



CHILDREN'S POLICY *and* LAW INITIATIVE *of* INDIANA



*Leaders Collaborating to Advance Positive
School Discipline in Indiana*

Summit Report & Recommendations

JUNE 30, 2016

Introduction

A crisis is happening in Indiana learning environments with a dramatic impact on the achievement of our children and the success of the workforce in our state. Due to exclusionary discipline practices, including suspension and expulsion for attendance related matters, 87,000 Indiana Students lost a total of 751,366 instructional days during the 2012-2013 school year (Indiana Suspension/Expulsion Report, 2014). Zero-tolerance practices are creating young adults who are uneducated and unemployable and feeding the school-to-prison pipeline at an alarming rate. In December 2015, a five-year estimate was released by the U.S. Census Bureau revealing that 21.53% or 119,075 young people between the ages 18 to 24 in Indiana, were without a diploma or high school equivalency (U.S. Census Bureau, 2015). If left unaddressed an entire generation of the Indiana workforce will be lost.

The Children’s Policy and Law Initiative of Indiana (CPLI) convened over 90 educators, best practice experts, public policy officials, and key stakeholders in the *Leaders Collaborating to Advance Positive School Discipline Summit* (“Summit”) in Indianapolis on October 6, 2015. The ensuing report and recommendations are the result of facilitated dialog among summit participants to identify strategies and techniques that contribute to positive school learning environments. The recommendations benefit from growing national momentum toward achieving positive school learning environments for all children. There are nine recommendations:

Recommendation 1: *Engage student and family to work as a team to ensure child’s behavioral, emotional, and academic needs are met.*

Recommendation 2: *Build an inclusive process and shared vision for positive school discipline reform.*

Recommendation 3: *Use disaggregated data to understand practices, devise solutions, and measure progress for improving the academic outcomes for all students.*

Recommendation 4: *Implement evidenced-based best practices for achieving student engagement and positive learning environments.*

Recommendation 5: *Provide resources and promote collaborations that support positive learning environments.*

Recommendation 6: *Provide regular training and professional development opportunities to advance positive school discipline and collaboration.*

Recommendation 7: *Train on implicit bias and culturally-responsive practices, and support best practice responses.*

Recommendation 8: *Integrate school law enforcement into the education team as a valued contributor to the positive learning environment.*

Recommendation 9: *Engender state support and legislative change to advance positive school discipline consistently throughout all Indiana schools.*

This report and recommendations support a call by summit participants for systemic or transformative change in school policy and culture across the state—toward culturally-responsive policies and practices that align with the developmental, emotional, behavioral, and academic needs of the “whole” child, and *for all children*.

A Shifting Landscape Away from Zero Tolerance

During the 2012-2013 school year, almost 1 in 10 Indiana students were suspended or expelled, while African American students were disproportionately suspended or expelled at a rate of more than 1 in every 5 students (Skiba, Chung, & Arredondo, 2015). There is no evidence that African American students have higher rates of disruption or violence to support these higher rates of exclusionary discipline (Staats, 2016). Rather, data suggests African American students are punished more severely for offenses more subjective in nature than white students. High rates of exclusion result in poor learning environments, lost instructional time, student disengagement, academic failure, and increased risk of delinquency and juvenile justice involvement. This data coincides with a growing concern across the nation about how educational disciplinary practices are increasing the criminalization of children, and contributing to the school-to-prison pipeline (USDOJ, 2014). A student is nearly 3 times more likely to come in contact with the juvenile justice system within a year of being suspended or expelled (Fabelo, Thompson, Plotkin, Carmichael, Marchbanks, & Booth, 2011). African American students are 3.23 times more likely and Hispanic students are 1.14 times more likely to be referred to juvenile court than white students (Garcia, Jarjoura, & Lisby, 2012). African American students are also charged and incarcerated more than their white peers engaged in similar conduct (Staats, 2016). This data indicates the need for systemic change in school culture that emphasizes positive school discipline and minimizes exclusionary practices for managing student behavior.

Understanding the importance of systemic change requires examining the role zero tolerance policies have played in the educational system. Zero tolerance practices were introduced in the 1990s to address gun violations (Gun Free Schools Act of 1994), and later were extended to drug enforcement and other school violations (American Psychological Association Zero Tolerance Task Force, 2008). Zero tolerance is not specifically defined but is characterized by severe punishment with predetermined consequences that disregard situational context and mitigating circumstances.

Zero tolerance policies rely on exclusionary practices that remove students from the classroom. In theory, the learning environment improves because of the student's absence, and such punishments act to deter other students from also engaging in disruptive behaviors. While the public perception of such zero tolerance practices is that they improve school safety, there has been no statistical reduction in school violence rates since the implementation of zero tolerance policies.

A similar perception exists related to the presence of school law enforcement. While public policy officials have supported the introduction of law enforcement in schools with the idea that it makes schools safer, too often law enforcement is used as a substitute for effective discipline policies. The literature demonstrates the disparate impact that zero tolerance policies, exclusionary practices, and school-based arrests have had on students of color, students with disabilities and other vulnerable student groups (American Psychological Association Zero Tolerance Task Force, 2008). Over the last decade, studies have confirmed the negative impact of school zero tolerance disciplinary practices on the academic achievement of the nation's children (APA, 2008; Fabelo et al., 2011). In 2014, the National Leadership Summit on School Discipline and Climate convened 22 statewide teams to develop and implement strategies for reforming suspension and expulsion practices in their respective states (Skiba et al., 2015). Similarly, in 2015, the Indiana Commission on the Status of Children charged its Education Task Force, through the creation of the Subcommittee on School Discipline and Climate, to work on developing recommendations for this state (Skiba et al., 2015).

The Juvenile Detention Alternatives Initiative (JDAI), a nationally recognized evidence-based program supported by the Annie E. Casey Foundation, is a state-wide initiative, currently being implemented in 32 counties in Indiana. This reform initiative is widely supported by public officials—with the Indiana Supreme Court, the Governor's Office, and multiple state agencies—Department of Correction, Department of Child Services, the Division of Mental Health and Addiction, and the Indiana Criminal Justice Institute—serving as lead agencies. In Marion

County alone, JDAI has reduced secure detention by 67% and referrals to juvenile court by 47%, and organizers have the stated intention of expanding the program to every county in the state. Across the state, JDAI has been an important catalyst for engaging educators and other key stakeholders in reform efforts that create alternatives to exclusionary discipline, school-based arrest and juvenile court referral.

Additionally, House Enrolled Act 1635 (2015) expanded the authorization for school safety grants for school-wide programs that improve school climate; and required the Indiana Department of Education (IDOE) to provide guidelines for universities for pre-service teacher training on culturally-responsive classroom management strategies. Schools across the state are seeking strategies to reduce the number of children excluded from school, and are in various stages of implementing best practice programs, such as Positive Behavioral Interventions and Supports (PBIS)—a program which is now underway in 18 school districts and more than 100 schools in Indiana (PBIS Indiana, 2015).

An Overview of Essential Programs and Strategies to Move Toward a Best Practice Framework for Advancing Positive School Discipline

Indiana schools are staffed by talented and dedicated school personnel whose single interaction may have a life-changing impact on the life of a child and improve the overall learning environment. However, in order to foster positive school discipline practices, school systems across the state could benefit from access to sustainable funding sources for culturally-responsive, multi-tiered systems of support (MTSS) that incorporate trauma-informed care and restorative justice principles. Additionally, federal, state and local funding sources are needed to provide time away from the classroom and opportunities for school personnel to receive professional development, training and technical assistance that facilitate the implementation of culturally-responsive practices in engaging students and supporting pro-social

behaviors. Below is a brief explanation of the best practice strategies discussed by summit participants and now embodied by the 9 recommendations that follow.

MTSS is an effective method to implement integrated approaches that consistently and comprehensively promote behavior supports for students and families with complex needs (National Association of School Psychologists, 2015). To successfully effect change, these interventions must be engaged collectively and systemically forming a continuum of supports, fully integrated—at a policy, operational and strategic level (UCLA Mental Health in Schools Center, 2016).

One rapidly growing trend nation-wide is to use Response-to-Intervention (RTI) and Positive Behavioral Intervention Strategies (PBIS) as the cornerstone of MTSS implementation (National Association of School Psychologists, 2015). PBIS is characterized by proactive prevention strategies that focus on desired behaviors rather than undesired behaviors (PBIS Indiana, 2015). PBIS addresses student behavior on a continuum, using a three-tiered approach to implementation to most effectively leverage teachers' limited resources. Tier 1 begins with universally teaching and reinforcing appropriate social behavior in the classroom. Recognizing that some students need additional support, Tier 2 uses efficient and prompt responses in small groups for students identified as high risk. Tier 3 is designed for students who need the most intensive assistance and intervention. Because PBIS focuses on reinforcing positive behavior, teachers, administrators, school personnel and families work together to create a network of support (PBIS Indiana, 2015).

Educational interventions that are culturally-responsive identify groups of students with poor educational outcomes through disaggregated data (PBIS Indiana, 2015). In practice, culturally-responsive approaches look at the community and develop a congruent system of behaviors, attitudes, and policies to improve the learning environment for all students of that community.

Trauma-informed care recognizes the negative effects of trauma on students' learning, behavior, and ability to form and maintain relationships (Cole,

Eisner, Gregory, & Ristuccia, 2013). More than 50% of 17,000 adults surveyed by Adverse Childhood Experiences (ACE) reported experiencing some form of childhood adversity, such as experiencing physical, emotional, or sexual abuse; witnessing violence against a parent; and living with a parent who spent time in prison, or who has mental health or substance abuse issues (Cole et al., 2013). Trauma-informed practices use holistic techniques to address a student's needs. In trauma-sensitive schools, all school personnel invest and share the responsibility of making the student feel safe and supported physically, socially, emotionally, and academically. All school personnel receive training in how to recognize signs of trauma and how to help students develop and practice effective coping skills (Cole et al., 2013).

Restorative practices forge relationships and foster a sense of community around conflict prevention and resolution through reinforcing accountability ("Resources on Positive School Discipline," 2016). Meaningful relationships with students are necessary before commencing restorative approaches to resolving conflict. Restorative practices empower individuals harmed by inviting them into the process by asking them what they need to resolve the conflict or issue at hand. Whereas a traditional system relies on consequences and punishment, a restorative approach attempts to better understand the causes of the infraction and maintain and restore community.

Implicit bias may influence how an educator perceives behavior and thus employs consequences to address the behavior. Implicit bias occurs when attitudes that affect a person's understanding, actions, and decisions remain in an unconscious state. Implicit biases create invisible barriers to the opportunity and achievement of some students--especially students who are already most at-risk. Similar patterns emerge from data related to students with disabilities, and rates are particularly high for students with emotional and behavioral disabilities (Staats, 2016). These high rates of suspensions and expulsions cause a considerable loss to the instruction time students receive in the school year and increase truancy, juvenile crime, and juvenile detention rates in communities (American Psychological Association Zero Tolerance Task Force, 2008). Teachers and other

school personnel may mitigate the effects of implicit bias by becoming aware of their biases through professional development and training. By creating an environment where teachers have the resources and space to reflect before making disciplinary decisions, the effect of implicit bias may also be mitigated (Gregory et al., 2014).

Resources:

- American Psychological Association Zero Tolerance Task Force. (2008). Are zero tolerance policies effective in the schools? An evidentiary review and recommendations. *American Psychologist*, 63(9), 852-862.
- Fabelo, T. Thompson, M., Plotkin, M., Carmichael, D., Marchbanks, M., & Booth, E. (2011). Breaking schools' rules: A statewide study of how school discipline relates to students success and juvenile justice involvement. Council on State Governments Justice Center https://csgjusticecenter.org/wp-content/uploads/2012/08/Breaking_Schools_Rules_Report_Final.pdf.
- Garcia, C., Jarjoura, R. & Lisby, K. (2012). Identifying Disproportionate Minority Contact in Indiana—Final Report. Submitted to the Indiana Criminal Justice Institute.
- Gregory, A., Bell, J., & Pollock, M. (2014). How educators can eradicate disparities in school discipline: A briefing paper on school-based interventions. *Discipline Disparities: A Research-to-Practice Collaborative*.
- Cole, S. F., Eisner, A., Gregory, M., & Ristuccia, J. (2013). Creating and advocating for trauma-sensitive schools. *Trauma and Policy Initiative*. www.traumasensitiveschools.org
- Losen, D. (2010). *Closing the school discipline gap: Equitable remedies for excessive exclusion*. New York: Teachers College Press.
- National Association of School Psychologists. (2015). *A Framework for Safe and Successful Schools*. https://www.nasponline.org/Documents/Research%20and%20Policy/Advocacy%20Resources/Framework_for_Safe_and_Successful_School_Environments.pdf
- PBIS Indiana: Culturally Responsive Practice. <http://www.indiana.edu/~crpbisin/2013/05/20/culturally-responsive-practice/>
- Resources on Positive School Discipline. (2016) *American Educator*, 39(4), 39.
- Staats, C. (2016). Understanding implicit bias: What educators should know. *American Educator*, 39(4), 29-34.
- Skiba, R., Choong-Geun, C., Arredondo, M. (2015). *Suspensions and expulsions in Indiana: A status report*. The Equity Project at Indiana University, Center for Evaluation and Education Policy.

Recommendations

The *Leaders Collaborating to Advance Positive School Discipline* Summit convened best practice experts and key stakeholders from diverse disciplines, universities, and professions to recommend research-based practices, strategies, and resources for developing competencies among educators and school officials (see Appendix for full list of participants). Participants were also asked to propose policy changes and identify accessible training opportunities needed to achieve consistent implementation of positive school discipline practices across the state. National Civil Rights Attorney Matthew Cregor and IU Equity Project Director Russell Skiba facilitated the day with a mix of presentations and roundtables. Participants were divided into teams for roundtable discussions, and the dialog was captured by a member of the team designated as the scribe.

The captured dialog was analyzed and themes emerged. The outcome is a set of empirically supported recommendations anchored in current research on positive school discipline best practices. Each recommendation is supported by a set of strategies rooted in best practices, and intended to foster policy changes at the school, local, and state level. The recommendations and strategies have been distributed to Summit participants and a broader group of stakeholders for extensive comment. Their feedback has been incorporated to bolster the impact of this report on transforming Indiana students' learning environments.

Participants recognized the importance of teachers, administrators, and school personnel as champions for these changes, and as a result the recommendations are written to emphasize the importance of these groups. The recommendations include strategies ranging from changes to school codes of conduct towards an overall societal shift away from zero tolerance practices to multi-tiered behavioral supports in culturally-responsive, trauma-informed learning environments that use restorative practices and principles. Policy reforms must be fully integrated in the school culture, driving effective implementation of unified and comprehensive interventions and supports, which are fully aligned with community-based care and

supports. Resources at the school, district and state level should reflect the priority commitment to implementation, ongoing development, replication and sustainability.

Recommendation 1

Engage Student and Family to Work as A Team to Ensure Child's Behavioral, Emotional and Academic Needs are Met

School cultures are focused on forming relationships and working with the whole child through holistic approaches that engage students as individuals – including partnering with their families to create learning environments where students feel respected, supported, and encouraged.

Strategy 1: School personnel view each child as an individual, and they work together to address each student's unique needs in holistic ways, involving parents as full partners in the well-being and academic success of their child at school. By focusing on relationship building, school personnel create an environment where students feel respected, supported, and encouraged. This environment attends to a student's network of relationships, academic competence, self-regulation, and physical and emotional well-being. Instructional aides and student service personnel are available to assist with teaching students self-regulation and emotional management techniques. School personnel embrace a sense of teamwork and shared responsibility to provide trauma-informed care to every student.

Strategy 2: Families are engaged in the school environment and are welcomed into the school community. Open communication is established between parents and teachers, including regular communication on student progress. The first contact home to a family is a positive one. Schools provide parent education nights or other opportunities to assist families in building the knowledge and skills to best navigate their student's academic pathway. Partnering with families includes sharing insight as to how to implement behavior practices that are being utilized at school into the home environment.

Resources:

A Framework for Safe and Successful Schools
https://www.nasponline.org/Documents/Research%20and%20Policy/Advocacy%20Resources/Framework_for_Safe_and_Successful_School_Environments.pdf

Cole, S. F., et al., (2005). Helping traumatized children learn: Supportive school environments for children traumatized by family violence. Boston: Massachusetts Advocates for Children Trauma and Learning Policy Initiative. <http://traumasensitiveschools.org/tlpi-publications/>

Cole, S. F., Eisner, A., Gregory, M., & Ristuccia, J. (2013). Creating and advocating for trauma-sensitive schools. Trauma and Policy Initiative. www.traumasensitiveschools.org

Cozolino, L. (2013). The social neuroscience of education: Optimizing attachment and learning in the classroom. New York: W.W. Norton & Company.

Desautels, L. & McKnight, M. (2016). Unwritten: The story of a living system. Deadwood, Oregon: Wyatt-MacKenzie.
Redford, J. (2015) *Paper Tigers*. United States: KPJR Films.

Recommendation 2

Build an Inclusive Process and Shared Vision for Positive School Discipline Reform

All school districts and schools have multidisciplinary teams that champion inclusive processes with stakeholder involvement to build a shared vision within the school community and cultivate an ongoing commitment to creating positive learning environments.

Strategy 1: School district policies are informed by ground-up examination at the individual school level, which helps drive district-wide practice reform. Each school district creates an inclusive approach to investigating best practices for behavior support and reviewing existing codes of conduct and disciplinary policies. This decision-making process involves all stakeholders in the school community, including teachers, administrators, school social workers, counselors, school law enforcement, students, parents, and youth-serving community partners.

Strategy 2: Simple lists of behaviors that lead to suspension and expulsion should be replaced by district and school codes of conduct that envision comprehensive plans for creating positive school climates. Principals are charged with becoming champions of change within their school buildings, and forming multidisciplinary teams that reflect shared vision and ground-up examination of

practices and procedures to eliminate zero tolerance discipline philosophies within their schools. Schools and districts clearly define professional roles of school law enforcement—setting clear boundaries for use of police powers--and integrating these professionals into the education team whose mission is to create positive learning environments. By having more varied and extensive prevention and positive supports available, these revised codes and role changes encourage teachers to implement strategies for supporting positive student behavior in the classroom.

Strategy 3: School leadership and community stakeholders strive to shift the cultural orientation from punishment-based discipline to developmentally-appropriate responses that support the decriminalization of youth. Responses to student behavior are shaped by trauma-informed care and restorative practices. Culturally-responsive, relationship-based discipline approaches are grounded in the emerging research in neuroscience on behavior and learning. School communities, including students, school personnel, and families are aware of the research that informs the application of best practices in their students' learning environments.

Resources:

A Framework for Safe and Successful Schools
https://www.nasponline.org/Documents/Research%20and%20Policy/Advocacy%20Resources/Framework_for_Safe_and_Successful_School_Environments.pdf

Cole, S. F., Eisner, A., Gregory, M., & Ristuccia, J. (2013). Creating and advocating for trauma-sensitive schools. Trauma and Policy Initiative. www.traumasensitiveschools.org

Cole, S. F., et al., (2005). Helping traumatized children learn: Supportive school environments for children traumatized by family violence. Boston: Massachusetts Advocates for Children Trauma and Learning Policy Initiative. <http://traumasensitiveschools.org/tlpi-publications/>

Equity Project at Indiana University:
<http://www.indiana.edu/~equity/>

Great Lakes Equity Center: <http://www.greatlakeequity.org/>

HEA 1635 <http://iga.in.gov/static-documents/7/f/0/3/7f03a9eb/HB1635.05.ENRH.pdf>

PBIS Indiana: Culturally Responsive Positive Behaviors and Interventions and Supports (CR-PBIS) <http://www.indiana.edu/~crpbisin/>

Skiba, R., Choong-Geun, C., Arredondo, M. (2015). Suspensions and expulsions in Indiana: A status report. The Equity Project at Indiana University, Center for Evaluation and Education Policy.

Thorius, K., Rodriguez, E., & Bal, A. (2013). Re-mediating the role of school-family partnerships in systemic change within Culturally Responsive Positive Behavioral Interventions and Supports. Madison,

Recommendation 3

Use Disaggregated Data to Understand Practices, Devise Solutions, and Measure Progress for Improving the Academic Outcomes for All Students

Disaggregated data across student categories helps inform and reform policies and practices, and instills accountability. Data at the state level is collected and shared to assist reform at the local level and support broader policy changes at the state level.

Strategy 1: Disaggregated data is used by school districts to analyze the disproportionality in exclusionary discipline across student categories and expose practices that need to be changed to become culturally-responsive. Continual monitoring helps inform changes in practices to ensure equitable outcomes for all students. Regularly collected data is made publicly available to ensure transparency, instill accountability, and cultivate trust among multiple stakeholders.

Strategy 2: The state analyzes statewide data to discern discipline patterns occurring in specific school districts, and makes data publicly available. Disaggregated data reflects multiple measures and variables collected from schools across different student categories. Technical assistance is available from the state to support disciplinary changes in school districts.

Strategy 3: The school community is made aware of the implications of disproportionate exclusionary discipline within each school and district, and opportunities exist for the school community to advocate for culturally-responsive practices.

Resources:

Equity Project at Indiana University:
<http://www.indiana.edu/~equity/>
Fabelo, T. et al., (2011). Breaking schools' rules: A statewide study of how school discipline relates to students success and juvenile justice involvement. Council on State Governments Justice Center
https://csgjusticecenter.org/wp-content/uploads/2012/08/Breaking_Schools_Rules_Report_Final.pdf

Recommendation 4

Implement Evidenced-Based, Best Practices for Achieving Student Engagement and Positive Learning Environments

All schools enlist the positive school discipline framework, creating culturally-responsive, multi-tiered behavioral *and learning* supports in trauma-informed learning environments using restorative practices and principles. Alternatives to suspension, expulsion and school-based arrest are used, with an emphasis on strategies that support students staying in the classroom and not losing instructional time.

Strategy 1: Administrators support teachers by creating time for reflection and training related to implicit bias. All school personnel are trained in trauma-informed care and restorative practices, and work together to create an integrated system of care to support individual students. Practices are focused on prevention, culturally-responsive interventions, access to care, restorative principles, and alternatives to suspension, expulsion and school-based arrest.

Strategy 2: School personnel educate and engage with students, families, and the community about best practice methods to create a culture shift towards positive learning environments. Communities advocate for legislative initiatives that promote positive school discipline principles.

Strategy 3: Legislative and state policy changes focus on aligning discipline codes of conduct, school accountability, teacher education and training, and school law enforcement training and requirements, with positive school discipline principles.

Resources:

Cole, S. F., Eisner, A., Gregory, M., & Ristuccia, J. (2013). *Creating and advocating for trauma-sensitive schools*. Trauma and Policy Initiative. www.traumasensitiveschools.org

PBIS Indiana: Culturally Responsive Practice.
<http://www.indiana.edu/~crpbisin/2013/05/20/culturally-responsive-practice/>

Resources on Positive School Discipline. (2016) *American Educator*, 39(4), 39.

Staats, C. (2016). Understanding implicit bias: What educators should know. *American Educator*, 39(4), 29-34.

Recommendation 5

Provide Resources and Promote Collaborations that Support Positive Learning Environments

Schools have the resources they need to support reforms and partnerships to create positive learning environments--including funding, adequate staffing of student services personnel, technical assistance with data collection and implementation of best practices, professional development opportunities, and access to community resources and partnerships. Through a multidisciplinary, collaborative approach, schools integrate comprehensive and cohesive learning supports.

Strategy 1: State technical assistance is available to schools to build capacity to collect disaggregated school discipline data, and implement reforms to address disproportionality or excessive exclusionary practices. As best practices are implemented, data is continually accessible to schools in order to inform ongoing use of best practice interventions.

Strategy 2: The state and local funding provided to school administrators ensures access to adequate and sustainable funding sources for comprehensive student services staffing configurations. School districts hire certified, licensed, and master's level student service professionals as outlined in Article 4 (511 IAC 4-1.5), which include school counselors, school social workers, and school psychologists. These student service professionals are school employees and are incorporated into the multidisciplinary education team. Additional incentives are offered by state and local decision-makers to reinforce and reward schools and individuals who promote trauma-informed care to create positive learning environments.

Strategy 3: School districts improve access to school-based mental health services through

adequate staffing levels of school-employed mental and behavioral health professionals. School personnel are trained to infuse prevention and intervention services into the learning process and to help integrate services provided by community partners. Mental health resources exist in the community to supplement school-based mental health services and support referrals coming from school personnel.

Strategy 4: School districts and community partners collaborate to assist vulnerable students through local System of Care (SOC) networks to minimize academic disruptions and referrals to the juvenile justice system. School districts and schools engage in other local child-centered initiatives such as JDAI, Crisis Intervention Training (CIT) for Youth, etc., and encourage partnerships with mental health, probation, juvenile justice, and social services agencies, as well as the business community, in the provision of services to youth. Particular concern is given to students presenting complex cognitive, social-emotional, and/or health needs, as well as those exposed to environmental challenges, such as poverty and homelessness.

Strategy 5: Community stakeholders continue to seek more reasonable workloads for teachers and school administrators, reduced class sizes, and training and professional development around trauma-informed care. Community stakeholders help promote the value of education, highlighting how investing in prevention and education not only preserves lives and communities but saves taxpayer dollars by reducing costs of juvenile detention and incarceration.

Resources:

Article 4, 511 IAC 4-1.5, "Student Services Rule",
<http://www.doe.in.gov/student-services>

A Framework for Safe and Successful Schools
https://www.nasponline.org/Documents/Research%20and%20Policy/Advocacy%20Resources/Framework_for_Safe_and_Successful_School_Environments.pdf

American School Counselor Association:
<http://www.schoolcounselor.org/asca/media/asca/home/rolestatement.pdf>

Cole, S. F., Eisner, A., Gregory, M., & Ristuccia, J. (2013). Creating and advocating for trauma-sensitive schools. Trauma and Policy Initiative. www.traumasensitiveschools.org

Cole, S. F., et al., (2005). Helping traumatized children learn: Supportive school environments for children traumatized by family violence. Boston: Massachusetts Advocates for Children Trauma and

Learning Policy Initiative. <http://traumasensitiveschools.org/tlpi-publications/>

Equity Project at Indiana University:
<http://www.indiana.edu/~equity/>

Great Lakes Equity Center: <http://www.greatlakesequity.org/>

HEA 1635 <http://iga.in.gov/static-documents/7/f/0/3/7f03a9eb/HB1635.05.ENRH.pdf>

Indiana Association of School Psychologists:
<http://www.iasponline.org/>

Indiana School Social Work Association: www.insswa.org

National Association of School Psychologists:
https://www.nasponline.org/Documents/Standards%20and%20Certification/Standards/V41N3_AframeworkforthePersonnelEvaluation.pdf

PBIS Indiana: Culturally Responsive Positive Behaviors and Interventions and Supports (CR-PBIS) <http://www.indiana.edu/~crpbisin/>

School Social Work Association of America:
<http://www.sswaa.org/?page=459>

Skiba, R., Choong-Geun, C., Arredondo, M. (2015). Suspensions and expulsions in Indiana: A status report. The Equity Project at Indiana University, Center for Evaluation and Education Policy.

Recommendation 6

Provide Regular Training and Professional Development Opportunities to Advance Positive School Discipline and Collaboration

Training and professional development on multi-tiered behavioral supports, culturally-responsive practice, trauma-informed learning environments and restorative practice are provided to all levels of school systems – staff, faculty, and administrators.

Strategy 1: Training and professional development should align with the changes to codes of conduct and a cultural shift towards the use of multi-tiered behavioral supports, trauma-informed care and restorative practices. Training and professional development should promote interdisciplinary teams where every member of school personnel is a valued member. School administrators demonstrate support for teacher collaboration, mentoring, and professional development by allocating the time and resources teachers need to carry out strategies that support community learning initiatives.

Strategy 2: Training and professional development on positive school discipline are extended to all school personnel on a recurring basis.

Strategy 3: Each school district creates professional development centers and support groups for stakeholders, students, family members, and community members. These efforts engage the community members as partners in the process, thereby fostering a spirit of collaboration and ownership in promoting positive school climates.

Resources:

Ashley, D. M. (2016). It's about relationships: Creating positive school climates. *American Educator*, 39(4). www.aft.org/ae

Cole, S. F., Eisner, A., Gregory, M., & Ristuccia, J. (2013). Creating and advocating for trauma-sensitive schools. Trauma and Policy Initiative. www.traumasensitiveschools.org

Desautels, L. & McKnight, M. (2016). *Unwritten: The story of a living system*. Deadwood, Oregon: Wyatt-MacKenzie. Equity Project at Indiana University:
<http://www.indiana.edu/~equity/>

Great Lakes Equity Center: <http://www.greatlakesequity.org/>

HEA 1635 <http://iga.in.gov/static-documents/7/f/0/3/7f03a9eb/HB1635.05.ENRH.pdf>

PBIS Indiana: Culturally Responsive Positive Behaviors and Interventions and Supports (CR-PBIS) <http://www.indiana.edu/~crpbisin/>

Skiba, R. & Losen, D. J. (2016). From reaction to prevention: Turning the page on school discipline. *American Educator*, 39(4). www.aft.org/ae

Recommendation 7

Train on Implicit Bias and Culturally-Responsive Practices, and Support Best Practice Responses

School districts educate school personnel on how implicit bias and disproportionality impact vulnerable groups of students, and support alternative responses.

Strategy 1: Schools provide all incoming personnel with disaggregated data, and train on implicit bias, culturally-responsive practices, and self-reflection. Schools provide time and safe reflective opportunities for school personnel to assess personal beliefs about behaviors and to analyze how personal experiences have shaped their responses to student behavior.

Strategy 2: Administrators demonstrate support for best practice responses by creating time and ensuring that resources are available for teachers to reflect on disciplinary situations and seek mentoring and peer support through interdisciplinary teams.

Strategy 3: The Department of Education creates and issues guidelines for use by accredited teacher education institutions and departments in preparing individuals to teach and successfully apply positive classroom behavioral management strategies and research based alternatives to exclusionary discipline in a manner that serves the diverse learning needs of all students. Education institutions apply these guidelines in the development of courses and methods that assist individuals in developing competencies in culturally-responsive practice and effective classroom management strategies. (Ind. Code § 20-28-3-3, 2015).

Resources:

A Framework for Safe and Successful Schools
https://www.nasponline.org/Documents/Research%20and%20Policy/Advocacy%20Resources/Framework_for_Safe_and_Successful_School_Environments.pdf

Ashley, D. M. (2016). It's about relationships: Creating positive school climates. *American Educator*, 39(4). www.aft.org/ae

Cole, S. F., et al., (2005). Helping traumatized children learn: Supportive school environments for children traumatized by family violence. Boston: Massachusetts Advocates for Children Trauma and Learning Policy Initiative. <http://traumasensitiveschools.org/tlpi-publications/>

Cole, S. F., Eisner, A., Gregory, M., & Ristuccia, J. (2013). Creating and advocating for trauma-sensitive schools. Trauma and Policy Initiative. www.traumasensitiveschools.org

Equity Project at Indiana University:
<http://www.indiana.edu/~equity/>

Great Lakes Equity Center: <http://www.greatlakesequity.org/>

HEA 1635 <http://iga.in.gov/static-documents/7/f/0/3/7f03a9eb/HB1635.05.ENRH.pdf>

Ind. Code § 20-28-3-3. (2015). *An act to amend the Indiana Code concerning education*. Indiana (State). Legislature. Assembly. 2014-2015. House Enrolled Act No. 1635.

Project Implicit: Implicit Association Test (IAT)
<http://implicit.harvard.edu>

PBIS Indiana: Culturally Responsive Positive Behaviors and Interventions and Supports (CR-PBIS) <http://www.indiana.edu/~crpbisin/>

Skiba, R., Choong-Geun, C., Arredondo, M. (2015). Suspensions and expulsions in Indiana: A status report. The Equity Project at Indiana University, Center for Evaluation and Education Policy.

Skiba, R. & Losen, D. J. (2016). From reaction to prevention: Turning the page on school discipline. *American Educator*, 39(4). www.aft.org/ae

Staats, C. (2016). Understanding implicit bias: What educators should know. *American Educator*, 39(4). www.aft.org/ae

Recommendation 8

Integrate School Law Enforcement into the Education Team as a Valued Contributor to the Positive Learning Environment

School law enforcement personnel are integrated into the school multidisciplinary education teams. Police powers are reserved for serious public safety issues (e.g., serious crimes). Extensive, regular training on critical topics for interacting with youth ensures that school law enforcement are equipped with adequate knowledge to interact effectively with diverse student populations and avoid arrest. The legal rights of students are safeguarded in a positive learning environment; and the use of police powers is regularly reported to the state and transparent to community stakeholders.

Strategy 1: Discipline codes, which are rewritten to align with positive school discipline best practices, include the role of school law enforcement and the proper use of police arrest powers.

Strategy 2: School administrators enter into Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) with school law enforcement that clearly defines roles and ensures accountability and transparency related to the use of police powers. Pursuant to the MOU, school law enforcement receive ongoing training related to positive school discipline best practices and alternatives to arrest implemented at the school.

Strategy 3: School law enforcement are fully integrated in to school multidisciplinary teams that propose, evaluate and implement alternatives to exclusionary discipline, including school-based arrest, and engage as members of the school's SOC network. School law enforcement are adequately trained in a variety of preventive measures including: implicit bias and culturally-responsive practice; interacting effectively with students with diverse needs; de-escalating conflict in order to avoid arrests; respecting the legal rights of student; and cooperating with school personnel to refer students to professionals for mental and behavioral health concerns.

Strategy 4: The use of law enforcement in schools is transparent. Families understand the role of law enforcement, have access to data to understand its use, and help ensure that the rights of students are protected within the school. There exists a process for families and students to file grievances challenging abuses of police power.

Resources:

Advancement Project. (2013). Proposed memorandum of understanding between the school district and police department.

A Framework for Safe and Successful Schools
https://www.nasponline.org/Documents/Research%20and%20Policy/Advocacy%20Resources/Framework_for_Safe_and_Successful_School_Environments.pdf

American Psychological Association Zero Tolerance Task Force (2008). Are zero tolerance policies effective in the schools? An evidentiary review and recommendations. *American Psychologist*, 63(9), 852-862.

Cohn, A. (2001). Positive Behavioral Supports: Information for Educators http://www.nasponline.org/resources/factsheets/pbs_fs.aspx

Desautels, L. (2016). Brains in pain cannot learn. <http://www.edutopia.org/blog/brains-in-pain-cannot-learn-lori-desautels>

Juvenile Justice Institute (2009). *The Costs of Confinement: Why Good Juvenile Justice Policies Make Good Fiscal Sense*. Washington, DC.

Justice Policy Institute (2010). *Healing invisible wounds: Why investing in trauma-informed care for children makes sense*. www.justicepolicy.org

National Alliance on Mental Illness, Indiana:
<http://www.namiindiana.org/find-help-during-a-crisis>

Skiba, R., Choong-Geun, C., Arredondo, M. (2015). *Suspensions and expulsions in Indiana: A status report*. The Equity Project at Indiana University, Center for Evaluation and Education Policy.

Skiba, R. & Losen, D. J. (2016). From reaction to prevention: Turning the page on school discipline. *American Educator*, 39(4). www.aft.org/ae

Recommendation 9

Engender State Support and Legislative Change to Advance Positive School Discipline Consistently Throughout All Indiana Schools

State partners collaborate around resources and funding to support reform efforts at local, district and school levels. Statewide reform initiatives are identified as key partners. Legislative changes are fostered by a paradigm shift reflected in the changing federal strategy to charge states with leading school discipline reform. Key stakeholders work for policies and funding strategies that emphasize and incentivize positive learning

environments throughout the state and local education systems.

Strategy 1: The state promotes transparency by making disaggregated suspension, expulsion, and school arrest data accessible to each school district and the public on the Indiana Department of Education (IDOE) website. The state appropriates funding for technical assistance to schools on collecting and analyzing their own data.

Strategy 2: State and community partners engage national, state and local experts and scholars in building a knowledge base of research-informed, best practice alternatives. A central clearinghouse for the emerging repository of resources is provided through the IDOE website.

Strategy 3: Statewide institutions allow for blended, flexible use of funding streams in education, mental and behavioral health, child welfare, and juvenile justice delivery systems, to support a continuum of care services across and among systems consistent with federal provisions.

Strategy 4: Schools minimize the use of placing students in alternative education settings to manage student classroom behavior. Schools involve families in the decision to place students in alternative education settings. In instances where alternative school placement is needed, standards are in place to ensure that alternative schools provide the same level of instruction and supports as traditional schools so every child is afforded the same educational opportunity. There is a presumption that students will return to traditional school placement following suspension, expulsion, or re-entry from a juvenile facility. A continuum of educational services is in place to facilitate a seamless re-entry process for students returning to traditional school placement.

Strategy 5: State institutions, professional associations and the business community, including the Indiana Commission on Higher Education, Indiana Commission on Workforce Development, and the Indiana Chamber of Commerce, collaborate with community stakeholders, educators, and legislative leaders to align workforce development needs with incentives for improving behavior supports that keep youth engaged in school.

Increasing academic success for all students produces citizens who contribute to Indiana's economy and future workforce.

Strategy 6: Community members and service delivery systems converge to envision, support, and monitor legislative and policy agendas at the local, state, and national levels that promote equitable and inclusive access to quality learning environments for all students. Key stakeholders across multiple disciplines are engaged by public policy officials in policy discussions and reforms.

Resources:

A Framework for Safe and Successful Schools
https://www.nasponline.org/Documents/Research%20and%20Policy/Advocacy%20Resources/Framework_for_Safe_and_Successful_School_Environments.pdf

Center for Evaluation and Education Policy (CEEP):
<http://ceep.indiana.edu/>

Cole, S. F., Eisner, A., Gregory, M., & Ristuccia, J. (2013). Creating and advocating for trauma-sensitive schools. Trauma and Policy Initiative. www.traumasensitiveschools.org

Equity Project at Indiana University:
<http://www.indiana.edu/~equity/>

Every Student Succeeds Act: <http://www.ed.gov/essa?src=rn>

Great Lakes Equity Center: <http://www.greatlakesequity.org/>

HEA 1635 <http://iga.in.gov/static-documents/7/f/0/3/7f03a9eb/HB1635.05.ENRH.pdf>

Losen, D. et al. (2010). Closing the school discipline gap: Equitable remedies for excessive exclusion. New York: Teachers College Press.

Skiba, R., Chung, C.G., Arredondo, M. (2015). Suspensions and expulsions in Indiana: A status report. The Equity Project at Indiana University, Center for Evaluation and Education Policy.

Conclusion

The disproportionate impact of zero tolerance policies on Indiana's most vulnerable children, and the excessive number of days of lost instruction time that arise from exclusionary discipline practices, has an adverse effect on the achievement of young people in Indiana. This crisis requires the immediate attention of all Hoosiers. Through this series of recommendations, derived from the *Leaders Collaborating to Advance Positive School Discipline* Summit, there is now the start of a collective vision and road map for creating positive learning environments for Indiana children. This vision and call to action shifts the paradigm and redefines the systemic roles within the school

community to be consistent with positive learning principles. It requires a reconsideration of how limited resources are used to support local communities and the education of young people. Public policy officials and state leaders will play a vital role in helping local school communities pursue a sustained commitment to systemic transformation of school cultures across the state toward positive learning environments in which all students achieve.

Appendix A

Positive School Discipline Training and Resources

Indiana Programs

Indiana Department of Education

- <http://www.doe.in.gov/student-services/school-climate-and-cultural-awareness>

Includes links to programs such as PBIS Indiana and the National Center for Safe and Supportive Learning Environment's Supportive School Discipline Webinar series.

HEA 1419

- <http://www.doe.in.gov/student-services/school-climate-and-cultural-awareness>

HEA 1419 (passed in 2009) required the Indiana Department of Education to develop a model evidence-based plan for improving discipline and behavior within schools. In response to this law, IDOE makes available a model evidence-based plan for schools, reporting template, and guidance documents.

The Equity Project at Indiana University

- <http://www.indiana.edu/~equity/>

The Equity Project supports school district leadership teams with technical assistance to help them eliminate disproportionality in their special education discipline and placement practices. Project staff help develop action steps based on embracing data analysis, root cause analysis, and culturally responsive practices.

Indiana University Center on Education and Lifelong Learning (CELL)

- <http://www.iidc.indiana.edu/pages/cell>

CELL works at the state, district, and school levels to conduct needs assessment and develop action plans that are integrated and aligned with accountability requirements and improvement plans.

PBIS Indiana

- <http://www.indiana.edu/~crpbisin/>

PBIS Indiana is a project of The Equity Project at Indiana University and Indiana University Center on Education and Lifelong Learning (CELL) through the PBIS Indiana Resource Center. The Indiana Resource Center is a statewide network of Culturally Responsive Positive Behavioral Interventions and Supports that use evidence-based frameworks with emerging model sites and school districts addressing issues of disproportionality. On-site and web-based professional

development opportunities are available throughout the state as well.

Great Lakes Equity Center (GLEC)

- <http://glec.education.iupui.edu/>

GLEC works with schools on a wide variety of equity and civil rights issues in schools. One of many areas of focus is Safe and Inclusive Schools, which includes Positive Discipline, Alternatives to Suspension and Expulsion, and Positive Behavior Intervention.

National Programs

Discipline Disparities: A Research to Practice Collaborative

- <http://www.indiana.edu/~atlantic>

Under the leadership of The Equity Center at Indiana University, this project brings together a group of 26 nationally known researchers, educators, advocates, and policy analysts to address the problem of disciplinary disparities. Included in the resources is the Discipline Disparities Research to Practice Collaborative website. The Intervention brief written by Anne Gregory, James Bell and Mica Pollock provides a good guide to interventions to reduce disparities that are both research-grounded and practical:

http://www.indiana.edu/~atlantic/wp-content/uploads/2014/12/Disparity_Intervention_Full_121114.pdf

The Technical Assistance Center on Positive Behavioral Interventions and Supports

(from the U.S. Department of Education Office of Special Education Programs)

- <http://www.pbis.org/>

Offers a wealth of resources such as blueprints, presentations, videos, and training manuals. Connects with state coordinator network for technical assistance (PBIS Indiana is the state coordinator for Indiana).

National Center on Safe Supportive Learning Environments

(from the U.S. Department of Education)

- <http://safesupportivelearning.ed.gov>

Offers resources on a huge variety of issues within the topics of engagement, safety, and school environment. Resources include: Supportive School Discipline Webinar series; numerous reports, guides, and resource links; and direct customized technical assistance. <https://safesupportivelearning.ed.gov/addressing-root-causes-disparities-school-discipline>.

Safe and Civil Schools

- <http://www.safeandcivilschools.com/>

Offers a range of fee-based PBIS consulting, training, and coaching services designed to assist all K-12 school personnel in using research-based positive behavior support strategies to structure all school settings for success. Offers range of implementation resources such as books, planners, DVD trainings, etc.

The National Registry of Evidence-based Programs and Practices (NREPP)

- <http://www.nrepp.samhsa.gov/>

Searchable online database of mental health and substance abuse interventions. All interventions in the registry have met NREPP's minimum requirements for review and have been independently assessed and rated for Quality of Research and Readiness for Dissemination.

U.S. Department of Education

- <http://www.ed.gov/>

Offers tools, data and resources that increase awareness of the prevalence, impact, and legal implications of suspension and expulsion; and basic information and resources on effective alternatives.

<http://www2.ed.gov/policy/gen/guid/school-discipline/index.html>. Resources include: *School Climate and Discipline: Know the Data*

<http://www2.ed.gov/policy/gen/guid/school-discipline/data.html>; and *Guiding Principles: A*

Resource Guide for Improving School Climate and Discipline <http://www2.ed.gov/policy/gen/guid/school-discipline/guiding-principles.pdf>.

U.S. Department of Justice

- <http://www.ed.gov/news/press-releases/us-departments-education-and-justice-release-school-discipline-guidance-package-enhance-school-climate-and-improve-school-discipline-policiespractices>

The U.S. Departments of Justice and Education released a school discipline guidance package to help states, districts, and schools enhance school climate and improve discipline policies and practices. The guidance package provides resources for creating safe, supportive, and inclusive school climates and a compendium of federal laws and regulations regarding school discipline.

U.S. Department of Education Civil Rights Data Collection (CRDC)

- Civil Rights Data Collection Website (2009-10 and 2011-12 District and School Reports) <http://ocrdata.ed.gov>
- Civil Rights Data Collection: Data Snapshot: School Discipline March, 2014) <http://www2.ed.gov/about/offices/list/ocr/docs/crdc-discipline-snapshot.pdf>

The U.S. Department of Education (ED) Civil Rights Data Collection (CRDC) obtains data related to the nation's public school districts and elementary and secondary schools' obligation to provide equal educational opportunity.

Acknowledgments

The Children’s Policy and Law Initiative of Indiana (CPLI) would like to thank the *Leaders Collaborating to Advance Positive School Discipline* Summit participants: Mariella Arrendondo, Renae Azziz, Tanya Bell, Todd Bess, Caterina Blitzer, Herbert Blitzer, Brishon Bond, Valerie Boots, Treva Bostic, John Brandon, Senator Jean Breaux, Rebecca Buhner, Jim Bush, Shawn Bush, Mary Byrne, Sandi Cole, Mike Commons, Katie Connel, Cathi Cornelius, JT Coopman, Rhondalyn Conrett, Andrew S. Cullen, Carole Craig, Matthew Cregor, Marlo Dale, Sheila Dennis, David Dickerson, Judge Kimberly Dowling, Leslie Dunn, Mark Fairchild, Lindsay Faulkenberg, Rachelle Gardner, Mindi Goodpaster, Nicole Goodson, Cathleen Graham, Mildred A. Guyse, Carey Haley Wong, JauNae Hanger, Denita Harris, Officer Tronoy Deon Harris, Andrew Harsha, Wendy Hendricks, Dr. Robin Hughes, Sylvia Hyde, Cynthia Jackson, Devina Jani, Jill Johnson, Tia Joseph, Amy Karozos, Gwen Kelley, Kathleen King Thorius, Donald B. Kite, Sr., Jo Knight, Teresa Knox, Jill Lambert, Susan Lockwood, Dr. Tony Lux, Nora Macey, Officer Norm McDuffie, Terri Miller, Jen Money-Brady, Jordan Murphy, Justin Oakley, Theresa A. Ochoa, Brandie Oliver, Dean Michael Patchner, Deborah Reichmann, Lisa Rich, Tara Rinehart, Shana Ritter, Sandy Runkle, Philip Seale Jr., Kameelah Shaheed-Diallo, Russell Skiba, Julie Smart, School Superintendent Shawn Smith, Joshua Sprunger, Michelle M. Tennell, Megan K. Thomas, Michael R. Twyman, Sandy Washburn, Frances Watson, D. Faye Williams-Robbins, and Jenny Young. The willingness of these individuals to come together from diverse disciplines and professions to recommend research-based practices, strategies and resources for developing competencies among educators has helped create a framework for achieving equitable educational outcomes for all Indiana children.

The success of the *Leaders Collaborating to Advance Positive School Discipline* Summit would not have been possible without sponsors United Way of Central Indiana, which hosted the event, and the National Alliance on Mental Illness of Indiana (NAMI)’s financial support. Additionally, CPLI appreciates the extensive in-kind contributions by: The Equity Project at Indiana University, MSD Lawrence Township, The Villages and Prevent Child Abuse Indiana, and Waples & Hanger. Special recognition is extended to both national civil rights attorney Matthew Cregor and IU Equity Project Director Russell Skiba for their roles in orchestrating the day. The Summit Planning Committee is thanked for tireless efforts in developing the vision and attending to details—Kristina Frey, JauNae Hanger, Wendy Hendricks, Gwen Kelley, Heather Kinser, Sandy Runkle, and Megan Young. Lindsay Carter, Sheila Dennis, JauNae Hanger, Gwen Kelley, Heather Kinser, Briana Rowe Bethany Sammons, and Beth Wendholt are thanked for synthesizing the recommendations and producing the early versions of this report. Finally, Carole Craig, Sheila Dennis, Susan Lockwood, Brandie Oliver, Russell Skiba and Josh Sprunger are thanked for critically reviewing the first draft, as are all the stakeholders who provided feedback during the comment period—which is now reflected in the final version of the report and recommendations.



CHILDREN’S POLICY and LAW INITIATIVE of INDIANA

JauNae Hanger, President

410 North Audubon Road Indianapolis, IN 46219

www.cpliofindiana.org