Developing Policies That Support a Positive Schoolwide Culture and Creating Fair Discipline Processes

NANCY:
[I’m Nancy Opalack] and I’m delivering a presentation on behavior management and discipline practices. My partner Beth Giovannetti and I designed [audio skip] student support office for a region of nine charter schools in New Orleans over the past two years. Under the student support office umbrella, we’ve had to develop a collaborative approach to building equitable discipline practices and processes across the region of schools. In order to do that, we conducted an awful lot of research to find out what people across the country were doing. We wanted to standardize some policy for the nine schools, but we also wanted to empower autonomy for the schools in developing their own processes and procedures to ensure discipline equity.

We’ll begin by looking at Slide Number 2. Now is the time not only for schools and states like Louisiana that legislate discipline policy and mandate pretty stringent discipline practices. I think it’s happening in a lot of states across the country because a growing national concern about discipline in the public schools has fueled increases in research about discipline. It’s really fueled more legislation about schools abiding by laws regarding discipline, and there’s an increased oversight in monitoring about discipline procedures. More and more discipline incidents are highly publicly sensationalized by the media. We hear stories of kids being handcuffed to chairs, tasered, kept—in New Orleans—kept in a room that looks like a prison cell. Whether these stories are true or not, the media has sensationalized discipline in schools.
Following one of the biggest [audio skip] influences that we’ve had to make on school leaders, not only in these nine schools but in other training we’ve done for discipline, is that it’s not just students with disabilities that are covered for or protected by laws, it’s students with Section 504 plans, and a good number of students involved in the RTI [response to intervention] process are protected by civil rights laws that prohibit discrimination, based both on identified disabilities and on indicators of possible disabilities.

It’s incumbent, on Slide 3, the most important point to empower principals to take the lead on discipline practices in their schools. All the research [audio skip] to one important point, and that is the school leader sets the tone and the policy and the practice of keeping safe schools. It’s incumbent on school leaders to keep abreast of current research and best practices in sustaining positive behavior support [PBS], understanding complexity of building comprehensive processes and procedures for discipline. We underestimate in almost every case how important it is to set up a schoolwide communication system that starts at the moment of the incident and spreads to everyone in the school that’s dealing with the student involved.

School leaders are always in charge of establishing high expectations for staff, parents, and students. Principals need to oversee the development of reasonable and carefully defined infractions in Codes of Conduct. It’s so much easier to enforce discipline policy when the rules are spelled out up front and everybody has an idea of what they’re responsible to do. It’s also incumbent on the school leader to ensure that the execution of consequences remains equitable for all students.
On Slide 4, I want listeners to know that we’re looking at seven different areas of discipline, themes in federal laws, what the current research reports, not only what it reports but what are the recommendations from research, what lawsuits are driving this process or have had some kind of influence over discipline. Then we want to take a look at what Louisiana has done. Louisiana has been extremely proactive in regulating discipline, and within a proactive state we want to go through a process we put in place to ensure that schools put their policies in place that are nondiscriminatory and safe for all kids.

On Slide 5, we talk about the themes in federal law regarding discipline. The *Special Ed Handbook* in Rockingham County, Virginia, has a fabulous introduction, which really summarizes what the federal law requires. All kids have a right to a safe environment, all staff need to have the tools required to ensure a safe environment, there has to be a balanced approach that protects the rights of all students, and there has to be well-developed strategies and interventions and [audio skip] kids with disabilities, well-written IEPs.

Also threaded on Slide 6 throughout the federal law and regulation is the governing principle that students with disabilities are entitled to the same constitutional rights as students without disabilities. All students’ fundamental rights include notice of a violation, a chance for the student to give his or her account of the incident, and all students with their parents need to have the right to appeal a suspension or expulsion.
On Slide 7, we look at what the current research reports, and we looked at, and here we’ve captured studies from 2010, 2011, and 2012. In 2010, the Civil Rights Project studied schools in 18 of the nation’s largest urban districts, and the important piece of this study is that 175 schools in these 18 districts suspended more than one third of their black male students. So, this study confirms that minority students are subjected to more suspensions than nonminority students.

In 2011, the Justice Center of the Counsel of State Governments conducted a study, a fascinating study, that looked at students, middle school and high school students, for more than six years in Texas. The findings from that study indicated that nearly 60 percent of all students were suspended or expelled. One in seven secondary-level students in Texas had been involved in the juvenile justice system. The study makes a strong correlation between the number of students suspended at least one time that had contact with the juvenile justice system, and this is close to 25 percent of students that had been suspended for at least one time.

Again, one of the prevalent problems that we see everywhere when we go in and conduct studies in schools is that in this study, only three percent of disciplinary actions were for conduct in which the state law mandated suspensions and expulsions. The rest were made at the discretion of school officials, primarily in response to violations of local school conduct codes. Again, it’s the school leader that sets the tone and sets the consistency of fairly doling out consequences.

The last study, again, Civil Rights Project, in April of 2012 concerns a study that was conducted in California, and basically what this study does is confirm for us that black students and American
Indian students and students with disabilities are more frequently suspended and expelled than their other peers in schools.

On Slide 8, we look at issues as the research reports regarding recommendations. Before we get to that, this particular slide talks about all the research that was done on positive behavior support. I don’t want to spend too much time on this because most educators have read research about positive behavior support. The National Association of School Psychologists findings indicate that in schools that did implement effective PBS, there was over a 90 percent reduction in problem behavior in over half the studies and that the problem behavior stopped completely in over 26 percent of the studies about positive behavior support.

If we go to Slide 9 now, we look at the research recommendations. There are many, many recommendations that came out of the research projects. Most of them urge schools to develop policies that decrease the suspension of at-risk children. It’s citing zero-tolerance policies other than those mandated, weapons, controlled substances, certainly IDAs, assault with intent to maim. Schools that establish zero-tolerance policies for lesser incidents end up suspending and expelling more students than necessary.

Again, the research recommendations recommend that we have to stop unlimited administrator discretion to suspend—the overuse of suspension. Oftentimes, suspensions occur because we have excessive, unrestrained policing of schools. We see this in the larger urban schools. Too much emphasis on high-stakes testing. There are still schools we find that will ask certain students to stay home on the days of testing, which is removal from the school setting, of course.
A lack of quality school-based prevention [audio skip] intervention and support services, many schools do not have alternatives to suspension. There are unidentified and unmet special ed needs. Often, when we look at cases of students that have been suspended and are not identified as needing special education, we find that at least RTI intervention should have been put in place and a consideration of more in-depth evaluation. Oftentimes, schools are underfunded or they claim underfunding. They don’t have the resources necessary to implement effective discipline policies, and all of that results in alienation and marginalization of parents and communities.

On Slide Number 10, we thought we’d include some of the lawsuits relevant to discipline in schools. Some of these go back a number of years. In 1975, there was a landmark case that stated students cannot be suspended without due process, and in 2005 in New Jersey, the court established that students that were suspended or expelled still have to have access to alternative education because students suffer irreparable harm when education is disrupted. Most recently, the Southern Poverty Law Center’s class action against, really, the Louisiana Department of Education. One of the big factors in that lawsuit was charter schools’ failure to protect students’ procedural safeguards in the discipline process, and this is for both kids identified with disabilities and students with Section 504 plans.
On Slide 11, I want to talk about the proactive state regulation in Louisiana. Louisiana’s charter law, as many charter laws do, and the charter school agreement requires charter school leaders and founders to sign assurances that they will abide by federal laws regarding discrimination. They will certainly abide by the state laws mandating nondiscriminatory practices.

Louisiana has instituted, legislated actually, the Model Master Discipline Plan, which we found, when we first looked at it, to be extremely cumbersome. But when we pulled it apart and began to look at how we could implement practice that is required by this plan, we found it to be a very practical, effective tool for developing discipline policies in schools. The Model Master Discipline Plan in Louisiana requires all schools, and all LEAs in New Orleans are responsible for collaboration with juvenile justice agencies, defining and adhering to zero-tolerance policies, and those are defined by the state.

Improving mental health services in schools has been a big challenge in New Orleans. Using positive behavior support for improved classroom management and improving and adhering to school suspension/expulsion policies and improving the reporting of disciplinary actions. We’re definitely always amazed when we do school-by-school studies in public schools as well as charter schools. It’s rare that state-level information matches what we find in the school-level documentation regarding incidents and suspensions. So, it’s really important that schools accurately report all discipline incidents and all suspensions and expulsions.
Louisiana has legislated that schools need to write a Code of Conduct that carefully defines levels of consequences and outcomes for those consequences. We have to put it on our website, and it has to be available to all parents. We also had to develop and adopt a definition for willful disobedience because so many schools were indiscriminately suspending kids for things like uniform violations, coming in late, talking back to a teacher, so the senate decided that schools needed to develop what willful disobedience was so that parents and students understood guidelines for those infractions and the consequences associated.

On Slide Number 12, we want to talk about how we began to do this process, as it may be helpful to anybody that’s looking to revamp discipline in their schools. The schools in this particular region, there was no designated dean of discipline. We had deans of culture, we had assistant principals, but we really didn’t have anybody that was assigned the sole task of assuming responsibility for equitable discipline practices. In these nine schools, the special educators and the folks who ran the child study teams, we refer to them as self- [audio skip]. We were knowledgeable about discipline policies governing and protecting the students that were involved in each of their functions; however, the communication among all players was so fragmented that oftentimes kids were sent home from school or suspended without notification of the people who needed to be notified.
On Slide 13, I want to start to talk about the steps that we’ve put in place. Building this discipline system in New Orleans required five key steps. The first step is that we convened four roundtables. School leaders agreed to assign a person they were designating to be in charge of discipline, their special education coordinator, and their child study team chairperson, and all three of these people from the nine schools attended four roundtables during the course of the school year.

We established as a group the purpose of the roundtable, which was really to ensure that there were three key informed leaders from each campus charged with guiding discipline practice based on familiarity with the laws. With their Student Code of Conduct, we were kind of surprised at how unfamiliar school leaders were with the regional school Code of Conduct.

The purpose of the roundtable was to ensure that everyone was familiar with federal and Louisiana laws. We wanted everybody to be familiar with best practices regarding positive behavior management. It might be important to note here that these nine schools, all of them had a positive behavior management system in place, which saved an awful lot of time at the beginning of the process. We wanted the participants to be very careful in understanding data-driven decision making in addressing schoolwide behavior issues, how to track incidents, how to address trends in incidents, and we spent an awful lot of time looking at how we could do that. We also wanted to make sure that every school had graduated levels of behavior interventions for students with disabilities. This is really hard to do, but if you have a strongly established RTI process for behavior management, you can easily put in three tiers of interventions starting with counseling, moving through the behavior intervention plan.
Moving to Slide 14, Step 3 is that we established tasks, deliverables, and timelines to be accomplished during the school year. Under those tasks, we had a number of tasks that we felt were really important for the schools to do. The first was to define discipline infractions currently common across the nine schools. Every school had different needs, but in common we shared problems with cell phone policy. We did a lot of research about national cell phone policies, actually, to learn that more and more schools were collecting cell phones as kids came into schools and holding onto them until the end of the day. The nine schools all—we created one cell phone policy—but the nine schools, some of them allowed cell phones and others didn’t. But, we wanted there to be consequences for the violation of cell phones, which we saw at the high school level this year was very distracting for students and actually resulted in a lot of fights because of text messaging and jealousies and cyberbullying.

We wanted to enhance, and we were required to by Louisiana law, the definition of bullying based on results of individual school bullying surveys, which I’ll talk about at the end of this presentation. We did define willful disobedience, and we clarified and added to four infraction levels with their appropriate consequences. We also clarified definitions of zero-tolerance actions. Louisiana’s zero-tolerance action includes firearms as weapons. They define what kind of knives are considered weapons, but guns must be firearms. In New Orleans, we have a lot of BB gun incidents. We’ve called police to schools because BB guns now look like real guns, so we included BB guns loaded with pellets to the dangerous weapons list.

Task B, each school, and the law requires us to do this, asked each school to convene a stakeholder group that included at a minimum a teacher, the roundtable participants, a parent, a student, a
nonteacher, and we included some of our bus drivers in the stakeholder groups. All of these groups were assembled by January 1, 2012, and met several times during the school year to review what the roundtable discussions were producing.

Task C on Slide Number 15, we reviewed and updated a *Pupil Policy Manual*, where what we call the Student Code of Conduct incorporating the policies and procedures we developed at the roundtable. At the end of this presentation, we'll go through some of the definitions that might be helpful for you as you’re trying to create your own policies and procedures.

The hardest part of all of this is Task D, and that is to create a streamlined and collaborative communication network among the school leaders, discipline designee, special education coordinator, child study team chairperson, and data manager to ensure accurate discipline reporting and analysis, safe schools, and fair and reasonable outcomes for all students.

Setting up a communication system is so crucial because when an incident happens, everything moves so quickly. The schools found by the end of the year that the more everyone knew about the processes and procedures that were followed as soon as an incident happened, the smoother the whole process became and actually fairer for students and their parents when a suspension was being considered. It also involved ensuring that students with Section 504 plans and IEPs and actually some of the students that were involved in the RTI process were given manifestation determination reviews so that we followed the law for all protected students.
Task E on Slide 16 was: Develop simply outlined processes and procedures with required documentation. We put together documentation in order of how it has to be filled out with a cover checklist and included formats and rubrics for incident reports, for student reporting of incident reports, staff reporting of incident reports. It included the forms that we’re required to fill out for the state, and it’s all in one packet, so as soon as an incident happens, the process goes into place, and the documents are readily accessible and actually help guide a school leader or anybody who’s in charge of a particular student to move through the discipline process.

Task F was to advocate for positive behavior management approaches based on best practice research and application. The schools, as I said before, these nine schools have really good positive behavior management approaches in place. What we’ve been putting in place is mental health and behavior standards as part of the curriculum and as part of a Tier 1 intervention. We’ve been fortunate enough to work with a psychiatrist from Ochsner Hospital, an adolescent psychiatrist, who has worked very hard to develop a mental health curriculum that can be incorporated across all themes, all subject areas, and it’s been very helpful for teachers, especially new teachers who are trying to establish behavior management protocols within their classrooms.

Task G was to create a Behavior Management and Discipline Practice Notebook. Every school now has a notebook with the forms, the processes and procedures, the applicable laws, the checklists that are required so that if we have any change in personnel, anybody who comes in and is in charge of discipline will have at his or her fingertips a manual that can guide him or her quickly through the process.
On Slide 17, we move to Step 4, where the goal was to comply with Louisiana’s mandate to implement this law called School Master Discipline Plan as defined by Louisiana’s statute. Part of this plan includes an awful lot of tasks such as providing a list and schedule of professional development sessions approved by the school leader that have to be incorporated into the pre-school opening training schedule. All staff will be trained on Tier 1 mental health supports. All staff will have the tools and training to help them abide by schoolwide policies, and we will provide students on Day 1 of school, as is required by law, a synopsis of the Code of Conduct and what classroom expectations are for good behavior management and good behavior.

We also defined again willful disobedience, cell phones, bullying, and zero-tolerance actions. We developed a plan for schoolwide, age appropriate groups and classes. We have to do this for substance abuse and alcoholism. We’re also doing it for bullying, and we’re also studying the trends of different behavioral incidents, so that our social workers can develop schoolwide counseling, large-group counseling sessions, or in-class interventions. And we’re ensuring, and we’re in the process of doing this as a social worker and other mental health professionals are hired to provide mental health support for all students. We have a social worker in every school. We have access to consulting psychiatrists and psychologists to help us with the students that seem to be demonstrating not only behavior management issues but serious social emotional concerns.
Step 5 is the development of a crisis plan for traumatic events. We have worked on this with our social workers. The month before school closed, we had a shooting on Friday of a 15-year-old eighth grader, and on Monday, his 14-year-old girlfriend, attending the same school, was found shot to death. We were able to bring 40 social workers from all over the city to come in and provide crisis intervention.

What we learned from that is not only do we have to have a plan in place for crisis management when horrible incidents like this happen, but we also have to have a plan for deescalating the crisis intervention services and then what do we want to do as follow-up phases of crisis management for both students and in this case for the staff.

The one thing we weren’t able to get to this year because it was a pretty full roundtable schedule—we didn’t develop alternatives to suspension. Schools in our experiences seem to be kind of, they push back, they’re a little bit resistant to doing this because it really takes a lot of time and effort, it has to take the passion of someone who believes, especially in the restorative justice and peer mediation programs. We are currently negotiating with one of the universities to set a peer court system in place for two of the middle schools, and we’ll work on that next year.

Moving to Slide Number 19, we included in this presentation the definitions that our teams came up with regarding cell phone policies. These definitions were based on what schools felt comfortable with, what the participants felt comfortable with for their schools, and based on an awful lot of research that we looked at for what other schools around the country were doing.
On Slide Number 20, we defined bullying. We used a very global definition—we defined bullying as aggressive behavior that involves unwanted, negative, or discriminatory action, a pattern of behavior repeated over time, and the most important piece of this, an imbalance of power. We’ve defined civil rights and bullying as harassment, physical touch, threats, and cyberbullying, and, as we all know, cyberbullying has become a pretty serious problem across middle schools and high schools.

In order to define bullying, we conducted a survey in all of our schools. Each school developed their own survey or adapted one that we had found from other schools that had gone through this process. The bullying results were surprising to us in that we found that 50 percent of elementary school kids had been called names, were told they couldn’t be friends, they’d been kicked, hit, or pushed. Fifty percent of the little kids reported telling or informing an adult or having an adult involved in a bullying incident. Middle school kids reported either having been bullied or witnessing another student being bullied. Very few reported that they had bullied themselves.

Nearly all students reported that teachers address bullying when they’re aware of it, but there was a sense in the surveys that bullying happens when teachers aren’t around, and that’s problematic—you can’t be everywhere. The middle school students wanted us to make rules against bullying and to discipline bullying as well as talk about bullying prevention in class. This came right from their open-ended questions.
At the high school, it’s a little more difficult. Seventy percent of high school students reported that they had not been bullied, but the same percentage, 70 percent, reported that they had seen others bullied. Over 35 percent saw kids bullied more than six times. At least 60 percent of students at the high school level reported someone being cyberbullied. The high school students wanted better supervision, they wanted talking about bullying prevention, and they wanted a forum where we could help students work out problems between a bully and the person who’s been bullied.

On Slide Number 21, each school had already developed its general expectations or its credo. We’ve given you an example of one. We also gave you an example of [audio skip] behavior expectations, which will be distributed to parents and students and staff and reviewed with students on the very first day of class.

On Slide Number 22, and this is what we’re asked about most, how do we define willful disobedience? We argued about this, we debated about this, we looked at what other jurisdictions had done to define willful disobedience, and the definition that we came up with here is a standard willful disobedience definition, but the participants wanted us to add that it includes, that willful disobedience must include an attempt at redirection by an adult. The student cannot be punished for willful disobedience unless there’s been an attempt to redirect the student.
On zero-tolerance actions, again we’re bound in Louisiana by following pretty much IDEA’s mandate on zero-tolerance actions, but this gives you some language that for our schools, it combines not only what Louisiana felt was serious, but we added some other things that we felt were very serious. The recovery school district and the state of Louisiana are also looking at adding sexual assault and setting fires to zero-tolerance actions in cases where students are a harm to themselves or to others.

That closes my discussion for today. Thank you so much.