**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) | Percentage  Gap? |
| 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. Juarez  Mr. Carlson & Ms. Juarez | Aug. 12th  June 2020 | Weekly  Annually | Mr. Carlson’s office  Mr. 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. Juarez  Ms. Juarez  Ms. Bradshaw/SBLT  Mr. Carlson  Mr. Lee | Aug 12th  Aug 12th  June 2020  July 29th  July 29th | Weekly  Weekly  End of Year only  As needed  At least bi-weekly | Admin Offices  Admin Offices  Admin Offices  Media Center or classrooms  Admin 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 |