

Tier 1 Problem Solving Documentation Template

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
2. Mr. Lee	School Psychologist	Problem Solving Facilitator/Team Coord.	Promote effective problem solving practices
3. Ms. Rivera	Office Assistant	Note Taker/Document Storage	Promote effective tracking of team decisions
4. Mr. Carlson	Asst. Principal	Data Coach/Mgmt	Promote efficient and effective data use
5. Ms. Karerra	ELA Coach	Content Expert & Staff Lead	Promote evidence-based practices for ELA
6. Ms. Reed	STEM Coach	Content Expert & Staff Lead	Promote evidence-base practices for STEM
7. Ms. Juarez	PBIS Coach	Content Expert & Staff Lead	Promote evidence-based practices for Behavior/SEL
8. 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 our historic trends for ODR, ISS, and OSS rates?

- a. **ODRs:** *increasing* from 124.6 per 100 students (15-16) to 165.7 per 100 students (18-19)
- b. **ISSs:** *increasing* from 49.7 per 100 students (15-16) to 167.7 per 100 students (18-19)
- c. **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?

- a. **ODRs:** current rates (18-19) are *nearly 8 times higher* than state average for other elementary schools implementing PBIS.
- b. **ISSs:** no local or state comparison available

Tier 1 Problem Solving Documentation Template

- c. **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?

- a. **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)?

- a. Core effectiveness report indicates only 72% of students have 0-1 office discipline referral.
- b. 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%

6. Do we have equitable outcomes for all students?

a. Populations with current risk ratios higher than 1.5?:

- i. ODRs:
 1. African American students
- ii. OSSs:
 1. African American students

b. Risk Ratio Trends:

- i. ODRs:

Tier 1 Problem Solving Documentation Template

1. reductions in risk ratio for Hispanic, African American, and SWDs compared to last year.
- ii. OSSs:
 1. Increased risk ratio for Hispanic students
 2. Decreased risk ratio for African American students and SWDs.
- c. **ODR risk by ethnicity:**
 - i. African American have a 69% risk compared to 41% of all other students.
 - ii. SWDs have a 22% risk
- d. **ODR risk by IEP Status:**
 - i. Both general education and special education students have increased risk compared to 2 year ago.
 - ii. General education student have a higher risk for an ODR than SWDs.
- e. **OSS risk by ethnicity:**
 - i. Risk rates for Africa American students and SWDs has increased with AA students having highest risk for OSS.
- f. **OSS risk by IEP status:**
 - i. Both general education and special education students have an increase risk compared to two years ago.
 - ii. Special Education students have a higher risk for an OSS than general education students.

7. 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?	2 nd Grade	23.7%
Most common consequence given?	Re-teach expectation	52.1%

Tier 1 Problem Solving Documentation Template

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

Behavior Type: <u>Phy. Contact</u> <div style="text-align: right; margin-top: 10px;"> % of Total Referrals: 35.5% </div>	Location: <u>Classroom</u> <div style="text-align: right; margin-top: 10px;"> % of Total Referrals: 61.5% ✓ </div>
Sub-Group: <u>White</u> <div style="text-align: right; margin-top: 10px;"> % of Total Referrals: 39.3% </div>	Grade level: <u>2nd</u> <div style="text-align: right; margin-top: 10px;"> % of Total Referrals: 23.7% </div>
Time: <u>Lunch (10:30-11:15)</u> <div style="text-align: right; margin-top: 10px;"> % of Total Referrals: 39.3% </div>	Admin Dec: <u>Reteach Exp</u> <div style="text-align: right; margin-top: 10px;"> % of Total Referrals: 39.3% </div>

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
 - Disrespect
 - Abusive Language
 - Aggression/Fighting
- } These 5 combined
= 86% of all ODRs across classrooms
- 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.

Tier 1 Problem Solving Documentation Template

- All populations and classrooms contributing to classroom-based ODRs for disruption or physical contact.

9. 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.

10. What will be our 1-year SMART goal?

- a. Reduce Classroom ODRs for disruption and physical contact, and number of students involved by 50% before the end of next school year (2019-2020).
 - i. Current combined rates = 418 (18-19 year)
 1. Target Goal (50% reduction) = <209 (by June 2020)
 - ii. Current number of students involved = 154 (18-19)
 1. Target Goal (50% reduction) = <77 students (by June 2020)

Tier 1 Problem Solving Documentation Template

PROBLEM ANALYSIS

11. What hypotheses do we have for why the problem (gap) exists?

12. Are our hypotheses relevant and alterable? (*turn your hypothesis into a question*)

13. Which hypotheses are valid?

Instruction Hypotheses

<p>1. <i>Expectations, rules and routines are not taught consistently</i></p> <p><u>Prediction:</u> If expectations, rules and routines are taught consistently, then students would be less disruptive and avoid physical contact with others.</p> <p><u>Question:</u> Are expectations, rules, and routines being taught consistently?</p> <p><u>Validation method(s):</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Review BOQ component for expectations and rules. Interview staff for their knowledge of SWEs or their classroom rules. <p><u>Valid?</u> YES</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> BOQ for expectations is low Interview results indicate 63% of staff are unsure of SWEs or their own classroom rules. 	<p>2. <i>Lessons for Behavior are not developed or used at least 1x/week</i></p> <p><u>Prediction:</u> If lessons for pro-social behaviors are used at least 1x/week, then students will be less disruptive and avoid physical contact with others.</p> <p><u>Question:</u> Are students being taught pro-social behaviors at least 1x/week?</p> <p><u>Validation method(s):</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Review BOQ component for lesson plans. Review teacher lesson plans for prosocial-skills instruction. <p><u>Valid?</u> YES</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> BOQ for lesson plans is low 0% of teachers had lesson plans developed for teaching pro-social behaviors. 	<p>3. <i>Academic instructional lessons do not provide students with enough opportunities to respond (OTR)</i></p> <p><u>Prediction:</u> 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.</p> <p><u>Question:</u> Do academic lessons provide students with sufficient opportunities to respond?</p> <p><u>Validation method(s):</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Classroom observations (sampling methods) <p><u>Valid?</u> NO</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 76% of classrooms provide sufficient opportunities for students to actively engage lesson content and activities.
---	---	--

Tier 1 Problem Solving Documentation Template

Curriculum Hypotheses

<p>1. <i>3-5 positive schoolwide expectations have not been developed or disseminated</i></p> <p><u>Prediction:</u> If school-wide expectations have been developed and disseminated, then students will be less disruptive and avoid physical contact.</p> <p><u>Question:</u> Have SWEs been developed and disseminated?</p> <p><u>Validation method(s):</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Review BOQ component for SWEs Interview staff to see if they can accurately identify SWEs. <p><u>Valid?</u> YES</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> BOQ score for SWEs is low 55% of staff could not accurately identify the SWEs. 	<p>2. <i>Rules for classrooms are not aligned to school-wide expectations</i></p> <p><u>Prediction:</u> If rules for classrooms were aligned to SWEs, then students would be less disruptive and avoid physical contact with others.</p> <p><u>Question:</u> Are rules for classrooms aligned to SWEs?</p> <p><u>Validation method(s):</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Observe classrooms for rules developed and posted. Review classroom rules for alignment to SWEs. <p><u>Valid?</u> NO</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 100% of classrooms have rules posted and are aligned to SWEs. 	<p>3. <i>Academic curricula is at student's frustration levels rather than instructional level</i></p> <p><u>Prediction:</u> 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.</p> <p><u>Question:</u> Is academic curricula at student's frustrational levels?</p> <p><u>Validation method(s):</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 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. <p><u>Valid?</u> YES</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 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

<p>1. <i>Students experience long periods of wait time during instruction</i></p> <p><u>Prediction:</u> 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.</p>	<p>2. <i>Classroom routines and behavior management practices are not being used consistently</i></p> <p><u>Prediction:</u> If classroom routines and behavior management practices are used consistently, then students will be less disruptive and not engage in physical contact.</p>	<p>3. <i>Teachers are not recognizing appropriate student behavior frequently or consistently enough</i></p> <p><u>Prediction:</u> If teachers are recognizing students for appropriate behaviors frequently or consistently, then students will be less disruptive and not engage in physical contact.</p>
---	---	--

Tier 1 Problem Solving Documentation Template

<p><u>Question:</u> Are students experiencing long periods of wait time during instruction?</p> <p><u>Validation method(s):</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Observe random sample of classrooms cross all grade levels to measure duration of time when students are waiting for instructions. <p><u>Valid?</u> YES</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 47% of classrooms provided less than 70% of allocated time for instruction. 	<p><u>Question:</u> Are class routines and management practices being used consistently?</p> <p><u>Validation method(s):</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Observe classrooms to see if routines and practices are happening consistently. <p><u>Valid?</u> YES</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 33% of classrooms were observed to be consistent in their practices. 	<p><u>Question:</u> Are teachers recognizing students frequently for engaging in appropriate behaviors?</p> <p><u>Validation method(s):</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 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. <p><u>Valid?</u> YES</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Teachers are using a median of 60% of recognition tickets 44% of students do not accessed the store on average.
<h3>Learner Hypotheses</h3>		
<p>1. <i>Students are motivated to escape or avoid academic instruction</i></p> <p><u>Prediction:</u> If students are not motivated to escape or avoid academic instruction, then they will be less disruptive and engage in less physical contact.</p> <p><u>Question:</u> Are students motivated by escape or avoidance of instruction?</p> <p><u>Validation method(s):</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Review ODR forms for motivation provided on the form. <p><u>Valid?</u> NO</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 82% of ODRs for disruption involve students motivated to get attention from others. 	<p>2. <i>Students are motivated to get attention</i></p> <p><u>Prediction:</u> if students are not motivated to get attention, then they will be less disruptive and engage in less physical contact.</p> <p><u>Question:</u> Are students motivated to get peer or adult attention?</p> <p><u>Validation method(s):</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Review ODR forms for motivation provided on the form. <p><u>Valid?</u> YES</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 71% of referrals for physical contact involve students motivated to get items or attention from others. 	<p>3. <i>Student's language arts skills are below their current grade level performance</i></p> <p><u>Prediction:</u> If students' language arts skills were at grade level, then students will be less disruptive and engage in less physical contact.</p> <p><u>Question:</u> Are students language arts skills below grade level?</p> <p><u>Validation method(s):</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Review % of students with 2+ODRs who are also below grade level in ELA. <p><u>Valid?</u> YES</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 59% of students with 2+ ODRs are below proficiency in Language Arts.

Tier 1 Problem Solving Documentation Template

PLAN DEVELOPMENT AND IMPLEMENTATION

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

<u>Actions to Improve Tier 1</u>	<u>Who</u>	<u>When Start</u>	<u>How Often</u>	<u>Where</u>
1. Provide booster for staff and students on schoolwide expectations and rules (Instruction Hypothesis #1)	Admin & PBIS Coach	July 29 th Staff Meeting	Twice; Aug. 19 th & Jan. 6 th	School Media Center
2. Review reward & recognition procedures and min admin expectations for use of tokens and access to reward stores (Environment Hypothesis #3)	Admin & PBIS Coach	July 29 th Staff Meeting	Twice; Aug. 19 th & Jan. 6 th	School Media Center
3. Provide job-embedded TA to staff (PLCs) on developing lesson plans for pro-social behavior instruction (Instruction Hypothesis #2)	PBIS Coach & ELA Coach	Aug. 5 th	Monthly (first Monday of every month after school hours)	PLC meetings – teacher classrooms
4. Provide aggregate fidelity measurements every week for staff use of recognition procedures (Environment Hypothesis #3)	Admin & PBIS Coach	Aug 12 th	Weekly	Posted in staff lunch room & mail boxes
5. 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 12 th	Weekly	Posted in staff lunch room and mail boxes
6. Provide in-service training on effective classroom management procedures (Environment Hypothesis #2)	PBIS Coach	Aug 12 th	Twice; Aug. 30 th and Jan. 13 th	School Media Center
7. Provide TA to staff on implementing classroom procedures with fidelity (Environment Hypothesis #1 and #2)	PBIS Coach & Admin	Aug 19 th	Bi-weekly	Classrooms
8. Support staff (PLCs) with improving maximum instructional minutes for use in lessons (Environment Hypothesis #1)	ELA & STEM Coaches	Aug 28 th	Bi-weekly	Classrooms
9. 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. 28 th	Bi-weekly	Classrooms

Tier 1 Problem Solving Documentation Template

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

<u>Supports for Action...</u>	<u>Who</u>	<u>When Start</u>	<u>How Often</u>	<u>Where</u>
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 5 th	Weekly as needed based on activities scheduled	Media Center or Classrooms
2. 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. 12 th	Weekly	Admin office & classrooms
3. 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 22 nd	Until completed by July 29 th for use with Staff	Admin office
4. 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 22 nd	As needed for each scheduled training or TA event – at least 1 week prior to each event, respectively.	Admin office
5. Post weekly token-use fidelity and student store % access in staff lounge and staff mailrooms	Ms. Bradshaw	Aug. 12 th	Weekly	Staff Lounge and Mailroom

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

<u>Evaluation Plan</u>	<u>Who</u>	<u>When Start</u>	<u>How Often</u>	<u>Where</u>
<u>Progress Data:</u>				
<u>Data Collection & Summary</u>				
<u>Actions:</u>				
1. Monitor and graph weekly trends in ODR patterns for	Mr. Carlson & Ms. Juarez	Aug. 12 th	Weekly	Mr. Carlson's office

Tier 1 Problem Solving Documentation Template

<p>classroom disruptions or physical contact (reports to update weekly: total ODR#/100 students, disaggregated by sub-groups, disaggregated by grade levels</p> <p>2. Annual ODR, ISS, OSS comparisons at School-Year-End 2020</p>	<p>Mr. Carlson & Ms. Juarez</p>	<p>June 2020</p>	<p>Annually</p>	<p>Mr. Carlson's office</p>
<p>Plan Fidelity Data:</p> <p>Data Collection & Summary Actions:</p>				
<p>1. Weekly measurement % of students accessing PBIS store</p>	<p>Ms. Juarez</p>	<p>Aug 12th</p>	<p>Weekly</p>	<p>Admin Offices</p>
<p>2. Weekly measurement of % of allocated tokens used by staff</p>	<p>Ms. Juarez</p>	<p>Aug 12th</p>	<p>Weekly</p>	<p>Admin Offices</p>
<p>3. BOQ fidelity (EOY)</p>	<p>Ms. Bradshaw/SBLT</p>	<p>June 2020</p>	<p>End of Year only</p>	<p>Admin Offices</p>
<p>4. Tracking Staff attendance at trainings and TA</p>	<p>Mr. Carlson</p>	<p>July 29th</p>	<p>As needed</p>	<p>Media Center or classrooms</p>
<p>5. % of action items completed above and consistency of ongoing actions by year-end.</p>	<p>Mr. Lee</p>	<p>July 29th</p>	<p>At least bi-weekly</p>	<p>Admin Offices</p>

Tier 1 Problem Solving Documentation Template

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

	Student Progress "Good" <i>(Both SMART goals achieved by June 2020)</i>	Student Progress "Questionable" <i>(One SMART goal met, and the other goal shows at least half of intended reduction)</i>	Student Progress "Poor" <i>(Neither Goal met by June 2020, and at least one of the goals is less than 50% of intended reduction)</i>
<p>Fidelity of Implementation "High" (80%+ of all actions in Step 3 above completed by June 2020)</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 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 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 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 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 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)
<p>Fidelity of Implementation "Low" (Less than 80% of actions in Step 3 above completed by June 2020)</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 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 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 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 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 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

Tier 1 Problem Solving Documentation Template

PLAN EVALUATION

18. 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.

19. How sufficiently is the Tier 1 improvement plan being implemented?

96% of all planned activities (including frequency of activities) was provided with fidelity.

20. 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.

Tier 1 Problem Solving Documentation Template

21. 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