at risk. These disconnects are stressful and drain psychic energy; they contribute to disparities in educational opportunities, special education placement, and discipline (e.g., Artiles et al., 2010; Pennington et al., 2016).

Culturally responsive schools foster safe environments that support inclusivity and connectedness, by helping to address emotional, motivational, interpersonal, and learning needs, build upon strengths, and create learning environments where students feel a sense of belonging, emotional and intellectual safety, and appropriate support and challenge (e.g., Gay & Howard, 2000). Rather than ignoring students' assets or viewing them as deficits (Valenzuela, 1999), culturally responsive approaches leverage cultural resources and build upon strengths.

Future research is needed to advance an understanding of how school discipline reform efforts integrate cultural relevancy/responsiveness, competence, and bias awareness. With educators engaging in implicit bias trainings (Sweedler, 2018) and "courageous conversations" about power and oppression (Singleton & Linton, 2006), practice in this area has outpaced research. Importantly, scholars

continue to develop and evaluate implicit bias interventions with educators (Whitford & Emerson, 2019), especially in light of the findings that intervention effects can fade over time (Lai et al., 2016). Moreover, scholars have begun to address much needed research on translating how cultural responsiveness translates into culture-specific classroom management strategies (Bottiani et al., 2017). For example, one experimental study demonstrated that teachers who participated in workshops and classroom coaching focused on increasing "CARES" (**C**onnection to the curriculum, **A**uthentic relationships, **R**eflective thinking, **E**ffective communication, and **S**ensitivity to students' cultures) engaged in significantly more proactive behavior management and had greater student cooperation, relative to comparison teachers (Bradshaw et al., 2018).

Neglecting Social, Emotional, and Behavioral Support

Too often school discipline approaches are implemented without complementary adaptations aimed at providing social, emotional, and behavioral support. Environmental stress, trauma, and adversities along with mental health disorders can contribute to troubling student behaviors and trouble-producing adult behaviors. These adaptations can and should align with and incorporate trauma sensitive approaches and strengths-based mental health and social services. No single approach or intervention may adequately address the multiple risk factors that diverse groups of students may present.

SWPBIS, SEL, and RP offer complementary and aligned formats (Sprague & Tobin, 2016; Sprague et al., 2019) for teaching and promoting positive school, peer and teacher-related skills, such as cooperation or academic effort (Walker & Sprague, 2007) and empathy (Weissberg et al., 2015). Students may be more comprehensively supported by blending practices *horizontally* (within a tier of support) and *vertically* (aligning practices across Tiers 1, 2, and 3; Domitrovich et al., 2010). Multiple types of supports can be provided to *all* students within a tier (e.g., learning basic school expectations such as "be respectful" along with learning impulse control or anger management) while individual students may receive additional practice in Tier 1 skills, or receive a Tier 2 support such as Check in, Check out (Hawken et al., 2007) or CBITS (Jaycox et al., 2019).

Check-In Check-Out (CICO) is a program to support students who can benefit from extra help managing their behavior. Students check in with an adult at the beginning of each day to be sure they are prepared for class and ready to learn. Throughout the day, students check in with teachers and receive points on a card (0, 1, or 2) related

to how closely they met school-wide behavior expectations. At the end of the day, students check out with an adult who totals up the points. Students take their point cards home to share with their parents and the card gets turned in the next morning at check-in. CICO programs without a family component ask students to turn in their cards at check-out and the cycle repeats itself each day. The Cognitive Behavioral Intervention for Trauma in Schools (CBITS) program is a school-based, group and individual intervention. It is designed to reduce symptoms of post-traumatic stress disorder (PTSD), depression, and behavioral problems, and to improve functioning, grades and attendance, peer and parent support, and coping skills. CBITS uses cognitive–behavioral techniques (e.g., psychoeducation, relaxation, social problem solving, cognitive restructuring, and exposure), typically in a small group format.

There is emerging evidence for a blended approach that draws on SEL and reinforcement of prosocial behavior associated with Tier 1 of SWPBIS (Cook et al., 2018; Domitrovich et al., 2016). For example, Domitrovich et al. (2016) trained teachers to use an integrated program, referred to as PATHS to PAX, of the PAX Good Behavior Game that uses group-contingent positive reinforcement (Embry et al., 2003), and a SEL curriculum called Promoting Alternative Thinking Strategies (PATHS©). Results indicated that the PATHS to PAX condition generally demonstrated the most benefits. These findings suggest that school-based preventive interventions can have a positive impact on teachers' beliefs and perceptions, particularly when the program includes a social–emotional component.

With a blended focus on both building positive adult–student relationships (e.g., RP) and reinforcing positive student behavior (e.g., Tier 1 of SWPBIS), Cook et al. (2018) have developed and tested an approach called "Greet, Stop, Prompt" (GSP). GSP relies on three core components to mitigate proximal causes of exclusionary discipline decisions, including: (a) proactive classroom management strategies; (b) a self-regulation technique to reduce the impact of teacher biases on the response to problem behavior; and (c) reactive strategies to increase empathic, consistent, and appropriate responses to problem behavior. Results from a single case experimental concurrent multiple baseline design across schools indicated that the GSP strategy yielded systematic reductions in risk ratios for African American male students. More specifically, these results showed that the likelihood of African American male students receiving an office referral was cut by two thirds following implementation of the GSP strategy. Notwithstanding this growing evidence base, more research is needed to examine blended approaches

(combining PBIS, SEL, and RP) to examine equity in student outcomes.

Failing to Address Opportunities to Learn

Too often school discipline reform is divorced from instructional reforms that address opportunity gaps. Students, who are academically challenged and experience strong conditions for learning, are less likely to be involved in disruptive behaviors (Dwyer et al., 2000). At the same time, punitive and reactive approaches to discipline disrupt vectors of learning and student's willingness to engage in academic struggle (Nasir, 2020; Osher et al., 2010). Unfortunately, many students of color disproportionately experience poor conditions for learning and high levels of militarized security (Finn & Servoss, 2015). To support optimal learning outcomes and related senses of safety among diverse learners, educators and schools should draw from scholars studying the science of learning and development (Darling-Hammond et al., 2020; Immordino-Yang et al., 2019)—they make the case that in addition to relational, SEL, and behavioral supports, students need: Productive instructional strategies that include collaborative inquiry-based activities that build on students' prior knowledge and employ explicit instruction, scaffolding, and application to make the work meaningful and to facilitate conceptual understanding, critical thinking, elaboration, coconstruction, and transferable knowledge and skills (Farrington, 2020).

Pursuing educational equity means that every student—regardless of background, circumstances or ability status—has access to strong conditions for learning, robust opportunities to learn, academic rigor and challenge, and the supports necessary to take advantage of the opportunities and challenge. Advances include districts examining whether marginalized groups have fair access to academic, socioemotional, behavioral supports and restorative interventions (Anyon et al., 2016; Osher et al., 2015). Opinions vary regarding the educational content and processes that are required to close persistent opportunity gaps and to fully develop young people's interests and human potential in an increasingly complex global community. Still, there is a growing consensus that quick-fix narrow "programs" are not likely to disrupt long-standing opportunity gaps and disparities in discipline and achievement. An equity-oriented and integrative approach to school discipline reform situates discipline policy and practices within a dynamic relational developmental systems perspective that focuses on thriving and robust equity and pays attention to the dynamic coinfluences between and among people, and between people and systems. This suggests that efforts

to transform school discipline are embedded in the relational and instructional contexts in schools (Osher et al., 2018).

FUTURE DIRECTIONS: IMPLEMENTATION MATTERS

How educational leaders and school psychologists address physical, emotional, psychological, and identity safety affect student learning and well-being (Flannery et al., 2019; Osher et al., 2019). The challenges of school violence and discipline are multifaceted and require a coherent and culturally competent multitiered, multicomponent approach that addresses the individual and ecological factors that dynamically contribute to these challenges including the impacts of institutionalized racism (Jagers et al., 2019; McIntosh et al., 2018; Nasir, 2020). Although the evidence and need for an equity-focused preventive approach to safety is compelling, changing practice is never easy (Domitrovich et al., 2008; Miles, 1993) and requires readiness and implementation support (Dymnicki et al., 2017; Wandersman et al., 2008).

Whereas temporary removal has successfully been sometimes used as a preventive "cool off" strategy in some contexts (Nelson, 1996), extended exclusion from instruction, without a balance of support and efforts to restore school engagement, weakens academic outcomes and maintains or amplifies antisocial trajectories (Fabelo et al., 2011). Also, while some students may become so disruptive or engage in unsafe behavior that warrants temporary, short-term removal from the classroom (e.g., a class period) or school (e.g., 1–2 days), extended suspension and expulsion are harmful interventions which may be inappropriately used due to systemic or school incapacity and/or teacher bias, stress, depression, and skill gaps. While removing a student may appear to be necessary, it limits opportunities for students to build and practice self-regulation skills (Bailey et al., 2019), reduces instructional time (Losen & Whitaker, 2017), contributes to chronic absenteeism, and impairs child–adult relationships and school attachment, particularly for students with chronic problem behavior (Baker et al., 2008). For example, a longitudinal quasi-experimental study by Osher and colleagues, which employed machine learning and propensity matching to examine the impacts of suspension and suspension dosage on every student in NYC schools for 10 years, found that suspension and suspension dosage contributed to more suspensions and more nonsuspension related absences while reducing the likelihood of graduation (LiCalsi et al., 2020). In addition, research on the appropriate use of threat assessment indicates that many students who were removed, do not have to be, and that disparities in suspensions for threat incidents can be averted through systematic processes that assess whether there is a need to remove the student (Cornell et al., 2018).

School psychologists and educators can lead efforts in changing disciplinary practice and addressing disparities. Yet, this is hard when adults have punitive mindsets, racial biases are primed (Hetey & Eberhardt, 2018; Spencer & Swanson, 2016), and children and teachers interact in stress-producing environments (Osher et al., 2020). Changing discipline practices is also particularly challenging where schools lack sufficient capacities to support both students and teachers. Fortunately, there are examples of schools and districts building a capacity to support students and teachers (see Osher et al., 2019) and tools are available to assist schools and teachers in this process (Gregory et al., 2017; Gregory et al., 2016; National Center on Safe Supportive Learning Environments, 2018; Osher et al., 2015). This includes tools for disaggregating school disciplinary data (e.g., https://www.pbis.org/resource/using-discipline-data-within-swpbis-to-identify-and-address-disproportionality-a-guide-for-school-teams) and school climate data (e.g., http://www.delawarepbs.org/school-climate/use-of-school-climate-data/)

These tools will be insufficient if school psychologists and educators do not address fragmentation, incoherence, and the gap between good intentions and everyday practice (Fullan & Rincon-Gallardo, 2020; Osher et al., 2019; Sprague et al., 2019). All too often new initiatives to reduce opportunity gaps, strengthen the relational and instructional context of classrooms, increase cultural responsiveness, honor student voice, and foster SEL, restorative, and behavioral supports are implemented in isolation from one another and without sufficient attention to the need for collaboration among all members of the school community (Osher et al., 2019; Rappaport, 2002). Yet, the accumulating science of learning and development demonstrates diverse learners' experience of safety, motivation to learn, engagement in academics, and sense of belonging are interrelated (Darling-Hammond et al., 2020; Immordino-Yang et al., 2019) and occur across all settings and interactions (Osher et al., 2020). Although collaboration and alignment are hard, so too is practice change: it requires that school psychologists foster readiness and support affective as well as cognitive change. Approaches such as the Concerns Based Adoption Model and readiness assessment and support (Butler et al., 2019; Dymnicki et al., 2017) along with social psychological strategies to address bias and mindsets (e.g., Eberhardt, 2019; Okonofua et al., 2020; Whitford & Emerson, 2019) may be particularly useful in addressing gnarly problems such as changing disciplinary expectations and practices. Future research on organizational change processes is needed to offer school psychologists guidance in implementing and sustaining best practices grounded in the science of implementing

integrated equity-oriented initiatives, particularly since these practices challenge hard to change dispositional factors—implicit biases, subtractive mindsets, and epistemes that support punishment and discipline.

DISCLOSURE

No potential conflict of interest was reported by the authors.

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. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10964-019-01013-2

Alexander, M. (2010). *The new Jim Crow: Mass incarceration in the age of color blindness*. The New Press.

Anderson, A. R., Christenson, S. L., Sinclair, M. F., & Lehr, C. A. (2004). Check & Connect: The importance of relationships for promoting engagement with school. *Journal of School Psychology*, 42(2), 95–113. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jsp.2004.01.002

Anderson, K. P., Ritter, G. W., & Zamarro, G. (2019). Understanding a vicious cycle: The relationship between student discipline and student academic outcomes. *Educational Researcher*, 48(5), 251–262. https://doi.org/10.3102/0013189X19848720

Anyon, Y., Gregory, A., Stone, S. I., Farrar, J., Jenson, J. M., McQueen, J., Downing, B., Greer, E., & Simmons, J. (2016). Restorative interventions and school discipline sanctions in a large urban school district. *American Educational Research Journal*, 53(6), 1663–1697. https://doi.org/10.3102/0002831216675719

Anyon, Y., Zhang, D., & Hazel, C. (2016). Race, exclusionary discipline, and connectedness to adults in secondary schools. *American Journal of Community Psychology*, 57(3–4), 342–352. https://doi.org/10.1002/ajcp.12061

Aronson, B., & Laughter, J. (2016). The theory and practice of culturally relevant education: A synthesis of research across content areas. *Review of Educational Research*, 86(1), 163–206. https://doi.org/10.3102/0034654315582066

Artiles, A. J., Kozleski, E. B., Trent, S. C., Osher, D., & Ortiz, A. (2010). Justifying and explaining disproportionality, 1968–2008: A critique of underlying views of culture. *Exceptional Children*, 76(3), 279–299. https://doi.org/10.1177/001440291007600303

Augustine, C. H., Engberg, J., Grimm, G. E., Lee, E., Wang, E. L., Christianson, K., & Joseph, A. A. (2018). *Can restorative practices improve school climate and curb suspensions? An evaluation of the impact of restorative practices in a mid-sized urban school district*. RAND Corporation.

Bailey, M., Meland, E. A., Brion-Meisels, G., & Jones, S. M. (2019). Getting developmental science back into schools: Can what we know about self-regulation help change how we think about "no excuses"? *Frontiers in Psychology*, 10, 1885. https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2019.01885

Baker, J. A., Grant, S., & Morlock, L. (2008). The teacher–student relationship as a developmental context for children with internalizing or externalizing behavior problems. *School Psychology Quarterly*, 23(1), 3–15. https://doi.org/10.1037/1045-3830.23.1.3

Bandura, A. (1969). *Principles of behavior modification*. Holt, Rinehart, & Winston.

Bear, G. G. (2010). *School discipline and self-discipline: A practical guide to promoting prosocial student behavior*. Guilford Press.

Bear, G. G. (2020). *Improving school climate: Practical strategies to reduce behavior problems and promote social-emotional learning*. Taylor & Francis.

Belsha, K. (2020, August 21). Virtual suspensions. Mask rules. More Trauma. Why some worry a student discipline crisis is on the horizon. *Chalkbeat*. https://www.chalkbeat.org/2020/8/21/21396481/virtual-suspensions-masks-school-discipline-crisis-coronavirus

Berg, J., Osher, D., Same, M. R., Nolan, E., Benson, D., & Jacobs, N. (2017). *Identifying, defining, and measuring social and emotional competencies*. American Institutes for Research.

Blalock, H. M. (1967). *Toward a theory of minority-group relations*. Wiley.

Bonell, C., Allen, E., Warren, E., McGowan, J., Bevilacqua, L., Jamal, F., Legood, R., Wiggins, M., Opondo, C., Mathiot, A., Sturgess, J., Fletcher, A., Sadique, Z., Elbourne, D., Christie, D., Bond, L., Scott, S., & Viner, R. M. (2018). Effects of the Learning Together intervention on bullying and aggression in English secondary schools (INCLUSIVE): A cluster randomized controlled trial. *The Lancet*, 392(10163), 2452–2464. https://doi.org/10.1016/S0140-6736(18)31782-3

Bottiani, J. H., Larson, K., Debnam, K., Bischoff, C., & Bradshaw, C. P. (2017). Promoting educators' use of culturally responsive practices: A systematic review of in-service interventions. *Journal of Teacher Education*, 69(4), 1–19. https://doi.org/10.1177/0022487117722553

Boyes-Watson, C., & Pranis, K. (2014). *Circle forward: Building a restorative school community*. Living Justice 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. https://doi.org/10.1037/a0018450

Bradshaw, C. P., Pas, E. T., Bottiani, J. H., Debnam, K. J., Reinke, W., Herman, K., & Rosenberg, M.S. (2018). Promoting cultural responsivity and student engagement through Double Check coaching of classroom teachers: An efficacy study. *School Psychology Review*, 47(2), 118–134. https://doi.org/10.17105/SPR-2017-0119.V47-2

Butler, A. R., Johnson, J., & Hall, G. E. (2019). Getting to outcomes: Planning, continuous improvement, and evaluation. In D. Osher, M. J. Mayer, R. J. Jagers, K. Kendziora, & L. Wood (Eds.), *Keeping students safe and helping them thrive: A collaborative handbook on school safety, mental health, and wellness* (pp. 413–432). Praeger/ABC-CLIO.

Cantor, P., Osher, D., Berg, J., Steyer, L., & Rose, T. (2019). Malleability, plasticity, and individuality: How children learn and develop in context. *Applied Developmental Science*, 23(4), 307–337. https://doi.org/10.1080/10888691.2017.1398649

Center for Responsive Schools. (2019). *About responsive classroom*. www.responsiveclassroom.org/about-responsive-classroom

Collaborative for Academic, Social, and Emotional Learning. (2019). *Core SEL competencies*. https://casel.org/core-competencies/

Colombi, G., Mayo, R. V., Tanyu, M., Osher, D., & Mart, A. (2018). Building and restoring school communities. In D. Osher, D. Moroney, & S. Williamson (Eds.), *Creating safe, equitable, engaging schools: A comprehensive, evidence-based approach to supporting students* (pp. 147–162). Harvard Education Press.

Cook, C. R., Fiat, A., Larson, M., Daikos, C., Slemrod, T., Holland, E. A., Thayer, A. J., & Renshaw, T. L. (2018). Positive greetings at the door: Evaluation of a low-cost, high-yield proactive classroom management strategy. *Journal of Positive Behavior Interventions*, *20*(3), 149–159. https://doi.org/10.1177/1098300717753831

Cornell, D., Maeng, J., Huang, F., Shukla, K., & Konold, T. (2018). Racial/ethnic parity in disciplinary consequences using student threat assessment. *School Psychology Review*, *47*(2), 183–195. https://doi.org/10.17105/SPR-2017-0030.V47-2

Craig, M. A., & Richeson, J. A. (2014). More diverse yet less tolerant? How the increasingly diverse racial landscape affects White Americans' racial attitudes. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, *40*(6), 750–761. https://doi.org/10.1177/0146167214524993

Darling-Hammond, L., Flook, L., Cook-Harvey, C., Barron, B., & Osher, D. (2020). Implications for educational practice of the science of learning and development. *Applied Developmental Science*, *24*(2), 97–44. https://doi.org/10.1080/10888691.2018.1537791

Darling-Hammond, S., Fronius, T. A., Sutherland, H., Guckenburg, S., Petrosino, A., & Hurley, N. (2020). Effectiveness of restorative justice in US K-12 Schools: A review of quantitative research. *Contemporary School Psychology*, *24*(3), 295–308. https://doi.org/10.1007/s40688-020-00290-0

Davis, F. (2019). *The little book of race and restorative justice*. Good Books.

Denham, S. A. (2018). Keeping SEL developmental: The importance of a developmental lens for fostering and assessing SEL competencies. *CASEL*. https://measuringsel.casel.org/frameworks/

DePaoli, J. L., Atwell, M. N., & Bridgeland, J. (2019). Ready to lead: A 2019 update of principals' perspectives on how social and emotional learning can prepare children and transform schools. *CASEL*. https://casel.org/wp-content/uploads/2019/10/Ready-to-Lead_FINAL.pdf

Domitrovich, C. E., Bradshaw, C. P., Berg, J. K., Pas, E. T., Becker, K. D., Musci, R., Embry, D. D., & Ialongo, N. (2016). How do school-based prevention programs impact teachers? Findings from a randomized trial of an integrated classroom management and social-emotional program. *Prevention Science*, *17*(3), 325–337. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11121-015-0618-z

Domitrovich, C. E., Bradshaw, C. P., Greenberg, M. T., Embry, D., Poduska, J. M., & Ialongo, N. S. (2010). Integrated models of school-based prevention: Logic and theory. *Psychology in the Schools*, *47*(1), 71–88. https://doi.org/10.1002/pits.20452

Domitrovich, C. E., Bradshaw, C. P., Poduska, J. M., Hoagwood, K., Buckley, J. A., Olin, S., Romanelli, L. H., Leaf, P. J., Greenberg, M. T., & Ialongo, N. S. (2008). Maximizing the implementation quality of evidence-based preventive interventions in schools: A conceptual framework. *Advances in School Mental Health Promotion*, *1*(3), 6–28. https://doi.org/10.1080/1754730x.2008.9715730

Dunlap, G., Iovannone, R., Wilson, K. J., Kincaid, D. K., & Strain, P. (2010). Prevent-Teach-Reinforce: A standardized model of school-based behavioral intervention. *Journal of Positive Behavior Interventions*, *12*(1), 9–22. https://doi.org/10.1177/1098300708330880

Durlak, J. A., Weissberg, R. P., Dymnicki, A. B., Taylor, R. D., & Schellinger, K. B. (2011). The impact of enhancing students' social and emotional learning: A meta-analysis of school-based universal interventions. *Child Development*, *82*(1), 405–432. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-8624.2010.01564.x

Dwyer, K. P., Osher, D., & Hoffman, C. C. (2000). Creating responsive schools: Contextualizing early warning, timely response. *Exceptional Children*, *66*(3), 347–365. https://doi.org/10.1177/001440290006600306

Dymnicki, A. B., Kendziora, K. T., & Osher, D. M. (2012). Adolescent development for students with learning disabilities and behavioral disorders: The promise of social emotional learning. In B. G. Cook, M. Tankersley, & T. J. Landrum (Eds.), *Classroom management: Advances in learning and behavioral disabilities* (Vol. 25, pp. 131–166). Emerald Publishing Group.

Dymnicki, A., Wandersman, A., Osher, D., & Pakstis, A. (2017). Bringing interventions to scale: Implications and challenges for the field of community psychology. In M. Bond, C. B. Keyes, I. Serano-Garcia, & M. Shinn (Eds.), *APA Handbook of community psychology: Methods for community research and action for diverse groups and issues* (pp. 297–310). American Psychological Association. https://doi.org/10.1037/14954-017

Eberhardt, J. L. (2019). *Biased: Uncovering the hidden prejudice that shapes what we see, think, and do*. Penguin Books.

Eberhardt, J. L., Goff, P. A., Purdie, V. J., & Davies, P. G. (2004). Seeing black: Race, crime, and visual processing. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, *87*(6), 876–893. https://doi.org/10.1037/0022-3514.87.6.876

Embry, D., Staatemeier, G., Richardson, C., Lauger, K., & Mitch, J. (2003). *The PAX good behavior game* (1st ed.). Hazelden.

Evans, K. R., & Vaandering, D. (2016). *The little book of restorative justice in education: Fostering responsibility, healing, and hope in schools*. Good Books.

Fabelo, T., Thompson, M. D., Plotkin, M., Carmichael, D., Marchbanks, M. P. I., Booth, E. A. (2011). Breaking schools' rules: A statewide study of how school discipline relates to students' success and juvenile justice involvement. Coucil of State Governments Justice Center. https://knowledgecenter.csg.org/kc/system/files/Breaking_School_Rules.pdf

Farrington, D. P. (2020). Childhood risk factors for criminal career duration: Comparisons with prevalence, onset, frequency and recidivism. *Criminal Behaviour and Mental Health: CBMH*, *30*(4), 159–171. https://doi.org/10.1002/cbm.2155

Finn, J. D., & Servoss, T. J. (2015). Security measures and discipline in American high schools. In D. J. Losen (Ed.), *Closing the school discipline gap: Equitable remedies for excessive exclusion* (pp. 44–58). Teachers College Press.

Flannery, D. J., Bear, G., Benbenishty, R., Astor, R. A., Bradshaw, C. P., Sugai, G., Cornell, D. G., Gottfredson, D. C., Nation, M., Jimerson, S. R., Nickerson, A. B., Mayer, M. J., Skiba, R. J., Weist, M. D., Espelage, D. L., Furlong, M. J., Guerra, N. G., Jagers, R. J., Noguera, P. A., Webster, D. W., & Osher, D. (2019). The scientific evidence supporting an eight-point public health-oriented action plan to prevent gun violence. In D. Osher, M. J. Mayer, R. J. Jagers, K. Kendziora, & L. Wood (Eds.), *Keeping students safe and helping them thrive: A collab-*

orative handbook on school safety, mental health, and wellness (pp. 227–255). Praeger/ABC-CLIO.

Frey, N., Fisher, D., & Smith, D. (2019). *All learning is social and emotional: Helping students develop essential skills for the classroom and beyond*. ASCD.

Fronius, T., Darling-Hammond, S., Persson, H., Guckenburg, S., Hurley, N., Petrosino, A. (2019). *Restorative justice in U.S. schools: An updated research review*. https://www.wested.org/wp-content/uploads/2019/04/resource-restorative-justice-in-u-s-schools-an-updated-research-review.pdf

Fullan, M., & Rincon-Gallardo, S. (2020). The integration of learning and well-being as the next frontier in whole-system change. In J. Cohen & D. L. Espelage (Eds.), *Feeling safe in school: Bullying and violence prevention around the world* (pp. 245–252). Harvard Education Press.

Gamarel, K. E., Walker, J. J., Rivera, L., & Golub, S. A. (2014). Identity safety and relational health in youth spaces: A needs assessment with LGBTQ youth of color. *Journal of LGBT Youth*, *11*(3), 289–315. https://doi.org/10.1080/19361653.2013.879464

Gay, G., & Howard, T. C. (2000). Multicultural teacher education for the 21st century. *The Teacher Educator*, *36*(1), 1–16. https://doi.org/10.1080/08878730009555246

Gion, C., McIntosh, K., & Falcon, S. (2020). Effects of a multifaceted classroom intervention on racial disproportionality. *School Psychology Review*, 1–17. https://doi.org/10.1080/2372966X.2020.1788906

Goff, P. A., Jackson, M. C., Di Leone, B. A., Culotta, C. M., & DiTomasso, N. A. (2014). The essence of innocence: Consequences of dehumanizing Black children. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, *106*(4), 526–545. https://doi.org/10.1037/a0035663

Goldenberg, I. (1978). *Oppression and social intervention: Essays on the human condition and the problems of change*. Nelson-Hall.

González, T. (2015). Socializing schools: Addressing racial disparities in discipline through restorative justice. In D. Losen (Ed.), *Closing the school discipline gap: Equitable remedies for excessive exclusion* (pp. 151–165). Teachers College Press.

Gopalan, M., & Nelson, A. (2019). Understanding the racial discipline gap in schools. *AERA Open*, *5*(2), 233285841984461–233285841984426. https://doi.org/10.1177/2332858419844613

Gregory, A., Allen, J. P., Mikami, A. Y., Hafen, C. A., & Pianta, R. (2014). Eliminating the racial disparity in classroom exclusionary discipline. *Journal of Applied Research on Children: Informing Policy for Children at Risk*, *5*(2), 12. https://digitalcommons.library.tmc.edu/childrenatrisk/vol5/iss2/12/

Gregory, A., & Fergus, E. (2017). Social-emotional learning and equity in school discipline. *The Future of Children*, *27*(1), 117–136. https://doi.org/10.1353/foc.2017.0006

Gregory, A., Hafen, C. A., Ruzek, E. A., Mikami, A. Y., Allen, J. P., & Pianta, R. C. (2016). Closing the racial discipline gap in classrooms by changing teacher practice. *School Psychology Review*, *45*(2), 171–191. https://doi.org/10.17105/SPR45-2.171-191

Gregory, A., Skiba, R. J., & Mediratta, K. (2017). Eliminating disparities in school discipline: A framework for intervention. *Review of Research in Education*, *41*(1), 253–278. https://doi.org/10.3102/0091732X17690499

Gregory, A., Skiba, R. J., & Noguera, P. A. (2010). The achievement gap and the discipline gap: Two sides of the same coin?

Educational Researcher, *39*(1), 59–68. https://doi.org/10.3102/0013189X09357621

Gregory, A., & Evans, K. R. (2020). The starts and stumbles of Restorative Justice in Education: Where do we go from here? National Education Policy Center. http://nepc.colorado.edu/publication/restorative-justice

Harper, K., Ryberg, R., & Temkin, D. (2019). Black students and students with disabilities remain more likely to receive out-of-school suspensions, despite overall declines. *Child Trends*. https://www.childtrends.org/publications/black-students-disabilities-out-of-school-suspensions.

Hawken, L. S., MacLeod, K. S., & Rawlings, L. (2007). Effects of the behavior education program (BEP) on problem behavior with elementary school students. *Journal of Positive Behavior Interventions*, *9*(2), 94–101. https://doi.org/10.1177/10983007070090020601

Hetey, R. C., & Eberhardt, J. L. (2018). The numbers don't speak for themselves: Racial disparities and the persistence of inequality in the criminal justice system. *Current Directions in Psychological Science*, *27*(3), 183–187. https://doi.org/10.1177/0963721418763931

Hofstadter, R., & Wallace, M. (1970). *American violence: A documentary history*. Knopf.

Horner, R. H., Sugai, G., & Anderson, C. (2010). Examining the evidence base for school-wide positive behavior support. *Focus on Exceptional Children*, *42*(8), 1–14. https://doi.org/10.17161/fec.v42i8.6906

Immordino-Yang, M. H., Darling-Hammond, L., & Krone, C R. (2019). Nurturing nature: How brain development is inherently social and emotional, and what this means for education. *Educational Psychologist*, *54*(3), 185–204. https://doi.org/10.1080/00461520.2019.1633924

Institute of Medicine and National Research Council. (2013). *U.S. health in international perspective: Shorter lives, poorer health*. The National Academies Press. https://doi.org/10.17226/13497.

Jagers, R. J. (2016). Framing social and emotional learning among African American youth: Toward an integrity-based approach. *Human Development*, *59*(1), 1–3. https://doi.org/10.1159/000447005

Jagers, R. J., Rivas-Drake, D., & Williams, B. (2019). Transformative social and emotional learning (SEL): Toward SEL in service of educational equity and excellence. *Educational Psychologist*, *54*(3), 162–184. https://doi.org/10.1080/00461520.2019.1623032

Jagers, R. J., Rivas-Drake, D., Borowski, T. (2018). Equity & social and emotional learning: A cultural analysis. Collaborative for Academic, Social, and Emotional Learning. https://measuringsel.casel.org/wp-content/uploads/2018/11/Frameworks-Equity.pdf

Jain, S., Bassey, H., Brown, M. A., & Karla, P. (2014). *Restorative justice in Oakland schools. Implementation and impact: An effective strategy to reduce racially disproportionate discipline, suspensions, and improve academic outcomes*. Data in Action.

Jaycox, L. H., Langley, A. K., & Hoover, S. A. (2019). *Cognitive behavioral intervention for trauma in schools (CBITS)* (2nd ed.). RAND Corporation.

Jennings, T., Minnici, A., & Yoder, N. (2019). Creating the working conditions to enhance teacher social and emotional well-being. In D. Osher (Eds.), *Keeping students safe and helping them thrive* (pp. 210–239). Praeger/ABC-CLIO.

Jones, S. M., & Bouffard, S. M. (2012). Social and emotional learning in schools: From programs to strategies (Social policy report). *Society for Research in Child Development*, *26*(4), 1–33. https://doi.org/10.1002/j.2379-3988.2012.tb00073.x

Keels, M., Durkee, M., & Hope, E. (2017). The psychological and academic costs of school-based racial and ethnic microaggressions. *American Educational Research Journal*, *54*(6), 1316–1344. https://doi.org/10.3102/0002831217722120

Knight, D., & Wadhwa, A. (2014). Expanding opportunity through critical restorative justice: Portraits of resilience at the individual and school level. *Schools*, *11*(1), 11–16. https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.1086/675745

Lai, C. K., Skinner, A. L., Cooley, E., Murrar, S., Brauer, M., Devos, T., Calanchini, J., Xiao, Y. J., Pedram, C., Marshburn, C. K., Simon, S., Blanchar, J. C., Joy-Gaba, J. A., Conway, J., Redford, L., Klein, R. A., Roussos, G., Schellhaas, F. M. H., Burns, M., … Nosek, B. A. (2016). Reducing implicit racial preferences: II. Intervention effectiveness across time. *Journal of Experimental Psychology. General*, *145*(8), 1001–1016. https://doi.org/10.1037/xge0000179

Leverson, M., Smith, K., McIntosh, K., Rose, J., & Pinkelman, S. (2019). PBIS cultural responsiveness field guide: Resources for trainers and coaches. OSEP Technical Assistance Center on Positive Behavioral Interventions and Supports. https://www.pbis.org/resource/pbis-cultural-responsiveness-field-guide-resources-for-trainers-and-coaches

LiCalsi, C., Osher, D., & Bailey, P. (2020). *The effects of exclusionary discipline type and length on student and peer educational outcomes and school climate in New York City high schools* [Paper presentation]. Fall Research Conference of the Association for Public Policy Analysis and Management.

Losen, D. J., & Whitaker, A. (2017). *Lost instruction: The disparate impact of the school discipline gap in California*. The Center for Civil Rights Remedies at the Civil Rights Project.

Manassah, T., Roderick, T., & Gregory, A. (2018). A promising path toward equity: Restorative circles develop relationships, build communities, and bridge differences. *Learning Forward*, *39*(4), 36–40. https://learningforward.org/journal/august-2018-vol-39-no-4/a-promising-path-toward-equity/

Mansfield, K. C., Fowler, B., & Rainbolt, S. (2018). The potential of restorative practices to ameliorate discipline gaps: The story of one high school's leadership team. *Educational Administration Quarterly*, *54*(2), 303–323. https://doi.org/10.1177/0013161X17751178

McIntosh, K., Moniz, C., Craft, C. B., Golby, R., & Steinwand-Deschambeault, T. (2014). Implementing school-wide positive behavioural interventions and supports to better meet the needs of indigenous students. *Canadian Journal of School Psychology*, *29*(3), 236–257. https://doi.org/10.1177/0829573514542217

McIntosh, K., Gion, C., Bastable, E. (2018). Do schools implementing SWPBIS have decreased racial and ethnic disproportionality in school discipline? Technical Assistance Center on Positive Behavioral Interventions and Supports (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED591154). https://eric.ed.gov/?id=ED591154

Miles, M. B. (1993). 40 years of change in schools: Some personal reflections. *Educational Administration Quarterly*, *29*(2), 213–248. https://doi.org/10.1177/0013161X93029002006

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. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jsp.2013.05.005

Mittleman, J. (2018). A downward spiral? Childhood suspension and the path to juvenile arrest. *Sociology of Education*, *91*(3),183–2014. https://doi.org/10.1177/0038040718784603

Morrison, G. F., & Ristenberg, N. (2019). Reflections on twenty years of restorative justice in schools. In D. Osher, M. J. Mayer, R. J. Jagers, K. Kendziora, & L. Wood (Eds.), *Keeping students safe and helping them thrive: A collaborative handbook on school safety, mental health, and wellness* (pp. 295–327). Praeger/ABC-CLIO.

Nasir, N. I. S. (2020). Teaching for equity: Where developmental needs meet racialized structures. *Applied Developmental Science*, *24*(2), 146–145. https://doi.org/10.1080/10888691.2019.1609737

National Center on Safe Supportive Learning Environments. (2018). https://safesupportivelearning.ed.gov/

Nelson, J. R. (1996). *The Think Time strategy for schools: Bringing order to the classroom*. Cyprus Group.

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. https://doi.org/10.17105/spr-14-0008.1

Oberle, E., & Schonert-Reichl, K. A. (2016). Stress contagion in the classroom? The link between classroom teacher burnout and morning cortisol in elementary school students. *Social Science & Medicine (1982))*, *159*, 30–37. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.socscimed.2016.04.031

Okonofua, J. A., Perez, A. D., & Darling-Hammond, S. (2020). When policy and psychology meet: Mitigating the consequences of bias in schools. *Science Advances*, *6*(42), eaba9479–10. https://doi.org/10.1126/sciadv.aba9479

O'Neill, R. E., Albin, R. W., Storey, K., Horner, R. H., & Sprague, J. R. (2014). *Functional assessment and program development for problem behavior* (3rd ed.). Cengage Learning.

Ortega, L., Lyubansky, M., Nettles, S., & Espelage, D. (2016). Outcomes of a restorative circles program in a high school setting. *Psychology of Violence*, *6*(3), 459–468. https://doi.org/10.1037/vio0000048

Osher, D., Bear, G., Sprague, J., & Doyle, W. (2010). How we can improve school discipline. *Educational Researcher*, *39*(1), 48–58. https://doi.org/10.3102/0013189X09357618

Osher, D., & Berg, J. (2017). *School climate and social and emotional learning: The integration of two approaches*. Edna Bennet Pierce Prevention Research Center, Pennsylvania State University. https://www.rwjf.org/en/library/research/2018/01/school-climate-and-social-and-emotional-learning.html

Osher, D., Cantor, P., Berg, J., Steyer, L., & Rose, T. (2020). Drivers of human development: How relationships and context shape learning and development. *Applied Developmental Science*, *24*(1), 6–31. https://doi.org/10.1080/10888691.2017.1398650

Osher, D., Cantor, P., & Caverly, S. (2019). The relational, ecological, and phenomenological foundations of school safety, mental health, wellness, and learning. In D. Osher, M. J. Mayer, R. J. Jagers, K. Kendziora, & L. Wood (Eds.), *Keeping students safe and helping them thrive: A collaborative handbook on school safety, mental health, and wellness* (pp. 29–58). Praeger/ABC-CLIO.

Osher, D., Fisher, D., Amos, L., Katz, J., Dwyer, K., Duffey, T., & Colombi, G. D. (2015). *Addressing the root causes of disparities in school discipline: An educator's action planning guide.* National Center on Safe Supportive Learning Environments.

Osher, D., Kidron, Y., Brackett, M., Dymnicki, A., Jones, S., & Weissberg, R. P. (2016). Advancing the science and practice of social and emotional learning: Looking back and moving forward. *Review of Research in Education*, *40*(1), 644–681. 0091732X16673595 https://doi.org/10.3102/

Osher, D., Mayer, M. J., Jagers, R. J., Kendziora, K., & Wood, L. (2019). *Keeping students safe and helping them thrive: A collaborative handbook on school safety, mental health, and wellness* (Vols. 2). Praeger/ABC-CLIO.

Osher, D., Moroney, D., & Williamson, S. K. (2018). *Creating safe, equitable, engaging schools: A comprehensive, evidence-based approach to supporting students.* Harvard Education Press.

Osher, D., Poirier, J., Jarjoura, R., Kendziora, K., & Brown, R. (2014). Avoid simple solutions and quick fixes: Lessons learned from a comprehensive district approach to improving conditions for learning. *Journal of Applied Research on Children*, *5*(2), 1–45. http://digitalcommons.library.tmc.edu/childrenatrisk/vol5/iss2/16

Osher, D., Sprague, J., Weissberg, R. P., Axelrod, J., Keenan, S., Kendziora, K., & Zins, J. E. (2008). A comprehensive approach to promoting social, emotional, and academic growth in contemporary schools. In A. Thomas & J. Grimes (Eds.), *Best practices in school psychology V* (Vol. 4, pp. 1263–1278). National Association of School Psychologists.

Osher, D., Williamson, S. K., Kendziora, K., Wells, K., & Sarikey, C. (2019). Interdisciplinary and cross-stakeholder collaboration for better outcomes. In D. Osher, M. J. Mayer, R. J. Jagers, K. Kendziora, & L. Wood (Eds.), *Keeping students safe and helping them thrive: A collaborative handbook on school safety, mental health, and wellness* (pp. 389–407). Praeger/ABC-CLIO.

Osher, D., Pittman, K., Young, J., Smith, H., Moroney, D., Irby, M. (2020). *Thriving, robust equity, and transformative learning & development: A more powerful conceptualization of the contributors to youth success.* American Institutes for Research and Forum for Youth Investment. https://www.air.org/sites/default/files/Thriving-Robust-Equity%2C-and-Transformative-Learning-and-Development-July-2020.pdf

Owens, J., & McLanahan, S. S. (2020). Unpacking the drivers of racial disparities in school suspension and expulsion. *Social Forces*, *98*(4), 1548–1577. https://doi.org/10.1093/sf/soz095

Payne, A. A., & Welch, K. (2015). Restorative justice in schools: The influence of race on restorative discipline. *Youth & Society*, *47*(4), 539–564. https://doi.org/10.1177/0044118X-12473125https://doi.org/10.1177/0044118X12473125

Pennington, C. R., Heim, D., Levy, A. R., & Larkin, D. T. (2016). Twenty years of stereotype threat research: A review of psychological mediators. *PloS One*, *11*(1), e0146487. https://doi.org//10.1371/journal.pone.0146487https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0146487

Rappaport, J. (2002). In praise of paradox: A social policy of empowerment over prevention. In T. A. Revenson (Eds.), *A quarter century of community psychology* (pp. 121–146). Springer. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-1-4419-8646-7_8

Riestenberg, N. (2012). *Circle in the square: Building community and repairing harm in schools.* Living Justice Press.

Rose, J., Leverson, M., & Smith, K. (2020). *Embedding culturally responsive practices in tier I.* Center on Positive Behavioral Interventions and Supports. https://assets-global.web-site-files.com/5d3725188825e071f1670246/5eaca0e7e-06327469a4f94de_Embedding%20Cultural%20Responsive%20Practices%202019%20RDQ%20Brief.pdf

Schlund, J., Jagers, R. J., & Schlinger, M. (2020). *Advancing social and emotional learning (SEL) as a lever for equity and excellence.* Collaborative for Academic, Social, and Emotional Learning. https://bit.ly/CASELEquityInsights

Schumacher, A. (2014). Talking circles for adolescent girls in an urban high school. *Sage Open*, *4*(4), 215824401455420–215824401455481. https://doi.org/10.1177/2158244014554204

Singleton, G., & Linton, C. (2006). *Courageous conversation about race: A field guide for achieving equity in schools.* Corwin.

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. https://doi.org/10.1080/02796015.2011.12087730

Spencer, M. B., & Swanson, D. P. (2016). Vulnerability and resiliency of African American youth: Revelations and challenges to theory and research. In D. Cicchetti (Ed.), *Developmental psychopathology* (3rd ed., pp. 34–380). John Wiley. https://doi.org/10.1002/9781119125556.devpsy407

Sprague, J. R., Biglan, A., Rusby, J., Gau, J., & Vincent, C. (2017). Implementing school wide PBIS in middle Schools: Results of a randomized trial. *Journal of Health and Science Education*, *1*(2), 1–10. https://doi.org/10.0000/JHSE.1000109

Sprague, J. R., & Horner, R. H. (2012). School wide positive behavior interventions and supports: Proven practices and future directions. In S. Jimerson, A. B. Nickerson, M. Mayer, & M. Furlong (Eds.), *Handbook of school violence and schools-Safety: International research and practice* (pp. 447–462). Routledge.

Sprague, J. R., Whitcomb, S., & Bear, G. (2019). Mechanisms for promoting and integrating school-wide discipline approaches. In M. Mayer & S. R. Jimerson (Eds.), *School safety and violence prevention: Science, practice, policy* (pp. 95–120). American Psychological Association.

Sprague, J. R., & Tobin, T. (2016). *Restorative practices in a tiered fidelity inventory framework (TFI-RP): An evaluation tool.* University of Oregon Institute on Violence and Destructive Behavior. https://oregon.qualtrics.com/jfe/form/SV_a5H6RcBJD8p6VF3

Steele, C. M., Spencer, S. J., & Aronson, J. (2002). Contending with group image: The psychology of stereotype and social identity threat. In M. Zanna (Ed.), *Advances in experimental social psychology* (pp. 379–440). Academic Press.

Stovall, D. (2018). Are we ready for 'school' abolition?: Thoughts and practices of radical imaginary in education. *Taboo: The Journal of Culture and Education*, *17*(1), 51–61. https://doi.org/10.31390/taboo.17.1.06

Sugai, G., & Horner, R. (2010). School-wide positive behavior support: Establishing a continuum of evidence-based practices. *Journal of Evidence-Based Practices for Schools*, *11*(1), 62–83.

Sweedler, M. (2018, August). New York City Education Department plans mandatory implicit bias training. *Wall Street Journal*. https://www.wsj.com/articles/new-york-city-

education-department-plans-mandatory-implicit-bias-train-ing-1534374956

Tauri, J. M. (2019). Restorative Justice as a colonial project in the disempowerment of Indigenous peoples. In T. Gavrielides (Ed.), *Routledge international handbook of restorative justice* (pp. 342–358). Routledge.

Taylor, R. D., Oberle, E., Durlak, J. A., & Weissberg, R. P. (2017). Promoting positive youth development through school-based social and emotional learning interventions: A meta-analysis of follow-up effects. *Child Development*, *88*(4), 1156–1171. https://doi.org/10.1111/cdev.12864

U.S. Department of Education, Office for Civil Rights. (2018). *2015-2016 civil rights data collection: School climate and safety*. U.S. Department of Education Office for Civil Rights. https://www2.ed.gov/about/offices/list/ocr/docs/school-climate-and-safety.pdf

Valandra, E. C., & Wapȟáha Hokšíla, W. (2020). Introduction. In E. C. Valandra & W. Wapȟáha Hokšíla (Eds.) *Colorizing Restorative Justice: Voicing our realities* (pp. 1–33). Justice Living Press.

Valenzuela, A. (1999). *Subtractive schooling: U.S. - Mexican youth and the politics of caring*. SUNY series, The Social Context of Education.

Vincent, C. G., Randall, C., Cartledge, G., Tobin, T. J., & Swain-Bradway, J. (2011). Towards a conceptual integration of cultural responsiveness and school-wide positive behavior support. *Journal of Positive Behavior Interventions*, *13*(4), 219–229. https://doi.org/10.1177/1098300711399765

Vincent, C. G., Sprague, J. R., CHiXapkaid, M., Tobin, T. J., & Gau, J. M. (2015). Effectiveness in Schoolwide Positive Behavior Interventions and Supports, in reducing racially inequitable discipline exclusion. In D. Losen (Ed.), *Closing the school discipline gap: Equitable remedies for excessive exclusion* (pp. 207–221). Teachers College Press.

Walker, H., Seeley, J., Small, J., Severson, H., Graham, B., Feil, E., Serna, L., Golly, A. M., & Forness, S. R. (2009). A Randomized controlled trial of the First Step to Success Early Intervention: Demonstration of program efficacy outcomes in a diverse, urban school district. *Journal of Emotional and Behavioral Disorders*, *17*(4), 197–212. https://doi.org/10.1177/1063426609341645

Walker, H. M., & Sprague, J. R. (2007). Early, evidence-based intervention with school-related behavior disorders: Key issues, continuing challenges, and promising practices. In J. B. Crockett, M. Gerber, & T. J. Landrum (Eds.), *Achieving the radical reform of special education: Essays in honor of James M. Kauffman* (pp. 37–58). Laurence Erlbaum Associates.

Wandersman, A., Duffy, J., Flaspohler, P., Noonan, R., Lubell, K., Stillman, L., Blachman, M., Dunville, R., & Saul, J. (2008). Bridging the gap between prevention research and practice: The interactive systems framework for dissemination and implementation. *American Journal of Community Psychology*, *41*(3–4), 171–181. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10464-008-9174-z

Weissberg, R. P., Durlak, J. A., Domitrovich, C. E., & Gullotta, T. P. (2015). Social and emotional learning: Past, present, and future. In J. A. Durlak, C. E. Domitrovich, R. P. Weissberg, & T. P. Gullotta (Eds.), *Handbook of social and emotional learning: Research and practice* (pp. 3–19). Guilford.

Welsh, R. O., & Little, S. (2018). The school discipline dilemma: A comprehensive review of disparities and alternative approaches. *Review of Educational Research*, *88*(5), 752–794. https://doi.org/10.3102/0034654318791582

Whitford, D. K., & Emerson, A. M. (2019). Empathy intervention to reduce implicit bias in pre-service teachers. *Psychological Reports*, *122*(2), 670–688. https://doi.org/10.1177/0033294118767435

Whitford, D. K., Gage, N. A., Katsiyannis, A., Counts, J., Rapa, L. J., & McWhorter, A. (2019). The exclusionary discipline of American Indian and Alaska Native (AI/AN) students with and without disabilities: A Civil Rights Data Collection (CRDC) national analysis. *Journal of Child and Family Studies*, *28*(12), 3327–3337. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10826-019-01511-8

Wigelsworth, M., Lendrum, A., Oldfield, J., Scott, A., Ten Bokkel, I., Tate, K., & Emery, C. (2016). The impact of trial stage, developer involvement, and international transferability on universal social and emotional learning programme outcomes: A meta-analysis. *Cambridge Journal of Education*, *46*(3), 347–376. https://doi.org/10.1080/0305764X.2016.1195791

Williamson, J. R. (1984). *The crucible of race: Black-white relations in the American south since emancipation*. Oxford University Press.

Winn, M. T. (2018). *Justice on both sides. Transforming education through restorative justice*. Harvard Education Press.

Yeager, D. S., Purdie-Vaughns, V., Hooper, S. Y., & Cohen, G. L. (2017). Loss of institutional trust among racial and ethnic minority adolescents: A consequence of procedural injustice and a cause of Life-Span Outcomes. *Child Development*, *88*(2), 658–676. https://doi.org/10.1111/cdev.12697

Zehr, H. (2014). *The little book of restorative justice*. Good Books.

AUTHOR BIOGRAPHICAL STATEMENTS

Anne Gregory, *PhD,* is a professor in the Graduate School of Applied and Professional Psychology at Rutgers University. Her research is in the area of racial and gender disparities in discipline and is currently examining school-wide restorative practices and equity-oriented social and emotional learning.

David Osher is a Vice President and Institute Fellow at the American Institutes for Research where he focuses on the conditions for learning, social and emotional learning, supportive and community building approaches to school discipline and safety, cultural competence and responsiveness, implementation science, and the science of learning and development.

George G. Bear, *PhD,* is a Professor in the School of Education. His research focuses on school climate, school discipline, and self-discipline. He has authored five books, coedited four others, and published over 100 additional book chapters and articles in peer-reviewed journals.

Robert J. Jagers is the Vice President of Research at the Collaborative for Academic, Social and Emotional Learning (CASEL). His work focuses on transformative approaches to SEL and implications for creating equitable learning

environments and enhancing developmental outcomes, especially for children and youth from historically underserved groups.

Jeffrey R. Sprague is a Professor of Special Education and Director of the University of Oregon Institute on Violence and Destructive Behavior. He directs research and demonstration projects related to *positive behavior interventions and supports*, multitiered support systems, school safety, restorative practice in schools, alternative education, juvenile delinquency prevention, and bullying prevention.