Committee Members Present:
Ms. Brenda Sheridan, Ms. Jill Turgeon, Ms. Debbie Rose

LCPS Staff Present:
Ms. Cynthia Ambrose, Assistant Superintendent for Instruction
Ms. Nereida Gonzalez-Sales, Director, High School
Dr. Ryan Tyler, Research Supervisor
Ms. Kathryn Garvey, Principal, Seneca Ridge Middle School
Mr. John Lody, Director Diagnostic and Preventive Services
Ms. Stephanie LaPolla, Behavior Support Coordinator
Mr. Neil Slevin, Director, Middle School
Dr. Michael Martin, Director, Elementary Education

Public Speakers: None. (1 Attendee, did not speak before the committee.)

§8-27(3.)
Ms. Gonzalez-Sales presented the changes to §8-27(3.) and Ms. Rose reviewed. This was a second review. Motion to refer to the school board as an information item by Ms. Rose. So moved, Ms. Sheridan.

Quantitative Data
Ms. Rose asked what is being done on a division-wide level to specifically target unconscious bias – beyond PBIS. Ms. Gonzalez-Sales indicated that this meeting of the Discipline Committee would be an opportunity to take a look at what the division has done; commented upon the team aspect of DOI. Ms. Ambrose indicated that what is looked at today is not yet complete.

Dr. Tyler shared that we are examining current trends; looking at data is a year-round process. Overall, LCPS is trending down:

- Black – 2.1, Hispanic- 1.6 and steady for students with an IEP – 2.8; rates of 1.5 in Fairfax, 2.0 in Prince William County and 6.0 nationally
- Our percentages may be lower, but we still have disproportionality
Ms. Sheridan asked what the suspension rates looked like by level. Dr. Tyler responded that there were more suspensions at the High School level – but there is still disproportionality at every level.

Ms. Rose questioned the possibility of providing the names of specific schools; Ms. Ambrose indicated that the division needed to first work with those schools.

Dr. Tyler spoke about the root causes of disproportionality – office referral and then disproportionality occurs or disproportionality in the students being referred? This affects the plans for professional development. Professional development plans should be designed to address the root causes.

Ms. Turgeon inquired as to protocol at each school and indicated that some teachers have their limits as to who to they are able to suspend.

Dr. Tyler noted that LCPS is flipped from the rest of the nation. Nationally, weapons and drugs are the top categories; in LCPS, the largest category is “disorderly conduct.” He also indicated that if there are small numbers, then there will be wide fluctuations (for example, a category with only two or three individuals - Pacific Islanders); however, we are seeing similar student behaviors.

Ms. Rose and Ms. Turgeon spoke about looking at the needs of a student (Is the student hungry? Free and Reduced lunch as a category to examine?) and then adjusting for that student; this flows into teacher PD and other discipline options such as redirection.

**Training Matrix**

Ms. Gonzalez-Sales presented the training matrix – pieces that LCPS focused on during the year – as a framework and a basis. Going forward, the Discipline Disproportionality Team will have monthly meetings (scheduled meetings begin summer 2016). The district is ready to have conversations on the subjects that raised so far in this meeting; we can drill down to the root causes.

**AP Seminar**

Ms. Garvey presented materials from the 2015-2016 training for APs. She indicated that there has been the recognition of a mismatch between students and teachers. Training: Increase cultural competency. Let’s talk; put it out there. Ask: What’s the problem? What happened? How can we keep this from happening again? Instead of merely asking the student, “Why did you do that?” PD seeks to utilize specialists within the building.
PBIS and PBIS App

Ms. LaPolla spoke about the 2015-2016 year as being a baseline year. Getting started with the PBIS Application in conjunction with the monthly and quarterly PD that teachers and coaches carry back to teachers. Classroom systems: unify - develop consistent language and expectations; action planning with teachers. February 2016, PBIS brought in principals and gave them actual numbers. Now, we can measure and intervene [with the PBIS App].

Ms. Rose raised the questions: What does that look like? What targeted academic intervention? How does academic instruction impact discipline?

Mr. Lody indicated that academic instruction affects student frustration level [and in turn, behaviors that arise from a student being frustrated affect discipline]. Mr. Lody continued, and spoke about implicit bias, addressing positive and negative behaviors, equitable discipline decisions and capturing structures in schools (synergy). Also, PBIS PD with teachers [School Board members noted the training is heavily with principals and APS] has been addressed and examined.

School Board members briefly discussed the difference between attending PD for an entire day or workshop (Attendance at the PD lead to “owning the training” – referenced by Ms. Turgeon) vs. a 45-minute school-based presentation to teachers by someone in that building…staff meetings should be for follow-up and support. Ms. Gonzalez-Sales related that the level directors are working with staff on implementation. Ms. Rose questioned the possibility of incorporating Gorski [Paul C. Gorski at George Mason]. Division administration is reviewing the possibility.

Ms. Ambrose noted that it is difficult to take things to scale. This work is a heavy lift and the Office of School Administration did not exist last year at this time. One key question is how do we continue to maximize our limited training budget?

Next public meeting, August 24, 2016 at 9:00 a.m. in Room 500.