

**Office of Superintendent of Public Instruction
November 10, 2014**

Committee Members in attendance:

Amy Liu, *League of Education Voters*
Amy Van on behalf of Zharina Angeles, *Commission on Asian Pacific American Affairs*
Dr. James Smith, *Educational Opportunity Gap Oversight and Accountability Committee*
Edri Geiger, *Washington State School Directors' Association*
Edward Prince, *Commission on African American Affairs*
Gil Mendoza, *Office of Superintendent of Public Instruction*
Gloria Ochoa, *Commission on Hispanic American Affairs*
Greg Beck on behalf of Tim Stensager, *K-12 Data Governance Committee*
Jennifer Harris, *Office of the Education Ombuds*
Jess Lewis, *Office of Superintendent of Public Instruction*
Myra Johnson, *Washington Education Association*
Paul Alig, *TeamChild*
Rosemarie Search, *Washington Association of School Administrators*

Committee Members not in attendance:

Matt Vaeena, *Commission on Asian Pacific American Affairs*
Mia Williams, *Association of Washington School Principals*
Trevor Greene, *Association of Washington School Principals*

Staff and Public in attendance:

Calandra Sechrist, *Director, Equity and Civil Rights— OSPI*
Krissy Johnson, *Data Analyst – OSPI*
Maria Flores, *Office of Superintendent of Public Instruction*
Megan Eliasson, *Office of Superintendent of Public Instruction*
Susan Canaga, *Data Governance – OSPI*

Introductions, agenda overview, and approval of meeting minutes

The meeting was called to order at 9:30 a.m. by OSPI staff. The September meeting minutes were approved and the November agenda items were reviewed.

Update: CEDARS Stakeholders Meeting

Greg Beck, *Application Development Director – OSPI*

- Greg discussed the discipline collections currently accomplished and those in progress.
- 2012-13
 - Student-level discipline collection began
- 2013-14
 - Separated marijuana as its own behavior code
 - Added in-school suspension as an intervention type
 - Added interim alternative education setting (IAES) as a separate element
- 2014-15
 - Added two new behavior codes (failure to cooperate and disruptive conduct) as guided by Discipline Task Force
 - Multiple behavior codes allowed per student per incident

- Added emergency expulsion as an initial & final intervention, in addition to number of days
- CEDARS Change process encourages – plan, do, check, and act model of data collection.
- The new data elements recommended by the Student Discipline Task Force are:
 - Education Services
 - Petitions for Readmission
 - Petition for over a year
 - Interventions prior to incident
 - Reengagement
 - Appeals
- On September 18th, 2014 Tim Stensager presented this new discipline collection to the Data Governance Committee and obtained agreement to move forward with designing and developing the collection.
- The proposed definitions went over fairly well, there were no objections to the elements or the ability to move forward with the revisions process.
- The next step is for OSPI to work with the CEDARS Stakeholders to design the collection and then publish the collection for the 15-16 school year.
- OSPI/District CEDARS Change Process Timeline:
 - Design Collection → November 2014 – January 2015
 - Publish Collection → February 2015
 - Implement Collection → August 2015
 - Collect Data → September 2015 – June 2016
- Collection of New Discipline Elements:
 - Academic Services: This element is the start date of when academic services were provided during the suspension or expulsion.
 - Behavior Services: This element is the start date of when behavior services were provided during the suspension or expulsion.
 - Petition for Readmission: This element is the date that a Petition for Readmission was submitted by or on behalf of the student expelled or suspended.
 - Granted Petition for Readmission: This element is the date that a Petition for Readmission was granted / approved for the student expelled or suspended.
 - Petition for over a year: This element indicates if the district made a petition to exceed more than one calendar year for the suspension / expulsion.
 - Pre incident Interventions: This element indicates if the district had held interventions with this student prior to this suspension / expulsion.
 - Reengagement Meeting: This element is the date that a reengagement meeting took place with the student returning from suspension.
 - Reengagement Plan: This element indicates if the district developed a reengagement plan for this students return from this suspension / expulsion.
 - Appeals: This element indicates if the suspension / expulsion was appealed.
- The data collection standards this group must develop at a minimum are:
 - information about education services provided while a student is subject to a disciplinary action,
 - the status of petitions for readmission to the school district when a student has been excluded from school,
 - credit retrieval during a period of exclusion, and
 - school dropout as a result of disciplinary action.

Existing CEDARS Data Elements: School dropout as a result of disciplinary action and credit retrieval during a period of exclusion

Krissy Johnson, *Data Analyst – OSPI*

- Reporting on Academic Progress – Dropout Analysis
 - Will use existing CEDARS data elements to compare students that are disciplined to students that are not disciplined and if they dropout.
 - Check enrollment at the end of the school year (May 31) for students who received short-term, long-term suspension or expulsion. Then compare this number to students that did not receive disciplinary interventions.
 - The percentage of students who dropped out after suspension or expulsion was 3.0% (5.5% for grades 9-12 only). The percentage of students who dropped, but were not suspended or expelled was 1.7% (3.8% for grades 9-12 only).
- Reporting on Academic Progress – Credit Loss
 - Will look at ratio of credits in a year for grades 9-12 and compare to students who received disciplinary interventions to those who did not.
 - Students will be grouped by the number of days out of school (1-5, 5-10, and greater than 10).
- Timeline for Academic Progress Deliverables:
 - Dropout Analysis → November 2014
 - Credit Loss Analysis → December 2014
 - Collection of new CEDARS data → September 2015 – June 2016
- Seeing the proposed data elements in CEDARS format raised further items for consideration.
- Discussion will be tabled until December – members will reprioritize the remaining elements.
- Visualizing the elements as they would appear in CEDARS was helpful for many to expose what's repetitive and what's still needed. Staff will request that Greg create the same examples for the remaining data elements. Due to time limits this request may not be possible by the December 8th meeting.

Public Comment

Public was invited to comment and no comment was provided.

Proposed Definitions for Legally Defined Behaviors

Calandra Sechrist, J.D., *Director, Equity and Civil Rights– OSPI*

- Focus on the student engaging in the behavior
 - Intent
 - What conduct or behavior did the student engage in?
 - Less focus on the effects on the targeted student
- From the perspective of Equity and Civil Rights, Callie has prepared draft definitions for the group's consideration and discussion. Each definition was presented alongside the Title IX Guidance and State Civil Rights Law to show changes.
- The proposed definitions do not eliminate legally required collection and processes through Title IX or state civil rights law.
- Proposed Definition for Sexual Harassment: Conduct or communication intended to be sexual in nature that is unwelcome by the targeted person(s).
- Proposed Definition for Discriminatory Harassment: Conduct or communication that: (1) is intended to be harmful, humiliating, or physically threatening; and (2) shows hostility toward a

person or persons based on their real or perceived sex, race, creed, religion, color, national origin, sexual orientation, gender identity, gender expression, veteran or military status, disability, or use of a trained dog guide or service animal.

- Hostility of environment depends on the circumstances of each incident (e.g. – effect on student’s education; type, frequency, or duration of conduct; identity, age, and sex of harasser and victim; relationship between harasser and victim; number of individuals involved; whether other similar incidents occurred at the school.
- Other definition – Discrimination
 - Civil rights laws prohibit discrimination by entities (e.g., school districts, public accommodations) not individuals
 - Discriminatory harassment is the key area where a district must address discriminatory behavior by students
- Other definition – HIB/Bullying
 - Not limited to protected class
 - Addressed using a different procedure
 - OSPI School Safety Center
 - RCW 28A.300.285

Working Lunch: Finalize Legally Defined Behaviors

- Members discussed sexual and discriminatory harassment definitions.

School Discipline Consensus Project (video conference)

Nina Salomon, *Senior Policy Analyst – School Discipline Consensus Project*

- The Justice Center is a national nonprofit, nonpartisan membership association of state government officials.
- The association provides practical advice informed by the best available evidence.
- School Discipline Consensus project provided a report as a resource to the field.
- Found that nearly **60%** of all middle and high school students experienced suspension and **15%** of all students were disciplined 11 or more separate times.
- Strategies to improve school discipline:
 - Make young people feel welcome and supported in school.
 - Close the achievement gap between white students and students of color.
 - Improve high school graduation rates.
 - Reduce the number of youth locked up in juvenile correctional facilities for minor offenses.
- Other states are acting on discipline policy:
 - California has banned suspensions under willful defiance.
 - Colorado passed legislation to give more flexibility back to schools and encourage alternatives to suspension.
 - Maryland passes regulations requiring school districts to adopt policies that reduce long-term OSS and expulsions.

Consensus Report Findings:

- Conditions for Learning: by creating welcoming, supportive, and secure learning environments, schools can reduce the likelihood that students will misbehave and improve educators’ ability to manage student behavior.
- Recommendation Examples:
 - Schools should be able to measure and track school climate indicators

- Codes of conduct should emphasize expectations for students; make clear suspension is a last resort
 - Graduated restorative responses should be in place
 - Educators should be provided skills to improve classroom engagement
- Targeted Behavioral Interventions: some students who are repeatedly involved in their schools' discipline systems may require additional supports and interventions including those that address unmet behavioral health, academic, or other needs.
- Recommendation Examples:
 - Districts, schools, and educators should collect data that identifies and supports students with behavioral health needs
 - Student support teams and community partnerships should be at every school to oversee behavioral challenges and review early warning data
 - Students removed from school for disciplinary reasons should be placed in quality alternative educational settings
- School-Police Partnerships: working collaboratively, schools and local law enforcement can ensure schools are safe and that students are not arrested for minor misconduct.
- Recommendation Examples:
 - School-based officers should be properly selected, trained, supervised, and evaluated; off-campus officers should be trained on alternatives to arrest
 - Police should not engage in routine classroom management and should rely on the school's disciplinary system to address minor offenses
 - School systems and law enforcement agencies should create detailed memorandums of understanding
- Courts and Juvenile Justice: Recognizing the negative long-term consequences of involvement in the juvenile justice system, every effort should be made to keep students in school and out of court, particularly through diversion of students who commit minor school-based offenses.
- Recommendation Examples:
 - School districts and local juvenile justice systems should share a common understanding of how many students schools refer each year to the juvenile justice system and for what offenses
 - Determine how, and under what circumstances, information regarding a student's risk of re-offending and his/her education record should be shared to improve diversion opportunities
 - Youth in juvenile corrections should receive educational opportunities that meet the same standards of community schools
- Nina reviewed existing data collection from school safety center website.
- By compiling and repackaging existing data, WA can achieve the following goals:
 - Help administrators and policy makers get a better sense of where their campuses and districts are vis-a-vis other campuses, districts, and the state on key discipline indicators
 - Allow states to identify schools and districts with disproportionately high rates of suspensions/expulsions and target supports to reduce their reliance on such disciplinary removals, and identify places that are doing particularly well and try to scale up best practices
 - Enable all critical stakeholders to track disciplinary trends over time
- WA Potential to Become a National Model
 - How can WA track school climate in a more systematic way?

- How can school discipline and school climate data be better packaged and presented to the state policymakers?
- How will this information be used?

Public Comment

Public was invited to comment and no comment was provided.

Work Session: Recommendations/Report

- A summative report of the Student Discipline Task Force will be drafted by staff. Will include the background on legislation, implementation of charge, progress to date, and areas outside of charge important to the members of the task force.
- Staff has pulled themes for other areas for potential recommendations:
 - Prevention for At-Risk Students
 - Positive Behavioral Interventions & Supports
 - Alternative to In-School Suspension
 - Family Engagement
 - Restorative Justice
 - Equitable Access to Education Services
 - School to Prison Pipeline
- The discussion of these recommendations was tabled for the December meeting.
- Members will fill in problem statements and corresponding recommendations using strong language (e.g. “must” or “shall”) as homework.
- Staff will compile recommendations and organize relevant background information.

Final announcements/Conclusion

- The task force will convene for a final meeting on December 8, 2014 from 9:00 a.m. – 4:00 p.m. at OSPI, in Olympia.
- Homework will include drafting background and recommendations outside of charge.
- Members will contribute to drafting report following the December meeting.
- Staff will set up a SharePoint for reviewing the draft report; additional remote meeting options may be arranged.

With no further comment, the meeting adjourned at 4:00 p.m.