**Date: \_\_\_August 9th, 2019\_\_\_\_\_\_\_**

**Team Membership**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Name | Title | Team Role | Responsibility |
| 1. Ms. Bradshaw
 | Principal | Accountable Officer | Promote effective team work & progress, & ensure alignment with LEA compliance & SIP |
| 1. Mr. Lee
 | School Psychologist | Problem Solving Facilitator/Team Coord. | Promote effective problem solving practices |
| 1. Ms. Rivera
 | Office Assistant | Note Taker/Document Storage | Promote effective tracking of team decisions |
| 1. Mr. Carlson
 | Asst. Principal | Data Coach/Mgmt | Promote efficient and effective data use |
| 1. Ms. Karerra
 | ELA Coach | Content Expert & Staff Lead | Promote evidence-based practices for ELA |
| 1. Ms. Reed
 | STEM Coach | Content Expert & Staff Lead | Promote evidence-base practices for STEM |
| 1. Ms. Juarez
 | PBIS Coach | Content Expert & Staff Lead | Promote evidence-based practices for Behavior/SEL |
| 1. Mr. Graham
 | Social Worker | Content Expert & Staff Lead | Promote evidence-based practices for SEL/MH |

**CONTENT AREA FOCUS FOR PROBLEM SOLVING**: \_\_\_\_\_(Behavior) Office Discipline Data\_\_\_\_\_

**PROBLEM IDENTIFICATION**

**Tier 1 Expectation/Goal**: 80% or more of our students (across total population & disaggregate groups) will have *no more than 1* office discipline referral for the year.

1. **What are out historic trends for ODR, ISS, and OSS rates?**
	1. **ODRs:** *increasing* from 124.6 per 100 students (15-16) to 165.7 per 100 students (18-19)
	2. **ISSs:** *increasing* from 49.7 per 100 students (15-16) to 167.7 per 100 students (18-19)
	3. **OSSs:** *increasing* from 61.9 per 100 students (15-16) to 96.4 per 100 students (18-19)
2. **How do current rates compare to local or state averages?**
	1. **ODRs:** current rates (18-19) are *nearly 8 times higher* than state average for other elementary schools implementing PBIS.
	2. **ISSs:** no local or state comparison available
	3. **OSSs:** current rates (18-19) are *nearly 9 times higher* than state average for other elementary schools implementing PBIS.
3. **How do our average daily rates of ODRs compare to this time last year?**
	1. **ODRs:** average ODRs per day per month are lower for all months compared to last year *except for August, January, and February*.
4. **Do the majority of students meet or exceed expected levels of performance (i.e., no more than 1 referral per student)?**
	1. Core effectiveness report indicates *only 72% of students* have 0-1 office discipline referral.
	2. Core is not as strong as it can/should be.
5. **Is Tier 1 “healthy” for disaggregated groups of students?**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | % of students with 0-1 referrals to date | Is Core Effective?(Yes/No) | PercentageGap? |
| Total Population: | 72% | No | 8% |
|  |  |
| White | 73% | No | 7% |
| Black | 63% | No | 17% |
| Hispanic | 79% | No | 1% |
| American Indian/Native | 100% | Yes | 0% |
| Asian | 100% | Yes | 0% |
| Island Pacific | 100% | Yes | 0% |
| Multi-racial | 70% | No | 10% |
| IEP (SWDs) | 71% | No | 9% |

1. **Do we have equitable outcomes for all students?**
	1. **Populations with current risk ratios higher than 1.5?:**
		1. ODRs:
			1. *African American students*
		2. OSSs:
			1. *African American students*
	2. **Risk Ratio Trends:**
		1. ODRs:
			1. reductions in risk ratio for Hispanic, African American, and SWDs compared to last year.
		2. OSSs:
			1. *Increased* risk ratio for Hispanic students
			2. *Decreased* risk ratio for African American students and SWDs.
	3. **ODR risk by ethnicity:**
		1. African American have a 69% risk compared to 41% of all other students.
		2. SWDs have a 22% risk
	4. **ODR risk by IEP Status:**
		1. Both general education and special education students have increased risk compared to 2 year ago.
		2. General education student have a higher risk for an ODR than SWDs.
	5. **OSS risk by ethnicity:**
		1. Risk rates for Africa American students and SWDs has increased with AA students having highest risk for OSS.
	6. **OSS risk by IEP status:**
		1. Both general education and special education students have an increase risk compared to two years ago.
		2. Special Education students have a higher risk for an OSS than general education students.
2. **What patterns exist in our ODR rates?**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Pattern** | **Answer** | **% of Total Referrals** |
| **Most common problem behavior type?** | Inappropriate Physical Contact | 35.5% |
| **Most common location for referrals?** | Classrooms | 61.5% |
| **Most common time of day for referrals?** | Lunch (10:30-11:15) | 11.2% |
| **Most common sub-group with referrals?** | White students | 39.3% |
| **Most common grade level with referrals?** | 2nd Grade | 23.7% |
| **Most common consequence given?** | Re-teach expectation | 52.1% |

1. **What will be our priority for Tier 1 problem solving or planning?: *Classrooms***

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Behavior Type: \_\_Phy. Contact\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_**35.5%**% of Total Referrals:** | **Location: \_\_Classroom\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_**61.5% ✓**% of Total Referrals:** |
| **Sub-Group: \_\_\_\_White\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_**39.3%**% of Total Referrals:** | **Grade level: \_\_\_2nd \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_**23.7%**% of Total Referrals:** |
| **Time: \_Lunch (10:30-11:15) \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_**39.3%**% of Total Referrals:** | **Admin Dec: \_Reteach Exp \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_**39.3%**% of Total Referrals:** |

**Additional Notes:**

* Additional data analyses for most common patterns specific to classroom referrals only.
	+ 2nd highest problem behavior type is disruption with 27.62% of total referrals.
	+ ODRs for Physical contact **plus** disruption accounts for
		- 63.1% of total ODRs in the school
		- 42% of all ODRs occurring in the classroom.
		- 5 of the 6 top behavior problem types in the classroom seem to involve relationships with others.
			* Disruption
			* Physical Contact These 5 combined
			* Disrespect = 86% of all ODRs across classrooms
			* Abusive Language
			* Aggression/Fighting
	+ Disruptions in classrooms exist in all grade levels; 2nd and 3rd grades combined = 57.7% of all total disruptions in the school
	+ Disruption and Physical Contact happen most often during
		- large group instructional times
		- Note: teachers are not specifying on their referral forms what activity was occurring during the behavior event – need to incorporate this into our action plan.
	+ All populations and classrooms contributing to classroom-based ODRs for disruption or physical contact.
1. **What will be our objective and measurable problem statement**?

\_\_**42%** of total office discipline referrals (ODRs) are coming from (what location?)

\_\_**Classrooms**\_\_ for (what behavior?) \_\_**Physical Contact or Disruption**\_\_ involving

(which groups?) \_\_\_**Grades K-5**\_\_, and with \_\_**27.5%**\_\_ of total students contributing

at least 1 ODR for this referral focus.

1. **What will be our 1-year SMART goal?**
	1. Reduce Classroom ODRs for disruption and physical contact, and number of students involved by 50% before the end of next school year (2019-2020).
		1. Current combined rates = 418 (18-19 year)
			1. *Target Goal (50% reduction) = <209 (by June 2020)*
		2. Current number of students involved = 154 (18-19)
			1. *Target Goal (50% reduction) = <77 students (by June 2020)*

**PROBLEM ANALYSIS**

1. What hypotheses do we have for why the problem (gap) exists?
2. Are our hypotheses relevant and alterable? (*turn your hypothesis into a question*)
3. Which hypotheses are valid?

|  |
| --- |
| **Instruction Hypotheses** |
| 1. *Expectations, rules and routines are not taught consistently*

*Prediction*: If expectations, rules and routines are taught consistently, then students would be less disruptive and avoid physical contact with others.*Question*: Are expectations, rules, and routines being taught consistently?*Validation method(s):** Review BOQ component for expectations and rules.
* Interview staff for their knowledge of SWEs or their classroom rules.

*Valid?* **YES*** BOQ for expectations is low
* Interview results indicate 63% of staff are unsure of SWEs or their own classroom rules.
 | 1. *Lessons for Behavior are not developed or used at least 1x/week*

*Prediction*: If lessons for pro-social behaviors are used at least 1x/week, then students will be less disruptive and avoid physical contact with others.*Question*: Are students being taught pro-social behaviors at least 1x/week?*Validation method(s*):* Review BOQ component for lesson plans.
* Review teacher lesson plans for prosocial-skills instruction.

*Valid*? **YES*** BOQ for lesson plans is low
* 0% of teachers had lesson plans developed for teaching pro-social behaviors.
 | 1. *Academic instructional lessons do not provide students with enough opportunities to respond (OTR)*

*Prediction*: If students were provided with sufficient opportunities to respond, then students would be more engaged in instruction and less likely to be disruptive or engage in physical contact.*Question*: Do academic lessons provide students with sufficient opportunities to respond?*Validation method(s)*?* Classroom observations (sampling methods)

*Valid*? **NO*** 76% of classrooms provide sufficient opportunities for students to actively engage lesson content and activities.
 |

|  |
| --- |
| **Curriculum Hypotheses** |
| 1. *3-5 positive schoolwide expectations have not been developed or disseminated*

*Prediction*: If school-wide expectations have been developed and disseminated, then students will be less disruptive and avoid physical contact.*Question*: Have SWEs been developed and disseminated?*Validation method(s*): * Review BOQ component for SWEs
* Interview staff to see if they can accurately identify SWEs.

*Valid*? **YES*** BOQ score for SWEs is low
* 55% of staff could not accurately identify the SWEs.
 | 1. *Rules for classrooms are not aligned to school-wide expectations*

*Prediction*: If rules for classrooms were aligned to SWEs, then students would be less disruptive and avoid physical contact with others.*Question*: Are rules for classrooms aligned to SWEs?*Validation method(s*)?* Observe classrooms for rules developed and posted.
* Review classroom rules for alignment to SWEs.

*Valid*? **NO*** 100% of classrooms have rules posted and are aligned to SWEs.
 | 1. *Academic curricula is at student’s frustration levels rather than instructional level*

*Prediction*: If academic curricula were at student’s instructional levels, then students would be more engaged in academic instruction and less disruptive and avoiding physical contact with others.*Question*: Is academic curricula at student’s frustrational levels?*Validation method(s)*?* Review of data – students with 2+ODRs who also are below proficiency in ELA.
* Review of ODRs for classrooms to see what activities occur when problem behaviors happen.

*Valid*? **YES*** 59% of students with 2+ ODRs in the classroom also are below grade level in ELA.
* 68% of Classroom ODRs occur during instructional times
 |
| **Environment Hypotheses** |
| 1. *Students experience long periods of wait time during instruction*

*Prediction*: If students do not experience long periods of wait time, then they will be more engaged in class activities and be less disruptive or engage in physical aggression.*Question*: Are students experiencing long periods of wait time during instruction?*Validation method(s*): * Observe random sample of classrooms cross all grade levels to measure duration of time when students are waiting for instructions.

*Valid*? **YES*** 47% of classrooms provided less than 70% of allocated time for instruction.
 | 1. *Classroom routines and behavior management practices are not being used consistently*

*Prediction*: If classroom routines and behavior management practices are used consistently, then students will be less disruptive and not engage in physical contact.*Question*: Are class routines and management practices being used consistently?*Validation method(s*): * Observe classrooms to see if routines and practices are happening consistently.

*Valid*? **YES*** 33% of classrooms were observed to be consistent in their practices.
 | 1. *Teachers are not recognizing appropriate student behavior frequently or consistently enough*

*Prediction*: If teachers are recognizing students for appropriate behaviors frequently or consistently, then students will be less disruptive and not engage in physical contact.*Question*: Are teachers recognizing students frequently for engaging in appropriate behaviors? *Validation method(s*): * Review tokens assigned to teachers for use and record % of tickets handed out.
* Review reward store records to see % of students accessing the store on any given week.

*Valid*? **YES*** Teachers are using a median of 60% of recognition tickets
* 44% of students do not accessed the store on average.
 |
| **Learner Hypotheses** |
| 1. *Students are motivated to escape or avoid academic instruction*

*Prediction*: If students are not motivated to escape or avoid academic instruction, then they will be less disruptive and engage in less physical contact.*Question*: Are students motivated by escape or avoidance of instruction?*Validation method(s*): * Review ODR forms for motivation provided on the form.

*Valid*? **NO*** 82% of ODRs for disruption involve students motivated to get attention from others.
 | 1. *Students are motivated to get attention*

*Prediction*: if students are not motivated to get attention, then they will be less disruptive and engage in less physical contact.*Question*: Are students motivated to get peer or adult attention?*Validation method(s*): * Review ODR forms for motivation provided on the form.

*Valid*? **YES*** 71% of referrals for physical contact involve students motivated to get items or attention from others.
 | 1. *Student’s language arts skills are below their current grade level performance*

*Prediction*: If students’ language arts skills were at grade level, then students will be less disruptive and engage in less physical contact.*Question*: Are students language arts skills below grade level?*Validation method(s*): * Review % of students with 2+ODRs who are also below grade level in ELA.

*Valid*? **YES*** 59% of students with 2+ ODRs are below proficiency in Language Arts.
 |

**PLAN DEVELOPMENT AND IMPLEMENTATION**

1. **What will be our actions to improve Tier 1?**

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Actions to Improve Tier 1 | Who | When Start | How Often | Where |
| 1. Provide booster for staff and students on schoolwide expectations and rules (Instruction Hypothesis #1)
 | Admin & PBIS Coach | July 29th Staff Meeting | Twice; Aug. 19th & Jan. 6th  | School Media Center |
| 1. Review reward & recognition procedures and min admin expectations for use of tokens and access to reward stores (Environment Hypothesis #3)
 | Admin & PBIS Coach | July 29th Staff Meeting | Twice; Aug. 19th & Jan. 6th | School Media Center |
| 1. Provide job-embedded TA to staff (PLCs) on developing lesson plans for pro-social behavior instruction (Instruction Hypothesis #2)
 | PBIS Coach & ELA Coach | Aug. 5th  | Monthly (first Monday of every month after school hours) | PLC meetings – teacher classrooms |
| 1. Provide aggregate fidelity measurements every week for staff use of recognition procedures (Environment Hypothesis #3)
 | Admin & PBIS Coach | Aug 12th  | Weekly  | Posted in staff lunch room & mail boxes |
| 1. Track and share data on % of students accessing store each week with goal of at least 90% of students each week (Environment Hypothesis #3 and Learner Hypothesis #2)
 | Admin & PBIS Coach | Aug 12th  | Weekly | Posted in staff lunch room and mail boxes |
| 1. Provide in-service training on effective classroom management procedures (Environment Hypothesis #2)
 | PBIS Coach | Aug 12th  | Twice; Aug. 30th and Jan. 13th  | School Media Center |
| 1. Provide TA to staff on implementing classroom procedures with fidelity (Environment Hypothesis #1 and #2)
 | PBIS Coach & Admin | Aug 19th  | Bi-weekly | Classrooms |
| 1. Support staff (PLCs) with improving maximum instructional minutes for use in lessons (Environment Hypothesis #1)
 | ELA & STEM Coaches | Aug 28th  | Bi-weekly | Classrooms |
| 1. Provide instructional coaching for staff to differentiate ELA & STEM instruction for students reading below grade level. (Curriculum Hypothesis #3; and Learner Hypothesis # 3)
 | ELA & STEM Coaches | Aug. 28th  | Bi-weekly | Classrooms |

1. **What supports will we put in place to help the interventionist(s), and ensure fidelity of the plan?**

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Supports for Action… | Who | When Start | How Often | Where |
| 1. Support PBIS, ELA, and STEM coaches for staff accountability and involvement, and data use in training or TA activities.
 | Mr. Carlson, & Mr. Lee | Aug 5th | Weekly as needed based on activities scheduled | Media Center or Classrooms |
| 1. Support Ms. Bradshaw with gathering all records and data needed to track weekly staff use of tokens and student access to PBIS store.
 | Mr. Carlson | Aug. 12th  | Weekly | Admin office & classrooms |
| 1. Support Admin & PBIS coach with developing materials and logistics to provide training and TA to staff on PBIS procedures; assist with training as needed
 | Mr. Lee & Mr. Graham | July 22nd  | Until completed by July 29th for use with Staff | Admin office |
| 1. Ensure all trainings and TA inservices scheduled for staff are reserved in designated areas and communicate with staff about expected participation & intended outcomes of TA/trainings (i.e., improve SIP outcomes)
 | Ms. Bradshaw | July 22nd  | As needed for each scheduled training or TA event – at least 1 week prior to each event, respectively. | Admin office |
| 1. Post weekly token-use fidelity and student store % access in staff lounge and staff mailrooms
 | Ms. Bradshaw | Aug. 12th  | Weekly | Staff Lounge and Mailroom |

1. **What will be our actions to measure and evaluate the success of the plan?**

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Evaluation Plan | Who | When Start | How Often | Where |
| Progress Data:Data Collection & Summary Actions:1. Monitor and graph weekly trends in ODR patterns for classroom disruptions or physical contact (reports to update weekly: total ODR#/100 students, disaggregated by sub-groups, disaggregated by grade levels
2. Annual ODR, ISS, OSS comparisons at School-Year-End 2020
 | Mr. Carlson & Ms. JuarezMr. Carlson & Ms. Juarez | Aug. 12th June 2020 | WeeklyAnnually | Mr. Carlson’s officeMr. Carlson’s office |
| Plan Fidelity Data:Data Collection & Summary Actions:1. Weekly measurement % of students accessing PBIS store
2. Weekly measurement of % of allocated tokens used by staff
3. BOQ fidelity (EOY)
4. Tracking Staff attendance at trainings and TA
5. % of action items completed above and consistency of ongoing actions by year-end.
 | Ms. JuarezMs. JuarezMs. Bradshaw/SBLTMr. CarlsonMr. Lee | Aug 12th Aug 12th June 2020July 29thJuly 29th  | WeeklyWeeklyEnd of Year onlyAs needed At least bi-weekly | Admin OfficesAdmin OfficesAdmin OfficesMedia Center or classroomsAdmin Offices |

1. **What decision rules will we use to evaluate plan effectiveness and determine next steps**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | **Student Progress****“Good”****(*Both SMART goals achieved by June 2020*)** | **Student Progress****“Questionable”****(*One SMART goal met, and the other goal shows at least half of intended reduction*)** | **Student Progress****“Poor”****(*Neither Goal met by June 2020, and at least one of the goals is less than 50% of intended reduction)*** |
| Fidelity of Implementation“High”(80%+ of all actions in Step 3 above completed by June 2020) | * Celebrate

 * Recognize and reward staff

 * Document success and share impacts with staff, DC Coord. And DLT.

 * Reevaluate current status and identify new priorities for solving
 | * Confirm fidelity of action steps followed from step 3 above.
* Continue plan & celebrate what is working; recognize staff for their efforts
* Review disaggregated ODR data for classroom locations for analysis of impacts across grade levels, classrooms, and sub-groups.

 * Determine supplemental actions and implement new actions with fidelity.
* Share updates with staff and DC

  | * Confirm fidelity of action steps followed from step 3 above and recognize staff for their efforts

 * Discontinue plan & return to problem solving

 * Share updates with Staff and DC

 * Request district supports if necessary (add’l content experts)
 |
| Fidelity of Implementation“Low”(Less than 80% of actions in Step 3 above completed by June 2020) | * Celebrate

 * Recognize and reward staff

 * Document success despite low fidelity of actions completed

 * Determine areas of low fidelity and problem solve barriers – might get stronger outcome changes.
* Share updates with Staff, DC, and DLT
 | * Continue plan & celebrate what is working; recognize staff for their efforts
* Confirm fidelity of action steps followed from step 3 above & problem solve barriers to fidelity

 * Update action items for strategies to boost fidelity

 * Share updates with Staff and DC

  | * Continue, but update plan

 * Confirm areas of low fidelity from step 3 actions and problem solve barriers to fidelity

 * Update action items for strategies to boost fidelity

 * Share updates with Staff and D
* Request district support as needed
 |

**PLAN EVALUATION**

|  |
| --- |
| 1. **Is the plan working?**
 |
| Intended Goals by June 2020* Current combined rates = 419 (18-19 year)
	+ *Target Goal (50% reduction) = <209 (by June 2020)*
* Current number of students involved = 110 (18-19)
	+ *Target Goal (50% reduction) = <55 students (by June 2020)*

Based on results reviewed: Goal 1 (50% reduction of total ODRs for classroom disruptions and classroom physical contact **was met**. TOTAL ODRs for classroom disruptions and classroom physical contact (per/100 students) was 186 ODRs/100. Positive improvements were found among all grades, and subgroups.Based on results reviewed: Goal 2 (50% reduction of % of students involved) **was not met**, but was close. 62 students involved in ODRs for classroom disruptions or classroom physical contact.  |
| 1. **How sufficiently is the Tier 1 improvement plan being implemented?**
 |
| 96% of all planned activities (including frequency of activities) was provided with fidelity. |
| 1. **If the plan has less fidelity than originally planned, is there a need to improve fidelity?**
 |
| No need to further improve fidelity. Results indicate there may be a need to continue strategies and focus on Classroom ODRs for disruption and physical contact until Goal 2 is met. Supplemental strategies (e.g., teacher prompts, explicit daily reminders, etc.) will be updated into the plan for the coming school year. |
| 1. **What next steps will the team implement to improve the results of the plan?**
 |
| Based on decision rules chart, high fidelity and questionable to good progress was noted. Next steps will include:* Confirm fidelity of action steps followed from step 3 above.
* Continue plan & celebrate what is working; recognize staff for their efforts
* Review disaggregated ODR data for classroom locations for analysis of impacts across grade levels, classrooms, and sub-groups.

 * Supplement plan with additional low-impact strategies for teacher to use daily to remind students of expected behavior and to pre-correct or prevent occurrences of disruption or physical contact in classrooms during instructional times.
* Share updates with staff and DC
 |