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Welcome

Students throughout the state of Washington receive tutoring, extra classes, summer programs, and other interventions with the help of funds from the Learning Assistance Program (LAP). The state of Washington invests several hundred million dollars per year in LAP to help students meet grade-level standards. About 13 percent of students statewide are served by LAP.

Unfortunately, in the past we saw high variability in LAP implementation. OSPI did not collect data on effective interventions, and statutory examples of best practices were limited. There was little or no collaboration among professionals across the state to promote what really works to help students within the program.

In 2013, the Legislature passed a bill (ESSB 5946), requiring the Office of Superintendent of Public Instruction (OSPI) to improve the LAP system and K–4 literacy outcomes. Now, OSPI annually convenes expert panels to identify best practices that can help students grow and succeed academically. Their work informs the Mathematics, English Language Arts, and Behavior Menu of Best Practices and Strategies. Each year, districts report on the academic growth of students receiving LAP services. Districts can either use the best practices from the menus, or provide data showing that their alternative practices are effective in achieving student growth. These provisions are detailed in RCW 28A.165 and RCW 28A.655.235.

The Legislature also passed a companion bill that authorized and enabled the Washington State Institute for Public Policy (WSIPP) to identify evidence-based and research-based best practices for student interventions. OSPI and WSIPP annually collaborate on the development of the menus.

We know an opportunity gap exists among different student populations. Poverty is a striking example of a factor that can significantly disrupt a student’s learning. Students learning English as an additional language face the task of learning a new language and new academic content at the same time. Students who have or are experiencing trauma may exhibit behavioral anomalies that can interrupt their academic progress. Teachers are actively seeking ways to better support all students. Throughout the menus, the expert panels have identified best practices shown to reduce the opportunity gap among all students.

This report contains not only best practices for behavior, but also foundational content describing Washington state’s approach to school discipline and other initiatives designed to
improve social-emotional learning for all students. It describes how a Multi-Tiered System of Supports (MTSS) framework is critical for implementing a high-achieving educational system. It also explains how assessment data and reporting serve to continuously improve LAP and student outcomes. We have included a rich set of resources and references for those who wish to further explore the identified best practices.

We are starting to see the promise in this focused partnership between districts, Educational Service Districts (ESDs), OSPI, WSIPP, and the Legislature. This is the third year the behavior menu has been published, and both years the professionals who comprise the panel searched current literature for proven interventions, made improvements to the existing practices, and provided additional advice support to teachers, student support staff, and school administrators who are implementing LAP with their students.

“We have a duty to educate all students. Collecting the best strategies that districts use to reach those who need extra help is a great step toward meeting that responsibility.”

Chris Reykdal, State Superintendent of Public Instruction

We thank you for your thoughtful read of this menu and for your ongoing commitment to serve students who need support the most.

The Learning Assistance Program Team
Office of Superintendent of Public Instruction
May 2018
STRENGTHENING STUDENT EDUCATIONAL OUTCOMES

The Strengthening Student Educational Outcomes Act (ESSB 5946) passed the state Legislature in 2013. It required OSPI to convene a behavior panel of experts to develop a menu of best practices and strategies to provide additional support to students who have not yet met grade-level standard and are enrolled in LAP. The same legislation also required OSPI and school districts in Washington to significantly change behavior and discipline policies and practices.

At the heart of the behavior menu is a focus on addressing behavior to accelerate student learning. The work of the behavior panel aligns with the work of the OSPI Student Discipline Task Force, the Educational Opportunity Gap Oversight and Accountability Committee (EOGOAC), and the Social Emotional Learning Benchmarks Workgroup. The practices and strategies in the behavior menu also reflect research-based guidance from the U.S. Department of Education on how to improve school climate and discipline.

Washington state law contains guidelines for how school districts can provide services, using the practices and strategies in the behavior menu to support students in LAP. In addition to the behavior menu, OSPI developed menus for math and ELA. Districts are required to use a practice or strategy from one of the state menus, or exercise the option of using an alternative practice or strategy, per OSPI guidelines.

The menus for behavior, math, and ELA are resources for school districts supporting students in grades K–12 with LAP services. All three menus will be updated annually by July 1.

To learn more about this process, please see the project webpage.
LEARNING ASSISTANCE PROGRAM
The Learning Assistance Program (LAP) offers supplemental services for K–12 students scoring below grade-level standard in English Language Arts (ELA) and mathematics. These supports focus on accelerating student growth so that students make progress towards grade-level. These supports may include academic readiness skill development or behavior supports to address barriers preventing students from accessing core instruction. The intent is for LAP-served students to increase academic growth during the period of time they are provided services. LAP requires districts to use research-based best practices to increase student achievement.

LAP K–4 Focus on Literacy
Districts must focus first on K–4 students who have not yet met grade-level standards in reading or are lacking the readiness skills needed for learning to read. The K–4 focus first on literacy does not mean that all LAP funds are to be used exclusively on K–4 literacy. OSPI guidelines allow that a district may meet the K–4 focus on literacy by ensuring that of the total number of K–4 students served by LAP districtwide, approximately 50 percent are students receiving ELA services. Districts are not capped at 50 percent and may serve more students in K–4 ELA. Additionally, districts may serve less than 50 percent under specific OSPI Guidelines.

LAP Eligibility
Districts identify the students eligible for LAP by using multiple measures of performance. These should include nationally normed assessments and/or state assessments to identify students scoring below grade-level standards for ELA or math. Other options to measure student eligibility include teacher-made assessments, teacher observations, teacher recommendations, and parent referrals. Credits earned, grade point average (GPA), discipline referrals, and absenteeism are also potential measures.

Entrance and exit assessment data for any LAP service are used to measure student academic growth in ELA or math, regardless of whether the student receives LAP academic services or LAP behavior services. A student may receive LAP services for academic and behavior support or just behavior support.

Behavior Services
Districts may serve students who have not yet met grade-level standards in ELA or math with behavior services. These services are available for students when the district believes addressing behavioral needs would improve students’ academic performance.

Prior to receiving LAP behavior services, students must have been identified, using multiple measures of performance, as scoring below standard for their grade level in either ELA or math.
While additional indicators must be used to identify a student for behavior services, the impact of behavior services is measured by academic growth. The assumption is that the provision of behavior services should positively influence student academic outcomes.

**LAP Allowable Activities**

Allowable LAP activities are guided by state statute (RCW 28A.165). They must be aligned to a best practice from the menu or an approved district alternative. Districts must use data to inform program development and integrate best practices and strategies to support supplemental instruction/services that accelerate growth for students who have not yet met grade-level standards.

Allowable activities may include extended learning time, extra support in the classroom, educator professional learning, family engagement, and purchase of specialized learning materials. Additional assistance for students identified in 8th grade to successfully transition into high school may be provided through LAP. Graduation assistance is an option for 11th- and 12th-grade students who are not on track to meet graduation requirements. Academic readiness and Readiness to Learn (RTL) are also LAP-allowable activities. These terms are often confused and are defined separately below.

**Readiness to Learn (RTL)—Up to Five Percent**

Up to five percent of a district’s LAP funds may be used for RTL. The school board must approve in an open meeting any community-based organization or local agency before LAP funds may be expended.

District RTL programs provide academic and non-academic supports for students at risk of not being successful in school. They may be offered in partnership with community-based organizations. The goal of RTL community supports is to reduce barriers to learning, strengthen engagement, and ensure all students are able to attend school, ready to learn.

Students do not need to have been identified as scoring below grade-level standard in math or ELA to participate in RTL programs. RTL programs are designed to serve students significantly at risk of not being successful in school. Each district determines the eligibility criteria for participation in RTL programs.

**Academic Readiness**

As part of the academic readiness component, schools use LAP funds to support students with necessary preparation skills needed to engage in math or ELA content. Readiness is applicable for all grades. However, LAP does pay particular attention to early grade classroom readiness skills. K–2 readiness includes emerging literacy, early numeracy, and classroom preparedness.
skills. Emerging research is showing that building early numeracy skills is a strong predictor of future academic success.

The WaKIDS GOLD™ Objectives and Dimensions observation tool identifies core skills in the social-emotional, physical, language, cognitive, literacy, and mathematics domains essential for being ready for kindergarten. The panels strongly emphasized social emotional, cognitive, numeracy, and language skills as being necessary for K–2 readiness. Each panel also recognized the importance of incorporating play into academic readiness activities.
WASHINGTON STATE INSTITUTE FOR PUBLIC POLICY

The 2013 Legislature directed WSIPP to “prepare an inventory of evidence-based and research-based effective practices, activities and programs for use by school districts in the Learning Assistance Program” (Senate Bill 5034, Section 610). The WSIPP Inventory of Evidence- and Research-Based Practices: Washington’s K–12 Learning Assistance Program classifies LAP strategies as evidence-based, research-based, or promising according to average effect sizes for identified interventions, a cost-benefit analysis, and other criteria. Both OSPI and WSIPP consider the two reports as companions. As such, OSPI and WSIPP coordinated their tasks to ensure that the content of both reports were consistent, while still adhering to the unique directives given to each agency.

Both agencies collaborated on identifying topics for consideration as best practices and strategies. WSIPP Research Associate Matt Lemon was a key participant in the expert panel sessions as a non-voting member. He provided research references to the panel members, and solicited panel member input regarding effective practices. The two agencies then followed different, complementary processes to identify and classify practices for inclusion in each report.

The identification of best practices and strategies in the OSPI report was informed by WSIPP’s findings and ultimately determined by the expert panel. OSPI included notations indicating whether the practices included in the menu are evidence-based or research-based, as determined by WSIPP. Additional practices and strategies are included in the menu as promising based on the research reviewed by the panel of experts.
WASHINGTON INTEGRATED STUDENT SUPPORTS PROTOCOL

In 2016, the Washington state legislature created the Washington Integrated Student Supports Protocol (WISSP) when it passed 4SHB 1541. In the bill, the Legislature included the WISSP among an extensive set of interdependent strategies for closing educational opportunity gaps. This comprehensive approach was based on the recommendation of the State’s Educational Opportunity Gap Oversight and Accountability Committee (EOGOAC).

In the bill, the Legislature charged the Center for the Improvement of Student Learning (CISL), within OSPI, with developing the WISSP. The purpose of the protocol, as outlined in the bill, is to help schools and districts move toward a student support approach where efforts to meet both the academic and non-academic needs of students are integrated into one system, and to partner more effectively with their communities to develop and secure the supports students need to be successful. The WISSP was released in October, 2017.

Integrated Student Supports

“Integrated Student Supports (ISS) is an emerging field of practice that is best described as a school-based approach to promoting students’ academic achievement and educational attainment by coordinating a seamless system of wraparound supports at multiple levels that target academic and non-academic barriers to student learning.” (Child Trends, 2014a, p. 19).

According to Child Trend’s Theory of Change, an ISS system enables educators to mobilize academic supports (i.e. reading or math interventions) as well as non-academic supports (e.g. mental health, medical care, behavior intervention plans, or basic needs support) to promote students’ academic success and overall health and well-being. In a synthesis of the evidence to support ISS, Child Trends notes that while “ISS programs take many forms, integration is key to the model—both integration of supports to meet individual students’ needs and integration of the ISS program into the life of a school” (Child Trends, 2014, p. 1).

Core Components of the WISSP

The following components are included as part of the integrated student supports framework adopted by the Legislature in 4SHB 1541.

**Needs Assessments:** In an ISS model, school or ISS program staff assess student’s needs and strengths to begin to identify the areas in which they may need additional support. Additionally, staff may conduct needs assessments at the school, district, and community levels to identify existing resources and potential areas to build additional capacity. School or ISS program staff can conduct needs assessments in collaboration with local organizations, community members, and families.
Integration within the school: When school staff facilitate ISS efforts, they are fully integrated into existing student support teams. When a partner organization facilitates ISS efforts, the organization works closely with school leadership and staff to enhance program effectiveness. To that end, partner staff are usually based in the school or, at minimum, have an office within the district.

Coordination of Supports: In an ISS model, school staff, partner organizations, and other service providers work together to connect students to existing supports in a timely manner. A central point of contact often serves to coordinate these efforts.

Use of Data: In an ISS model, school staff use data to identify students’ needs and strengths, to monitor their progress over time, and to guide future planning. Data may include assessment outcomes, discipline referrals, attendance records, home-language survey information, or other student level data.

Community Partnerships: In an ISS model, schools partner with individual community members, local businesses, health and social service providers, and other community organizations to address the needs of students and their families.

Connections between ISS and Other Systems of Support
The components of the WISSP are not unique to ISS. These components are also found in other student support frameworks such as Response to Intervention (RTI), School-wide Positive Behavioral Interventions and Supports (PBIS), Inter-connected Systems Framework (ISF), and other tiered-systems of support that address one or more domains of learning.

These components are also present in a comprehensive Multi-Tiered System of Supports (MTSS) framework that, when implemented, enables educators and community members to work together to effectively and efficiently address students’ needs across all domains within one seamless system.

The Washington Integrated Student Supports Protocol is not meant to replace existing systems of support. Rather, the purpose of the protocol is to encourage schools to use needs assessments to identify students’ academic and non-academic barriers to learning, collaborate with their community to secure additional resources for students and their families, use data to monitor progress, and strive for greater alignment across student support services and programs like LAP.

References

Multi-Tiered System of Supports (MTSS) is a service delivery framework focused on problem solving and prevention for all students. MTSS connects all of the academic and nonacademic interventions, supports, and services available in schools and communities to support instruction and eliminate barriers to learning and teaching. Multiple levels of instruction, assessment, and intervention are designed to support the academic and non-academic needs of ALL students within the MTSS framework.

**ALL** students benefit from school-wide Tier I instruction and supports (such as teaching academic and behavioral expectations, career and technical competencies, and social emotional skills) to be prepared for career, college, and life.

**SOME** students can benefit from supplemental Tier II instruction and supports (such as a reading or math intervention or behavioral check-in). These students are identified as needing more intensive or accelerated academic, career, behavioral, and/or mental health interventions in addition to Tier I services.

**A SMALL NUMBER** of students can benefit from intensive Tier III instruction and supports (such as those provided through community partnerships and specialized programs to provide more intensive or accelerated academic, career, behavioral, and/or mental health supports). These students may need case management or accelerated instruction in addition to Tier I services.

*Figure 1. Multi-Tiered System of Supports, from OSPI.*
MTSS Approach
There are many approaches to support student achievement and eliminate barriers to learning and teaching. To effectively and efficiently meet the unique needs of students, it is important to have a coherent, unified system that takes a holistic approach to simultaneously address the academic and non-academic (such as physical, behavioral, social, and emotional) needs of students. Common tiered frameworks in Washington include Response to Intervention (RTI), Positive Behavioral Interventions and Supports (PBIS), and Social and Emotional Learning (SEL). Integrated approaches reduce silos and duplication while making better use of resources and ensuring students experience support seamlessly.

Core Instruction and Tiered Supports
Within Multi-Tiered System of Supports, educators use data-informed practices to support student outcomes while also establishing and sustaining a positive school climate. An MTSS framework should be designed to promote collaboration among educators and professional learning across schools/districts. While the number of tiers of support outlined for any given MTSS model may vary, a three-tiered theory of action framework is standard. Within a multi-tiered framework, the tiers refer to supports students receive rather than students. In a three-tiered framework, all students receive tier 1 instruction, some students receive tier 2 services/support, and a small number of students receive tier 3 services/support. Normally, tier 3 academic services in an MTSS model are for both highly capable students and students who have not yet met grade-level expectations. For the purpose of the Learning Assistance Program (LAP), tier 3 refers to services intended to address the needs of students who have not yet met academic learning goals.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of Students</th>
<th>Description of Tier</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>All</td>
<td>Tier 1 is for all students and is designed to meet the needs of at least 80 percent of the student population. Differentiated instruction during core learning time is the first response for students who have not yet met academic and non-academic goals.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Some</td>
<td>Tier 2 is for students who need additional support to meet academic and non-academic goals. A standard assessment plan and clear criteria are necessary for successfully entering and exiting students from tier 2 interventions. Supports should be designed to quickly screen for and target students who need extra instruction or services to get back on track. This level typically addresses the needs of around 15 percent of a student population.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Background and Philosophy

Tier 3 interventions may take longer for students to meet learning goals. When tier 1 and tier 2 are implemented well, tier 3 typically addresses the needs of about five percent of a student population. Tier 3 supports are available for ALL students, as opposed to the common misunderstanding that they are reserved for students in special education.

An effective MTSS system is grounded in strong evidence-based instruction that is designed to meet the educational needs of at least 80 percent of students. If more than 20 percent of students are not meeting grade-level education expectations, then core instructional design and strategies should be re-evaluated. When students are not meeting their learning goals in the general education classroom, school improvement teams meet to discuss the best approach to provide effective differentiated instruction in the core curricula and interventions through a systematic support framework.

Data-Based Decision Making Teams
Decision-making within an MTSS framework is done with a systematic, comprehensive approach. This process includes decisions about the development of the MTSS framework, the selection of assessments used to identify students, the design of an implementation plan, and evaluation of a school or district’s individual students’ needs. The decision-making team will make adjustments and improvements to the framework as students’ needs change, ultimately supporting both academic and non-academic success in the classroom. Teams should develop a feedback process to evaluate the effectiveness of their MTSS framework and implementation. Data-based decision making should be informed by measurable and relevant learning criteria to support student learning. Data-based outcomes should be used to guide decisions regarding instructional effectiveness, student responsiveness, and intervention adaptations or modifications.

Tiers of support are fluid. Students may need different levels of support as their circumstances and needs change. Data-based progress monitoring of student academic achievement and social/emotional learning can indicate a need to adjust the support based on responses to interventions, services, and emerging needs. Established protocols for data-based decision making will help identify when students need supplemental services, or when they have met exit criteria and no longer need additional support. Data-based decision making in an MTSS framework is enabled by a comprehensive assessment system. Districts/schools must determine which assessments to use to identify and monitor student progress.
Comprehensive System to Identify Students

A comprehensive assessment system includes universal screening, diagnostic data collection, formative assessment processes, and progress monitoring. For each of these components, it is important to ensure protocols are followed for all formal assessments, decision rules are in place for students not making satisfactory progress, and training is sufficiently delivered to instructional/data teams to support implementation of the comprehensive system. It is also important to recognize that different types of assessments are useful for different purposes. The key is to ensure the results of an assessment are used for the intended purpose and not extrapolated or misused otherwise. For example, confusion between universal screening and diagnostic assessment can lead to misuse of results from screening measures.

A comprehensive assessment system should include:

**Universal screening tools:** These tools are used to identify all students who may potentially need more support. By design, universal screeners tend to over identify students, meaning more students are identified as potentially needing more support than are actually needing additional support in an attempt to not miss anyone who might benefit from additional layers of support. Screeners are used in many different ways—in everyday life, before an eye exam, during oil changes for cars, or when checking blood pressure. Universal screening takes place at scheduled intervals (typically three times per year), and is followed by more targeted diagnostic assessment for students identified as needing additional support. These screeners inform decision makers of whether or not diagnostic data collection is necessary. Screeners also serve the purpose of assessing how well all students are responding to core instruction and if modifications or adjustments are needed to the school-wide tier 1 plan.

**Diagnostic data collection:** Collecting diagnostic data can help identify the initial skill level for each student and can determine the need for supports, interventions, enrichments, and resources. Diagnostic data are collected before instruction or after screening occurs to identify the appropriate instruction and/or intervention plan. Diagnostic data provides detailed information. Diagnostic data can help determine why a person’s temperature is high, why the indicator light went on in a car, or whether a full eye exam is needed. For example, in reading, a diagnostic test may measure a student’s ability to evaluate print, understand phonics, decode letters and sounds, recognize words, analyze word patterns and sounds, determine oral reading accuracy and fluency, and comprehend reading passages. Once the diagnostic data are available, educators can determine what to teach and select appropriate interventions to address specific skill deficiencies.

**Formative assessment processes:** Formative assessment is not a single event—it is an ongoing process used by educators and students to assess learning and adjust instruction. The formative assessment process is deliberate and provides actionable feedback to improve students’
learning. There are four attributes in the formative assessment process: 1) clarify intended learning; 2) elicit evidence; 3) interpret evidence; and 4) act on evidence. For example, when a chef is cooking soup the formative assessment process happens when the chef tastes the soup along the way. Based on the taste tests, the chef makes adjustments to the soup to improve the flavor.

Summative assessment processes: Summative assessments are outcome-based assessments. The goal of summative assessment is to confirm and verify student learning and skill acquisition. Summative assessments are typically given once after an instructional unit, course, semester, program or school year to measure student proficiency toward meeting standards. Examples of summative assessments may include final projects, midterm exams, or state assessments. Summative assessments are limited in providing adequate data to drive instructional decisions because they are given at the end of a unit, course, semester, program or school year.

**Progress monitoring tools:** Student performance and progress should be reviewed on a regular basis and in a systematic manner to identify students who are: making adequate progress, at some risk of failure if not provided extra assistance, or at high risk of failure if not provided specialized supports. Progress monitoring is used to determine if students are responding to the instruction being provided. It is useful in determining the next level of instruction or intervention to be used with individual students, a small group, or an entire class. While formative assessment is closely linked to the immediate learning that occurs during a lesson, progress monitoring assesses what the student understands as a result of the unit of instruction. Progress monitoring occurs on a more frequent basis for students receiving tier 2 and tier 3 supports.

Supplemental Supports and Services
The Learning Assistance Program (LAP) primarily provides supplemental services in the content areas of ELA, mathematics, and/or behavior to support core instruction. As a supplemental program, LAP generally provides Tier 2 or Tier 3 supports, but does not replace core instruction. Students receiving targeted interventions must have full access to core instruction.

LAP serves eligible students (including students with disabilities) who need additional academic support to accelerate student growth in English language arts and mathematics, or who need to develop K–2 readiness knowledge and skills to successfully meet standards in these core content areas. LAP also serves students who could benefit from behavioral supports in order to improve academic and non-academic student outcomes. By focusing on acceleration, students served outside of core instruction should increase learning over a given period of time. However, the degree of content growth depends on the intensity and quality of the services.
This menu provides information regarding evidence-based, research-based, and promising practices and strategies for supplemental supports/services.
Content Philosophy

The practices and strategies contained in this menu align with an overall philosophy that equitable educational opportunities and student outcomes are more attainable when learning environments and support services contribute to the social-emotional well-being and academic achievement of all students. Emphasized throughout this menu is the idea that behavioral expectations, interventions, and services should be developmentally appropriate, culturally responsive, and data-informed.

ADDRESSING BEHAVIOR IN WASHINGTON STATE SCHOOLS

Throughout the state of Washington, educators, interest groups, and OSPI are modifying the way student behavior is addressed in schools and changing the behavior of the school system. Recent state-level reforms and federal guidance regarding school discipline are increasingly aligning, in theory and practice, with the ongoing efforts of education practitioners, researchers, and advocates. Educators are reevaluating school discipline policies in order to implement practices that support student learning, promote positive behaviors, and reduce disproportionate outcomes in student discipline.

In 2012, Washington Appleseed & Team Child released Reclaiming Students: The Educational & Economic Costs of Exclusionary Discipline in Washington State, a report documenting the disruptive effects school discipline policies and practices were having on students in Washington. One of the key recommendations in the report was to “drastically reduce reliance on out-of-school exclusions, replacing them with evidence-based and promising practices that address student behaviors while keeping students engaged in school and on track to graduation” (Mosehauer, McGrath, Nist, & Pillar, 2012 p. 46). In early 2013, the Educational Opportunity Gap Oversight and Accountability Committee (EOGOAC) submitted a report to the legislature that contained a comprehensive list of recommendations for closing the opportunity gap in Washington’s education system. The EOGOAC report included recommendations for reducing disproportionality in student discipline, citing findings from the Washington Appleseed & Team Child report. Within the next month legislation was introduced based on the recommendations of the EOGOAC (HB 1680). Many of the recommendations from the Washington Appleseed & Team Child report and the EOGOAC were adopted by Washington legislators and passed into law in 2013, as part of ESSB 5946. This menu of best practices, as well as the ability to use LAP funding to address behavior, were two of many outcomes from that legislation.

What has emerged from federal departments, state agencies, communities, and school districts are data-informed initiatives grounded in relevant and emerging research. These efforts focus on reducing the use of exclusionary discipline practices, developing alternative approaches to
behavior that enhance learning, and integrating strategies to improve school climates. Recent research supports the concept that academic achievement and social-emotional development are interrelated components of the learning experience (Durlak, Weissberg, Dymnicki, Taylor, & Schellinger, 2011; Yoder, 2014). Educators and researchers are increasingly recognizing the need to implement behavioral strategies that holistically address student needs.

**DISCIPLINE POLICIES AND PRACTICES**

The 2012 report from Washington Appleseed & Team Child was instrumental because it provided, for the first time, a broad picture of discipline practices in the state of Washington. The unseen impacts on specific groups of students were made visible. The available data indicated that, in response to a range of behaviors, schools were regularly making discretionary discipline decisions to exclude students from school. Data revealed exclusionary discipline was often imposed without providing educational services during periods of exclusion, and sometimes for indefinite periods of time. Also evident was that students of color and students identified as low-income were disproportionately impacted by exclusionary discipline practices. The report offered several recommendations to improve discipline data quality and to change discipline policies (Mosehauer, et al., 2012).

**ESSB 5946** required OSPI to convene a discipline task force. The Student Discipline Task Force confirmed the findings in the Washington Appleseed & Team Child report and emphasized the need to develop common state definitions for behavioral infractions, particularly for discretionary disciplinary offenses reported under the broad category of other. The task force’s primary task was to develop data collection and definition standards related to school discipline in order to revise the statewide Comprehensive Educational Data and Research System (CEDARS). In addition to completing the CEDARS revisions, the task force proposed several policy recommendations for policy makers and educators to consider—including adopting a restorative justice model to address behavior and increasing family engagement (OSPI, 2014).

In early 2014, as the discipline task force was still conducting its work, the U.S. Department of Education (ED) released several resources to assist states, districts, and schools in reforming school discipline approaches. In the document, *Guiding Principles: A Resource Guide for Improving School Climate and Discipline*, ED outlined three principles and related action steps to guide educators.

The three guiding principles focus on:

- School climate and prevention-based strategies.
- School-wide policies that set clear behavioral expectations and consequences.
- Principles regarding equity and continuous school improvement (ED, 2014).
Among several action steps, ED recommended reserving any removal of students from the classroom as a last resort. Research shows that “attempting to maintain order by unnecessarily relying on suspensions or expulsions for minor misbehaviors may undermine a school’s ability to help students improve behavior, fail to improve the safety or productivity of the school’s learning environment, and seriously and negatively impact individual and school-wide academic outcomes” (ED, 2014, p. 14). State and federal agencies recognize student discipline that is not applied proportional to behavioral infractions can be disruptive to student learning.

At the same time, ED and the Department of Justice (DOJ) issued a Dear Colleague Letter to offer schools guidance on how to administer school discipline in a nondiscriminatory way. In the document, the departments identified discipline disparities in national data and explained that investigations confirm the reality of racial discrimination in schools. The departments also emphasized how discrimination can occur individually or systemically: “The administration of student discipline can result in unlawful discrimination based on race in two ways: first, if a student is subjected to different treatment based on the student’s race, and second, if a policy is neutral on its face—meaning that the policy itself does not mention race—and is administered in an evenhanded manner but has a disparate impact, i.e., a disproportionate and unjustified effect on students of a particular race” (ED & DOJ, 2014). In the same year OSPI created WAC 392-190-048, requiring districts to annually review disaggregated discipline data for disproportionality and to “take prompt action to ensure that the disproportion is not the result of discrimination.”

Ongoing federal and state legal developments are guiding schools to improve discipline policies and address disproportionate responses to student behavior. At the federal level, under the Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA), states and school districts are required to develop a plan that describes how they will support efforts to reduce “the overuse of discipline practices that remove students from the classroom” in order to receive certain federal funds. A bill based on the EOGOAC recommendations for closing the opportunity gap, including significant changes introduced in a section on “Disproportionality in Student Discipline,” passed into state law following the 2016 legislative session (4SHB 1541). This bill included a directive to support educator cultural competence, and established the Washington Integrated Student Supports Protocol (WISSP)—an initiative that will prioritize the provision of non-academic supports to improve student educational outcomes.

**SOCIAL-EMOTIONAL LEARNING (SEL)**

Schools today are faced with challenges as they attempt to meet the social-emotional and academic needs of an increasingly diverse student body. Academic standards tend to be clearly defined at a state level, but behavioral expectations are often defined according to local social norms and subjective individual interpretations. While schools are familiar with a number of
tools and strategies to identify students’ academic needs, comparable approaches for identifying social-emotional or behavioral needs can be complex.

Educators and researchers recognize that social-emotional competencies and skills related to school preparedness develop early in life. A recent study reports that children who enter kindergarten with underdeveloped social-behavioral skills are more likely to be retained in grade level, identified for special education services, and suspended or expelled from school (Bettencourt, Gross, & Ho, 2016). While focusing on social-emotional development in early childhood is critical, SEL can take place throughout a student’s primary and secondary education. Research indicates that SEL programs can positively influence a variety of student educational outcomes across grade levels (Durlak, et al., 2011). Educators can implement interventions in accordance with a malleable view of intelligence, or growth mindset, which can support a student’s capacity to engage in self-efficacy and self-regulated learning (Boykin & Noguera, 2011; Yeager, et al., 2016). At the classroom level, a recent meta-analysis found that classroom management interventions were more effective if social-emotional development was a component of the intervention strategy (Korpershoek, Harms, Boer, Kuijk, & Doolaard, 2016).

In 2012, the Washington State Early Learning and Development Guidelines was released. This document is an updated version of a prior publication, both of which describe behaviors and skills related to early childhood development. While the Guidelines “provide essential information to support and enhance children’s development and learning,” they should not be used as “an assessment tool or for use to determine children’s eligibility for various programs or services” (DEL, OSPI, & Thrive by Five Washington, 2012, p. 2). The content is not exhaustive but every five years the Guidelines may be subject to review and revision to incorporate new learning. The Guidelines emphasize how important a holistic approach to early child development is for future learning and is aligned with the WaKIDS Whole-Child Assessment, an observational tool used in full-day kindergarten classrooms throughout Washington. Social-emotional development is a major component of these state documents.

In 2015, the Legislature directed OSPI “to convene a workgroup to recommend comprehensive benchmarks for developmentally appropriate interpersonal and decision-making knowledge and skills of social-emotional learning for grades kindergarten through high school that build upon what is being done in early learning” (ESSB 6052 Sec 501 (34)). Building upon the Early Learning and Development Guidelines, this workgroup submitted recommendations in the form of a report, Addressing Social Emotional Learning in Washington’s K–12 Public Schools, to the Legislature on October 1, 2016. However, similar to the guidance on using the Guidelines, the Social Emotional Learning Benchmarks Workgroup (SELB) cautioned that the standards and benchmarks “should never be used as an assessment tool” (OSPI, 2016, p. 10). In 2017, OSPI
created a SEL Online Education Module based on the recommendations of the SELB workgroup. Also in 2017, OSPI convened the Social Emotional Learning Indicators Workgroup to “identify and articulate developmental indicators for each grade level for each of the social emotional learning benchmarks, solicit feedback from stakeholders, and develop a model of best practices or guidance for schools on implementing the benchmarks and indicators” (ESSB 5883 Sec. 501 (31)).

The Illinois Board of Education was one of the first states to establish standards for SEL. The Illinois Social and Emotional Learning (SEL) Standards include ten SEL standards with age-appropriate benchmarks and indicators that are aligned with knowledge, behavior, and skill-based goals. The state of Alaska is also nationally recognized for leading SEL efforts in schools and embedding SEL language into education policy. The Anchorage School District K–12 Social and Emotional Learning (SEL) Standards and Indicators represent a comprehensive conceptual framework that is often presented as a national model to follow.

SELB relied on the standards set by Illinois and Alaska, and carefully integrated components of cultural competency and trauma-informed approaches into the standards and benchmarks. The SELB final report established guiding principles around professional learning, school/family/community partnerships, and cultural responsiveness—and set forth recommendations that SEL implementation efforts include principles of Universal Design for Learning, a focus on equity, and a holistic approach (OSPI, 2016).

Although slightly different, various state SEL standards efforts emphasize social-emotional competency goals such as self-awareness, social-awareness, interpersonal or relationship skills, self-management, social management or responsibility, and decision-making skills.

The Collaborative for Academic, Social, and Emotional Learning (CASEL) is a national organization that is striving to make SEL an integral part of the education system. CASEL defines SEL as “the process through which children and
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adults acquire and effectively apply the knowledge, attitudes, and skills necessary to understand and manage emotions, set and achieve goals, feel and show empathy for others, establish and maintain positive relationships, and make responsible decisions.” When developing SEL standards, education policy-makers often adopt, modify, and/or refer to CASEL’s definition of SEL, as was the case in Washington. Although definitions may vary and are likely to change as new research in SEL emerges, educators and policy makers will continue to incorporate SEL concepts into their pedagogies, relational interactions, and policies.

Many factors influence students’ social-emotional development, including their environment and the context in which they are developing SEL skills (Durlak, et al., 2011; Korpershoek, et al., 2016). Potential bias can occur as a result of using SEL-related benchmarks, which largely rely on educators’ subjective analysis, to rate students’ social-behavioral readiness or social-emotional competencies (Bettencourt, et al., 2016). A significant factor researchers identify that requires more research is what differential benefits or effects SEL programs may have on demographically diverse student populations (Durlak, et al., 2011; Korpershoek, et al., 2016). As schools increasingly adopt SEL practices, it is important for educators to use accountability systems and evidence-based research to support program development and implementation efforts (Melnick, Cook-Harvey, & Darling-Hammond, 2017).

CULTURAL RESPONSIVENESS AND EQUITY IN STUDENT DISCIPLINE
All student behaviors occur within larger social and cultural contexts, and whether behaviors are perceived as appropriate or inappropriate varies across cultures, genders, and life experiences (Klingner, et al., 2005). Families, students, staff, and other groups representing all demographics of the community should have equitable opportunities to engage in policy-making processes. Laws in the state of Washington require school districts to develop discipline policies/procedures with parent and community participation (RCW 28A.600.020) and to consult with staff, students, families, and the community when reviewing and updating policies/procedures (RCW 28A.320.211).

School discipline policies and behavioral expectations contain sets of values, whether consciously or unconsciously adopted, that are disseminated through written and oral communication channels. Ensuring historically underrepresented groups have a voice in school policies or processes may be an effective way to improve teacher-student relations while also increasing the likelihood that students will perceive the school system as fair (Way, 2011). Evidence points to the prevalent use of punitive and zero-tolerance policies over the years as contributing to increased levels of exclusionary discipline and racial disparities, even while failing to improve school learning environments or reduce overall student misbehavior and producing collateral consequences that negatively impact all students (Curran, 2016; Perry & Morris, 2014).
Even when schools adopt policies and procedures with clear behavioral expectations that include the use of preventative and supportive discipline practices, educators still exercise discretion that can produce racial disparities through differential selection in office discipline referrals and differential processing of discipline resolutions (Anyon, et al., 2014; Gregory, Skiba, & Noguera, 2010). Implementation of school-wide preventative and supportive programs may lead to overall reductions in office discipline referrals and exclusions without addressing persistent racial disparities or closing the gap between racial subgroups (Vincent & Tobin, 2011). Therefore, educators should review disaggregated discipline data at regular intervals while also ensuring that any adopted evidence-based practices demonstrate cultural validity and produce equitable outcomes (Banks & Obiakor, 2015; Skiba, Horner, Chung, Rausch, May, & Tobin, 2011; Vincent, Randall, Cartledge, Tobin, & Swain-Bradway, 2011).

Civil Rights Data Collection (CRDC) reports show that students with disabilities and students of color continue to be disproportionately overrepresented in suspension rates at the national level. Additionally, the representation of culturally and linguistically diverse (CLD) students in special education programs is also disproportionate (Klingner, et al., 2005; Sullivan, 2011). The panel of experts urge educators to be aware of disproportionality in special education programs and disciplinary practices. To ensure equitable student outcomes, the panel urges educators to avoid delaying making a referral for a special education evaluation, while also avoiding preemptively labeling student’s behavior as a disorder or disability. Systematic approaches to disproportionality are complex:

The persistent disproportionate representation of students who are CLD in special education is a complex problem that is related to the construction of difference, educational opportunity, and local context of policy and practice. For many students, special education identification and placement is appropriate and indeed necessary; however, for others, it may be the result of factors outside the student and unrelated to the presence of disability per se. Evidence of disproportionality should be treated as indicative of underlying problems across and within multiple levels of the system (Sullivan, 2011).

The implementation of Positive Behavioral Interventions and Supports (PBIS) or other school-wide systems should be an inclusive and reflective process involving culturally responsive decision-making regarding what constitutes appropriate or inappropriate behavior (Banks & Obiakor, 2015; Klingner, et al., 2005). The Technical Assistance Center on PBIS developed a series of Equity & PBIS resources for supporting equitable student outcomes within a PBIS framework, including PBIS Cultural Responsiveness Field Guide: Resources for Trainers and Coaches.
Educators’ implicit biases can partially contribute to racial disparities in student discipline (Gilliam, Maupin, Reyes, Accavitti, & Shic, 2016). Therefore, in addition to establishing behavioral expectations in a culturally sensitive manner, culturally responsive efforts should include professional learning that focuses on increasing educators’ self-awareness of implicit biases (Bal, Schrader, Afacan, & Mawene, 2016). Educators must ensure that best practices and strategies, including those contained in this menu, are adapted to local and cultural contexts in order to prevent the best of intentions from producing unintended outcomes (Nelson-Barber & Johnson, 2016).

If decision makers lack an understanding of the cultural differences and needs of the school community, phenomena such as disproportionate discipline rates and lack of student engagement will likely persist. In addition to improving discipline data collection systems and addressing disproportionality in student discipline, cultural competence training and integrated student supports are significant components of recent state legislation to ensure equitable outcomes in Washington schools.

To achieve a high quality public education for all students, all educators must be able to work effectively in diverse settings. To become effective in diverse contexts, educators must be willing to learn about systemic racism and inequities in the public education system and to develop culturally competent skills and mindsets (EOGOAC, 2017). Professional learning opportunities aimed at increasing cultural competencies are focused on increasing educators’ knowledge of student cultural histories and contexts (as well as family norms and values in different cultures), abilities to access community resources for community and family outreach, and skills in adapting instruction to align to students’ experiences and identifying cultural contexts for individual students (RCW 28A.410.260). In accordance with best practices regarding family engagement, districts should make every effort to ensure cultural competence training programs are developed and implemented in partnership with families and communities (EOGOAC, 2017).

When classrooms and schools are staffed with culturally competent educators, schools are more likely to effectively work towards closing the opportunity gap and increasing student achievement. OSPI has created a toolkit to support educators as they integrate students’ funds of knowledge in the classroom. Additional resources that support culturally responsive practices include *Culturally Responsive Teaching Matters!*, *Culturally Responsive Classroom Management*, and *Culturally Responsive Teaching*.

---

**SCHOOL CLIMATE, RELATIONSHIPS, AND STUDENT SUPPORTS**

Over the past several years, research has found that a positive school climate contributes significantly to increased academic achievement, and may actually be more influential on
learning outcomes than other resources available to schools (Voight, Austin, & Hanson, 2013). A positive school climate, which requires positive teacher-student relationships, can potentially mitigate racial disparities in school discipline and negative effects of low socioeconomic status on academic achievement (Berkowitz, Moor, Astor, & Benbenishty, 2016; Okonofua, Walton, & Eberhardt, 2016). More schools are implementing strategies that encourage student self-discipline instead of focusing on trying to control student behavior through sanctions or threats of punishment (Mayworm & Sharkey, 2014). As educators look forward, they will continue to adopt strategies and make systemic changes in response to government initiatives and emerging research.

When schools attempt to create a culture of compliance by using punishments, such efforts may actually generate defiance and the unintended consequences of increased disruptive behavior (Way, 2011). Studies on student-teacher relationships and student cooperation indicate that relational approaches can mitigate defiant behavior and potentially reduce racial gaps in discipline referrals (Gregory, Hafen, Ruzek, Mikami, Allen, & Pianta, 2016; Gregory & Ripski, 2008). A recent study found that punitive climates can induce punitive attitudes regarding student discipline that decrease students’ respect towards teachers and their motivation to behave in class, but that scalable empathic-mindset interventions for teachers could result in improved relations with students and lower suspension rates (Okonofua, Paunesku, & Walton, 2016). The results of these studies are promising for future research in other practices and strategies that explicitly aim to improve student-teacher relationships and to foster safe and supportive school climates.

Schools are encouraged to use surveys to develop responsive policies and programs that serve student needs. The U.S. Department of Education released ED School Climate Surveys as part of a concerted effort to assist educators in creating safe and supportive learning environments within their schools. The Healthy Youth Survey, the result of a collaboration between OSPI and other state agencies, is designed to help schools and other service providers identify trends in attitudes and behaviors among youth throughout Washington. Survey results can assist schools in identifying individual/peer, school, community, and family conditions that impact student learning and school climate.

School-wide preventative approaches that also aim to improve school climate, such as PBIS, SEL, or restorative justice, can be particularly effective towards improving student outcomes (Mayworm & Sharkey, 2014; Voight, et al., 2013). Research on SEL programs suggests that social-emotional supports can be provided more effectively when integrated into daily educational routines (Durlak, et al., 2011). Social engagement is a key component of restorative justice in schools, a systemic approach that encourages the development of social-emotional competencies and internalization of behavioral values within a relational context (Morrison &
Vaandering, 2012). A student’s academic and behavioral needs may be interrelated because components of one domain can influence the other; therefore, researchers recommend that educators adopt an integrated and systemic approach towards addressing behavior and academics (McIntosh & Goodman, 2017). Educators throughout the state of Washington are innovatively combining elements of various practices and strategies as they develop comprehensive student support systems to meet the needs of all students.

School-wide programs and supports may limit any potential stigma associated with referrals for additional services while also fostering student engagement and self-discipline (Bettencourt, et al., 2016; Mayworm & Sharkey, 2014). In addition to direct classroom observations, schools use a variety of indicators to determine whether a student could benefit from additional supports, such as office referrals, attendance, and academic performance. Universal instruction and supports are necessary and should remain in place even while a student is being assessed and receiving supplemental services. Before a student is referred for additional services in LAP, it is important to ensure best practices are implemented with consistency in the classroom and school environment. Educators can then more easily determine whether the behaviors a student is displaying are the result of environmental variables or individual student needs, whether academic or non-academic, and respond accordingly.
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OVERVIEW

The expert panels worked together with the Washington State Institute for Public Policy (WSIPP) to develop a comprehensive menu of best practices and strategies based on the most current evidence and rigorous research available. Panelists used the following WSIPP definitions for evidence-based, research-based, and promising practices.

Evidence-based
A program or practice that has been tested in heterogeneous or intended populations with multiple randomized, or statistically controlled evaluations, or both; or one large multiple site randomized, or statistically controlled evaluation, or both, where the weight of the evidence from a systemic review demonstrates sustained improvements in at least one outcome. Evidence-based also means a program or practice that can be implemented with a set of procedures to allow successful replication in Washington and, when possible, is determined to be cost-beneficial.

Research-based
A program or practice that has been tested with a single randomized, or statistically controlled evaluation, or both, demonstrating sustained desirable outcomes; or where the weight of the evidence from a systemic review supports sustained outcomes [. . .] but does not meet the full criteria for evidence-based.

Promising
A practice that, based on statistical analyses or a well-established theory of change, shows potential for meeting the evidence-based or research-based criteria.

The behavior menu lists practices and strategies that have been shown to support the behavioral needs of students who have not yet met grade-level standards. It is important to note that the work of the expert panel was to identify proven general practices and strategies, not specifically branded programs that might include those practices. Districts considering adoption of programs or curriculum are encouraged to review the materials for alignment to the best practices and strategies outlined in this menu. Any chosen program or curriculum should be evaluated on an ongoing basis to ensure it effectively impacts student achievement.
Menu Organization

The menus have been organized into four broad categories of interventions. Student-centered practices and strategies include activities that directly involve students, like mentoring, social skills instruction, or restorative justice. Transition and readiness practices and strategies are designed to get students ready to learn, move from middle to high school, or graduate from high school. Educator-focused practices and strategies include activities like targeted professional learning, de-escalation, or trauma-informed approaches. Family and community practices and strategies include activities related to family engagement and school-community partnerships.
## BEHAVIOR MENU AT A GLANCE

### Student-Centered Practices and Strategies

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Practice</th>
<th>Type</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Behavioral Health</td>
<td>Research-Based</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Behavior Monitoring</td>
<td>Research-Based</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mentoring</td>
<td>Research-Based</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peer Mediation</td>
<td>Promising</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Restorative Justice</td>
<td>Promising</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Skills Instruction</td>
<td>Research-Based</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Educator-Focused Practices and Strategies

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Practice</th>
<th>Type</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Behavior Consultant Teacher/Instructional Coach</td>
<td>Research-Based</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>De-escalation</td>
<td>Promising</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional Learning Communities**</td>
<td>Promising</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Targeted Professional Learning</td>
<td>Research-Based</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trauma-Informed Approaches</td>
<td>Promising</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Transition and Readiness Practices and Strategies

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Practice</th>
<th>Type</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Credit Retrieval and Mastery of High School Standards*</td>
<td>Promising</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grade 8 to High School Transitions*</td>
<td>Promising</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kindergarten Transitions</td>
<td>Promising</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Family and Community Practices and Strategies

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Practice</th>
<th>Type</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Family Engagement</td>
<td>Research-Based</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School-Community Partnerships</td>
<td>Research-Based</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* New Entry

** Updated Entry
STUDENT-CENTERED PRACTICES AND STRATEGIES

- Transition & Readiness
- Student-Centered
- Educator-Focused
- Family & Community
Behavioral Health

Behavioral health encompasses the social, emotional, and mental health needs of students. Services can be school based or community based. Schools can deliver supports to students exhibiting at-risk behaviors as well provide case management for students with severe behavioral needs.

Practice Possibilities—Ideas to Consider When Planning

- Develop a formalized process for identifying students who exhibit risk factors leading to behaviors that interfere with the learning process, by partially utilizing academic performance, behavioral data, disciplinary data, and attendance records.
- Use behavioral health screeners to enhance the identification process and facilitate the linking of students to appropriate intervention services.
- Create a space with a positive environment within each school to provide social, emotional, and behavioral health services.
- Deliver professional learning to build relationships and capacity of the school staff to support students with behavioral health needs in partnership with families, community, and community service providers.
- Explore having a case manager or community resource person to facilitate and integrate community and school resources to address social, emotional, and mental health needs of students.
- Build relationships with Educational Service Districts to explore how Prevention & Intervention specialists can connect students with behavioral health services.
- Deliver professional learning to staff to support students with autism spectrum disorder or other neurodiversity in the classroom. Partner with families and community service providers such as Applied Behavior Analysis (ABA) therapists.

Demographic Considerations—Student Factors to Consider When Planning

- Some students with specific behavioral health needs may already have a 504 plan or may currently be receiving special education services. Both students with a 504 plan and students eligible for special education are eligible to receive LAP services. LAP services, however, are not to be used as a substitute for the provision of special education described in a student’s Individualized Education Plan (IEP). Educators are encouraged to communicate with other staff members responsible for providing and monitoring direct services to students with disabilities. Educators are also encouraged to share and discuss how the individual behavioral health needs of students with disabilities on a 504 plan or an IEP can be supported by an integrated, universal behavioral health support system designed to meet the needs of all students.
• Educators who believe that a student with behavioral health needs may have a disability and may be in need of services should be familiar with district procedures for making a referral for an evaluation under Section 504 and/or an evaluation to determine eligibility for special education. Participation in LAP may not be used to delay evaluating a student for services under Section 504 of the Rehabilitation Act of 1973 or the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA). A student is not required to obtain or currently have a mental/behavioral health diagnosis in order to be referred and evaluated for services under Section 504 or the IDEA. Educators are encouraged to document and share any observations about a student with behavioral health needs with other staff members involved in determining possible eligibility for services under Section 504 or the IDEA. Educators, on the other hand, are cautioned against making broad generalizations about an individual student’s behavioral health needs and openly using diagnostic language that could inappropriately label a student and unnecessarily delay an evaluation for special education services or services under Section 504.

Strategies for Implementation—Success Factors to Consider When Planning

• Enhance behavioral health service delivery to students by ensuring rapid response and regular follow-up to interventions.

• Increase learning of functional life skills and intervention supports to discourage alcohol, tobacco, and drug use.

• Coordinate interventions to facilitate students in transitioning through services and supports with minimal disruption to their daily routine, programs, and education.

• Interventions need to be developed that are culturally relevant and sensitive to the family and students’ culture.

• Consultation with behavioral health specialists can increase validity and reliability of the student and family care plan.

• Services at all grade levels must include developmentally appropriate content and strategies.

Resources—Tools for Planning

• Treatment and Services Adaptation Center

• CASEL: Effective Social and Emotional Learning Programs

• University of Washington College of Education: School Mental Health Assessment, Research, & Training (SMART) Center

• University of Maryland School of Medicine: School Mental Health
Behavioral health refers to a state of mental/emotional being and/or choices and actions that affect wellness (SAMSHA, 2011). It includes behaviors resulting from actual or suspected substance abuse, violence (domestic, peer, or community) and/or mental health concerns of students and/or their caregivers (OSPI, 2012; Quinn, Osher, Hoffman, & Hanley, 1998).

The effects of the behavioral health interventions are enhanced when:

1) They are comprehensive, integrated, multifaceted, and coordinated with other school and community resources (Adelman & Taylor, 2011).

2) The intensity of the intervention is commensurate with the severity or intensity of the problem behavior (Quinn, et al., p. 31).

3) The effectiveness and efficiency of the individual student system matches the effectiveness and efficiency of the school-wide system (Quinn, et al., 1998).

Research indicates that student risk behaviors peak in mid or late adolescence, as do adolescent stressors. Protective factors, such as resiliency and the capability to overcome barriers, can develop when students are engaged with the right support services. Research has shown that middle school students who learn these fundamental life skills delay the onset of alcohol, tobacco and drug use, and social and emotional behavior problems, such as violence, aggression, delinquency and issues with mental health (OSPI, 2012). Rapid response time and regular follow-up are major success factors in crisis interventions. As schools increasingly expand multi-tiered system of supports to meet the behavioral needs of all students, the potential for providing a broader variety of less intensive mental health interventions may reduce reliance on intensive interventions if early access is prioritized (Barrett, Eber, & Weist, 2013). However, if a crisis intervention is warranted, typically a certified mental health or substance abuse professional should be deeply involved.

According to the Washington's Student Assistance Prevention-Intervention Services Program Manual, the following individual and small group activities for should be considered for students with moderate-to-high behavioral health needs:

1. Identification and screening: a formalized process for identifying students who exhibit risk factors leading to behaviors that interfere with the learning process or that are harmful to the student or others in the school setting. If substance use or mental health
issues are suspected, further information is gathered to help determine whether some form of treatment is necessary.

2. Intervention and support services activities: identification of students who are:

   a. At-risk of initiating substance use or exhibit signs of behavioral health issues.

   b. Coping with the substance use and/or mental health issues of significant others.

   c. Using tobacco, alcohol, or other drugs (including prescriptions drugs).

   d. Developing a dependence on drugs. Support services help motivate students and their families to address the documented concerns. An array of counseling, peer support groups, social skills training, and individual and family interventions are used to address the particular needs of each student and provide assistance for youth returning to school after treatment.

3. Referral and case management: identified services for students whose severity of substance use or social, emotional, or mental health issues requires services that cannot be provided in the school setting. Students are referred to community services such as mental health and chemical dependency treatment. School-based case management services include follow-up, re-entry, and reengagement.

The intensity and severity of the problem behavior should determine the level of involvement of social, emotional, and behavioral health interventions.

1. Tier 1 (low risk/involvement): Tier 1 behavioral health interventions involve universal delivery of behavioral expectations and SEL skills and are not included as a tutoring intervention to reduce disruptive behavior.

2. Tier 2 (medium risk/involvement): Tier 2 behavioral health interventions target children and youth identified to be in the early stages of mental health, violence, or substance abuse problem behaviors affecting a safe learning environment. Small-group tutoring and individual tutoring are appropriate for Tier 2 youth, mainly focusing on SEL and resiliency skill building with knowledge building and screening for severity.

3. Tier 3 (high risk/involvement): Tier 3 behavioral health interventions target children and youth assessed as high risk using a validated screening tool. Interventions for students identified as Tier 3 include further assessment by professionals certified in substance abuse or mental health issues which often result in recommendations for the student to attend treatment. Behavioral tutoring for Tier 3 students includes individual
and small group sessions supporting the treatment plan, and successful re-entry of the student if treatment recommendations result in an in-patient stay.

Research clearly highlights that behavioral health interventions are most successful when implemented as part of a comprehensive school-wide positive behavior intervention system (OSPI, 2012; Quinn, et al., 1998). It is also important for school and district leadership to have access to certified mental health and substance abuse professionals who can also provide guidance and assistance with behavioral health interventions. School-based services should be coordinated with other community resources, and should complement other treatments that the student is receiving (Adelman & Taylor, 2011; Durlak, Weissberg, Dymnicki, Taylor, & Schellinger, 2011; OSPI 2012; Quinn, et al., 1998).
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Behavior Monitoring

Behavior monitoring involves collecting student behavior data on a regular basis over a period of time and using the data to assist students in meeting behavioral goals. Behavior monitoring can involve varying levels of complexity depending on the skill(s) being monitored, the degree of student involvement in data collection and goal setting, as well as the alignment of data with motivational systems.

Practice Possibilities—Ideas to Consider When Planning

- Establish and teach check-in/check-out practices for students, staff, and parents.
- Create a relationship-based intervention to enhance student engagement through individualized attention for students in partnership with other school staff, family members, and other community service organization.
- Establish data-based teams to regularly review student data (e.g. attendance, behavior, and academic indicators) to inform decision making processes. Identify students who need support and progress monitor students already identified. Develop exit criteria and a transition plan for students no longer needing additional support.
- Create a daily behavior and/or academic report card to monitor student progress. Behavioral progress monitoring records are used by staff to provide students with specific feedback or instruction to monitor performance and develop skills.
- Have students develop routines and common language to assist with their communication skills regarding classroom behaviors (e.g. Stop. Think. Go.).

Demographic Considerations—Student Factors to Consider When Planning

- Students who display culturally appropriate behavior patterns that could potentially be interpreted in a negative way should be considered in decision-making processes before codifying behaviors. Otherwise, schools risk identifying behaviors that are culturally appropriate as disruptive. Meaningful input from families representing various cultural populations can enhance classroom sensitivity, understanding, and responsiveness and also increase family engagement, belonging, and involvement. Also consider language access needs – both how to reduce communication barriers and how to incorporate a student’s primary language into individualized plans.
- Students who have been bullied or harassed, or who are at risk of being targets, could be vulnerable in behavior monitoring group-settings and would instead benefit from an individualized progress-monitoring plan. Also, be careful to distinguish between behavioral needs that warrant extra support and behavioral responses to bullying or other forms of harassment.
• For students with autism and other neurodiversity in the classroom, establish predictable routines using visual supports and visual schedules. Use visual stories to support changes in routines.

Strategies for Implementation—Success Factors to Consider When Planning
• Identify a research based framework to guide behavior monitoring.
• Establish a program to monitor, identify and impact behavior based on research.
• Ensure a systematic approach to include the use of technology for tracking and self-monitoring/assessment.
• Educate all stakeholders on the framework/program and the system.
• Include social, emotional, and academic indicators in the behavior monitoring tool.
• Use common definitions to identify behaviors (where possible align single words with codes in required reporting formats to simply data collection efforts).
• Determine intervals and what goals are achievable within certain timeframes.
• Ensure there is fidelity to the program as well as fairness and equity.
• Establish and align a method for documenting, coding and tracking behavior.
• Identify the factors and forces that impact the various types of behavior. Determine if variables are attributed to the school or to external forces and address them differently.

Resources—Tools for Planning
• Comprehensive, Integrated, Three-Tiered (Ci3T) Model of Prevention: Behavior Education Program (BEP)/Check-In/Check-Out
• National Center on Intensive Intervention: Behavioral Progress Monitoring Tools
• University of Connecticut, NEAG School of Education: Direct Behavior Ratings

Supporting Research
Behavior monitoring involves collecting student behavior data on a regular basis over a period of time and using the data to assist students in meeting behavioral goals. Effective structured group and individual behavior monitoring systems and programs can be part of a comprehensive school-wide framework that provides screening, early identification, intentional supports, and best practices for students. Behavioral and academic progress monitoring records are used by staff to provide students with specific feedback and instruction to develop skills while continually monitor performance outcomes.
Behavior monitoring can involve varying levels of complexity depending on the skill(s) being monitored, the degree of student involvement in data collection and goal setting, as well as the alignment of data with motivational systems. This flexible intervention can involve students in monitoring their own progress data or in conjunction with an adult (Moss, O’Conner, & Peterson, 2013). Behavior monitoring can focus on increasing positive behavior or decreasing negative behavior (Sprick & Garrison, 2008).

An example of an effective behavior monitoring intervention is the use of a daily behavior report card. (What Works Clearinghouse, 2012). A daily report card is a list of targeted behaviors and overall behavioral goals that are individualized for that student. Teachers use the daily behavior report cards to provide ongoing feedback to the students during class. Variations on the use of daily report cards involves home or school-based incentives for daily performance. Students often meet with a designated staff member at the beginning and end of the day or at scheduled times to review the expected academic targets and/or behavioral expectations and review goals for improvement. (Cheney, et al., 2010).

Another behavior monitoring intervention, self-regulation, involves teaching students to systematically self-assess and self-evaluate their behavior. (Reid, Trout, & Schartz, 2005). Self-regulation encompasses self-monitoring, self-monitoring plus reinforcement, self-management and self-reinforcement (Peterson, Young, Salzberg, West, & Hill, 2006; Reid, et al., 2005). Research supports the use of self-management and self-monitoring skills for the successful transfer of newly acquired skills to non-training settings (Peterson, et. al, 2006). Self-regulation can be an effective strategy when a student’s behavior results from a performance deficit rather than a skill deficit (McIntosh, Flannery, Sugai, Braun, & Cochrane, 2009; Reid, et al., 2005).

Given the variety of target behaviors that can be addressed by this intervention, as well as the ability to vary the task complexity when students are involved in self-monitoring, evidence indicates self-regulation is a successful strategy across the K–12 grade span. (Cheney, et al., 2010; Moss, et al., 2013; Peterson, et al., 2006). However, care should be taken to ensure educators have cultural competency related to the student populations they serve. Otherwise, the school runs the risk of identifying behaviors that are culturally appropriate as disruptive.

No matter which behavior monitoring strategy is utilized, it is of upmost importance to clearly define the behavior being monitored using specific and measurable terms. Once the target behavior is measured, the next critical step will be to identify a data collection system. The data system selected needs to be one that is easily used by the adult and/or student and is not embarrassing for the student. (Sprick & Garrison, 2008).
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Mentoring
Mentoring is defined as a relationship in which an experienced person (mentor) assists another, less-experienced person (mentee) in developing specific skills and knowledge that will enhance the mentee’s growth.

Practice Possibilities—Ideas to Consider When Planning
- Partner with local service organizations to establish adult-youth mentoring relationships that include service learning. For example, firefighters could mentor students while also teaching fire safety.
- Empower a group of students to identify potential mentors and develop a mentoring program.
- Develop mentoring in combination with school activities and student clubs.

Demographic Considerations—Student Factors to Consider When Planning
- Students who have limited adult contact or support outside of school could benefit from an adult mentor relationship.
- Students without a parent of their gender may benefit from a gender-matched mentoring program.

Strategies for Implementation—Success Factors to Consider When Planning
- Ensure mentoring relationships are clearly defined.
- Evaluate mentors’ interpersonal sensitivity and capacity to build rapport with youth as well as families.
- Make mentoring programs available to students in grade levels throughout the district so students can benefit from a mentoring relationship during each stage of their development.
- Streamline processes for clearing volunteer mentors within school buildings.
- Identify potential mentoring resources for metropolitan as well as rural areas and, when necessary, develop a plan to deliver mentoring services in various locations.

Resources—Tools for Planning
- Mentor Washington
- MENTOR: The National Mentoring Partnership
- National Mentoring Resource Center
- The Rhodes Lab: Center for Evidence-based Mentoring
University of Minnesota, Institute on Community Integration: Check & Connect Student Engagement Intervention

Education Northwest: Institute for Youth Success, Mentor/Mentee Training and Relationship Support Resources, and Youth Mentoring Program Planning and Design Resources

Supporting Research

Mentoring often occurs naturally during adolescent development and usually involves an older person with more life experience providing care and assistance to a younger person in the context of a lengthy relationship (CSAP, 2000). Mentoring programs can provide a structured and trusting relationship that bring young people together with caring individuals who offer guidance, support, and encouragement (Hartley, 2004). Mentoring programs can occur in group settings but usually facilitate one-on-one mentoring relationships (DuBois, Portillo, Rhodes, Silverthorn, & Valentine, 2011). Mentoring programs can range from informal to formal, but school-based or community-based mentoring programs are often very intentional efforts that recruit mentors who are both experienced and trained (CSAP, 2000).

Mentoring programs can have a positive impact on academic and non-academic student outcomes. One study that partnered at-risk students with positive adult role models in one-on-one mentoring relationships saw improved attendance and grades, as well as decreased discipline referrals over a two year period (Johnson & Lampley, 2010). A recent meta-analysis of mentoring programs concluded that “mentoring is, by and large, an effective mode of intervention for young people” but added that “effects may hinge to a noteworthy extent on decisions regarding which youth and mentors are targeted and selected for the intervention as well as on the care with which mentoring relationships are then established and guided toward activities that are consistent with the goals of a program” (DuBois, et al., 2011, p. 80).

Mentoring programs for students can focus on particular areas such as:

- **Social and emotional wellbeing.** Mentoring to assist young people to increase their self-esteem, self-efficacy and resilience by actively supporting their social and emotional wellbeing. The focus includes improving both the young person’s life skills and the positive connections they have with their community.

- **Individual talents and leadership.** Mentoring to assist young people to further develop their individual talents and/or leadership skills in a specific area (e.g. sports, photography, and drama) in order for them to reach their full potential.

- **Identity and culture.** Mentoring to assist young people to grow in their understanding of their faith and/or culture and cultural identity. The program actively supports young
people to be proud and confident of their identity and culture, and to be able to exercise this in their community.

- **Youth justice and crime prevention.** Mentoring to assist young people to avoid anti-social and offending behaviors by encouraging connectedness with positive elements in their community and increasing protective factors.

- **Education, training and employment.** Mentoring to assist young people to positively engage in and maintain their participation in education, training, and employment. These programs assist young people to develop a vision for their future and provide support to achieve their education, training and career goals.

Cultural competence is a factor that may impact a mentoring relationship. Cultural competence refers to the extent to which individuals have the capacity to effectively work with individuals of a cultural group (Sue, 2006). In regards to youth mentoring, cultural competence requires mentors to acknowledge and reflect on how their values and biases play a role in the perceptions of mentees, and how they experience their relationships with mentees. It is important to consider the mentor’s interpersonal sensitivity and capacity to build rapport with youth and their families. When mentees perceive their mentors to be more culturally competent, better quality relationships are likely to result (Sanchez, Feuer, & 2012). Ultimately, mentoring is dependent upon how effective mentors are in establishing relationships with mentees, and cultural competency is an important component of building these relationships.

Mentoring is relational and requires time in which both partners can learn about one another and establish mutual trust. Though a mentor may be a student’s peer, most often a mentor is a person at least one or two grade levels higher. Mentor pairings may include middle school students with elementary age students, high school with middle school, or adults with students. If implemented well, mentoring programs hold potential for promoting social-emotional learning and addressing social-behavioral needs in a preventative way (DuBois, et al., 2011).
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Peer Mediation

Peer mediation is a promising practice for resolving interpersonal conflicts among students and teaching practical social skills development. However, successful implementation may depend upon whether the program is designed well enough to avoid peer mediator selection bias and inequitable student learning opportunities. As a practice, peer mediation may be developed as a small component of a larger strategy for teaching conflict resolution skills, improving school climate, and responding to disciplinary referrals.

Practice Possibilities—Ideas to Consider When Planning

- Develop training for students and staff in peer mediation techniques.
- Implement peer mediation programs at different levels: as a school-wide program, in a classroom, or as a school club.
- Partner with local organizations to train students in conflict resolution and mediation techniques. A university-based partnership could support capacity building efforts.
- Integrate peer mediation into a larger school climate improvement plan or develop a peer mediation program as a component of a school-wide restorative justice initiative.

Demographic Considerations—Student Factors to Consider When Planning

- Secondary-level students in particular can benefit developmentally from peer mediation programs because they rely heavily on their peers for social-emotional support and capacity for advanced communication and empathy skills.

Strategies for Implementation—Success Factors to Consider When Planning

- Involve students in all aspects of the program development, implementation, and evaluation.
- Ensure program participation is an option for all students.
- Peer mediators should be neutral and void of a conflict of interest.
- Peer mediators should be supervised by school professionals who have training and expertise in the model.
- The composition of peer mediators should reflect the cultural demographics of the school.
- Participation in peer mediation should be voluntary and amenable to both parties.
- Confidentiality must be considered when developing policy and practice guidance.
- Ensure peer mediation is not used for situations where bullying or harassing behaviors, including repeated and unwanted acts by a person with actual or perceived power over
another, are suspected or occurring. See RCW 28A.300.285 for the Washington state definition of bullying.

- Peer mediators and adult supervisors need specific training and skills to identify and effectively address overt and covert acts of bigotry, bias, prejudice, and institutional and structural oppression in their own practice as well as in the peer conflict.

**Resources—Tools for Planning**

- Association for Conflict Resolution
- Mediator Mentors Project

**Supporting Research**

Peer conflict, both in and out of the classroom, can have a detrimental impact on the school, and classroom climate. Traditional punitive methods of addressing conflict in school, such as suspending and expelling students, have also been shown to be detrimental for the students in conflict as well as for the climate of the school. Peer mediation can be an effective intervention by which two students experiencing conflict are guided by a trained and impartial peer mediator to come to a deeper understanding of the others’ perspective for the purpose of coming to a mutually agreed upon resolution. It is based on the assumption that conflict is normal and can be resolved in a mutually agreeable manner.

Peer mediation programs can be delivered school-wide, in a manner that is class specific, or via a “pull out”/club model. Outcomes of peer mediation programs include: reductions in discipline referrals, improvements in school climate (when part of a school-wide conflict resolution program), satisfaction with solutions, and increased mediator skills in problem solving, decision making, tolerance for alternate points of view, and respect for others (Burrel, Zirbel, & Allen, 2003; Chittooran & Hoeing, 2004). One study showed that peer mediation, combined with mentoring in social-emotional learning, had a significant effect on academic achievement in the language arts (DeVoogd, Lane-Garon, & Kralowec, 2016). A two-year study at a high school in Turkey found that most conflicts referred for peer mediation resulted in resolutions and the overall process was effective for developing social skills and peacefully resolving conflicts (Turnuklu, Kacmaz, Sunbul, & Ergul, 2009).

Peer mediation programs can be implemented within individual schools or as a component of a larger school district initiative (ACR, 2007). Oakland Unified School District expanded their peer conflict resolution program to integrate it with the district’s school-wide restorative justice program. While peer mediation was less common than school-wide restorative justice approaches, some schools within the district implemented peer mediation programs apart from a school-wide initiative. In practice, OUSD’s peer restorative justice program primarily involved
targeted group-level interventions. However, the district did not conduct a systematic program evaluation to detail program components or outcomes (Jain, Bassey, Brown, & Kalra, 2014).

Meta-analysis research shows that peer mediation studies focus mainly on satisfaction with the process, impact on overall school climate, and skill acquisition by mediator as compared to skill acquisition of participants (Burrell et al., 2003). In particular, the benefits of a student going through peer-mediation training and being given the opportunity to practically apply the skills, far outweigh the benefits students who haven’t been trained in conflict resolution techniques may derive from participation in peer mediation (Burrell, et al., 2003; DeVoogd, et al., 2016). Schools might want to offer conflict resolution training for all students to promote equity in social-emotional learning. One study highlights the benefits of combining an inclusive training program with a student-led peer-mediator nomination and selection process (Turnuklu, et al., 2009). Programs should be designed to avoid peer mediator selection bias or any favoritism that would result in inequitable student learning opportunities.
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Restorative Justice

In the context of the school system, restorative justice is a set of promising practices that includes preventative as well as responsive strategies to create opportunities for social-emotional learning, foster a school-wide culture of relationship-based accountability, and provide alternatives to exclusionary discipline practices. Restorative justice is a broad term that refers to a philosophy or theory of justice and a variety of related practices such as circles, mediation, and conferencing. The focus of restorative justice is relational, rather than legal.

Practice Possibilities—Ideas to Consider When Planning

- Institute talking circles into regular classroom scheduling to check in with students and build positive relationships.
- Identify specific behaviors represented in exclusionary discipline data that can alternatively be referred to restorative justice practices and implement a plan accordingly. Consider what restorative strategies may address discipline disparities affecting specific populations.
- Integrate restorative justice language into district discipline policies, office referral processes, and classroom pedagogy to encourage the systemic adoption of restorative practices.
- Develop a district-wide restorative justice training program that can support consistent and frequent ongoing training for staff. A community partnership, such as with a local Dispute Resolution Center or Educational Service District, can support internal capacity-building and service delivery.
- Create restorative justice coordinator positions within school buildings to facilitate circles and conferences, manage data collection and evaluation processes, and collaborate with restorative justice partnerships.
- Establish alternative spaces within the school building that can be used for intentional reflection, restorative interventions, and social-emotional learning or integrate such practices into already existent in-school suspension rooms.
- Train a group of students to conduct peer mediations and promote restorative justice.
- Partner with local law enforcement and juvenile courts to integrate restorative justice into diversion processes. One strategy could be to encourage the use of restitution-based alternatives in lieu of legal penalties or fines.
Demographic Considerations—Student Factors to Consider When Planning

- Students with disabilities, depending on the severity and type of disability, could benefit from the participation of a special education teacher or guardian in formal circles or conferences.

- Students of color and their families, as populations most affected by the disproportionate consequences of exclusionary discipline practices, should be actively consulted and directly involved in restorative justice processes.

- Students from indigenous communities with longstanding traditions of using restorative practices may wish to share examples from their culture, but may also be protective of specific knowledge and protocols. Respectfully acknowledge the rich history of restorative justice as practiced in indigenous cultures throughout the world, but avoid appropriating or decontextualizing specific indigenous practices. Building meaningful relations with local Tribes could benefit the restorative justice process.

Strategies for Implementation—Success Factors to Consider When Planning

- Consider implementing a restorative justice pilot program before expanding policies and practices district wide.

- Focus on creating buy-in by involving staff, families, and the community in restorative justice policy and implementation processes. Dictating any change of policy without the input of those immediately affected is not only bad practice, but is also fundamentally contradictory to a restorative justice framework.

- Eliminate any unnecessary zero-tolerance or punitive language from written documents and oral communication channels, as such messaging can impede restorative justice initiatives.

- Guard against efforts to make restorative practices part of a punitive discipline process. Willing participation is a core component of restorative philosophies and practice. Incentivizing participation may be beneficial to the process but using coercive actions to elicit participation can be counterproductive.

- Avoid using overly prescriptive definitions of restorative justice so that creative strategies can emerge and schools can adapt to changing student needs. Consider how your theory of action for restorative justice already aligns with existing practices and may integrate other established programs or frameworks (such as PBIS, SEL, and MTSS) into a comprehensive school-wide approach.

- For situations involving a clear victim and offender, take measures to prevent any further victimization or trauma and to ensure the victim’s voice is heard in the process.
• Adapt restorative programs to align with local cultural practices and student backgrounds.

• Ensure school security personnel and any contracted school building personnel, especially school resource officers (SRO), participate in restorative justice trainings and are confident in using restorative questioning as de-escalation techniques.

• Encourage students to engage not only as participants in restorative processes, but as agents of change for creating a positive school culture and improving school climate.

Resources—Tools for Planning
• Oakland Unified School District: Restorative Justice
• Restorative Justice for Oakland Youth
• San Francisco Unified School District: Restorative Practices
• Resolution Washington
• National Association of Community and Restorative Justice
• Northwest Justice Forum
• International Institute for Restorative Practices: Safer-Saner-Schools

Supporting Research
The term *restorative justice* can refer to a variety of philosophical, cultural, and social frameworks, movements, or practices (Van Ness & Strong, 2014). Similar terms, such as *restorative practices*, *transformative justice*, or *relational justice*, are often used when referring to the same idea or practice (Van Ness & Strong, 2014). Other times, associated terms are intentionally separated in attempts to make subtle theoretical distinctions (Wachtel, 2013).

Researchers generally recognize contemporary restorative justice theories and practices are rooted in many longstanding traditions, particularly within indigenous communities (Galaway & Hudson, 1996; Van Ness & Strong, 2014; Zehr, 2002). However, *restorative justice* is often narrowly defined as a new approach to conflict within the field of criminology (McCold & Wachtel, 2003; Wachtel, 2013). Dorothy Vaandering defends using the term *restorative justice* and argues for a broader understanding of the concept of justice across fields of practice (Vaandering, 2011). Researchers and practitioners who apply the term *restorative justice* broadly do so in order to include a variety of similar practices or theories within their scope of interest and also to avoid overly prescriptive efforts that may inhibit innovation in the ever emerging field (Braithwaite, 2002; Fronius, Persson, Guckenburg, Hurley, & Petrosino, 2016).
Restorative Justice Movement

Social organizations advocating for restorative justice have steadily moved institutions toward addressing wrongdoing in a non-punitive way. In the U.S., the institutional expansion of restorative justice was a somewhat progressive development that started in the criminal justice system, expanded within the juvenile justice system, and recently emerged in the school system (Bazemore & Umbreit, 1997; Fronius, et al., 2016; Gonzalez, 2012; Van Ness & Strong, 2014). Community-based restorative justice efforts largely mobilized around the goal of providing alternative approaches to practices that perpetuated injustices within existing power structures. Researchers and advocates utilize the term school-to-prison pipeline to express a system for which they share concerns regarding the coinciding phenomena of increasing incarceration rates and exclusionary discipline rates (Advancement Project, 2010; NAACP, 2005; Schiff & Bazemore, 2012). The correlation between zero-tolerance discipline policies and increased exclusionary practices is well documented and includes authoritative denunciations of such practices as being morally and pragmatically deficient (American Psychological Association, 2008; Biehl, 2011; Losen & Martinez, 2013; Skiba, 2004; Skiba & Knesting, 2001). Researchers and advocates emphasize the disproportionate impact such practices have on students of color (Advancement Project, 2010; Gonzalez, 2011; NAACP, 2005; Schiff & Bazemore, 2012). Based on case studies in several cities where communities mobilized to enact reforms, one researcher noted that such examples were “not isolated instances of community organizing creating change, but rather a movement for restoring justice in public schools” (Gonzalez, 2011, p. 36). National trends correspond with developments in Washington state, where advocacy for alternatives to exclusionary discipline practices coincided with grassroots initiatives that preceded and influenced substantive state action (Mosehauer, McGrath, Nist, & Pilar, 2012).

Restorative Justice Framework

Throughout recent social movements to change criminal justice and school systems, restorative justice is commonly defined by what it is not or by what it opposes. Prominent restorative justice leaders, Desmond Tutu and Howard Zehr, both contrast retributive justice with restorative justice (Tutu, 1999; Zehr, 2002). Comparisons between restorative justice and retributive or exclusionary practices are commonly made for reframing questions related to the criminal justice system and school discipline (Ashley & Burke, 2009; Bazemore & Umbreit, 1997; Hopkins, 2002;).

In general, a retributive approach focuses on what rule or law was broken, who the violator is, and how the violator should be punished; a restorative approach identifies who was harmed, what interests must be addressed to repair the harm, and who is responsible for repairing the harm – the focus is relational, rather than legal (Zehr, 2002). Restorative justice initiatives are typically guided by general maxims rather than a prescriptive set of rules (Braithwaite, 2002). A
foundational principle of restorative justice in schools is the idea that conflict and wrongdoing are opportunities for learning (Ashley & Burke, 2009). While a lot of literature focuses on restorative practices for addressing harm, the scope of restorative justice includes preventative, relationship-building practices and strategies. One widely used model for explaining how restorative practices differ from other types of pedagogical and disciplinary practices contrasts restorative with punitive, permissive, and neglectful approaches. The model portrays how a restorative approach involves “doing things with people, rather than to them or for them,” or doing nothing at all, and is collaborative process that provides high levels of support and accountability (Wachtel, 2013, p. 3). Dorothy Vaandering conceptualized a relationship-oriented variation of the model that is applicable to professional development and relational restorative justice in education (Vaandering, 2014b). What follows is an example of how restorative justice principles can be embedded in the goals of a restorative approach in schools (Ashley & Burke, 2009, p. 6):

- **Accountability.** Restorative justice strategies provide opportunities for wrongdoers to be accountable to those they have harmed, and enable them to repair the harm they caused to the extent possible.

- **Community safety.** Restorative justice recognizes the need to keep the community safe through strategies that build relationships and empower the community to take responsibility for the well-being of its members.

- **Competency development.** Restorative justice seeks to increase the pro-social skills of those who have harmed others, address underlying factors that lead youth to engage in delinquent behavior, and build on strengths in each young person.

**Restorative Justice in Practice**

In practice, restorative approaches range from very informal communication to highly structured conferences (Wachtel, 2013). As in the criminal justice system, schools can successfully address serious misbehavior and incidents of violence using restorative interventions (Varnham, 2005). However, in U.S. schools, the types of behaviors referred for restorative interventions tend to focus on minor infractions (Guckenburg, Hurley, Persson, Fronius, & Petrosino, 2016). The type of behavior most often addressed in schools using restorative practices is interpersonal verbal conflicts, but restorative interventions are also associated with physical fights, damage to property or theft, and other serious behaviors (Baker, 2009; Guckenburg, et al., 2016). Restorative agreements can include restitution, formal apologies, or some other type of written agreement (Baker, 2009; Jain, Bassey, Brown & Kalra, 2014). Schools commonly incorporate restorative justice into a tiered system of supports, an example of which is displayed below in Figure 3.
Restorative justice practices, whether preventative or responsive, utilize restorative questioning as part of the restorative process. Practitioners rely on a variety of open-ended questions to encourage reflective processing and to engage participants in restorative dialogue (Ashley & Burke, 2009; Wachtel, 2013). Restorative questioning involves asking open-ended questions with language that doesn’t make assumptions or stigmatize, and in a calm tone that invites participation. Restorative questioning is commonly used as a de-escalation technique (Guckenburg, et al., 2016). Participants can practice active listening by paraphrasing what they’ve heard other participants saying and practitioners play a crucial role modeling restorative justice techniques. Restorative processes include circles, conferences, mediations, and other facilitated discussions that vary in structure and intensity (Ashley & Burke, 2009; Guckenburg, et al., 2016; Jain, et al., 2014).

The range of behaviors that are addressed through restorative practices varies, as some schools determine whether types of behavior are appropriate for restorative processes on a case-by-case basis while others identify specific offenses that are deemed inappropriate (Guckenburg, et al., 2016). Whether the decision to use restorative practices for specific behaviors is situational or made according to a pre-determined formula will likely depend on the needs of the school as well as where the school is at in the restorative justice implementation process (Blood & Thorsborne, 2005).

Restorative justice can be introduced into schools in a variety of ways, including through visionary school leadership or grassroots efforts initiated by teachers (Guckenburg, et al., 2016; McCluskey, Lloyd, Kane, Riddell, Stead, & Weedon, 2008). Research indicates that restorative justice practices are most effective when embedded within a school-wide philosophy and approach (Ashley & Burke, 2009; Blood & Thorsborne, 2005). School districts in Oakland and Denver initially piloted restorative justice programs at select sites before expanding efforts and making substantive changes to district policy (Baker, 2009; Jain, et al., 2014). By starting small, these school districts were able to use positive preliminary outcomes as evidence to justify and
secure funding for further implementation. In addition to convincing funding sources, pilot programs and small initial projects that result in positive outcomes can help create buy-in from personnel who may be hesitant or skeptical about restorative justice (Anyon, 2016). In any school, individuals may promote restorative justice within their spheres of influence to gain support (Advancement Project, 2014).

Practitioners identify lack of staff buy-in, insufficient funding, and staff training needs as significant challenges to successful restorative justice implementation (Guckenburg, et al., 2016; Jain, et al., 2014). Variations between restorative justice initiatives may be indicative of innovation and local particularities, but inconsistencies internal to an initiative can be detrimental to implementation efforts (Braithwaite, 2002; Jain, et al., 2014). Recommendations to avoid internal inconstancies include making discipline policies clear regarding what types of behavior correspond with different interventions, educating all staff on referral processes, assuring consistent application of restorative practices with equally consistent follow-up, and regular opportunities for staff training as well as family communication and participation (Jain, et al., 2014).

Restorative Justice Outcomes
Research on the cumulative effects of restorative justice initiatives in U.S. schools is largely descriptive rather than evaluative. However, preliminary evidence yielded promising results and helped justify the expenditure of funding for additional research (Fronius, et al., 2016; Schiff & Bazemore, 2012). Common outcomes associated with restorative justice initiatives primarily include reductions in suspensions, expulsions, and discipline referrals (Schiff & Bazemore, 2012). Additional outcomes include reductions in law enforcement involvement, improved social skills and school engagement, and many perceived benefits that are often difficult to quantify (Baker, 2009; Gonzalez, 2011; Jain, et al., 2014). In Oakland Unified School District, participant perceptions on restorative justice were overwhelmingly positive across a range of potential benefits (Jain, et al., 2014; Sumner, Silverman, & Frampton, 2010).

Recent evaluative research on restorative approaches in schools suggests that well-implemented restorative practices hold potential for improving student-teacher relationships and reducing racial disparities in school discipline practices (Gregory, Clawson, Davis, & Gerewitz, 2016). Findings from an analysis of discipline records in Denver Public Schools showed significant reductions in office discipline referrals, across racial categories, following student participation in restorative interventions. However, although black students had a higher participation rate in restorative interventions than white students, black students continued to be more at risk for suspension (Anyon, et al., 2016). Despite limitations in the available data and research methodologies, researchers are optimistic that restorative justice practices seem to be culturally responsive and, to the extent that implementation is done with
fidelity, associated with equitable discipline practices (Gregory, et al., 2016). Future research on restorative justice practices should continue to attempt measuring implementation fidelity and disaggregated student outcomes, while also corroborating evidence from similar practices that educators may not programmatically brand or label as *restorative*.

Restorative justice designed partnerships between juvenile justice personnel and educators also hold promise for reducing risk of involvement in the criminal justice system while also increasing student engagement in schools (Schiff & Bazemore, 2012). Research suggests that the transformational effects of a school-wide restorative justice initiative will typically take three to five years to materialize (Gonzalez, 2011; Jain, et al., 2014). As restorative justice initiatives continue to expand and attract funding for further research, an emerging body of evidence will serve to guide future innovative strategies.

**Restorative Justice Perspectives**

Researchers are aware of two distinct, yet overlapping, perspectives of what restorative justice is and, based on one definition or the other, how to precede with school-based implementation efforts (Hurley, Guckenburg, Persson, Fronius, & Petrosino, 2015). The first perspective is comprehensive, with restorative justice being defined as a philosophy or an attitudinal approach to human relations. The second perspective is selective, with a focus on applied skillsets or restorative justice as a programmatic strategy for addressing human misbehavior. The latter perspective accepts the idea that restorative-based programs can operate in schools to address individual student misbehavior without necessarily initiating system-wide changes. The former perspective emphasizes that restorative justice must be an all-inclusive theory of practice that effectively addresses wrongdoing while acting to bring about fundamental cultural changes. Each distinct perspective may be independently observed in contrasting school practices, but variations of theory and praxis are likely within any given restorative justice initiative (Fronius, et al., 2016; Guckenburg, et al., 2016; Vaandering, 2014a).

Research suggests that while restorative justice efforts have the potential to foster a positive relational school culture, when such efforts focus on managing classroom behavior rather than promoting conscientious learning, a culture of compliance and managerial control can inadvertently be reinforced (Vaandering, 2014a). Even practitioners who aim to establish a positive school-wide culture of behavior management recognize that if restorative efforts are narrowly focused on responsive interventions to wrongdoing, any subsequent impact on school culture is quite limited (Blood & Thorsborne, 2005). These practitioners conclude that, “while the implementation of carefully thought out strategy is vital, one of the critical issues for successful implementation and sustainability of a restorative philosophy is the realization that this means organisational and cultural change” (Blood & Thorsborne, 2005, pp. 2-3). Recent research suggests that high-quality implementation should involve the integration of student...
voice in school-wide implementation planning processes, a restorative practice that is broadly related to improving student-teacher relationships and school climates (Gregory, et al., 2016).

Institutional Challenges

When implementing restorative justice practices in schools, transitional tensions will inevitably occur as reform-oriented efforts conflict with punitive-oriented mechanisms of social control. Because restorative justice encourages a deeper commitment to equality and equity, both in theory and practice, practitioners often describe the restorative justice implementation process as a paradigm shift or a culture shift (Hopkins, 2002; Jain, et al., 2014). Based on an analysis of restorative justice initiatives in schools, one researcher concludes that practitioners should be consciously aware of the institutional constraints affecting restorative justice efforts in schools and actively strain against such limitations by situating restorative justice within engaged pedagogies (Vaandering, 2014a). Increased student voice and responsibility in decision-making processes can result in staff feeling uncomfortable, especially if they perceive student participation as a questioning of adult authority (Sumner, et al., 2010). Planning to manage difficulties that occur as a result of the impact of such cultural shifts should coincide with changes in organization, policy, and practice throughout the implementation phase (Anyon, 2016; Blood & Thorsborne, 2005). Research suggests that restorative justice practices are less likely to be used in schools with proportionally higher populations of black students (Payne & Welch, 2013). Therefore, schools that choose to implement restorative justice in order to address discipline disparities and overreliance on exclusionary practices should develop a strategic plan that specifically accounts for the needs of those students most likely to be affected.

In practice, restorative justice standards can serve to empower restorative processes or disempower—the impact depends on what the standards represent and the implementation process (Braithwaite, 2002). As agencies of the state, schools operate within a larger power structure that historically marginalized or even subjugated specific populations of peoples and contemporarily continues to do so, even if unintentionally (Vaandering, 2014a). Advocates for restorative justice acknowledge such tensions as they strategize how to empower students and families within a system that is often perceived as disempowering (Ashley & Burke, 2009). Restorative justice, as a theory of action used against and within existing systems, can potentially initiate systemic changes in specific schools or larger state institutions. This hope is expressed in a recent research article that concludes: “a switch from a punitive model of discipline to a restorative justice philosophy seems crucial both for overall student success and a more inclusive, less stratified educational system” (Payne & Welch, 2013, p. 19). State-level or broad cross-organizational efforts to develop restorative justice standards are contested by and made meaningful in local communities, where the generation of contextual standards continuously influences larger standardization efforts (Braithwaite, 2002). Researchers
recommend ensuring that restorative justice principles are continuously informed by practice as the overall restorative justice initiative is customized within the context of each school community (Jain, et al., 2014; Sumner, et al., 2010).
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Social Skills Instruction

The purpose of providing social-emotional skills instruction is to increase social competence. Social skills are those skills (competencies) necessary for students to initiate and maintain appropriate social networks and friendships, meet the demands of both adults and peers, and readily adapt to changes in social environments.

Practice Possibilities—Ideas to Consider When Planning

- Develop and teach social skills curriculum in all content areas.
- Integrate informal social skills instruction into all communication channels. Informal social skills instruction can occur when natural opportunities (teachable moments) arise to teach appropriate social behavior.
- Teach social skills through cultural arts. Use skits, role-playing, and drama performances to model social skills in classroom settings or school assemblies.
- Develop a peer mentoring program that focuses on older students modeling social skills to younger students.

Demographic Considerations—Student Factors to Consider When Planning

- Students who participate in extra-curricular activities or clubs could benefit from social skills instruction specific to the social interactions that occur while participating in those activities.
- Elementary school students may derive more benefit from learning age appropriate behaviors in group activities with their peers than through individual adult instruction.
- Students from diverse backgrounds could share social skills with students and educators to enrich the group learning process. Staff should be trained in cultural competency so as not to interpret cultural differences as social skills deficits.

Strategies for Implementation—Success Factors to Consider When Planning

- Explicitly teach social skills without assuming students already know the skills. Even if they do, explicitly teaching can reinforce appropriate social skills.
- Identify resources or curriculum that are available from local universities or libraries.
- Support successful moments when students display social skills competencies. Intentionally teach skills in natural settings where practical usage of social skills are most apparently applicable.
- Align the intensity of social skills instruction with the intensity and type of social skills deficit.
• Include cultural relevance in social skills instruction. Be explicit in explaining how cultural factors influence social behavior and the social environment.

• Utilize strategies to generalize social skills intervention skills across the school curriculum.

• Social skills instruction should be planned, focused, and scheduled within teaching and learning activities.

• Ensure social skills are transferred into group experiences and generally promoted school-wide.

• Focus social skills instruction on identified social behaviors that are valued by students and likely to be further integrated into school culture.

• Include peers in social skills instruction activities.

Resources—Tools for Planning
• Collaborative for Academic, Social, and Emotional Learning (CASEL)

• Committee for Children

• The PBIS Compendium: Social Skills

Supporting Research
Social-emotional skills instruction increases social competence. Social competence can include the acquisition of positive peer relational skills, self-management, academic skills, compliance skills, and assertion skills (Gresham, Sugai, & Horner, 2001). Social skills instruction in these specific abilities supports the development of students’ social and emotional competence in both direct and indirect ways, which significantly improves academic performance (Gresham, Elliott, Cook, Vance, & Kettler, 2010; Weisz, Sandler, Durlak, & Anton, 2005; Zins & Elias, 2007).

Social skills are defined as those skills or competencies that are necessary for students to initiate and maintain social networks and friendships, meet the demands of adults and peers, and adapt to changes in social environments (Durlak, Weissberg, & Pachan, 2010, Gresham & MacMillan 1997; Lane, Menzies, Barton-Atwood, Doukas, & Munton, 2005; Walker, Colvin, & Ramsey, 1995). Students who demonstrate a fluent use of social skills are viewed by others as being "socially competent" and experience many positive school outcomes including teacher acceptance, peer acceptance, positive peer relationships, academic achievement, and friendships (Lane et. al, 2005; Lane, Wheby, & Cooley, 2006). Like any academic content area, social skills can be taught (Algozzine, et al., 2010).

Social skills instruction can be successfully implemented in both adult tutoring and peer tutoring arrangements (Cook, Gresham, Kern, Barreras, Thornton, & Crews, 2008; Ginsburg-
Peer tutoring interventions focused on academic learning can positively influence a student’s social skills, self-concept, and behavior (Fuchs, D., Fuchs, L., Mathes, & Simmons, 1996; Nath & Ross, 2001).

Social skills instruction is an effective intervention for students, preschool through age 21 (Cook, et al., 2008). Peer tutoring interventions focused on academic learning can have positive results on both academic and social-emotional growth for elementary-aged students (Evans, Axelrod, & Sapia, 2000). Students may benefit from social skills instruction if they suffer fetal alcohol syndrome disorders, have learning disabilities, or are diagnosed with attention deficit disorders (NCTICITE, 2015). Social skills instruction is only minimally effective when used with students diagnosed with emotional and behavioral disorders (Evans, et al., 2000).

Throughout the process of assessing and providing social skills instruction, it is imperative for staff to recognize that cultural differences are not the same as social skills deficits. Staff need to be aware that within school and classroom settings, judgments of social competence are frequently made based upon the dominant white, middle-class American culture, which may be a mismatch for the culture of the students, thus causing misunderstandings and frustration. (Cartledge & Loe, 2001).

To increase social skills competencies, students need to be provided skills instruction, and they need sufficient opportunities to master the skills they learn, become fluent in their use, and adapt the use of these skills to a wide variety of social settings (Lane et al., 2005; Walker et. al, 1995). Skills taught in tutoring situations, such as friendship groups or social skills buddy groups, generalize better when those skills are taught in a tutoring model (e.g. 1:1 or direct, small group) and then transferred to a group or classroom experience (Bierman & Furhman, 1984). In other words, prescriptive tutoring in social skills (whether 1:1 or small group) is more powerful and generalizes more effectively when transferred to a class-wide focus.

Students are more likely to generalize the social skills they are taught if the social skills instruction focuses on targeted social behaviors that are valued and likely to be reinforced in the students’ natural settings. Generalization is also enhanced when the social skills instruction is provided across persons and settings that the student is likely to encounter daily. Additional strategies for ensuring the generalization of social skills instruction include the planned fading of training supports (such as prompting) to approximate the natural setting and contingencies, purposely teaching and reinforcing applications of the skills to new and applicable situations, as well as the inclusion of peers in the social skills instruction (Elliot & Busse, 1991; Evans, et al., 2000; Heron, et al., 2006).
Social skills instruction is found to be the most effective when the skills taught have social validity for the student and their social contexts, utilize precise assessment, systematic programming for generalization across settings and time, and additional support services for those students with chronic problems (Evans, et al., 2000). Prior to providing social skills instruction, it is imperative to accurately identify the students who could benefit from additional instruction in a targeted social skill, based on the presence of a social skills deficit (Lane et. al, 2005; Walker, et. al, 1991). The use of a formalized and consistent assessment system, including a combination of teacher ratings and teacher nominations for those students receiving targeted social skills instruction, will help increase the effectiveness and efficiency of the social skill instruction being provided (Evans, et al., 2000; Lane, et al., 2005; Walker, et. al, 1991). The implementation of social skill instruction is most effective when the deficit skills are clearly identified, teaching of the skills is provided, and gradual programming for generalization is included (Evans, et al., 2000).

In many cases, social skills instruction alone may not be an effective intervention to address the comprehensive needs of students at risk for challenging behaviors or those already displaying complex behaviors. In these cases, social skills instruction should be combined with other behavioral interventions within an RTI/MTSS framework and tied to the identified function of the student’s targeted behaviors. (Fox & Lentini, 2006; Ginsburg-Block, et al., 2006). In the case of students with significant behavioral difficulties, social skills instruction should be part of an evidenced-based system of care (Evans, et al., 2000).

According to the National Center for Technology Innovation and Center for Implementing Technology in Education (NCTICITE, 2015), the four types of skill sets schools should target when teaching social skills instruction include:

- **Foundation skills**: basic social interaction (eye contact, personal space, understanding gestures, body language, and facial expressions).
- **Interaction skills**: skills needed to interact with others (conflict resolution, turn-taking, beginning and ending conversations, determining appropriate conversational topics, and interactions with authority figures).
- **Affective skills**: skills needed for understanding oneself and others (identifying own and others’ feelings, demonstrating empathy, decoding body language and facial expressions, determining trustworthiness).
- **Cognitive skills**: skills needed to maintain more complex social interactions (social perception, making choices, self-monitoring, understanding community norms, determining appropriate situational behaviors).

The NCTICITE (2015) recommends introducing social skills methods by:
• **Incidental teaching** – use a natural adult-student interaction to teach a skill.

• **Reading and discussing literature and videos** – use stories that focus on social skills topics, such as making friends, dealing with bullies, etc.

• **Social skill autopsies** – discuss what the student did after a social interaction, focus on what the student did, what happened, the positive or negative outcome, and what the student will do in the same situation in the future.

• **Use of social stories** – social stories provide students with a narrative or script about a variety of situations and appropriate behavior.
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EDUCATOR-FOCUSED PRACTICES AND STRATEGIES

Transition & Readiness

Student-Centered

Educator-Focused

Family & Community
Behavior Consultant Teacher/Instructional Coach

Behavior consultant teachers/instructional coaches analyze behavioral data and implement evidence-based strategies in partnership with teachers to support student academic and behavioral achievement. Coaches work 1:1 with a classroom teacher or with a team of teachers to target specific professional learning to meet the needs of LAP students.

Practice Possibilities—Ideas to Consider When Planning

- Provide training to teachers on a variety of evidence-based practices that address behaviors of concern. Educators will be able to identify behaviors of concern, and the behavioral consultant teacher/instructional coach will develop training based on observations and areas of identified need.

- Partner with educators to identify common behavioral classroom expectations that they want their students to know. The behavior consultant teacher/instructional coach can help to identify evidence-based practices for teaching agreed upon classroom expectations and supply teachers with information on positive school climate and culture.

- Develop and model how to use progress monitoring tools for individual student’s behavior, as well as monitoring of classroom behavioral expectations.

- Facilitate discussions with educators on identifying socially/developmentally appropriate behavior and how to teach the skills to promote social growth. Assess identified behaviors (both from a broader perspective and an individual student perspective) and create behavior plans based on data gathered.

- Participate in classroom activities and lesson plans as a way to gather data in the form of informal and formal observations.

- Schedule daily/weekly/bi-weekly consulting meetings with the educator to review data, analyze outcomes, and discuss the necessity for updating behavior plans.

- Provide guided questions/format/plans for teacher self-assessment and self-efficacy to identify areas for teacher growth.

- Convene and lead a behavior team of educators to focus on providing consistent supports to high level need students.

Demographic Considerations—Student Factors to Consider When Planning

- Students with disabilities could benefit from having a behavioral consultant teacher/instructional coach with special education expertise model responsive strategies to classroom educators.
• Students of color could benefit from having an instructional coach with a shared background, ethnicity, or culture coach educators on culturally responsive strategies.

Strategies for Implementation—Success Factors to Consider When Planning

• Establish collaborative relationships between behavior consultant teachers/instructional coaches and classroom educators.

• Focus work on behaviors within the classroom environment.

• Allow flexibility in a behavior consultant teacher/instructional coach’s schedule for meetings and student observations that are convenient for educators.

• Identify behavioral practices that can be incorporated into the existing work and daily routine of the classroom.

• Demonstrate and support evidence-based practices in real time.

• Create practical data collection tools that educators can use throughout the day.

• Work to understand the conditions that prompt and reinforce behaviors.

• Foster a problem-solving and supportive environment for students and educators.

• Encourage accountability and fidelity through partnerships with educational staff.

• Adjust services to accommodate and value cultural differences.

• Prepare an array of best practices including programs and interventions that allow educators to have choices.

• Provide support and guidance for classroom teachers to learn and explore what works in their specific learning environment.

Resources—Tools for Planning

• Comprehensive, Integrated, Three-Tiered (Ci3T) Model of Prevention: Functional Assessment-Based Interventions

• Technical Assistance Center on Positive Behavioral Interventions and Supports: Supporting and Responding to Behavior: Evidence-Based Classroom Strategies for Teachers

• Autism Speaks: Family Services School Community Tool Kit

• National Center on Intensive Interventions: How can behavioral support staff support and collaborate with general education teachers to address the needs of students with intensive behavioral needs?
Supporting Research

Behavior consultant teachers/instructional coaches are defined as staff members within school districts whose role it is to support core classrooms teachers’ instructional practices and student academic and behavioral achievement. Serving in a variety of roles within school districts, behavior consultant teachers/instructional coaches are mentors, coaches, and trainers. When the focus is around student behavior, often behavior consultant teachers are known by a variety of job titles including Behavior Facilitators, Instructional Coaches, Behavior Specialists, Intervention Specialists, Behavior Technicians, Teacher Leaders, Teachers on Special Assignments (TOSAs), Behavior Coaches, but the role and responsibilities tend to be the same.

The behavior consultant teacher/instructional coach’s job is to promote the implementation of evidenced-based behavioral supports and to ensure educators implement behavioral interventions consistently. When a collaborative model is embedded within the daily practice of teachers, it becomes part of the work, rather than something outside of the daily routine. When working collaboratively with a behavior consultant teacher/instructional coach, the classroom teacher is more likely to use the new learning, feel a sense of shared responsibility, and invest in the collaborative model to improve behavioral supports (Barr, Simmons, & Zarrow, 2003; Coggins, Stoddard, & Cutler, 2003; WestEd, 2000). Studies have documented that the teacher consultant/instructional coach model improves teachers’ classroom management, instructional practice and behavioral interventions (Gutkin & Curtis, 1990; Medway, 1979; Neufeld & Roper, 2003; Poglinco, Bach, Hovde, Rosenblum, Saunders, & Supovitz, 2003).

Through their direct work with teachers, the behavior consultant teacher/instructional coach fosters a collegial and problem-solving consultant-consultee relationship with the intent of improving the student’s behavioral and academic success in school (Epstein, Atkins, Cullinan, & Weaver, 2008; Reynolds & Fletcher-Janzen, 2007; Wilkinson, 2003). In this role, the behavior consultant teacher/instructional coach should have no direct authority over the teachers and should be viewed as a support to the teachers’ ongoing behavioral professional learning (Reynolds & Fletcher-Janzen, 2007).

Along with increasing effective teaching practices, behavior consultant teachers/instructional coaches promote reciprocal accountability as well as support improvements in instructional capacity of teachers through collaboration and reflection about their work (Poglinco et al. 2003; Neufeld & Roper 2003;). Using new skills and tools that are guided by the behavior consultant teacher/instructional coach, educators work collaboratively and hold each other accountable for improved teaching and learning in real situations (Barr, et al., 2003; Coggins, et al., 2003; Neufeld & Roper 2003; WestEd 2000).

While behavior consultant teacher/instructional coaches are supporting classroom teachers to implement strategies focused on behavior change in the target student(s), they are also
supporting the teachers themselves to make behavioral changes. Successfully managing behavior change on these multiple levels necessitates that the consultant is responsive to the needs of the adult learner, understanding the principals of behavior change, and translating evidence based practice into practical application (Epstein, et. al, 2008; Kratcohwill & Bergan, 1990; Reynolds & Fletcher-Jantzen, 2007; Wilkinson, 2003).

The behavior consultant teacher/instructional coach shifts the learning method from professional learning outside the classroom to more varied and specific learning opportunities within the classroom. This collaborative process is done with the teacher, rather than to the teacher (Epstein, et al., 2008; Reynolds & Fletcher-Jantzen, 2007; Wilkinson, 2003). To enhance success, behavior consultant teachers/instructional coaches provide services within the framework of a behavioral consultation/instructional coaching model, which involves:

- The identification of the student’s targeted behavior.
- Selecting and planning for the use of evidence based practice(s) to address the targeted behavior.
- Training, coaching and support for staff to implement the intervention.
- Ongoing progress monitoring of the targeted behavior.
- Ongoing monitoring regarding the fidelity with which the intervention is implemented.
- Adjustment and adaptation of the intervention based on student and fidelity assessment (National Center on Intensive Intervention, 2013).

The behavior consultant teacher/instructional coach needs to have a strong foundational knowledge of specific to applied behavioral analysis techniques that include: behavioral principles, functional behavior assessment, evidence-based classroom management strategies, and behavior change approaches (Epstein, et. al, 2008; Kratcohwill & Bergan, 1990; Reynolds & Fletcher-Jantzen, 2007; Wilkinson, 2003). Additionally, they need to demonstrate the ability to translate this information for the teacher(s) in a manner that is accessible and practical for the classroom and school setting (Epstein, et. al, 2008). The behavior consultant teacher/instructional coach must have an understanding of the consultation skills that lead the teachers to insight of and change in practice (Epstein, et al, 2008; Kratcohwill & Bergan, 1990; Reynolds & Fletcher-Jantzen, 2007; Wilkinson, 2003).

Behavior consultant teachers/instructional coaches must incorporate preventative practices into their work by supporting staff as they set, encourage, and reinforce positive behavioral expectations for all students (Epstein, et. al, 2008). To be most effective, preventative strategies should be embedded within larger school-wide and district-wide multi-tiered system
of supports and proactively coached through the behavior consultant teacher/instructional coach.
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De-Escalation

De-escalation is a technique employed by individuals to provide communicative support to persons experiencing an escalated state. De-escalation communication techniques are verbal and non-verbal. This practice includes identifying escalated situations, using communicative methods to calm individuals, and modeling behavior or providing instruction in self-regulation. As a method of intervention, de-escalation should ultimately lead to the teaching of new skills that can be used in a variety of situations independently.

Practice Possibilities—Ideas to Consider When Planning

- Implement ongoing de-escalation training for all staff that addresses common behaviors while being respectful of cultural differences. Consider including bus drivers, custodians, and other personnel that interact with students who may benefit from de-escalation training.

- Teach staff and students the signs/symptoms of someone experiencing an escalated state and what type of language to use during conflicts. Students and staff could learn how to respond to someone in an escalated state by participating in role-playing activities.

- Provide safe locations and environments in which de-escalation opportunities and silent reflection can occur. Make space available for students to move and exert extra energy.

Demographic Considerations—Student Factors to Consider When Planning

- Younger children may need more support to identify emotions and to engage in self-calming behaviors. Teaching younger children may also include different techniques based upon their developmental level and readiness. Older children and young adults can rely on increasing knowledge of emotions, and coping mechanisms and may benefit from adult support to pair/match coping with emotions and behaviors.

- Students with physical or cognitive disabilities may have pre-identified triggers that educators should take preemptive actions to address. Monitoring symptoms and documenting the frequency and timing could help guide staff to be aware of events or time(s) of day that the student may be more likely to escalate. Careful monitoring can help determine what type of interventions to employ, whether a referral is appropriate, and/or if an amendment of a student’s Individual Education Plan (IEP) is needed.

- Students who come to school with exposure to various types of trauma may disclose information during a de-escalation process that requires follow-up services. When responding to a student in an escalated state, be cognizant/aware of issues of abuse, family situations (i.e. divorce, separations, domestic violence, foster care, adoption,
Strategies for Implementation—Success Factors to Consider When Planning

- Ensure adequate consideration is given to cultural practices and their relationship to behavioral expectations at all times. Staff should be aware of cultural considerations and assess how the influencing effect of dominant cultural norms may exacerbate escalated behavior and/or delay calming and de-escalation.
- Identify factors outside of the school’s control that may trigger an escalation. Intervention at this cycle should be carefully organized, planned, and practiced.
- Train all staff in de-escalation techniques, including school building personnel that aren’t employed by the district.
- Ensure training is ongoing and frequent enough to support school-wide application. Integrate de-escalation training into induction programs for new educators.
- Utilize assessment tools to identify potential triggers.
- Include students in de-escalation role-playing activities to teach and reinforce self-regulation skills.
- Develop similar language, strategies, and approaches in order to promote generalization of skills and consistency in addressing escalated situations.

Resources—Tools for Planning

- Crisis Prevention Institute: De-escalation Tips
- Kansas Technical Assistance System Network (TASN): De-Escalation Materials
- Intervention Central: How To: Calm the Agitated Student: Tools for Effective Behavior Management
- University of Nebraska-Lincoln Student Engagement Project: Conflict De-escalation
- The IRIS Center: Behavior and Classroom Management

Supporting Research

De-escalation, as a technique, involves the practical use of communication methods to support students experiencing an escalated state (Bath, 2008). This includes assistance to identify escalated situations, provide methods for calming, and model techniques students can use to
self-regulate. As a method of intervention, de-escalation should ultimately lead to the teaching of new skills that can be used in a variety of situations independently.

When a student is considered to be in an escalated state, behavior may range from silent frustration to vocal or physical outburst that present a danger to the student and/or others. Escalated situations can and do occur in the school setting and are best approached systematically, using prevention and intervention strategies. Escalation can happen for a wide variety of reasons. During escalation, there are usually multiple points along a continuum in what could be termed a behavioral crisis cycle (Long, 2007). A student may begin the cycle with mild agitation, where they are somewhat in control, and progress to a point at which they have little to no control over their choices, behavior, or thought process. Educators can use de-escalation techniques at any point during the escalation stage. The de-escalation process should include a recovery phase that may involve the student engaging in reflection, debriefing, and problem solving (Colvin & Scott, 2014).

Marston (2001) recommends linking functional behavior assessments to the de-escalation process. Repeated interventions and multiple opportunities for teaching may be needed by some students for maximum generalization (Bath, 2008). Identifying triggers can help educators align and implement similar strategies, thereby increasing opportunities for generalization.
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Professional Learning Communities

Professional Learning Communities (PLCs) are promising. PLCs capitalize on the positive effects of collaborative learning. PLCs can be defined as a group of teachers, administrators, coaches, or school staff that meet on a regular, planned basis to collaboratively improve behavioral and academic practices, with the goal of supporting student outcomes. For a PLC to be funded through LAP, the goal must be to support LAP-served students. Activities may focus on determining behavioral supports, differentiating instructional practices, implementing an early warning system, and developing formative assessment processes to support student growth.

Practice Possibilities—Ideas to Consider When Planning

• Establish PLCs with a shared vision and goals focused on student learning and educator professional learning. Invite paraeducators, special education staff, educators who support English learners, behavior specialists, and interventionists to participate. Educators will identify behavioral skills students need to improve to effectively support student academic outcomes and identify which skills are needed for continued professional learning for staff. PLCs will develop a learning plan for educators to acquire these skills to support students who have not yet met grade-level standards in math or ELA.

• Use PLC time to focus on best practices and strategy implementation for students served by LAP. Develop a learning plan, establish observable success criteria, and schedule walk-throughs for PLC members to observe colleagues implementing best practices. Use PLC time to share self-reflections, discuss observations, and provide feedback to improve implementation effectiveness.

• Implement processes for changing the academic and social culture of the school and community through ongoing focused learning. Content teachers could come together to review formative and summative assessment data, as well as non-academic indicators such as absences, office discipline referrals, and check-in/check-out data, to develop targeted intervention plans for students who have not yet met grade-level standards.

• Host parents and family members at regularly scheduled professional learning community discussions to involve them in the conversation and decision-making processes.

• Include behavior specialists in grade-level or school-wide PLCs to help identify new learning and develop a plan for educators to acquire practical skills related to social-emotional learning.
Demographic Considerations—Student Factors to Consider When Planning

- English language learners and culturally and linguistically diverse students could benefit from culturally responsive classroom strategies that are integrated into pedagogical approaches as a result of focused learning on cultural competency in a PLC.

- Adult instructional practices improve when educators intentionally identify and implement practices, strategies, content, and assessments that engage and represent the needs of all learners, including historically underserved or underrepresented students.

Strategies for Implementation—Success Factors to Consider When Planning

- Create a collaborative culture: classroom, building, district, and region.

- Address specific cultural differences through PLCs to promote a collegial understanding of the demographics of the school, district, and community.

- Develop collaborative teams who work interdependently and hold each other mutually accountable to achieve a clear and shared mission, vision, values, and goals.

- Invite support staff to PLCs to increase awareness of the needs of the population(s) identified and discuss how to support students through targeted academic and non-academic strategies.

- Implement a continuous improvement model that focuses on outcome data. Ensure educators review formative and summative data regularly to monitor student progress. Review and adjust educator practice when students are not demonstrating growth.

- Focus on a single theme or idea frequently over an extended period of time, rather than expending energy on ad hoc individual student work.

- Align PLCs with current frameworks or initiatives such as Teacher/Principal Evaluation Project (TPEP), school improvement plans, and National Board certification to improve educator effectiveness.

- Focus on reviewing student work, anticipating student misconceptions, and identifying instructional strategies educators will use to support student learning.

- Establish a regular schedule for collaboration time with clear objectives for each session to support students who have not yet met grade-level standards.

- Provide initial and ongoing professional learning for all PLC participants.

- Establish clear agendas and protocols maximize the effectiveness of the PLC.

Resources—Tools for Planning

- PLC Washington
All Things PLC

- **Marzano Research**: Tips from Dr. Marzano—Collaborative Teams That Transform Schools
- **Rutgers University Center for Effective School Practices**: Measurement instruments for assessing the performance of professional learning communities

**Learning Forward: The Professional Learning Association**

- **K–12 Blueprint: Professional Learning**
- **Smarter Balanced Digital Library**: Formative Assessment Process Modules

**Supporting Research**

A professional learning community, or PLC, can be defined as a group of teachers, administrators, coaches, or school staff (or a combination of people in these roles) that meets on a regular, planned basis with the explicit goal of collaboratively improving practices in the classroom, school, and/or district in order to improve student learning outcomes. PLCs must be based on clearly articulated, shared goals for student achievement and school improvement (DuFour & DuFour, 2012). An effective professional learning community is more than just a given group of educators learning together—rather, it is a process of continuous improvement that requires engaged inquiry, reflection, planning, analysis, and action (DuFour & DuFour, 2012; Killion & Crow, 2011). The goal of PLCs is to improve the effectiveness of educators in order to directly impact student learning.

Educators working as part of a professional learning community should work collaboratively in alignment with the school’s comprehensive improvement plan. To establish an effective PLC, educators must develop an agreed upon set of norms. Developing norms together, sets the stage for the collaborative culture needed for PLC success. Collaborative PLCs encourage sharing, reflecting and risk taking. Teams who are not trained to have collegial conversations may become frustrated, resulting in less productive PLCs. Educators need skills for facilitation, having collegial conversations, building shared norms, and discussing teaching practices (Wood, 2007). Examples of how educators can deprivatize practice include, but are not limited to: lesson sharing, establishing and using protocols, peer observation and reflective dialogue, as well as examining research around best practices. Blankstein (2010) suggests six essential principles for schools with PLCs:

- Common mission, vision, values and goals;
- Ensure achievement for all students;
- Collaborative teaming focused on teaching and learning;
• Using data to guide decision making and continuous improvement;
• Gaining active engagement from family and community; and
• Building sustainable leadership capacity.

Once the foundation of trust is in place, the PLC team can support the evaluation of student learning data and focus on a clear set of goals to improve student achievement.

In order for professional learning communities focused on improving outcomes for students to be successful, they must have strong administrative support (Akopoff, 2010). According to Barton and Stepanek, “Principals exert considerable influence over the successful implementation and continued functioning of PLCs.” School leaders can support PLCs by building a climate of trust and mutual respect, supporting de-privatization of practice and professional growth (Little, 1993, Kruse, Louis, and Bryk, 1995, and McLaughlin and Talbert, 2001). Key success factors include creating time for teams to focus on student data, observe and reflect on instructional practices, and plan interventions for students who have not yet met standard (Reynolds, 2008). Jones et al., (2013) emphasize the role of the school principal in facilitating PLCs, being an instructional leader who models what they want educators to do, and facilitating a positive school learning culture. For teacher collaboration to be meaningful, DuFour (2008) highlights that leaders ensure:

• Teachers have time to meet built into the schedule,
• Clear priorities are given for collaboration,
• PLC participants develop an appropriate knowledge base for decision making,
• Professional learning is provided and differentiated for teacher participants, and
• Clear expectations for assessing instructional impact on student achievement are made.

Providing a clear framework for how a school’s professional learning communities fit into the larger districtwide goal of improving student achievement can help build leadership capacity. PLCs can also reach beyond the building level to provide collaboration and support districtwide. Forming collaborative teams across the district develops a collective responsibility for student learning and it leverages educator expertise from across the district (Barton & Stepanek, 2012; DuFour & Reeves, 2016).

The fundamental purpose of PLCs is to transform traditional school systems by establishing collaborative cultures focused on building capacity for continuous improvement. These collaborative cultures welcome new ways of thinking and learning (Fullan, 2006). Therefore, collaboration must be embedded into the school culture as an essential component. According to Darling-Hammond et al. (2009), collaboration is one of four characteristics of professional learning that positively impacts student achievement. DuFour and Reeves (2016) draw attention to four essential questions that drive the work of collaborative PLCs:
1. What do we want students to learn?
2. How will we know if they have learned it?
3. What will we do if they have not learned it?
4. How will we provide extended learning opportunities for students who have mastered the content?

Educators working in an effective PLC, driven by the guiding questions above, must continually reflect on the ways they are working together to explore which practices are leading to effective results and to ensure that each practitioner has the skills and support to get there (DuFour & Reeves, 2016).

PLCs are action oriented and have a strong focus on bridging the knowing-doing gap (DuFour & DuFour, 2012). Using a continuous improvement model, educators participating in a PLC review each action and evaluate it for effectiveness. In other words, effective PLC teams focus on evaluating student learning data, a shared vision, and a clear set of goals to monitor progress impacting student achievement (Nelson, et al. 2010, Jacobson, 2010). A shared focus on learning, collaboration, and reflective dialogue put into practice through a cycle of continuous improvement expands educator knowledge and practice which can result in enhanced student learning (Dimino, Taylor & Morris, 2015, Fullan, 2006). Hord and Sommers (2008) note that PLC success depends on the application of what is learned about practice.

PLCs should pursue measurable goals and evaluate the success of these goals by looking at evidence of student achievement (DuFour, 2004). When professionals form a collaborative learning community with an explicit shared focus on student achievement and school improvement goals, they purposefully engage in professional learning that has tremendous potential.
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Targeted Professional Learning

Targeted professional learning refers to an evidence-based practice that focuses on improving teaching practices in a particular content area and/or a particular grade level in order to meet student needs. Targeted professional learning should be explicitly aligned to student learning goals, student achievement, and school improvement. The focus of targeted professional learning, when funded by LAP, should include behavioral strategies, pedagogies, and skills that will support students who have not yet met grade-level standards.

It is important to note there are many professional learning opportunities that can benefit all students, not just students identified for LAP services. If the intent is to support LAP students, other forms of targeted professional learning that may benefit all students can be used. For example, LAP funds can support targeted professional development for kindergarten educators, early learning providers, and caregivers of students in areas where WaKIDS data identify student needs.

Practice Possibilities—Ideas to Consider When Planning

- Implement a collaborative collegial process that uses data to develop ongoing strategies for addressing academic and social development of students.
- Teach an aligned P–12 social skills program (second step, bucket filling, character education, Capturing Kids Hearts, etc.) to staff so they can implement it with fidelity.
- Focus on professional learning opportunities that align teacher processes for addressing behavior with tiered levels of support.
- Foster an understanding of social-emotional student backgrounds through ACE, cultural competency, and SEL training.
- Teach staff how to use differentiated instruction practices to address learning entry points across grade levels for all students.
- Deliver targeted professional learning for grade-level or content-based teams, and then have teams cross-collaborate to identify common goals and strategies.
- Create online modules to offer educators short learning opportunities of common interest.

Demographic Considerations—Student Factors to Consider When Planning

- Students who are recent immigrants or ethnically diverse students may respond well to staff who receive ongoing professional learning in multicultural education strategies that can be applied to improve social interactions in the classroom.

Strategies for Implementation—Success Factors to Consider When Planning

- Establish clear shared mission, vision, values, and goals.
• Include classified staff and other school personnel in professional learning trainings.

• Focus on the modeling of instructional strategies for teachers and opportunities for applied practice that builds knowledge of content.

• Skilled facilitators should lead professional learning opportunities.

• Professional learning should be research based, practical, and relevant to the teacher’s assigned role as well as the goals of the school/district in supporting students.

• Professional learning must be sustained and ongoing to support growth in best practices with instruction and to deepen teachers’ content knowledge. It must include theory, demonstration, practice and feedback, and classroom support.

• Be sure to provide feedback to participants when implementation of professional learning is observed.

• Align professional learning with school improvement goals and engage in a cycle of inquiry to evaluate progress. Periodically review disaggregated data showing student outcomes and make data-informed decisions to improve teacher practices.

Resources—Tools for Planning

• Learning Forward: The Professional Learning Association

• Washington Education Association

• Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development (ASCD)

Supporting Research

Research suggests that targeted professional learning can positively impact student outcomes. A recent review of the most current research on best practices in professional learning, “Professional Learning in the Learning Profession” (Darling-Hammond, Wei, Andree, Richardson, & Orphanos, 2009), notes that professional learning is most effective when it is targeted to address specific content that has been explicitly tied to goals for student achievement and school improvement. Professional learning shown to improve student achievement is focused on “the concrete, everyday challenges involved in teaching and learning specific academic subject matter, rather than focusing on abstract educational principles or teaching methods taken out of context” (Darling-Hammond et al., 2009, p. 10). Further, effective professional learning should be aligned to learning standards and/or instructional strategies, and must be aligned to the needs of learners.

Evidence suggests that in order to positively impact student achievement, professional learning must be contextualized and sustained; that is, effective professional learning must be provided as an ongoing, systematic process informed by evaluation of student, teacher and school needs,
and embedded within a comprehensive plan for school improvement (Darling-Hammond et al., 2009). As noted by McREL’s Professional Development Analysis report, professional learning that is long-lasting, content-focused, and based on student and teacher performance data, takes more time and effort to implement when compared to less effective types of professional learning. One study found that “impacts on teachers and their teaching were typically evident after approximately 30 hours of PD, with further impacts detected through 80 hours of PD” (Weiss & Pasley, 2006, p. 14). However, as other researchers note, “[a] professional development activity is more likely to be effective in improving teachers' knowledge and skills if it forms a coherent part of a wider set of opportunities for teacher learning and development” (Garet, Porter, Desimone, Birman, & Yoon, 2001 p. 927).

As Knowles (1983) notes, “professional development should engage an educator in an ongoing cycle of reflection and ultimately, support the transfer of new knowledge into the classroom and daily practice.” Effective professional learning for educational professionals supports motivation and commitment to the learning process. It combines the needs of individuals with school or district goals. According to Joyce & Showers (2002), professional learning should consist of a continuum in which participants receive a presentation of the theory, see demonstrations, practice and receive feedback around an applied practice, and are ultimately provided with coaching or other classroom supports to self-evaluate with the goal of positive growth. Ultimately, best practices in professional learning must be focused on improving student achievement.

Morris, Millenky, Raver, & Jones (2013) found that providing teachers with PD opportunities to improve their capacity to manage students’ disruptive behaviors increased their ability to identify these behaviors, while also increasing their use of effective student interventions. Additionally, participating in professional learning to develop skills for working with students with antisocial behaviors also increases cognizance regarding the importance of student-teacher relationships, which can encourage positive interactions (Coggshall, Osher, & Colombi, 2013; Spilt, Koomen, Thijs, & Leij, 2012). It is also important for teachers and school staff to have training and professional learning on students’ concerns (mental health needs, impact of psychotropic medication on behavior and learning, trauma, addiction, and family issues) that directly impact student behavior (Whitson, Bernard, & Kaufman, 2015).

Stand-alone professional learning opportunities, such as workshops, do not necessarily connect to the daily reality of an educator’s role, nor do they provide for collegial networking (Goldring, Preston, & Huff, 2012). Collaborative professional learning, on the other hand, allows members of the group to benefit from the shared and collective knowledge of the group as a whole, which builds individual’s skills in managing disruptive behaviors (Carmeli, Gelbard, & Reiter-Palmon, 2013). Washington districts have all been required to adopt both an instructional and a
leadership framework. Criterion 5 (Fostering and managing a safe, positive learning environment) of the teacher evaluation system and Criterion 2 (Providing for school safety) in the administrator system specifically address social emotional learning and climate. Within collaborative professional learning opportunities, members of the group should consider initiatives, problems, or practices and discuss methods to address and improve practices or routines (Barnes, Camburn, Sanders, & Sebastian, 2010). Enomoto (2012) postulated that collaborative professional learning encourages the establishment of relationships among group members, which serves to allow individuals to get to know each other on both a personal and professional basis, suggesting such relationships may further encourage networking among the group members.

Planning for professional learning should be systematic, explicit, and based upon rigorous data analysis. Effective professional learning should be job embedded, which provides context and focus for the learning (Knowles, 1983). Collaborative teaming structures, such as professional learning communities, may support teachers’ professional learning goals. Effective professional learning should be of considerable duration—time spent in theory, demonstration, practice and feedback, and classroom support (Darling-Hammond, et al., 2009; Garet, et al., 2001). It should also be focused on specific content and/or instructional strategies rather than a general approach (Darling-Hammond et al., 2009).
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Trauma-Informed Approaches

Trauma-informed approaches refers to emerging promising practices designed to provide educators with relational skills and strategies that keep students impacted from trauma engaged in learning. The purpose of trauma-informed training is to support educators in recognizing trauma, responding to student’s individual needs, and cultivating a healthy school climate through improved student-educator relationships. Educators can foster resilience in impacted students by employing compassionate approaches and responses that support student engagement, social-emotional learning, and healthy adolescent development.

Practice Possibilities—Ideas to Consider When Planning

- Deliver professional learning on trauma-informed approaches for all staff. Train school counselors to identify students who may be negatively impacted by trauma in terms of academic and social skill development.

- Access curricula to support a resiliency focused support services staff position, teachers, or classroom to enhance student school engagement and achievement.

- Provide instructional training that impacts both school and classroom with activities and strategies staff can utilize to help students develop skills identified in the Common Core that assist them in addressing trauma, i.e., critical thinking, problem solving, and analytical skills.

- Raise student sense of belonging and achievement by accessing leadership youth development programs and activities.

- Establish teams of four to six individuals who hold the vision for the school climate and culture, as well as providing focused and coordinated services and supports to high-risk students impacted by trauma.

Demographic Considerations—Student Factors to Consider When Planning

- Students experiencing homelessness, neglect, or delinquency, or living in families receiving temporary assistance may require increased team-identified social and material supports.

- Students and families who are adding English as another language can benefit from increased connections and communication in their primary language.

Strategies for Implementation—Success Factors to Consider When Planning

- Focus on culture and climate in the school and community. A PLC focusing on this topic could strengthen school improvement plans.

- Train and support all staff regarding how trauma impacts learning.

- Encourage and sustain open and regular communication for all staff and partners.
• Develop a strengths-based approach in working with students, peers, and partners.

• Ensure discipline policies and practices that address behavior are compassionate, consistent, and equitable.

• Provide tiered support for all students based on what they need through a structured and studied assessment lens. Teach staff and students that a tiered support for all students and staff is needed.

• Create flexible accommodations for diverse learners including both language and culture. Create a care plan for students and staff needing supports.

• Use data to identify vulnerable students and determine outcomes and strategies for continuous quality improvement.

• Recognize that some students’ religious beliefs could facilitate feelings of anger, guilt, shame, or punishment that are attributed to a higher power. Make community connections and referrals to appropriate supports.

Resources—Tools for Planning

- Trauma and Learning Policy Initiative
- Collaborative Learning for Educational Achievement and Resilience (CLEAR)
- OSPI: Compassionate Schools and Mental Health and Schools
- Rethinking School Discipline: Trauma-Informed Approaches to Supporting Girls of Color (Morning Session)
- Treatment and Services Adaptation Center
- Adolescent Health Working Group: AHWG Provider Toolkit: Trauma and Resilience
- Wisconsin Department of Public Instruction: Trauma-Sensitive Schools Learning Modules

Supporting Research

In recent years, education researchers have synthesized scientific evidence regarding brain development, social-emotional learning, and adverse childhood experiences (ACEs) into a growing body of research regarding trauma-informed approaches in schools (Blodgett, 2016).

According to the Substance Abuse and Mental Health Services Administration (SAMSHA), trauma “results from an event, series of events, or set of circumstances that is experienced by an individual as physically or emotionally harmful or life threatening and that has lasting adverse effects on the individual’s functioning and mental, physical, social, emotional, or
spiritual well-being” (SAMHSA, 2014, p. 6). The National Child Traumatic Stress Network (NCTSN) reports that one out of four students have been exposed to a traumatic event that can impact school performance (including academics, attendance, and discipline), impair learning (including memory, information processing, and problem-solving), and result in physical and/or emotional distress (NCTSN, 2008). Studies show associations between trauma and violence exposure and decreased reading ability, lower grade point average, more days of school absence, and decreased rates of high school graduation (Jaycox, Kataoka, Stein, Langley, & Wong, 2012).

SAMSHA’s working definition of a trauma-informed approach is one that realizes the impact of trauma, recognizes the symptoms of trauma, responds by systemically integrating knowledge about trauma, and resists re-traumatization. SAMSHA outlines six key principles of a trauma-informed approach to guide organizations when implementing a trauma-informed approach: (1) Safety; (2) Trustworthiness and transparency; (3) Peer support; (4) Collaboration and mutuality; (5) Empowerment, voice and choice; and (6) Cultural, historical, and gender issues (SAMSHA, 2014).

Educational staff are in a unique position as first responders to recognize and connect students impacted by trauma with support systems. Trauma-informed approaches and compassionate practices can benefit students by fostering compassionate attitudes among educators (Wolpow, Johnson, Hertel, & Kincaid, 2009). A compassionate school staff can work effectively to keep students engaged in learning while supporting a healthy climate and culture within the school (Hertel, Frausto, & Harrington, 2009; Wolpow, et al., 2009).

The range of experiences that may be classified as stressors can vary according to the socio-economic or cultural contexts in which individual students live so additional ACEs indicators might be useful for understanding the impact of childhood stressors on long-term health outcomes in such contexts. Economic hardship and family dynamics that do not include the experience of parental separation or divorce, such as growing up in a single-parent home, may contribute to childhood adversity (Wade, Shea, Rubin, & Wood, 2014). Although a lot of research focuses on the early childhood effects of trauma on adolescents later in life, students may accumulate adverse experiences during their time in the K–12 system. Trauma may occur along a spectrum and may be attributed to transitions a student goes through.

When designing trauma-informed programs and interventions educators should consider the personal resiliency of individual students and school-level environmental factors that cultivate resilience. Educators might consider integrating trauma-informed approaches with other interventions that serve to buffer the effects of adversities on student achievement (Claro, Paunesku, & Dweck, 2015). However, educators must take care to ensure that any assessments related to personal resiliency are strength-based and not stigmatizing, culturally and
developmentally appropriate, and demonstrate overall reliability and validity (Prince-Embury, 2015). Teachers can assist intervention efforts by identifying students displaying symptoms of trauma early on and making in-school referrals, participating in trauma-informed treatment teams at the school level, and supporting students impacted by trauma through any therapeutic processes (Bell & Limberg, 2013). Referrals to external clinicians might be necessary to deliver trauma-focused interventions for students affected by complex trauma (Arvidson, et al., 2011).

Schools can integrate trauma-informed approaches into already existing multi-tiered frameworks with careful planning and educator preparation (Chafoules, Johnson, Overstreet, & Santos, 2016). Even without the extensive use of specific screeners or direct assessments, schools can implement trauma-informed approaches when the systems and processes designed by the school are based on statistically probable assumptions about ACEs exposure among student populations (Soures & Hall, 2016). Schools may decide to prioritize trauma-informed staff training and school climate efforts in order to minimize risks associated with the collection of more detailed and sensitive student-level information. To the extent that information about childhood trauma or ACEs exposure is gathered, such knowledge should inform educator practices and guide organizational change (Blodgett, 2012).
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TRANSITION AND READINESS PRACTICES AND STRATEGIES

Transition & Readiness

Student-Centered

Educator-Focused

Family & Community
Credit Retrieval and Mastery of High School Standards*

Credit retrieval for students who have not yet met graduation requirements is a promising practice. Students may be at-risk of not graduating because of not earning credit in courses due to unsatisfactory grades and/or insufficient attendance. Other students graduate, but then need to immediately enroll in remedial community college courses before starting regular freshman level work.

LAP funding can be allocated for these programs targeting 11th- and 12th-grade students at-risk of not graduating or meeting state standards on the high school assessments. It is important that these specialized programs provide innovative structures that are rigorous (targeting ELA speaking, conceptual understanding, self-management and other SEL benchmarks, listening, reading, and/or writing), develop a growth mindset, and focus on college and career readiness.

Credit retrieval, or credit recovery, allows students to retake academic courses, stay in school, and graduate on time. Credit retrieval programs may be offered in a variety of formats and times such as online, face-to-face, and through a blended-learning approach. Credit retrieval programs allow students to retake coursework for which credit was not earned.

Note: OSPI does not establish the criteria for 11th- and 12th-grade students in Washington state. Districts set this policy (e.g. by age of student or by student credit accumulation). The OSPI CEDARS manual for data reporting lists age as a suggestion for determining grade-level, with age 16 as of August 31 for 11th grade and age 17 as of August 31 for 12th grade. It is recommended that eligibility for LAP credit retrieval be based on age.

Practice Possibilities—Ideas to Consider When Planning

- Implement a diagnostic assessment protocol that integrates functional analyses for behavior and academics to identify appropriate supports for students at risk of dropping out of school.

- Use LAP funds to support during, after, and/or summer school programs for credit retrieval. Funds can be used to cover teacher salaries, teacher prep time, paraeducator support, reading, and other instructional materials, and applicable professional learning opportunities.

- Offer a 4th-year transition course to support 12th-grade students who have not yet met standard on the assessments, but do intend to enroll in post-secondary coursework after high school. Transition courses should provide an opportunity for students to focus on the academic and non-academic skills they will need to be successful in credit bearing courses in college. For successful post-high school transitions, courses may include Bridge to College or Advancement Via Individual Determination (AVID).
• Collaborate with the local library to offer online credit retrieval access and enrichment opportunities.

• Create an alternative program for whole class instruction and activities that incorporates social-emotional learning. Assess and think about what barriers caused students not to receive credit. Design and deliver instruction that meets similar learning course objectives while accounting for previous learning barriers.

• Provide project-based courses or Career and Technical Education-equivalent courses for students in order to engage them in an application-based learning environment.

• Create a project-based, computer assisted credit retrieval program for 11th and 12th-grade students. Out-of-School Time (OST) credit retrieval can be available for students before/after school and/or during the summer.

Demographic Considerations—Student Factors to Consider When Planning

• Services are for 11th- and 12th-grade students.

• Students in the process of adjudication could benefit from additional education opportunities, such as skill centers, while they transition into their regular high school setting.

• Students already experiencing transition as a result of homelessness, military relocation, medical treatment, or foster care placement may require a variety of additional support services as they transition into or out of high school.

• High school migrant students may benefit from opportunities to access credit retrieval, tutorial support, and additional time to submit assignments.

Strategies for Implementation—Success Factors to Consider When Planning

• Online courses or hybrid courses that are designed to be individualized and self-paced should be designed to provide students’ support from an instructor who is well versed in the content and can effectively coach and motivate students.

• Be explicit with students about developing effective study skills and self-management strategies when engaging in online courses.

• Create a systematic structure for online and blended programs.

• Identify students in 9th- and 10th-grade at-risk of not graduating on time. While LAP funding for credit retrieval is restricted to 11th- and 12th-grade students, early identification and intervention is more successful.
• Target individualized instruction only to needed areas of remediation to avoid repeating mastered elements. Use formative and diagnostic assessments to customize coursework.

• Allow for flexible enrollment in credit retrieval programs, thinking beyond the traditional schedule.

• Include counseling and student support teams to provide communication and monitoring to help regulate student progress.

Resources—Tools for Planning

• Advancement Via Individual Determination (AVID)

• OSPI: Career Guidance Washington, Digital Learning Department, CTE Statewide Course Equivalencies, Open Educational Resources, and Bridge to College Courses

• Center for Change in Transition Services

• theWashBoard.org

• College Spark Washington

• Washington Student Oral Histories Project: Listening to and Learning from Disconnected Youth

• Buck Institute for Education (BIE): Project Based Learning

• Institute of Education Sciences (IES): Helping Students Navigate the Path to College: What High Schools Can Do

• National Education Association: Research Spotlight on Project-Based Learning

Supporting Research

Credit retrieval, or credit recovery, is a LAP-allowable service under RCW 28A.320.190. Credit retrieval refers to alternative ways for 11th and 12th-grade students to earn high school credit toward graduation after a student has completed a course and not earned credit on the initial attempt. Credit retrieval is a promising practice because it provides a time during and outside school for additional learning opportunities (D'Agustino, 2013). These opportunities may better suit students who struggle with regular attendance, essential literacy skill deficits, are learning English as an additional language, need additional time and support to complete ELA coursework, have specific learning disabilities (such as dyslexia, dysgraphia, and ADD/ADHD—sometimes undiagnosed), or are disconnected from school. Credit retrieval programs are often used to keep students in school and on track for graduation (Watson and Gemin, 2008).

Credit retrieval programs may be designed in a variety of formats.
• One possible credit retrieval format is to implement an online program. Online credit retrieval programs may allow for greater rates of credit retrieval (Hughes, Zhou, & Petscher, 2015), but also pose challenges for some learners. Franco and Patel (2011) note that self-regulative strategies are key traits for learner success in these programs. Online components of credit retrieval programs can offer benefits to students who have not yet met standard by providing extra student support and contact time while developing 21st century skills (Watson & Gemin, 2009).

• Another possible credit retrieval format is to present material via alternative whole-class instruction. Here the design often differs from the classroom design where the student previously did not earn credit. Some design challenges which have been implemented with an attention to increasing student credit retrieval success are providing smaller class sizes, different curriculum (than what was previously taught), and essential skills development. The use of different instructional material that is more appropriate for the target population provides students a second chance to engage with the content and improve their chances for achieving success. By using pre- and post-assessments to measure growth and attainment of the relevant standards, both students and teachers can feel more confident that essential skills are being developed. Students who have not yet met standard benefit from smaller class sizes as they receive more individualized attention from the teacher and support in areas of skill deficit (Malloy et al, 2010).

• Not surprisingly, some educators have blended online and traditional classroom instruction with some success. It stands to reason that if some credit retrieval students have not yet met standard because they lack regulatory controls, then having a highly qualified educator available to develop and implement instruction (as well as offer individual tutoring) would increase student success. As Watson and Gemin (2008) have explained, “The blended approach is important because it provides expanded student support and face-to-face contact. The online component—whether fully online or blended—provides 21st century skills to a group of students who often have less than average exposure to computers and technology” (p. 15).

• A fourth possible credit retrieval format is to implement a project-based learning approach.

Across grade levels, behavioral needs of students are frequently linked with deficits in academic performance which, at the high school level, can become a barrier to graduation (Bruce, Bridgeland, Fox, & Balfanz, 2011). Students exhibiting behavioral challenges in the school setting are at increased risk for dropout, especially when they experience exclusionary discipline as a consequence for behavioral infractions (McIntosh, Flannery, Sugai, Braun, & Cochane, 2008). Because students’ academic and behavior needs are interrelated, schools must address a variety of behavioral variables that affect student learning (McIntosh, et al., 2008).
According to 2016 data published by the Education Research & Data Center (ERDC) in the High School Feedback Report, 47 percent of Washington state high school graduates enrolling in 2-year and 11 percent enrolling in 4-year post-secondary institutions had to take some level of pre-college remedial coursework. Students assigned to remedial courses are less likely to earn their post-secondary degree or credential (Vandal, 2010). High school transition courses may provide opportunities for high school students to shore up their academic readiness skills prior to graduation and bypass remediation. These courses are most effective when targeted towards students who intend to pursue college and are close to, but have not, quite demonstrated mastery of high school proficiency on academic assessments. Professional learning for participating high school faculty on the specific transition curriculum is another key factor for success (Barnett, 2016).
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Grade 8 to High School Transitions*

Grade 8 transition readiness is a promising practice. Transition readiness opportunities refer to programs intended to support successful transitions from 8th grade to high school. Students identified for support might benefit from instruction in one or more of the following areas: self-management, self-efficacy, reading, writing, mathematical reasoning, and/or communication skills. For the purpose of LAP, high school transition programs begin in 8th grade and may continue in the summer and through 9th grade. In some cases, when over one-third of the incoming freshman students experience one or more early warning indicators (excessive absenteeism, failing a course in the first quarter, or receiving a suspension), LAP funds may be used for school-wide transition programs.

Practice Possibilities—Ideas to Consider When Planning

- Create an 8th-grade student mentor system where each student is assigned a high school peer mentor. Mentor/mentee activities could be scheduled monthly, over the course of the school year, or during the summer, and into 9th grade.

- Design an 8th-grade course that focuses on the skills and habits of mind needed to be successful in a high school environment. For example, a program like Advancement Via Individual Determination (AVID) may be particularly effective for transition readiness. AVID’s professional learning for educators focuses on cultivating a positive learning environment and instructional strategies in mathematics, literacy, writing, and speaking.

- Partner with local service groups (Kiwanis, Rotary, Lions, etc.) to establish mentoring and service learning projects.

- Design and implement a summer academy for incoming freshman. This program should introduce students to the expectations regarding academics, activities, school culture, and the habits of success needed for high school.

- Design a 9th-grade transition readiness academy to support LAP students identified in grade 8. For example, provide intentional academic and social-emotional learning supports including team teaching, student advisories, and diagnostic assessments to monitor student progress through grade 9.

Demographic Considerations—Student Factors to Consider When Planning

- Students and families who are recent immigrants may benefit from additional encouragement and support that is responsive to their academic, cultural, and social-emotional strengths and needs as they transition into the U.S. education system.

- Students already experiencing transition as a result of homelessness, military relocation, medical treatment, or foster care placement may require a variety of additional support services as they transition into high school.
• Students and families from American Indian/Alaska Native communities may benefit from a teaching environment that focuses on cooperation instead of competition, has Tribal cultures represented in the classroom, and utilizes culturally responsive teaching methods. In accordance with state requirements under RCW 28A.320.170, school districts should support effective implementation of the Since Time Immemorial: Tribal Sovereignty in Washington State curriculum (STI)—which focuses on teaching about Tribal history, culture, and the government of Tribes whose boundaries lay within Washington state. Consistent with the legislative intent of RCW 28A.320.170, high school transitions services can be designed to “improve the experiences” American Indian/Alaska Native students have in WA schools and to ensure all students in WA are informed “about the experiences, contributions, and perspectives of their tribal neighbors, fellow citizens, and classmates” (SSB 5433, Section 1). For example, in collaboration with local Tribes, school districts may integrate expanded and improved STI curricular materials and related activities into core instruction, summer programs, and supplemental services.

• Students learning English as an additional language and their families may benefit from early support towards understanding high school graduation requirements pertaining to language acquisition and credit accrual.

Strategies for Implementation—Success Factors to Consider When Planning

• Design transition interventions with models that accelerate learning.

• Provide both content and non-content supports for students. Attention to growth mindset, motivation, and counseling can help enable learning.

• Embed specific practices like goal setting, progress monitoring, and authentic learning involving real-world, complex problems and their solutions into designed supports.

• Ensure counseling services are available for students who are struggling with the transition into high school.

• Improve communication channels between middle schools and high schools, both within the district and between neighboring school districts.

Resources—Tools for Planning

• Advancement Via Individual Determination (AVID)

• Gear Up Washington State

• Education Northwest: A Practitioner’s Guide to Implementing Early Warning Systems

• Great Schools Partnership: Ninth Grade Counts: A Three-Part Guide to Strengthening the Transition into High School
• Washington Student Oral Histories Project: Listening to and Learning from Disconnected Youth

• The University of Texas at Austin, Charles A. Dana Center: Academic Youth Development (AYD) and AYD Factsheet

• U.S. Department of Education: Newcomer Tool Kit

Supporting Research

Across grade levels, behavioral needs of students are frequently linked with deficits in academic performance which, at the high school level, can become a barrier to graduation (Bruce, Bridgeland, Fox, & Balfanz, 2011). Because students’ academic and behavior needs are interrelated, schools must address a variety of behavioral situations that affect student learning (McIntosh, Flannery, Sugai, Braun, & Coehane, 2008). Researchers emphasize that ninth grade is a critical year for students because academic performance is a strong predictor of future academic achievement and the failure rate for students in grade nine is higher than other grade levels (Bottoms, 2008; Easton, Johnson, & Sartain, 2017). Therefore, to address ninth-grade failure in a proactive manner, districts and schools should consider having a robust grade 8 transition readiness plan in place.

Students exhibiting behavioral challenges in the school setting are at increased risk for dropout, especially when they experience exclusionary discipline as a consequence for behavioral infractions (McIntosh, et al., 2008). Recent national and state reports have documented the extensive use of exclusionary discipline, which disproportionately affects students of color and has multiple negative impacts on students and their communities (Morgan, Salomon, Plotkin, & Cohen, 2014). Dropping out of high school is a process that begins well before students enter high school, and there are identifiable warning signs at least one-to-three years before students actually drop out. Research shows that identifiable early warning signs are evident up to three years prior to when a student actually drops out (McIntosh, et. al, 2008; Burrus & Roberts, 2012).

Feldman, Smith, & Waxman (2013) interviewed students who dropped out and found the majority of students follow a four-phase process including: initial disengagement, early skipping, more serious truancy, followed by actual dropping out. Early warning indicators (course failure, truancy, and discipline referrals) continue to be the best predictors of dropping out for all ages. Specific behavioral risk factors for dropout include, truancy, not completing schoolwork, suspension/expulsion, involvement with juvenile justice, substance abuse, mental health, and being victims of bullying (Dalton, Glennie, & Ingels, 2009; Smink & Reimer, 2009).

The reasons for students falling off the graduation track during their first year of high school can be attributed to social and developmental adjustments, structural and organizational
changes, and increased academic rigor experienced as a result of the transition (Erickson, Peterson, & Lembeck, 2013). Dr. Robert Balfanz, a researcher at Johns Hopkins University, is one of the nation’s leading experts on high school dropouts. His work suggests that behavior should be considered in addition to attendance and course performance. Districts and middle schools systematically reviewing the ABCs (Attendance, Behavior, and Course performance) can identify those at-risk of dropping out and help put them on the path to graduation. An intentional focus on the middle grades’ transition program is essential due to the difficulties that students’ experience with social, emotional, cognitive, and physical changes, which often exacerbate the transitional concerns (Andrews & Bishop, 2012; Balfanz, Herzog, & Iver, 2007; McIntosh, et. al 2008; Somers, Owens, & Piliowksy, 2009). Students need to be explicitly taught the skills and behaviors needed for high school success. 9th-grade specific courses are a great place to house the teaching of problem-solving skills, behavior expectations, time management and organizational skills, and self-advocacy (Bottoms, 2008).

In most cases, a well-designed transition program for LAP-eligible students can be a successful intervention strategy. In instances where a school has over one-third of their 9th-grade students at-risk for failure, LAP funds can be used for a school-wide transition program. School-wide transition programs have also been successful at improving student performance and decreasing drop-out rates for all students. One model, freshman academies, provides focused support for 9th-graders. The academies group students and intentionally provide academic and social supports including team teaching, student advisories, and diagnostic assessment to monitor student progress (Kennelly & Monrad, 2007).

According to a recent study, “teacher teams [core content teachers who share the same students throughout the day] are the most effective model for easing the transition to high school and preparing freshmen for success” (Habeeb, 2013 p. 20). While many schools can employ this type of model, it is important to note that others may struggle to meet the demands of incoming freshmen; therefore, whatever model used must include support that is flexible, positive, goal-oriented, efficacious, and empowering (Habeeb, 2013). Traditional remedial classes are not effective in supporting successful transitions; instead, transition interventions that effectively prepare students for high school operate on a model of accelerated learning (Herlihy, 2007). Transition interventions should address not only academic content but also increase student engagement, advance social-emotional learning, develop a growth mindset, and reward academic risk-taking.

Whatever strategies schools choose to support incoming 9th-grade students should be rooted in results—reduced failure rates, improved achievement, and increased graduation rates. If schools are dedicated to designing and implementing successful transition programs, the
outcomes will be visible in the statistics, and more importantly, in the attitudes, motivations, and accomplishments of the students.
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Kindergarten Transitions

Supporting kindergarten transitions is a promising practice. Transitioning through kindergarten is a time when behavioral, emotional, and social changes impact all students and their families. Communities, schools, families, and educators can increase the likelihood of a successful student transition by providing academic and non-academic support services. Kindergarten transition opportunities provide support to students and their families for successful transitions from in-home care, daycare, relative care, pre-school, ECEAP, or Head Start.

LAP funds may support transition to kindergarten through a number of different strategies. Districts are encouraged to set up data-sharing opportunities with early learning providers and families to be able to identify the children who may need additional transition support prior to the start of the kindergarten year.

Note: Washington state statute starts LAP eligibility at kindergartners. As such, kindergarten transition strategies funded with LAP should start after a child has enrolled in kindergarten. As such, kindergarten transition strategies funded with LAP should start after a child has enrolled in kindergarten. They may start prior to the first day of school. LAP allowable funding options for children enrolled in kindergarten, and identified as needing extra support, may include:

- In late spring/summer, educators can conduct family engagement and home visits.
- During the summer, before kindergarten starts, educators can provide transitions programs.

LAP funds could be used throughout the year for professional learning time between early learning providers (preschool and childcare) and kindergarten teachers to focus on strategies to improve the academic readiness of students arriving at kindergarten. LAP funds for this professional development should be focused on foundational early skills alignment (social-emotional, numeracy, and literacy) and on the providers serving students most in need of kindergarten transition support. WaKIDS data is a great resource for districts to use to identify students for services and content for instruction and professional learning.

Practice Possibilities—Ideas to Consider When Planning

- Establish a program that allows pre-kindergarten and kindergarten educators to create a transition plan with a focus on sharing student data, aligning curriculum, and supporting strategies for transitioning students.
- Create an outreach program that promotes early kindergarten registration, conducts needs assessments with families, finds and connects families with resources, and provides a safety net of support for the first several months a child attends kindergarten.
• Provide opportunities for families to visit elementary schools before children begin kindergarten by inviting students and families to participate in school events, school tours, school lunch, library time, and recess.

• Develop summer transition programs, or kindergarten camps, that focus on incoming kindergarteners who may not have attended a pre-school program. Allow time for kindergarten students to become familiar with teachers, buildings, classrooms, and routines.

• Cultivate a peer connection program that arranges for pre-school children and kindergarten children to meet, play, and connect within a classroom or outside the classroom at a community event.

• Provide opportunities for teachers to share WaKIDS results with parents and provide activities parents can engage in with their children to support areas of need as identified on the WaKIDS assessment.

Demographic Considerations—Student Factors to Consider When Planning

• Students and families who are new to the school system benefit from a friendly environment where families are valued as decision-makers regarding their own child’s education and school programs.

• Migratory families may benefit from programs that help students learn about school routines and ease the separation from home to school; families benefit from learning about activities and strategies families can do in the home to strengthen their child’s education in the classroom.

• Students and families who are learning English as an additional language benefit from a welcoming environment where responsive two-way communication, in the language spoken by the family, is facilitated.

• Students and families who qualify for free- and reduced-priced lunch benefit when they are connected to resources and information related to family services.

• Students and families who participate in Head Start or ECEAP programs benefit when standards, curriculum, support services, and assessments from pre-kindergarten to kindergarten are carefully aligned.

• Students who struggle with emotional and/or social issues that may hinder a successful transition benefit from peer connections that continue from pre-school into kindergarten.

• Students and families from American Indian/Alaska Native communities may benefit from a teaching environment that focuses on cooperation instead of competition, has
Tribal cultures represented in the classroom, and utilizes culturally responsive teaching methods.

Strategies for Implementation—Success Factors to Consider When Planning

- Establish protocols for collecting data from pre-kindergarten programs to support early intervention.

- Promote academic readiness and emerging literacy, language, numeracy, and social emotional skills families can practice at home. WaKIDS data can help inform these practices.

- Provide families tools and support to be advocates for their children.

- Provide funds to purchase support materials for age-level readiness practices.

- Provide time and funding for collaboration between pre-kindergarten and kindergarten staff, families, and community members to establish a district-wide transition plan for students entering kindergarten.

- Provide time and resources to promote ongoing connections among children, families, in-home, daycare, and pre-kindergarten providers with elementary schools.

- Identify a coordinator to oversee kindergarten transition programs, connect with families/early childhood centers, and monitor progress.

- Provide training for kindergarten educators to further develop an understanding of the norms, practices, and procedures of pre-school education.

- Provide training for educators on culturally sensitive and anti-bias pedagogy, curriculum, early childhood development and evidence-based practices.

- Provide services tailored to the cultural, linguistic, and learning needs of students and their families.

Resources—Tools for Planning

- Institute for Educational Leadership: Case Studies of Early Childhood Education & Family Engagement in Community Schools

- ChildCare Aware of Washington: Collaboration with Principals and Child Care Providers

- Washington State Early Learning and Development Guidelines Birth Through Third Grade and WaKIDS

- Kindergarten Questionnaires and Checklists: Bellingham Public Schools- Kindergarten Parent Questionnaire and Teacher Questionnaire; Washington State Department of Early Learning Kindergarten Checklist

- The Early Childhood Community School Linkages Project
Behavior Menu

- **OSPI**: Washington State Full-Day Kindergarten Guide, Early Literacy Pathways, Early Numeracy Pathways, and Early Learning and Development Guidelines
- **Patterns of Practice**: Case Studies of Early Childhood Education & Family Engagement in Community Schools
- **University of Washington’s Institute for Learning & Brain Sciences**: Love, Talk, Play
- **Enhancing the Transition to Kindergarten**: Linking Children, Families, and Schools
- **Center on the Social and Emotional Foundations for Early Learning**
- **Technical Assistance Center on Social Emotional Intervention for Young Children**
- **Erikson Institute**: Programs and Services

Supporting Research

Kindergarten transition is a crucial time for young students and families. Transition programs can set the stage for how families will handle their children’s future educational experiences by engaging them in the transition to kindergarten. Kindergarten students in particular need of additional support and care when transitioning as changing learning environments present new challenges: new academic expectations, different school structures, and new social interactions with peers and adults. Families, educators, and community partners can use effective transition activities to create supports and connections across pre-kindergarten and kindergarten settings. (LoCasale-Crouch, Mashburn, Downer, & Pianta, 2008). These practices should begin prior to kindergarten and take into account the cultural, linguistic, and learning needs of individual students and their families (National Center on Parent, Family, and Community Engagement, 2013).

Key guiding principles should be in place as a framework for kindergarten transition success (Kraft-Sayre & Pianta, 2000, p. 2):

- Foster collaborative relationship building among educators, families, and students;
- Promote continuity between pre-school and kindergarten systems;
- Focus on family strengths to develop school support; and
- Focus on the individual needs of the student.

Building capacity for students, families, and schools is essential. Children’s successful transition to kindergarten relies upon building relationships with a variety of people, including families, day care providers, pre-school educators, and elementary educators (La Paro, Kraft-Sayre, & Pianta, 2003). Family connections, whole child assessment, and early learning collaboration are key components of the Washington Kindergarten Inventory of Developing Skills (WaKIDS). Research supports using these three components as the foundation for best practices in successful kindergarten transitions.
Transition to kindergarten activities need to establish effective communication between pre-school/pre-kindergarten settings and elementary schools (La Paro, Kraft-Sayre, & Pianta, 2003; Sullivan-Dudzic, Gearn, & Leavell, 2010). Fostering collaborative relationships, and two-way communication, among stakeholders supports successful and seamless transitions for students. The culture in an elementary school may be more formal than the typical culture of a preschool (Connors & Epstein, 1995; Pianta & Kraft-Sayre, 1999), which makes communication between the two settings more crucial to help students and families navigate the new environment. “These environments should also work together to ensure that standards, curriculum, support services, and assessments from pre-kindergarten settings to kindergarten are carefully aligned” (Bohan-Baker & Little, 2004; Kagan & Neuman, 1998; Pianta & Kraft-Sayre, 2003; Sullivan-Dudzic, Gearn, & Leavell, 2010).

Communication with Families

Kindergarten transition plans that promote family participation prior to the start of the school year have been associated with students having increased self-confidence, school enjoyment, and overall happiness with the kindergarten experience (Hubbell, Plantz, Condelli, & Barrett, 1987). Transition to kindergarten should include opportunities for students and families to learn about the new setting, build relationships, and experience continuity in curriculum and assessments within their new setting. Children show greater school readiness (Hubbell et. al., 1987; LoCasale-Crouch et. al., 2008), reduced stress at the beginning of school (Hubbell et. al., 1987), and stronger academic growth over their kindergarten year (Ahtola, Poikonen, Kontoniemi, Niemi, & Nurmi, 2011; Schulting, Malone, & Dodge, 2005) when such opportunities are offered.

Outreach to families should be done in a personal way before students enter kindergarten (Pianta, Cox, Taylor, & Early, 1999; Sullivan-Dudzic, Gearn, & Leavell, 2010). Families are more likely to be involved in their student’s kindergarten year when schools actively engage families in the transition process and recognize the families’ efforts to participate (Schulting et. al., 2005). Outreach with families that is established in pre-kindergarten programs promotes positive relationships and emphasizes early on that families are valued partners in their child(ren)’s education (La Paro, Kraft-Sayre, & Pianta, 2003). Schools and educators can smooth the transition to kindergarten by engaging families in meaningful ways. Families gain confidence from helping their children adjust to new schools. (Van Voorhis, Maier, Epstein, Lloyd, & Leuong, 2013, p. 117). One way to support early family engagement is to establish family visits between kindergarten educators and school staff prior to the beginning of the school.

Research by La Paro, Kraft-Sayre, & Pianta (2003) showed that despite barriers families may face, when offered opportunities to interact with the transition process, such as meeting with educators prior to the beginning of the school year and visiting kindergarten classrooms,
families almost always participated and believed that these opportunities were helpful. When asked, families can offer educators knowledge about their children to support classroom routines and can help reinforce essential academic and non-academic skills at home (Ferretti & Bub, 2017; Sullivan-Dudzic, Gearns, & Leavell, 2010). Students who experience more stability in their early school settings, and in the relationships with the adults in these settings, perform better socially and academically (Curby, Rimm-Kaufman, & Ponitz, 2009; Tran & Winsler, 2011) during their kindergarten year and beyond.

Regardless of a student’s skill level, positive relationships between schools and families support children’s academic progress (Kraft-Sayre & Pianta, 2000). Establishing relationships with community partners, pre-kindergarten learning partners, and kindergarten educators may help provide resources to and support for students and families during the kindergarten transition. “Peer connections that continue from children’s pre-school years into kindergarten also can help ease children’s transition to school by being a source of familiarity and an avenue for building social competencies” (Kraft-Sayre & Pianta, 2000). These types of adult and peer relationships support social and emotional competencies in young students that aid in their school success (Kraft-Sayre & Pianta, 2000).

Community Partnerships

Pre-school and kindergarten programs can make the transition for families smoother by aligning pre-school and kindergarten policies and practices (National Center for Early Development and Learning (NCEDL), 2002; Sullivan-Dudzic, Gearns, & Leavell, 2010). “Connecting early childhood programs with the K–12 educational system is a proactive strategic plan to increase student achievement” (Sullivan-Dudzic, Gearns, & Leavell, 2010, p. 1). Consider including the following stakeholders as part of the district kindergarten transition team (Sullivan-Dudzic, Gearns, & Leavell, 2010):

- Elementary school principals,
- Kindergarten and local pre-school educators,
- Families (include multiple demographics and include pre-school and private school families),
- School board members,
- Child care providers,
- Higher-education professionals,
- District leadership (e.g. Title I director, special programs coordinator, etc.),
- School district PTA/PTO president, and
• Other community organization representatives (e.g. Tribal leaders, Head Start supervisor, healthcare providers, etc.).

By inviting multiple partners to be part of the planning and implementation of kindergarten transition practices, districts can focus on “increasing achievement, by using a unified approach that honors existing efforts and builds on the strengths and resources in your community” (Sullivan-Dudzic, Gearns, & Leavell, 2010, p. 27).

It is also important for pre-kindergarten and kindergarten educators to participate in ongoing professional learning opportunities together to support social emotional and academic competencies necessary for school success and achievement (NCEDL, 2002). Promoting professional learning on culturally sensitive and anti-bias pedagogy, curriculum, early child development, and evidence-based practices ensures that educators receive the supports needed to fully engage students and families both academically and non-academically (Henderson and Berla, 1994; Epstein 2001; Weiss, Caspe, & Lopez, 2006; Halgunseth, Peterson, Stark, & Moodie, 2009).

Student Success

“Teachers report that nearly half of typically developing children experience some degree of difficulty during the transition to kindergarten” (Ferretti & Bub, 2017; Rimm-Kaufman & Pianta, 2000; Rimm-Kaufman, Pianta, Cox, 2000). In any classroom, there are students achieving beyond the grade-level standards and students not yet achieving the grade-level standards. The goal is for all students to meet the end-of-year expectations, and when necessary, to recognize that stages of development are based on experiences and not solely defined by age or grade. It is essential to take into consideration the learning progressions necessary for student growth by planning intentional experiences, selecting appropriate materials, and determining the best instructional approaches to meet students’ academic and non-academic learning needs. In order for the unique learning needs of students to be met, educators must understand the social-emotional, language, literacy, and numeracy needs of each student.

Educators and researchers recognize that social-emotional competencies and skills related to school preparedness develop early in life. A recent study reports that children who enter kindergarten with underdeveloped social-behavioral skills are more likely to be identified for special education services, suspended or expelled from school, and retained to repeat grade-level standards (Bettencourt, Gross, & Ho, 2016). While focusing on social-emotional development in early childhood is critical, social-emotional learning (SEL) can take place throughout a student’s primary and secondary education. Research indicates that SEL programs can positively influence a variety of student educational outcomes across grade levels (Durlak, Weissberg, Dymnicki, Taylor, & Schellinger, 2011).
High-quality instruction in language and literacy skills is vital to students’ academic and non-academic success. Children start developing language and literacy skills at birth; *emergent reading* skills and *early reading* skills start around age three (OSPI, 2016). Oral language skill development helps students as they begin to develop and progress reading and writing skills. As students enter kindergarten, oral language skills are connected to later gaps in both reading and writing (Coll, 2005; Storch & Whitehurst, 2002). English language development for students learning an additional language is also grounded in oral language skill development and needs explicit instruction; by providing instruction in oral language development in a student’s native language, educators can build a foundation for literacy and a bridge for the student’s English literacy development (Beeman & Urow, 2013). For additional information, research, and best practices on oral language, alphabet knowledge, and phonological awareness refer to ELA Menu: Appendix A.

Mastery of early math concepts (number sense and counting) upon school entry is the strongest predictor of future academic success (Duncan, et al., 2007). Learning to make sense of mathematics early helps build future math proficiency. Students transitioning to kindergarten should have opportunities to make sense of math ideas including number concepts and quantities, number relationships and operations, geometry and spatial sense, patterns, and measurement and comparison. For more information on math progressions for early learners, refer to Learning Pathways in Numeracy. An important success factor, and an important tie-in to early literacy, is to get children to communicate their ideas and explain their thinking about mathematics in their natural language. By providing opportunities for students to share their thinking, educators can assess what concepts students understand, and they can identify gaps in students’ mathematical understanding.

Families, pre-kindergarten, and kindergarten programs can provide opportunities to develop social-emotional learning, language, literacy, and numeracy skills through play, songs, books, games, and other daily routines. For more information on social-emotional learning, early literacy, and early numeracy, please refer to the background and philosophy sections in the menus of best practices and strategies.
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Family Engagement

Family engagement is a promising practice. Family engagement involves two-way communication in which families and educators come together as equal partners to engage in decision-making processes. Family engagement supports academic and non-academic outcomes of students as they progress through early and adolescent developmental stages. All families engage in social activities to support the development of language, behavior, and communication. Such activities lay the foundation for social-emotional development in school and life.

Family engagement involves collaboration between families and schools towards increasing student success. Family engagement can occur during the regular school day (within the school building or outside of school), within families' homes, or within the community. LAP funding may support family engagement programs to improve the academic outcomes of participating students. The following menu entry provides a robust list of research-based practices and possibilities, including family engagement coordinators and modeling instructional strategies families can provide at home.

Practice Possibilities—Ideas to Consider When Planning

- Create a culturally responsive family leadership program and invite families to join the school-improvement planning process and committees. To ensure joint decision-making, ask families to make recommendations to support and promote family engagement practices.

- Provide a space within the school where families are welcome to convene before, during, and after school for the purpose of informal gatherings, ceremonial use, social-emotional learning programs, and various community-building activities.

- Build meaningful relations with families in their communities by holding meetings at community-based locations. Participate in and encourage family led conferences.

- Encourage families to volunteer at school events and to participate in new student/family welcoming committees. Experienced participants can mentor new participants, families can plan social events, and families can lead groups to provide translations around their languages and areas of expertise to help all families feel welcome at school.

- Establish a home visit program where educators engage families. Family preference should determine if visitations occur in the home or at another mutually agreeable location. Home visits present educators with opportunities to develop authentic and meaningful relationships with families.
• Provide educators with professional learning opportunities on the effective use of **funds of knowledge**. Funds of knowledge are the knowledge and skills a student learns from their family and cultural background. Apply this learning when designing school discipline policies, behavioral interventions, family engagement activities, and volunteer opportunities.

• Use technology to support positive ongoing communication with families. Take a photo with each student on the first day of school and share it with the family. Continue to send positive visual updates bi-weekly/monthly on students engaging in positive behaviors. Older students can share accomplishments electronically with their families.

**Demographic Considerations—Student Factors to Consider When Planning**

• Students without immediate family members in their lives, such as students experiencing homelessness or students in transitional situations, should be welcome to participate in family engagement activities and be encouraged to invite friends or other persons they consider family.

• Families who are learning English as an additional language benefit from personal invitations, translation services, and guided support.

• Families with adverse experiences in schools may require prolonged and intentional positive feedback from school staff before the family will engage in regular, meaningful communication with the school.

• Family engagement in schools starts to decrease as early as grade 3.

• Migratory families benefit from information about the school, community, and services their children can receive as they may be new to the area and unsure how to access resources.

• Students and families from American Indian/Alaska Native communities may benefit from Title VI—Indian Education funded support services.

• Students and families from American Indian/Alaska Native communities may benefit by participating in extra-curricular Tribally sponsored events like read-arounds, pow wows, culture nights, youth leadership programs, Tribal Journeys/canoe families, etc.

**Strategies for Implementation—Success Factors to Consider When Planning**

• Welcome all families. Create a family friendly school learning community that is inviting and authentic.

• Focus on getting to know students and families during home visits.

• Communicate positively about behavior with a belief that all students are developing at different rates and growing up within different cultural contexts. Promote a learning
environment in which mistakes are expected and used as learning opportunities and cultural differences are celebrated and respected.

- Consider ways to provide workshop and family night information to those who could not attend: podcasts, online videos, and other formats aligned with parent resources at home.

- Advertise events through multiple modalities: personal invitations in the family’s home language, emails, social media, phone messages, and postcards.

- Establish a positive relationship with families during the first few weeks of school by making phone calls and using authentic outreach efforts.

- Hire a family/community liaison to explicitly connect and communicate with families about the resources available within the community.

- Design support for families around behavioral skills, homework, student progress monitoring, and conversations about academic and non-academic supports.

- Communicate using the family’s home language when sharing information about events, expectations, and available resources and materials.

- Identify families where English is not the home language and provide interpreters at events to support these families.

- Design activities and games for students to take home and play with their families.

- Give families timely notice and schedule flexible meeting times to provide families with irregular working schedules more opportunities to participate.

Resources—Tools for Planning


- **National Network of Partnership Schools**: Dr. Joyce Epstein, Six Types of Involvement: Keys to Successful Partnerships and PTA National Standards for Family-School Partnerships Assessment

- **OSPI**: Family Engagement Resource List, WA State Title I, Part A website, Funds of Knowledge and Home Visits Toolkit

- **REL**: Toolkit of Resources for Engaging Families and the Community as Partners in Education Part 1, Part 2, Part 3, Part 4

- **National Association for the Education of Young Children**: Engaging Diverse Families Project
• Washington State Family and Community Engagement Trust.
• High Expectations

Supporting Research
Families can and do make a difference in the academic and social-emotional lives of students. School-based family engagement efforts can have a positive impact on K–12 student academic achievement (Jeynes, 2012). However, effective family engagement practices ultimately support improved student academic and non-academic outcomes (Caspe & Lopez, 2006). “When schools build partnerships with families that respond to their concerns and honor their contributions, they are successful in sustaining connections that are aimed at improving student achievement” (Henderson & Mapp, 2002, p. 8).

Family engagement strategies are built on the foundation that:

• All families have goals and dreams for their children.
• All families have the capacity to support a child’s literacy outcomes.
• All families and educators are equal partners.
• Educational leaders are responsible for engaging partnerships (Henderson, Mapp, Johnson, & Davies, 2007).

The Washington State Governor’s Office of the Education Ombuds (OEO) recommends developing and sustaining meaningful, culturally responsive school and family partnerships. The OEO Family and Community Engagement Recommendations (2016) highlights the importance of genuine, authentic relationships between diverse groups of families, educators, and community members to support student success in schools.

Family and community engagement strategies are more inclusive than involvement strategies. Consider the following (Mapp & Kutnner, 2013):

• Involvement means to include as a necessary condition. Involvement strategies tend to coincide with meeting requirements and lack a true partnership. Family and community involvement strategies often result in one-directional communication. This looks and feels like educators are passing on information to families.
• Engagement means to pledge or to make an agreement. Engagement strategies work to develop relationships and to build trust. Family and community engagement strategies ignite two-way communication and bring families and educators together as equal partners in the decision-making processes. This looks and feels like teamwork.

Communication with families is vital to promote collaboration between students’ home and school settings, and provides the direct benefit of increased student achievement. However, barriers can and do exist that limit effective communication with families. Schools need to
consider socio-economic conditions, cultural and linguistic factors, disability-related needs, and other family characteristics when strategizing how to overcome barriers to effective communication and collaboration with families (Cheatham & Santos, 2011; Drummond & Stipek, 2004; Tucker & Schwartz, 2013). Schools should make a considerable effort to promote collaboration by using multiple means of communication (Cheatham & Santos, 2011; Graham-Clay, 2005). Often families only receive communication from the school when their child has done something wrong. The perspectives of families with a history of negative interactions with the school can inform communications plans if their input is valued (Tucker & Schwartz, 2013). Effective two-way communication with families can be implemented in a variety of ways to strengthen collaboration between school and home.

It is important to have a well-organized family engagement plan around partnership with families (Epstein & Salinas, 2004). Family and community engagement can include a variety of activities and events. When planning family and community activities/events, it is important to include and invite families and community members in all aspects of planning and implementation stages (OEO, 2016). Joint decision-making and responsibility are key components to successful partnerships. When planning events, it is also important to have targeted learning goals and time for participants to practice and receive feedback on the desired outcomes. For example, the learning goal of a literacy event may be to provide families with shared reading strategies to support literacy at home. This event would be designed to provide strategies, examples of the strategy in use, and time for family and community participants to practice and receive feedback on implementing these strategies (Mapp & Kuttner, 2013).

Home visits can be beneficial for all students K-12, especially for newcomers to a district and for those transitioning into a new building (Johnson, 2016). These meetings can occur before the school year begins, and they can take place in the student’s home or at an agreed upon location in the community. As families and educators meet for the first time, these conversations should not be an overload of information based on expectations and rules. Instead, these meetings should be conversational and focused solely on the child. One question educators can ask families to start these conversations would be: “What are your hopes and dreams for your child?” It is important for families and educators to build a foundation of trust and respect.

One example of home visits could occur at the beginning of the school year when kindergarten teachers meet with families and early learning providers to talk about each child’s strengths and needs. The Washington Kindergarten Inventory of Developing Skills, or WaKIDS, brings families, educators, and early learning providers together to support each child’s learning and transition into public schools. These meetings are beneficial to students, families, and
educators and can take place in neutral locations. They can also increase student attendance and family participation in additional school activities and events (Mapp & Kuttner, 2013).

Family and community engagement includes all of the various ways families and communities effectively support a child’s learning and healthy development. Family members are a child’s first teachers, and literacy development begins at home. Engagement strategies should target multiple stages of a child’s literacy progression, and they should be consistent with, and inclusive of, a child’s home language and culture (Wessels & Trainin, 2014). A focus on *intergenerational family literacy*, working with the family rather than the child or the adult separately, provides the greatest impact. Effective programs might provide early childhood interventions, early parenting strategies, and increased adult literacy in addition to guidance for parents in the development of their child’s literacy skills (Wasik & Fierrmann, 2004). Family engagement strategies involving learning activities at home are more likely to have a positive effect on both student achievement and social-emotional development (Voorhis, Maier, Epstein, & Lloyd, 2013).

Well-designed family engagement programs “should be ongoing, culturally relevant, responsive to the community, and target both families and school staff” (O’Donnell & Kirkner, 2014). Using a student’s home language and providing families with strategies to support cognitive development that are explicit and culturally responsive empower families to take an active role in supporting their student’s literacy development (Wessels & Trainin, 2014). Family nights can also introduce parents to school and community resources, ways to provide homework help, and other ways to support the school curriculum at home, each of which can greatly benefit student achievement through family support (Blazer, 2011; St. Clair et al., 2012; Waldener, 2004; Wessels & Trainin, 2014).

It is important to establish family supports early to have a long-lasting effect on student achievement. For example, a family literacy program for migrant kindergarten families showed significant academic gains for students at the end of 1st grade, as well as at the end of 5th and 6th grades (St. Clair et al., 2012). This culturally sensitive program provided family workshops with an adult educator to support student literacy development at home. Additionally, families were provided with materials to support literacy learning at home: letter and word identification games, books, and electronic talking books. By teaching migrant families how to support their student’s language skills, schools can establish a positive collaborative effort with families that will result in increased language and literacy development at home (St. Clair et al., 2012).

As schools/districts review student outcome data, it is important to include families and community members that represent the diversity of the school. Team members should represent the demographic needs of all students. Data-informed decision-making and goal
setting improves when educators and community members work together. One suggestion is to have an action team for partnerships (Epstein & Salinas, 2004). An action team should consist of teachers, administrators, parents, and community partners, and be proactively connected to the school council or school improvement team. The focus of the partnership is to promote student success, develop the annual plans for family engagement, evaluate family engagement, and develop activities to include all families in the school community.
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School-Community Partnerships

School-community partnerships are formal working relationships between schools and outside organizations that are developed for the purpose of delivering academic or nonacademic supports to identified students. As a practice focusing on social-emotional outcomes, school-community partnerships may involve multiple partners and/or employ a range of strategies that align with the needs of the student population both when at school and within their local community.

Practice Possibilities—Ideas to Consider When Planning

- Provide service-learning opportunities through partnerships with local service groups such as youth centers, churches, the YMCA, Boys and Girls Clubs of America, etc. Service-learning goals can focus on social-awareness through caring acts while also promoting empathic behavior.

- Design project-based learning settings that encourage intercultural dialogue through applied skills development. School districts can build meaningful relations with local Tribes through service learning projects that encourage students to learn about how a Tribe’s resource management strategies reflect cultural values and practices.

- Improve early identification screening processes or other assessment tools for non-academic referrals through a university-based partnership. Your local university or community college may be able to provide technical assistance or even implement a community-based research project.

- Strengthen relations with your school district’s educational service district (ESD) by taking advantage of ESD coaching and administrative services. ESDs could provide transportation and budgeting assistance or data coaching during the implementation phase of any school-community partnership.

- Create a youth diversion program, with the assistance of local juvenile justice entities to address infractions at the school level as an alternative to direct court involvement.

- Establish a basic needs collaborative network to identify and match student needs with community providers. Student needs may include backpacks, winter clothing, school supplies, personal hygiene items, weekend meals, etc.

Demographic Considerations—Student Factors to Consider When Planning

- Students in frequent contact with the juvenile justice system could benefit from collaborative school-court partnerships to support preventative, remedial, and reintegration programs.

- American Indian/Alaska Native students may be affiliated (through shared ancestry or current family members) with a local Tribe without being an enrolled member of the
Tribe. When partnering with local Tribes, do not make assumptions about a student’s cultural ties or political status with a Tribe based on the student’s ethnic self-identification.

**Strategies for Implementation—Success Factors to Consider When Planning**

- Ensure service-learning opportunities align with the developmental stages of participating students.
- Working in small groups for community-based projects will have a greater impact on student learning than individualized or whole class projects.
- Establish effective communication and feedback loops, including data-sharing agreements or Memorandum of Understandings (MOU) to ensure compliance with all federal laws (such as FERPA or HIPPA) that may impact public entities.
- Develop meaningful relations between school district staff and Tribal leaders prior to collaborating on projects. Design projects to focus on common goals and relational understanding.
- Establish a resource mapping initiative to create and regularly update a map of community resources within the school’s local area.
- Design organizational and operational capacity-building mechanisms that can provide oversight, leadership, resource development, and ongoing support throughout all phases of a community partnership.

**Resources—Tools for Planning**

- Communities In Schools Washington
- Build Initiative
- Thrive Washington
- John Hopkins University: National Network of Partnership Schools
- The School-Justice Partnership Project

**Supporting Research**

A community partnership serves as a formal arrangement between a school or schools and entities outside of the school district in order to provide appropriate programs, services, or resources to help facilitate and support student achievement (Ohio Community Collaboration Model for School Improvement (OCCMSI), n.d.). School-community partnerships can enhance the social-emotional learning and intellectual development of students while also improving school climate and student behavior (Willems & Gonzalez-DeHass, 2012).
The intent of collaborative school-community partnerships should be to merge school resources with resources available within the larger community or local neighborhoods and provide services that are sustainable over time (Center for Mental Health in Schools at UCLA (CMHS-UCLA), n.d.). Community resources not only include the plethora of community organizations or agencies, but also include individual members of the community, local businesses, colleges or universities, religious and civic affiliations, parks and library programs, and other facilities that provide opportunities for students to participate in recreation or learning opportunities, or may receive enrichment or support services (CMHS-UCLA, n.d.). For example, an enrichment partnership with a university could focus on capacity-building efforts to improve the implementation and delivery of evidence-based programs for students (Spoth, Greenberg, Bierman, & Redmond, 2004). Many school-community partnerships are designed to place students into situated or problem-based learning contexts where they can engage in authentic real world activities with the community. The benefits of such activities can include improved critical thinking skills, greater ability to self-regulate, and increased self-motivation (Willems & Gonzalez-DeHass, 2012).

A service-learning partnership can present opportunities for students to make contributions to their communities based upon the identification of a community need, the generation of a plan to meet that need, implementation of the plan, and a celebration at the project’s completion (Kielsmeier, 2011). It is the reciprocal nature of service-learning, whereby all participants benefit from the project by sharing a learning experience and reflecting and constructing meaning from the experience, which sets it apart from community service (Billig, 2011). The social nature of service learning offers benefits to student learning, community engagement, and the creation of a positive learning environment (Nikitina, 2010). For example, by focusing on students’ positive assets and their contributions to the project, adult participants can take on a mentorship role and assist students in overcoming adversity (Nelson & Eckstein, 2008). A successful service-learning project should combine both academic and project objectives through a hands-on approach to master both social-emotional and academic skills (Billig, 2011). Project Based Learning (PBL) is a similar practice that allows students to acquire applied knowledge and skills in a relevant setting. In whatever form they take, direct experiential learning settings should facilitate the active engagement of students in the learning process.

Educational leadership should assume responsibility for engaging people in the collaborative process of determining and problem-solving the needs of the greater community (Potter & Rockinson-Szapkiw, 2012). School leaders should consider developing an action team to guide the development of partnership programming in a comprehensive way so as to integrate family and community involvement activities within a holistic action plan (Epstein, 2010). School-community partnerships can even begin to form through the deliberative process of identifying and selecting action team members. A diverse membership that includes parents, teachers, and
students representing different grade levels, community members, and other critical school staff will help ensure the action team adequately addresses the varied needs of all interested parties (Epstein, 2010). As student demographics become increasingly diverse, schools should be increasingly adept at reaching out to people, organizations, and agencies that reflect the varied ethnic and cultural aspects of their school and community. Outreach strategies familiar to the white, dominant culture may not be effective in communities of color, so schools should develop strategies for improving ethnic relations through culturally responsive parent and community engagement (MALDEF & NEA, 2010; Seattle Office for Civil Rights, 2012). Any community partnership initiative should provide comprehensive and integrated services that specifically focus on the unique needs of the student population in each locale.

When schools form partnerships within the community, they adopt a more integral and positive role within the community (CMHS-UCLA, n.d.). The CMHS-UCLA found that these collaborative partnerships positively impact academic achievement, increase staff morale, result in fewer discipline issues, and improve the use of school’s resources. In addition, the OCCMSI (n.d.) explained that schools are no longer solely responsible for improving students’ academic achievement and their social-emotional health development; all community stakeholders are responsible for assisting student academic and social-emotional growth. Given that students will become contributing members of society, and that the economic health and growth of the community will be reliant on the next generation, it is essential that individual and community groups assume responsibility for students’ growth and development and that educators appreciate the potential of these partnerships for facilitating student success (OCCMSI, n.d.).
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BACKGROUND, RESEARCH, AND IMPLEMENTATION FIDELITY

The behavior menu was created to guide schools and districts as they develop supports and services for students who have not yet met grade-level standards. It is critical to ensure best practices are used to design intensive intervention plans for students. These plans need to be implemented with fidelity because even proven practices, when poorly implemented, can fail to raise student educational outcomes.

Often, the word *fidelity* is viewed negatively; however, the LAP team encourages approaching fidelity in a similar manner as integrity or commitment. Implementation fidelity is about delivering an intervention as it was intended to be delivered according to the implementation team’s plan.

The panel of experts recognizes that there are a number of steps that must be taken to ensure that the practices within the menus are implemented with fidelity across the state. Using implementation science is optional. This information is provided as a resource for buildings and districts.

Active Versus Passive Implementation

New practices are implemented at the district/building level each year. Some are implemented with success, while others are not. All too often, promising innovations and practices are abandoned after just a year or two because the expected results were not actualized and the best practice was viewed as ineffective. But, was the *practice* ineffective or was *implementation* ineffective?

As schools/districts select practices from the menu, the implementation plan, and the degree to which the plan is delivered, is key to successfully achieving the desired student outcomes. Active implementation is the direct result of action-driven teams, purposeful planning, and systematic improvement cycles.

*Figure 4. Used with permission from the National Implementation Research Network.*
Figure 1 displays both passive and active implementation. When passive implementation occurs, it takes approximately 17 years to accomplish trivial results (14 percent). Whereas with active implementation, teams can move toward full implementation (with 80 percent effectiveness) in three years.

Implementation Science

Implementation science provides a framework to support the implementation of best practices in education. Implementation science values local conditions and context-specific issues with the assumption that one size will not fit all. Full implementation of best practices takes purposeful planning and time. Implementation science includes a systematic process to ensure full implementation is actualized. The frameworks include the what, how, and who to assist implementation teams with the process. The most effective implementation teams consist of decision makers and practitioners across the system to develop and review systematic improvement cycles.

The National Implementation Research Network (NIRN) focuses on active implementation. The Active Implementation Hub (AI Hub) is a free resource available to schools/districts who want to deepen their understanding of implementation science and the power of active implementation. Modules on the AI Hub provide an overview of active implementation and include implementation drivers, teams, stages, improvement cycles, usable interventions, and fidelity checklists.

Plan, Do, Study, Act

The Plan, Do, Study, Act approach in implementation and improvement science, and the Plan, Do, Check, Act approach in Lean organizations, are iterative improvement cycles that support active implementation. Iterative cycles are repetitive and use a trial-and-learning approach. In each cycle, implementation teams plan, provide the intervention, review the results, and identify areas for improvement. These teams review student outcomes and adult behaviors, specifically identifying if the intervention was delivered as intended by the plan; then, teams identify specific actions to improve the plan.

Figure 5. Used with permission from the National Implementation Research Network.
With each improvement cycle, implementation teams learn what went well and what needs to be adjusted to deliver the intervention more effectively in order to benefit student outcomes. Over the course of three active improvement cycles, the effectiveness of an intervention generally reaches 80 percent effectiveness.

Each phase of the Plan, Do, Study, Act cycle guides implementation teams:

- **Plan**—Implementation teams identify purpose, desired outcomes, and success criteria for implementation. Teams identify data and progress monitoring tools that will be used to measure the success of the intervention, who is responsible for collecting data, and when data will be collected and reviewed. Teams will identify challenges that may impact implementation (e.g., transportation, staffing, etc.) and specify how to move interventions forward.

- **Do**—Implementation teams execute the intended intervention plan. Educators complete intended outcomes according to the plan and collect data to ensure the intervention support was delivered.

- **Study**—Implementation teams reflect on the execution of the intended intervention plan. Teams review success criteria and outcomes. Reflective discussions include: what went well, what can be improved, and what unexpected barriers or surprises occurred.

- **Act**—Implementation teams apply learning to identify action steps to improve the process. Teams make targeted adjustments to the original plan to impact student outcomes. Implementation teams use these action steps to begin planning for the next cycle.

Improvement cycles vary in length. The improvement cycle may span across a single school year or for a specific amount of time (such as a quarter, trimester, or semester). Rapid improvement cycles generally range from 30–90 days. Implementation teams should discuss and determine which cycle is best to use with the intervention they are implementing.

**References**


District and Building Resources for Implementation

AI Hub is a web-based resource that has been developed and maintained by the State Implementation and Scaling-up of Evidence-based Practices Center (SISEP) and NIRN at The University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill’s Frank Porter Graham Child Development Institute. Implementation Science Modules & Lessons are available to assist implementation teams. The modules provide self-paced content, activities, and assessments that are designed to promote the knowledge and practice of implementation science and scaling-up, improving and expanding the impact of, best practices.

One tool within the AI Hub is the Hexagon Tool. The Hexagon Tool can help states, districts, and schools appropriately select evidence-based instructional, behavioral, and social-emotional interventions and prevention approaches by reviewing six broad factors in relation to the program or practice under consideration. NIRN developed the Hexagon Discussion and Analysis Tool for Implementation Teams to guide deeper discussions and address unique needs.

NIRN provides a glossary of terms for educators who are new to implementation science.
The Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching is grounded in improvement science and has several resources to accelerate learning and address problems of practice. Improvement science is a systematic learning-by-doing approach. The Carnegie Foundation highlights using Plan, Do, Study, Act for implementation and provides a variety of resources for facilitating improvements in education, including teacher effectiveness. Resources recommended by the panel of experts for optional use are the 90-day Cycle Handbook and the Six Core Principles of Improvement.

### The Six Core Principles of Improvement
Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Principles</th>
<th>Descriptions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Make the work problem-specific and user-centered.</td>
<td>Starting question: “What specifically is the problem we are trying to solve?”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Variation in performance is the core problem to address.</td>
<td>Focus on what works, for whom, and under what set of conditions.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. See the system that produces the current outcomes.</td>
<td>Explore and think about how local conditions shape work processes. Share your hypotheses for change with others to help clarify your goal.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. We cannot improve at scale what we cannot measure.</td>
<td>Include measures of key outcomes and processes to track if the implemented change is an improvement.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Anchor practice improvement in disciplined inquiry.</td>
<td>Try to use rapid cycles of Plan, Do, Study, Act (PDSA) to learn and improve quickly.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Accelerate improvements through networked communities.</td>
<td>Find other partners and share what you learn in order to be more productive.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The Carnegie Foundation provides a glossary of improvement science terms and network improvement communities.
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# APPENDIX C: LIST OF ACRONYMS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Acronym</th>
<th>Definition</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ABA</td>
<td>Applied Behavior Analysis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACE</td>
<td>Adverse Childhood Experience</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AI</td>
<td>Active Implementation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AVID</td>
<td>Advancement Via Individual Determination</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CASEL</td>
<td>Collaborative for Academic, Social, and Emotional Learning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CEDARS</td>
<td>Comprehensive Educational Data and Research System</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CISL</td>
<td>Center for the Improvement of Student Learning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CLD</td>
<td>Culturally and Linguistically Diverse</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CRDC</td>
<td>Civil Rights Data Collection</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DEL</td>
<td>Department of Early Learning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ED</td>
<td>U.S. Department of Education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ELA</td>
<td>English Language Arts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EOGOAC</td>
<td>Educational Opportunity Gap Oversight and Accountability Committee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ESD</td>
<td>Educational Service District</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ESSB</td>
<td>Engrossed Substitute Senate Bill</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FERPA</td>
<td>Family Educational Rights and Privacy Act</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GPA</td>
<td>Grade Point Average</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HIPPA</td>
<td>Health Insurance Portability and Accountability Act</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IDEA</td>
<td>Individuals with Disabilities Education Act</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acronym</td>
<td>Definition</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
<td>------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IEP</td>
<td>Individualized Education Plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ISS</td>
<td>Integrated Student Supports</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LAP</td>
<td>Learning Assistance Program</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LEP</td>
<td>Limited English Proficiency</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MTSS</td>
<td>Multi-Tiered System of Supports</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MOU</td>
<td>Memorandum of Understanding</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NIRN</td>
<td>National Implementation Research Network</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OSPI</td>
<td>Office of Superintendent of Public Instruction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PBIS</td>
<td>Positive Behavioral Interventions and Supports</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PBL</td>
<td>Problem Based Learning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PD</td>
<td>Professional Development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PDSA</td>
<td>Plan, Do, Study, Act</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PLC</td>
<td>Professional Learning Community</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PTA</td>
<td>Parent Teacher Association</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RCW</td>
<td>Revised Code of Washington</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RTI</td>
<td>Response to intervention</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RTL</td>
<td>Readiness to Learn</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SAMHSA</td>
<td>Substance Abuse and Mental Health Services Administration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SEL</td>
<td>Social-Emotional Learning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SRO</td>
<td>School Resource Officer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TPEP</td>
<td>Washington State Teacher/Principal Evaluation Project</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acronym</td>
<td>Definition</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WISSP</td>
<td>Washington Integrated Student Supports Protocol</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WSIPP</td>
<td>Washington State Institute for Public Policy</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Please make sure that permission has been received to use all elements of this publication (images, charts, text, etc.) that are not created by OSPI staff, grantees, or contractors. This permission should be displayed as an attribution statement in the manner specified by the copyright holder. It should be made clear that the element is one of the “except where otherwise noted” exceptions to the OSPI open license.

For additional information, please visit the OSPI Interactive Copyright and Licensing Guide.

OSPI provides equal access to all programs and services without discrimination based on sex, race, creed, religion, color, national origin, age, honorably discharged veteran or military status, sexual orientation including gender expression or identity, the presence of any sensory, mental, or physical disability, or the use of a trained dog guide or service animal by a person with a disability. Questions and complaints of alleged discrimination should be directed to the Equity and Civil Rights Director at 360-725-6162 or P.O. Box 47200 Olympia, WA 98504-7200.

Download this material in PDF at http://www.k12.wa.us/SSEO/BehaviorMenu.aspx. This material is available in alternative format upon request. Contact the Resource Center at 888-595-3276, TTY 360-664-3631. Please refer to this document number for quicker service: 18-0019.