**Date: \_\_\_June 18th, 2020\_\_\_\_\_\_\_**

**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**: \_\_\_\_\_Tier 2 Behavior Concerns \_\_\_\_\_

**PROBLEM IDENTIFICATION**

**Tier 2 Expectation/Goal**: ~70% or more of our students receiving Tier 2 interventions will demonstrate improved performance at Tier 1 for behavior.

1. **What is the expected level of behavior performance at Tier 1 for targeted students?**
   1. No more than 1 ODR, and 0 suspensions.
2. **Are there students who are not meeting Tier 1 behavior performance expectations for whom you think would benefit from Tier 2 supports? And, what criteria will we use to decide if a student needs Tier 2?**
   1. 62 students identified as not responding adequately to Tier 1 improvements to reduce office referrals for disruption and inappropriate physical contact in classrooms.
   2. Decision-rule for Tier 2 membership:
      1. Students with 2+ ODRs, or 1+ OSS/ISS events, and who have at-risk or significant concerns on at least 2 or more of the 5 data sources used will be targeted for Tier 2 (or Tier 3) focus.
   3. Based on decision-rule, approximately 15 students do not appear to need additional assistance at this time, and may need closer monitoring at Tier 1.
   4. 47 students left to consider for Tier 2 or Tier 3.
3. **For each student not meeting Tier 1 performance levels, what behavioral, social-emotional, or mental health concerns or patterns exist?**
   1. Some students have 6+ ODRs, 1+ OSS/ISS events, and multiple concerns across 4 of the 5 sources of data used.
   2. Some students have 1 ODR, and no other concerns noted across the other 4 sources of data used
   3. Some students have 2-5 ODRs, or 1+ OSS/ISS events, and multiple concerns across at least one other data source used.
   4. Additional Patterns noted:
      1. Students with 6+ ODRs indicate at-risk and significant concerns for all subscale and total score of the social-emotional screener.
      2. Students with 2-5 ODRs and at least one other area of need based on the 5 data sources indicate emotional concerns, aggression/fighting concerns, non-compliance concerns, and concerns with building and maintaining positive social relationships.
4. **Are there students who have common needs who could be grouped for receiving a Tier 2 group intervention? How will you define each group’s problem statement?**
   1. Group 1: Refer to Tier 3
      1. Students have high referral rates (6+) and, also have an SDQ Total Score in the high range with moderate to high levels in *all* categories of SDQ, and concerns with 1 or more other areas (e.g., suspensions, attendance, or nominations).
   2. Group 2: Tier 2
      1. Students have referrals for fighting who also indicate moderate to high levels on Conduct, Peer, or prosocial concerns from SDQ + Externalizing concerns by teachers & parents.
   3. Group 3: Tier 2
      1. Students have SDQ Total Score in normal range and, also have moderate to high concerns with either conduct or hyperactivity in the classroom, and teacher nominations indicate externalizing concern as not following rules or not completing assignments.
   4. Group 4: Tier 2
      1. Students have Total SDQ Score in the at-risk range who also indicate moderate to high levels of emotional problems and internalizing concerns by teachers or parents
   5. Group 5: Tier 2
      1. Students have Total SDQ scores in the at-risk range who also indicate moderate to high levels of problems with peers or exhibiting prosocial behaviors, and who are nominated by teachers or parents.
   6. Group 6: Monitor more closely at Tier 1
5. **What will be our 1-year SMART goal?**
   1. Group 2 (from above list):
      1. Students will:
         1. Have 0 incidents of fighting.
         2. Decrease rate of ODRs to no more than 1 ODR,
         3. Improve in SDQ scores of Conduct, Peer, or Prosocial concerns to a lower risk level, and
         4. Have anecdotal improvement seen by teacher/parent.
   2. Group 3 (from above list):
      1. Students will:
         1. Decrease rate of ODRs to no more than 1 ODR,
         2. Improve SDQ Total Score to low risk range, or SDQ scores of Conduct or Hyperactivity by at least 1 risk level, and
         3. Have anecdotal improvement seen by teacher/parent.
   3. Group 4 (from above list):
      1. Students will:
         1. Decrease rate of ODRs to no more than 1 ODR,
         2. Improve in Total SDQ score to low-risk range, and/or improve SDQ score for emotional concerns to low risk level, and
         3. Have anecdotal improvement seen by teacher/parent.
   4. Group 5 (from above list):
      1. Students will:
         1. Decrease rate of ODRs to no more than 1 ODR,
         2. Improve in Total SDQ score to low-risk range, or improve SDQ score for Peer or Prosocial concerns to low risk level, and
         3. Have anecdotal improvement seen by teacher/parent.

**PROBLEM ANALYSIS**

1. **Based on sources of data collected in Step 1 (problem identification) what supports does your team suspect each group needs?**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Grouped Concerns** | **Hypotheses for Why Disruption or Inappropriate Physical Contact are Still Happening in Classrooms?** |
| Students have referrals for fighting who also indicate moderate to high levels on Conduct, Peer, or prosocial concerns from SDQ + Externalizing concerns by teachers & parents. | Students lack skills to manage their anger, manage their stress, or, develop & maintain positive relationships with peers and adults. |
| Students have SDQ Total Score in normal range and, also have moderate to high concerns with either conduct or hyperactivity in the classroom, and teacher nominations indicate externalizing concern as not following rules or not completing assignments. | Students have performance deficits with completing tasks, focus/attention, or minor classroom behavior concerns, and may need extra mentoring and/or incentive to meet classroom demands. |
| Students with Total SDQ Score in the at-risk range who also indicate moderate to high levels of emotional problems and internalizing concerns by teachers or parents | Students are struggling with internalizing or emotional concerns that distracts them from meeting schoolwide Tier 1 expectations. |
| Students with Total SDQ scores in the at-risk range who also indicate moderate to high levels of problems with peers or exhibiting prosocial behaviors, and who are nominated by teachers or parents. | Students lack skills with developing and maintaining positive social relationships with others. |

1. **What evidence-based treatments or interventions could be used to address each group’s needs?**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Suspected Needs | Proposed Intervention for Tier 2 |
| Issues with anger, and poor relationships with peers and adults | Anger management or stress management program |
| Issues with task completion, focus/attention, or minor classroom behavior concerns | Check-In/Check-Out (CICO) mentoring program |
| Issues with internalizing concerns, social avoidance, and/or emotional concerns | Group Counseling/Therapy/Mental Wellness supports |
| Issues with negative or poor peer relations, social avoidance/isolation, and/or prosocial skill concerns | Social Skills or Character-building program |

**PLAN DEVELOPMENT AND IMPLEMENTATION**

1. **What will be our actions to improve Tier 2? (CICO Group)**

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Actions to Improve Tier 1 | Who | When Start | How Often | Where |
| 1. Communicate the program with parents and students involved | Principal | August 24th | One time | Office |
| 1. Describe the procedures, responsibilities, and reward menu and criteria to students | PBIS Coach & Principal | August 24th | One time | Office |
| 1. Serve as “mentor” to students and meet with targeted students in the AM (before classes) and PM (after classes) every day. Use Student Report Card | Social Worker (K-2)  PBIS Coach  (3-5) | August 31st | Daily | Media Center |
| 1. Check-in & Check-out with students before and after each class or subject taught by teachers using Student Report Card | Students’ teachers | August 31st | Daily | Media Center |
| 1. Facilitate students using points earned to purchase rewards from the PBIS store. | Asst. Principal | Sept. 7th | Weekly, Monday of every week for points earned previous week. | PBIS Store |

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. Ensure all relevant materials for CICO are gathered and prepared for use | PBIS Coach | August 24th | Weekly | Office |
| 1. Student Report Cards are filed and stored for evaluation at end of each week. | PBIS Coach & Social Worker | Sept. 4th | Weekly on every Friday | Media Center |
| 1. Support Teachers with technical assistance or trouble-shooting regarding process for check-in/check-out procedures for using during classes. | PBIS Coach & Asst. Principal | As needed | As needed | Teacher classroom or Office |
| 1. Ensure new or range of reward options based on student interest and choice | Asst. Principal | August 31st. | Monthly or as needed based on student results | PBIS Store |
| 1. Manage PBIS store supplies and coordinate timing/schedule for students to cash in points for rewards. | Asst. Principal | Sept. 4th | Weekly on Fridays (Inventory monitoring) | PBIS Store |
| 1. Schedule Tier 2 monitoring meetings for bi-weekly schedule | Asst. Principal | Sept. 4th | One time – schedule to start Sept 14th bi-weekly on Monday’s | Office |

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. Track Student Report Cards – Total Points Earned and Percentage of Total Points earned. 2. Record total points earned and %age of points earned in excel file for graphing results. 3. Provide team with updated progress data graphs and team decision-rules to Tier 2 team for use in evaluating intervention effectiveness and next steps. “Good” week = 90%+ of total possible points earned. | PBIS Coach & Social Worker  PBIS Coach & Social Worker  PBIS Coach | Sept 4th  Sept. 4th  Sept. 11th | Weekly  Weekly  Bi-Weekly on Fridays | Media Center  Media Center  Media Center/Office |
| Plan Fidelity Data:  Data Collection & Summary Actions:   1. Monitor student attendance and participation in daily CICO procedures using Student Report Card document. High fidelity = 90% or more of the components used. 2. Monitor parent involvement using Parent report – parent signature required daily. 3. Monitor students accessing PBIS store weekly (if sufficient points earned). 4. Monitor Teacher participation in CICO procedures using teacher signature on daily Report Cards. | PBIS Coach  PBIS Coach  Asst. Principal  PBIS Coach & Asst. Principal | Sept. 4th    Same  Same  Same | Weekly  Same  Same  Same | Media Center  Same  Same  Same |

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

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | **Student Progress**  **“Good”**  **Individual: (9*0% of Weekly Points earned*)**  **Group: 70%+ of students are demonstrating “good” progress** | **Student Progress**  **“Questionable”**  **Individual:(*70%-90% of Weekly Points earned*)**  **Group: 25% - 70% of students are demonstrating “good” progress** | **Student Progress**  **“Poor”**  **Individual: (<*70% of Weekly Points earned)***  ***Group: <25% of students are demonstrating “good” progress*** |
| Fidelity of Implementation  “High”  (90%+ of all actions in Step 3 above completed) | * 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 effort * Review student progress trends and determine any opportunities to boost performance * 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, or consider Tier 3 focus for individual students, or redesign for entire group for Tier 2.      * Share updates with Staff and DC      * Request district supports if necessary (add’l content experts) |
| Fidelity of Implementation  “Low”  (Less than 90% of actions in Step 3 above completed) | * 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?** |
| Regarding CICO Intervention success  **(2 months of intervention so far)**  Of the 11 students receiving CICO,   * 7 of the students are demonstrating a “good” response. * 2 of the students are demonstrating a “questionable” response. * 2 of the students are demonstrating a “poor” response.   For the entire Group of CICO students:   * 63.6% of total students are demonstrating a “good” response = overall results so far of group = “questionable” response.   Regarding Tier 1 performance improvements by students in CICO program:   * 81% of CICO group demonstrating improvements at Tier 1. * Of the 11 students in the CICO program, 9 have had “0” incidents of ODR, OSS/ISS, or any other reported concerns by parents or teachers. * 2 of the students have had increases in ODRs and suspensions involve aggression and teacher disrespect. |
| 1. **How sufficiently is the Tier 1 improvement plan being implemented?** |
| 100% of all intervention components, and participation rates observed. |
| 1. **If the plan has less fidelity than originally planned, is there a need to improve fidelity?** |
| No need to further improve fidelity. |
| 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:   * For the two students with questionable responses to the CICO program:   + One student has had recent attendance concerns due to illness and did not receive some of the intervention across absent days. Continue to monitor in the CICO program now that the student is regularly attending school again.   + One student requires adjustment to their daily objectives/goals to address “following teacher directions” explicitly. * For the two students with “poor” responses to the CICO program, both have had high participation rates, and all fidelity components were completed by staff involved. These two students have recently been engaging in new concerns involving aggression, an incident of trying to leave campus, and increases in teacher-focused disrespect. These two students will be referred for Tier 3 supports. * Continue to monitor remaining students in CICO program bi-weekly. For students who meet their goal of maintaining at least 90% of points daily for three consecutive weeks will be transitioned to the self-management version of the program with eventual fading of the CICO program based on continued improvements at Tier 1. |