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Purpose:
To assist in understanding disproportionality in school discipline and how to use a four-step problem-solving process to address it when it occurs.

Participant Outcomes (ELOs)
- Understand the importance of considering racial and ethnic disproportionality as it pertains to school discipline
- Use of metrics to measure and monitor disproportionality to inform action plans addressing discipline disparities
- Discuss issues around implicit bias and its impact on disproportionality
- Use a four-step problem-solving process to address issues of disproportionality
Disproportionality in School Discipline
Schools want good outcomes for all their students.

By and large, the profession is not purposely leaving anyone behind.

But unfortunately, the outcomes are not always equitable for everyone, which means....

That some students and student groups have outcomes that are different or disproportionate when compared to others.
Disproportionality can be understood as when a group is over- or underrepresented in a category differently than what we might expect for that group.

Racial and Ethnic Overrepresentation
- Identification for Special Education
- Receiving office discipline referrals
- Receiving a school suspension or expulsion

Racial and Ethnic Underrepresentation
- Identification for Talented and Gifted classes
- Identification for Advanced Placement classes
Research Basis

Disproportionate outcomes related to school discipline for children in grades Pre K-12 are well documented.

- Losen & Gillespie, 2012
- Fabelo et al., 2011
- Shaw & Braden, 1990
- Children’s Defense Fund, 1975
Research Basis

Civil Rights Data Collection (CRDC) for 2015-16

K-12

• 2.7 million K-12 students (5-6%) were suspended one or more times

• Black students represent 15% of students enrolled, but...
  • 22% of students disciplined for harassment or bullying
  • 39% of students suspended out of school
  • 31% of students referred to law enforcement or subjected to school-related arrests
  • 33% of students expelled

FIGURE 13: Percentage distribution of students receiving one or more out-of-school suspensions, by race and sex.

By Race and Gender

NOTE: Data may not add up to 100 percent due to rounding.
2015-16 Expulsions by Race and Gender

FIGURE 15: Percentage distribution of students receiving expulsions, by race and sex

NOTE: Data may not add up to 100 percent due to rounding.
Causes of Disproportionality?

Poverty
- Affects students of color disproportionately
- When controlling for poverty, studies show poverty alone does not fully explain disproportionate outcomes for students of color...race also contributes.

Unequal educational opportunity
- Students of color are often limited by poor facilities and inadequate resources
- Underrepresented in curriculum and see fewer highly qualified teachers

Behavior
- Though disciplined at a higher rate, no evidence that this disparity is due to higher rate of misbehavior by students of color
- Black students punished more severely for less serious and more subjective behaviors

The Equity Project at Indiana University webpage, (2017)
Behavior Incident Records

Records of behavioral incidents (office discipline referrals, ODRs) are commonly used as an indicator of school environments. (Irvin, Tobin, Sprague, Sugai, and Vincent, 2004)

Office discipline referrals help identify:

- Who was involved, What happened, When, Where, How often, and Why
- Consequence

Consequences or outcomes of those behavioral incidences vary

- Record of the incident
- Teacher or Administrator conference with student and/or parents
- Compensatory activity (e.g., apology, community service, loss of privilege)
- Exclusionary discipline (e.g., removal from class, ISS, OSS, expulsion)
Disproportionately affect students of color

Lead to negative outcomes
- Lower academic achievement
- Lower graduation rates
- Increased likelihood of contact with the juvenile justice system

*Breaking Schools’ Rules, (2011)*
Disproportionality in School Discipline

Elementary and Secondary Out-of-School Suspension Rates by Subgroup, 2013-14

Percentage of All Students who Have Received One or More Out of School Suspensions by District (2011-12)

Out-of-School Suspensions

All Students

Districts - OSS

Greater than 25%
15.1% - 25%
10.1% - 15%
5.1% - 10%
0% - 5%
Null or Missing Data

NOTE: For each school district, the percent of students receiving one or more out of school suspensions (OSS) is calculated by dividing the district's cumulative number of students receiving one or more out of school suspensions for the entire 2011-2012 school year by the district's student enrollment based on a count of students taken on a single day between September 27 and December 31.
Percentage of Black Students who Have Received One or More Out of School Suspensions by District (2011-12)

Out-of-School Suspensions

Black Students

Districts - OSS

- Greater than 25%
- 15.1% - 25%
- 10.1% - 15%
- 5.1% - 10%
- 0% - 5%
- Null or Missing Data

Civil Rights Data Collection 2011-12

Note: Per each school district, the percent of students receiving one or more out of school suspensions (OSS) is calculated by dividing the district’s cumulative number of students receiving one or more out-of-school suspensions for the entire 2011-2012 school year, by the district’s student enrollment based on a count of students taken on a single day between September 27 and December 31. Because race/ethnicity data on OSS are not available for students receiving services under a 504 Plan, the OSS percentages reported for students with disabilities are restricted to data for students receiving services under IDEA.
Resources
PBIS.org is the national resource center for materials and information related to the implementation of PBIS with fidelity.
pbis.org is the national resource center for materials and information related to the implementation of PBIS with fidelity.

- School
- Equity & PBIS
Equity & PBIS

PBIS Resources for Equity

PBIS Practice Guides / Evaluation Briefs

Do Schools Implementing SWPBIS Have Decreased Racial and Ethnic Disproportionality in School Discipline?
By Kent McIntosh, Cody Gion, & Eoin Bastaible

A 5-Point Intervention Approach for Enhancing Equity in School Discipline (updated Feb 2018)
by Kent McIntosh, Erik J. Girvan, Robert H. Horner, Keith Smolkowski, & George Sugai

PBIS Cultural Responsiveness Field Guide: Resources for Trainers and Coaches
by Milaney Leversion, Kent Smith, Kent McIntosh, Jennifer Rose, & Sarah Pinkelman

Examples of Engaging Instruction to Increase Equity in Education
by Erin A. Chaparro, Rhonda N. T. Nese, & Kent McIntosh

Key Elements of Policies to Address Discipline Disproportionality: A Guide for District and School Teams
by Ambra Green, Rhonda Nese, Kent McIntosh, Vicki Nishioka, Bert Eliason, & Alondra Canizal Delabra

Using Discipline Data within SWPBIS to Identify and Address Disproportionality: A Guide for School Teams
by Kent McIntosh, Aaron Barnes, Bert Eliason, & Kelsey Morris
“Given the well-documented negative effects of exclusionary discipline on a range of student outcomes, educators must address this issue by…

Measure disproportionality
Intervene
Monitor effects of intervention on disproportionality.”

(McIntosh, Girvan, Horner, Smolkowski, and Sugai, 2018)
Follow-up document provides further detail and practical suggestions related to the organization and use of discipline data to address disproportionality.

PBIS Technical Assistance Center (McIntosh, Barnes, Eliason, & Morris, 2014)

Using Discipline Data within SWPBIS to Identify and Address Disproportionality: A Guide for School Teams

PBIS Technical Assistance Center

Available for free at pbis.org
Discipline Disparities Series

Funded by Atlantic Philanthropies and Open Society Foundations, the Collaborative of 26 nationally known researchers, educators, advocates and policy analysts spent more than three years working...

“...to increase the availability of interventions that are both practical and evidence-based, and to develop and support a policy agenda for reform to improve equity in school discipline.”

1. Discipline Disparities Series: Overview
2. Interventions for Reducing Disparities
3. Policy Recommendations for Reducing Disparities
4. New and Developing Research
5. Acknowledging Race
6. Documenting Disparities for LGBT Students
   - Discipline Disparities: Myths and Facts
Equity Project at Indiana University

Russell Skiba, Director
Mariella Arredondo, Associate Director

Understanding Equity

More than 50 years after the landmark decision in Brown v. Board of Education, the promise of equal educational opportunity remains unfulfilled for many children in America’s schools. Racial and ethnic disparities remain ubiquitous in our educational system, manifesting themselves in the achievement gap, disproportionality in special education, dropout and graduation rates, racial disparities in school suspension and expulsion, and eligibility for gifted/talented programs. Striving for equity means facing these disparities, and struggling to equalize the opportunity for all children to achieve at the same high educational standards.

Read More...
The Center for Civil Rights Remedies

The Center is located at and part of The Civil Rights Project at UCLA

Dan Losen, Director

Special projects include:
• School-to-Prison Pipeline
• Racial Inequity in Special Education
PBIS Applications as a Resource
Problem Solving Model
Problem Solving Model

1. Problem Identification
2. Problem Analysis
3. Plan Implementation
4. Plan Evaluation

Is there a problem?
Why is it happening?
Is the plan working?
What should be done?
Step 1: Problem Identification

Is there a problem?

1. Problem Identification

Use valid & reliable metrics.

Quantify the difference between current outcomes and goals.

This is the performance gap!
Step 1: Problem Identification

For disproportionality
- Quantify disaggregated outcomes across racial/ethnic subgroups
- Compare differences
  - Specified group vs. Comparator group
  - Subgroup vs. White subgroup
  - Subgroup vs. All Other students
    - Native vs. All Non-Native students

Multiple metrics are recommended!

IDEA Data Center, 2014
Multiple Measures Needed

Percent of Students in Subgroup with Office Discipline Referral

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subgroups</th>
<th>Percent with Referral</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Multiple Measures Needed

Percent of Students with ODRs in Subgroup Who have Multiple Referrals

Subgroups

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subgroup</th>
<th>Percent with Multiple Referrals</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>65%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>40%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td>55%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Multiple Measures Needed

Percent of Students with ODRs in Subgroup Who Received Out of School Suspension

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subgroup</th>
<th>Percent of Students with OSS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>75%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>45%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td>65%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Step 1: Problem Identification

Multiple metrics are recommended!
IDEA Data Center, 2014

The Data Guide recommends using at least:

- Relative Measure: Risk Index
- Relative Measure: Risk Ratio
- Composition Measure: Students with Referrals
- Composition Measure: Total Referrals

An upcoming revision will likely add:
- Absolute Measure: ODRs per Student
### Metric #1 – Risk Index

Percent of a group at risk for a certain outcome
- % Receiving an office discipline referral (ODR)
- % Receiving a suspension or expulsion

**Calculate the Risk Index?**
- Divide
- **At Risk / Total Number**

**How?**
- Calculate by hand
- Create a spreadsheet
- Use automated program

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ethnicity</th>
<th>Enrolled</th>
<th># Students with Referrals</th>
<th>% Students with Referrals</th>
<th>Risk Index</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Native</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>50.00%</td>
<td>0.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>28.57%</td>
<td>0.29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>72.31%</td>
<td>0.72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Latino</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>40.00%</td>
<td>0.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pacific</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>34.33%</td>
<td>0.34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multi-Racial</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>504</strong></td>
<td><strong>195</strong></td>
<td><strong>Metric #1 – Risk Index</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Step 1: Problem Identification**

Calculate the Risk Index?
- Divide
- **At Risk / Total Number**

How?
- Calculate by hand
- Create a spreadsheet
- Use automated program
Calculates the percentage of students who have received a referral from each of the various racial/ethnic subgroups enrolled in the school.

**Metric #1**

**Risk Index**

Calculates the percentage of students who have received a referral from each of the various racial/ethnic subgroups enrolled in the school.
Metric #2 – Risk Ratio
Risk index of one group divided by the risk index of a comparison group

How do we calculate Risk Ratio?

- Divide

Risk Ratio = \frac{\text{Risk Index of Specified Group}}{\text{Risk Index of Comparison Group}}

1.0 is equal risk
> 1.0 is overrepresentation
< 1.0 is underrepresentation
Step 1: Problem Identification

Lots of resources available! Some are FREE!
Step 1: Problem Identification

Risk Ratio Calculator from Wisconsin RtI Center

www.wisconsinrticenter.org

FREE Risk Ratio Calculator from Wisconsin RtI Center

www.wisconsinrticenter.org
The risk ratio tells us how much more or less likely one group is to receive a certain outcome when compared to another group.

**For Example:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Risk for Native Students</th>
<th>50.00%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Risk for White Students</td>
<td>34.33%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1.46</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

How do we read this?

In this school, Native students are **1.46 times more likely** to receive an Office Discipline Referral than the White students.
Is 1.46 times more likely...bad?

Well, 1.0 would be an even chance or equitable outcomes.

- What is bad?
- 1.01, 1.5, 2.0, 3.0, 4.0,...?
- What is the threshold for bad?
- What is “significant disproportionality”?
Currently, there is no national threshold for significant disproportionality.
Since 2006, each state has been allowed to select their own methodology and criteria for identification of “significant disproportionality.”

2013 GAO published their study on Racial and Ethnic Overrepresentation in Special Education

“When left to the states to decide, in 2010-2011, only 356 of more than 17,000 districts nationwide (about 2%) were identified as meeting the threshold of “significant disproportionality.”
45 states used some form of risk ratio as their methodology to report disproportionality.

But criteria for threshold of “significant disproportionality” ranged widely:

- Seven states chose a risk ratio that exceeds 3.0
- Sixteen states chose a risk ratio that exceeds 4.0
- Seven states chose a risk ratio that exceeds 5.0

Almost half the nation (23 states) found significant disproportionality only if it was four times or more likely for a group to be at risk than another group.
During the Spring of 2016, Feds asked for input on proposals regarding **methodology** and **criteria** for identifying **significant disproportionality** related to IDEA:

- **Identification** of students for special education
- **Educational environments** for identified students
  - Amount of time in regular classroom
- **Discipline incidents** involving identified students
- **Suspension/Expulsion** of identified students
The Feds don’t define a threshold, but OSEP has since mandated that all states will report disproportionality using one methodology:

- **Risk Ratio with All Other Students** as the comparator group

Additionally, states would be required to establish a “reasonable threshold” as criteria for identifying significant disproportionality.

Again, they didn’t define “reasonable threshold,” but shared that states should be prepared to defend their criteria if the outcomes seemed to have a disparate impact on certain racial or ethnic groups.

Mandate also prescribed a significant financial impact if districts didn’t attend to this. 15% of Special Ed funding → Coordinated Early Intervening Services
In July of 2018, Secretary DeVos of the U.S. Department of Education announced a delay by two years the date for States to comply with the “Equity in IDEA” or “significant disproportionality” regulations. States are allowed to implement the new standard if they wish to, the Education Department said, and they are still obligated under IDEA to assess school districts for significant disproportionality.

In May, while this move was under consideration, 15 states indicated they would move forward with implementation at the beginning of the 2018-19 school year.

March of 2019, DC judge ruled ED cannot delay implementation of policy.
# Equity in IDEA

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>States Indicating They Would Implement</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Alaska</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arizona</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Connecticut</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indiana</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maryland</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Percent of Districts in Each State that would be Significantly Disproportionate if Any Subgroup Had a Risk Ratio Greater than Two Times the National Median

So what would be a reasonable goal?
Possible Risk Ratio Goals for Schools

Improvement over previous years at same school

Local, state, or national norms

- 2011-12 SWIS Median Risk Ratio
  - African American to White = 1.84
  - 25th percentile = 1.38

Logical criterion

- Equal Employment Opportunity Commission (EEOC)
  - Disparate impact criterion – “4/5s Rule”
  - Risk ratio range between .80 and 1.25

State threshold for “significant disproportionality”
Step 1: Problem Identification

Metric #2 – Risk Ratio

How would we calculate Risk Ratio for All Others

\[
\text{Risk Index of Specified Group} \\
\text{Combined Risk Index of} \\
\text{All Other Students Not in the Specified Group} \\
\]

\[
\text{Risk Index of Black Students} \\
\text{Risk Index of} \\
\text{All Other Students who are not Black} \\
\]
What happens when you use All Other students instead of the subgroup of White students?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Race</th>
<th># Students Enrolled</th>
<th># Students with Referrals</th>
<th>% Students with Referrals</th>
<th>Risk Index</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Native</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>50.00%</td>
<td>0.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>28.57%</td>
<td>0.29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>72.31%</td>
<td>0.72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Latino</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>40.00%</td>
<td>0.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pacific</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>34.33%</td>
<td>0.34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multi-Racial</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>504</strong></td>
<td><strong>195</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Risk Ratio for Black students compared to the group of All Other students = **2.15**

Risk Ratio for Black students compared to the subgroup of White students = **2.11**

The difference in most cases when using All Other students instead of White students is not dramatic.
Step 1: Problem Identification

Metric #2
Risk Ratio

Calculates the risk ratio for each of the various racial/ethnic subgroups enrolled in the school when compared to the group of All Other Students.
Composition Graphs

We’ve seen the relative measures:
- Metric #1 – Referral Risk Index
- Metric #2 – Referral Risk Ratio

Composition measurements
- Tell us about the context of what is going on
- Look for proportional representation
Step 1: Problem Identification

Metric #3

Percent of Students with Referrals

- Compares subgroup’s percentage of school enrollment to the subgroup’s percentage of just the students who have ODRs
- Is each subgroup’s percent of students who have ODRs equal to their percent of school enrollment?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ethnicity</th>
<th># Students Enrolled</th>
<th># Students with Referrals</th>
<th>% Students of Enrolled Students</th>
<th>% Students with Referrals</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Native</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1.19%</td>
<td>1.54%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.39%</td>
<td>1.03%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>12.90%</td>
<td>24.10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Latino</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>19.84%</td>
<td>20.51%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pacific</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.79%</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>59.52%</td>
<td>52.82%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multi-Racial</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4.37%</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>504</td>
<td>195</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

It doesn’t matter how many referrals a student has, only that they have a referral!
Step 1: Problem Identification

Metric #3
Students with Referrals

Calculates the proportionality between the subgroup’s percent of school population and subgroup’s percent of students with referrals.
Step 1: Problem Identification

Metric #4

Percent of Total Referrals

- Compares subgroup’s percentage of school enrollment to the subgroup’s percentage of all the ODRs written.

- Is each subgroup’s percent of all ODRs written equal to their percent of the school enrollment?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ethnicity</th>
<th># of Students Enrolled</th>
<th># of Referrals Written</th>
<th>% Students of Enrolled Students</th>
<th>% of Referrals Written</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Native</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>1.19%</td>
<td>1.35%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1.39%</td>
<td>0.75%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>143</td>
<td>12.90%</td>
<td>21.47%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Latino</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>155</td>
<td>19.84%</td>
<td>23.27%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pacific</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.79%</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>354</td>
<td>59.52%</td>
<td>53.15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multi-Racial</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4.37%</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>504</strong></td>
<td><strong>666</strong></td>
<td><strong>100%</strong></td>
<td><strong>100%</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In this case, it DOES matter how many referrals a student has!
Calculates the proportionality between a subgroup’s percent of population and the subgroup’s percent of total referrals.

**Metric #4**

**Total Referrals**

### Referrals By Ethnicity

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ethnicity</th>
<th>% of Enrolled Students</th>
<th>% of Total Referrals</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Native</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Latino</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pac-Mc</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multi-racial</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Graph Details:**

- **Percentage (out of 100%)**
- **Ethnicity**
- **Overrepresentation**
- **Underrepresentation**

**Step 1: Problem Identification**

**Metric #4**

**Total Referrals**

Calculates the proportionality between a subgroup’s percent of population and the subgroup’s percent of total referrals.
Step 1: Problem Identification

We’ve seen... ...now let’s look at...

Relative measures:
- Metric #1 – Referral Risk Index
- Metric #2 – Referral Risk Ratio

Composition measures:
- Metric #3 – Students with Referrals by Ethnicity
- Metric #4 – Total Referrals by Ethnicity

Absolute measure:
- Metric #5 – ODRs per Student
### Metric #5
**ODRs per Student**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th># of Students Enrolled</th>
<th># of Referrals Written</th>
<th>% Students of Enrolled Students</th>
<th>% of Referrals Written</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Native</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>1.19%</td>
<td>1.35%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1.39%</td>
<td>0.75%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>143</td>
<td>12.90%</td>
<td>21.47%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Latino</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>155</td>
<td>19.84%</td>
<td>23.27%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pacific</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.79%</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>354</td>
<td>59.52%</td>
<td>53.15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multi-Racial</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4.37%</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>504</strong></td>
<td><strong>666</strong></td>
<td><strong>100%</strong></td>
<td><strong>100%</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Divide the number of ODRs for a subgroup by the number enrolled in the group, which gives us the **# of ODRs per Student** in the subgroup.

\[
\frac{143}{65} = 2.20 \text{ ODRs per Student}
\]

\[
\frac{354}{300} = 1.18 \text{ ODRs per Student}
\]

\[
\frac{666}{504} = 1.32 \text{ ODRs per Student}
\]
1. **Select multiple metrics**

2. **Set goals**
   - Previous years from same school
   - Local, state or national norms
   - Logical criteria
     - *Goal risk ratio range below 1.25*
   - State’s “Reasonable Threshold”
Step 2: Problem Analysis

1. Problem Identification

2. Problem Analysis

Is there a problem?

Why is it happening?
Step 2: Problem Analysis

Purpose: Identify underlying causes of the problem
Focus: Systems & practices that can be changed
Evaluate: Tier 1 (Universal systems)
  - Check fidelity of PBIS implementation (PBIS Assessment)

Disparities other than discipline
  - Academic Placement
  - Attendance
  - School climate
  - Graduation

Discipline data for patterns of bias
  - Explicit bias
  - Implicit bias
Assumptions about Bias

- We can generally agree that a student’s color should not *fate* him or her to negative outcomes.
- Discussing equity and race is sometimes *uncomfortable*.
- Creating discomfort without providing *effective strategies* for equity is not productive.
- In discussing equity and taking steps, we will make *mistakes*.
Patterns of Explicit Bias

Explicit Bias (conscious bias)

Pattern:
- Consistent discipline disproportionality across all situations

Implications:
- Strong school and district policies
- Strong accountability for change
- Regular review and reporting of data
Patterns of Implicit Bias

Implicit Bias (unconscious bias)

Pattern:
- Peaks and valleys of disproportionality depending upon the situation

Implications:
- Clarify discipline procedures
- Provide strategies for decision making
Implicit Bias

Unconscious, automatic

Based on stereotypes

We all have it (even those affected by it).

Generally *not* an indication of our beliefs and values

More likely to influence:
- Snap decisions
- Decisions that are ambiguous
Step 2: Problem Analysis

A Unidimensional View of Bias

Racial Bias

Disproportionate Outcomes
A Multidimensional View of Bias

Step 2: Problem Analysis

Racial Bias -> Situation -> Vulnerable Decision Point -> Disproportionate Outcomes
What is a Vulnerable Decision Point?

A VDP is a specific decision that is more vulnerable to effects of implicit bias.

Two parts:

1. Elements of the situation
   - External or environmental context

2. The person’s decision state
   - Internal state or personal context
Step 2: Problem Analysis

A Multidimensional View of Bias

Vulnerable Decision Point

Racial Bias

External Context

Situation

Internal Context

Disproportionate Outcomes
Step 2: Problem Analysis

VDPs from national ODR data

Subjective problem behavior
- Defiance, Disrespect, Disruption

Vague discipline system
- Major vs. Minor

Non-classroom areas
- Hallways
- Playgrounds

Afternoons

AMBIGUITY

LACK OF CONTACT

FATIGUE / HUNGER
What can we do about these VDPs?

Teach two-step Neutralizing Routine for Staff:

When you see problem behavior, stop and ask:

1. **Is this possibly a VDP?**
   - Consider the context of the situation
   - Consider your personal decision state

2. **If so, use an agreed-upon alternative response**
   - Slow down, consider options
Two Systems for Decision Making

System 1: **Fast Decisions**
- Automatic, snap judgments
- Intuitive, unconscious

System 2: **Slow Decisions**
- Deliberate decisions
- Allows for conscious attention

*Thinking Fast and Slow*, Kahneman, (2011)
Neutralizing Routines for Reducing Effects of Implicit Bias

Step 2: Problem Analysis

**Setting event**
- Lack of positive interactions with student
- Fatigue

**Antecedent**
- Loud complaints about work (subjective behavior)

**Behavior**
- Send student to office (ODR)

**Consequence**
- Student leaves class (Avoids task & Gains Peer Attention)

**Self-assessment**
- “Is this a vulnerable decision point?”

**Alternative Response**
- “See me after class.”
Additional problem analysis routines

Purpose:
Identify underlying causes of the problem

Focus:
Systems and practices that can be changed
Step 2: Problem Analysis

Quick Personal Story
Defining Problems using a Precise Problem Statement

- Who is involved?........................................
  - Her 6th grade students
- What are the problem behaviors?.......  
  - Running
- Where is it happening?.......................  
  - In the hallways
- When is it happening?.........................  
  - On the way to lunch
- Why are these things happening?.......  
  - To get to the front of the lunch line
  - Perceived function of problem behavior

Marcia’s students were running in the hallways on the way to lunch so they could get to the lunch line first.
Step 2: Problem Analysis

When we believe we have a problem....

Assess

- PBIS implementation fidelity
- Performance gap
- Achievement gap
- Academic placement
- Attendance
- School climate

Identified Subgroup

All or Some?

Problem Behavior

Time of Day

Location

Motivation
## SWIS Drill Down

### Subgroup: African American Students

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3&lt;sup&gt;rd&lt;/sup&gt; grade</td>
<td>11:30 - Noon</td>
<td>Physical Aggression</td>
<td>Playground</td>
<td>Peer Attention</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4&lt;sup&gt;th&lt;/sup&gt; grade</td>
<td>8:00 AM– 9:30 AM</td>
<td>M-Defiance</td>
<td>Classroom</td>
<td>Avoid task</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7&lt;sup&gt;th&lt;/sup&gt; grade</td>
<td>After 12:00 PM</td>
<td>Inappropriate Language</td>
<td>Classroom Hallway</td>
<td>Avoid task Obtain Peer Attention</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Precise Problem Statements

- African American students in the 3rd grade are receiving referrals for physical aggression during noon recess related to gaining peer attention.

- African American students in the 4th grade are more likely to receive referrals for minor defiance in the classroom during the morning instructional block related to task avoidance.

- African American students in the 7th grade are receiving afternoon referrals in the classroom and hallways for inappropriate language. Referrals seem to be related to avoiding tasks and gaining peer attention.
Step 3: Plan Implementation

Is there a problem?

1. Problem Identification

2. Problem Analysis

3. Plan Implementation

Why is it happening?

What should be done?
Information from Step 2 Problem Analysis is used to select tasks, activities, and strategies to address the problem.

An action plan is created to ensure adequate implementation of the tasks and strategies.

Action plans show everyone – **WHO** will do **WHAT** by **WHEN**

Action plans that are published – Help create accountability
Step 3: Plan Implementation

Options

All issues
• Calculate and share disproportionality data regularly

Inadequate PBIS implementation
• Implement core features of PBIS to establish a foundation of support

Misunderstandings regarding school-wide expectations
• Enhance culturally-responsive PBIS with input from the students/families

Academic achievement gap
• Implement effective academic instruction
Step 3: Plan Implementation

Three important universal or Tier I strategies:

Relationship Building
• Strengthening teacher-student relationships

Social-Emotional Learning
• These interventions or programs can vary a great deal but generally build students’ social/emotional skill set.

Structural Interventions
• Changing the structure of the disciplinary system
  • Can reduce use of exclusionary consequences
  • May reduce disparities in exclusionary discipline

(Reaction to Prevention: Turning the Page on School Discipline, Skiba and Losen, 2016)
Step 3: Plan Implementation

Conflict Prevention
- Supportive Relationships with Students
- Academic Rigor
- Culturally Relevant and Responsive Teaching
- Bias-free Classrooms and Respectful School Environments

Conflict Intervention
- Inquiry into the Causes of Conflicts
- Problem-solving Approaches to Discipline
- Recognition of Student and Family Voice and Perceptions of Conflict’s Causes and Solutions
- Re-integration of Students after Conflict

*(Discipline Disparities Series: Interventions, Gregory, Bell, & Pollock, 2014)*
Step 4: Plan Evaluation

1. Problem Identification
2. Problem Analysis
3. Plan Implementation
4. Plan Evaluation

Is there a problem?
Why is it happening?
Is the plan working?
What should be done?
Step 4: Plan Evaluation

Evaluation

1. Regularly assess
   - Progress and fidelity of action plan implementation
   - Fidelity of PBIS implementation

2. Calculate metrics from Step 1

3. Compare to the goal determined in Step 1

4. Share results with relevant stakeholders

5. Plan for what is next
Evaluation Time Frame:

Identify time periods for regularly evaluating and analyzing disproportionality data

- Consider monthly assessment of action plan implementation
- Consider quarterly assessment of disproportionality metrics

Words of caution:

- Disproportionality metrics may not be sensitive to rapid change.
- Avoid relying on risk indices as they will increase throughout the year.
- Be careful of small n’s!
- Use multiple measures to ensure that you are tracking the correct thing.
Problem Solving Model

1. Problem Identification
   - Is there a problem?

2. Problem Analysis
   - Why is it happening?

3. Plan Implementation
   - What should be done?

4. Plan Evaluation
   - Is the plan working?

Intervene

Measure

Monitor

Why is it happening?

What should be done?
For more information:

**Support**
- Use the Search bar
- Read through topical FAQs
- Email us through Support
- Phone us

**Resources**
- Video Tutorials
- Users Guides & Materials
- Trainings & Webinars
Use your available resources to effectively and efficiently gather the data to inform your action plans for school improvement.

Contact:

support@pbisapps.org
training@pbisapps.org
beliason@uoregon.edu