

TUSD RFI #(s): 2572 - 2591
Estimated TUSD Staff Time: 30 hours
Attachment(s):

-----Information above this line is to be completed by District Staff -----

TUSD Request for Information Form

| | |
|-------------------------|--|
| RFI Instructions | |
| 1. | TUSD will then assign each request its TUSD RFI number. |
| 2. | Provide the topic of the request (e.g., Corrective Action Plans) |
| 3. | Present the RFI in the form of one or more specific questions. |
| 4. | Optional: For every question/request on the form, please indicate include the reason(s) why the information being requested is needed. |
| 5. | Indicate the relevant section of the USP, court order, district report or other document (i.e., reference) that relates to RFI. Page numbers may be more appropriate in some instances). |
| 6. | Use a separate form for each specific topic about which information is being requested unless the answers to the questions posed are interdependent or relate to the same section of the document you are referencing (e.g., the USP). |
| 7. | Copy the TUSD email group “Deseg.” |

Request for Information

| | |
|-------------------------|--|
| Submitted by: | Juan Rodriguez and Lois Thompson for the Mendoza Plaintiffs |
| Submission Date: | November 15, 2019 |
| Subject: | TUSD Annual Report for 2018-19 (“DAR” or “Annual Report”) – Discipline |
| USP or Reference | Annual Report – Discipline, USP VI |

RFI #2572 - How did the District arrive at the above-cited figures using the appendix VII-29 data? If the District did not use appendix VII-29 data to arrive at the figures, please provide the raw data from which the District arrived at the above-cited figures.

Response: There is no appendix VII-29, the District assumes Mendoza Plaintiffs are referring to appendix VI-29. VI-29 shows the number of unique students receiving at least one disciplinary action by specific disposition type (e.g. in school discipline, long term suspensions) where students may be counted in more than one category. The data used in VI-22 for discipline are unique student counts across all disposition types (i.e. student is only counted once). See below for the number of students receiving at least one disciplinary action:

| | White | African American | Hispanic | Native American | Asian/Pacific Islander | Multi-Race | Total |
|---|-------|------------------|----------|-----------------|------------------------|------------|-------|
| Number of students receiving at least 1 disciplinary action | 640 | 528 | 2055 | 172 | 42 | 145 | 3582 |

RFI #2573 - Does “discipline rates” refer to all types of discipline combined? Do the District figures above reflect an approach that looks at number of discipline incidents or number of students who were administered discipline (regardless of the number of incidents administered to individual students)?

Response: see RFI #2572

RFI #2574 - How did the District arrive at the above-cited figures using the appendix VII-29 data? If the District did not use appendix VII-29 data to arrive at the figures, please provide the raw data from which the District arrived at the above-cited figures.

Response: There is no appendix VII-29, the District assumes Mendoza Plaintiffs are referring to appendix VI-29. The data for the likelihood ratios is provided in Appendix VI-22.

RFI #2575 - Do the District ratios above reflect an approach that looks at the number of long-term suspensions or number of students who were administered those suspensions (regardless of the number of of times the individual students were administered a long-term suspension)? Does the 2018-19 ratio include referrals to DAEP?

Response: The ratios reflect the number of students receiving a long-term suspension disposition regardless of whether the students attend the DAEP program or not.

RFI #2576 - What is the Comprehensive Behavior and Discipline Committee referenced on page VI-126 of the DAR? Please describe who, aside of Student Relations, is in the committee and what the role and responsibilities of the committee are.

Response: The Comprehensive Behavior and Discipline Committee include the Student Relations staff (director, coordinator and compliance liaison), the Regional Assistant Superintendents, the Assistant Superintendent and director for Curriculum and Instruction, and the Student Services directors (MASSD, AASSD, NASSD). The role of the committee is to meet on a weekly, monthly, and quarterly basis to review discipline data, analyze trends, hot spots, and issues. The committee reviews supportive action plans and assesses progress towards compliance.

RFI #2577 - With respect to Student Code of Conduct presentations to students and parents at school sites, does appendix VI-2 accurately reflect the dates of such presentations at each school site? If not, please detail for each school site what date(s) the Student Code of Conduct presentation was held in 2018-19?

Response: To the best of our knowledge, yes. These dates were provided to Student Relations by each site.

RFI #2578 - Beyond those schools for which the District provides a corrective action plan in appendix VI-30 (Booth Fickett, Doolen, Magee, Roberts Naylor Safford, Secrist Utterback), were any other schools put on a corrective action plan in 2018-19?

Response: No

RFI #2579 - Of the schools on a corrective action plan in 2018-19, how many remained on a corrective action plan into the 2019-20 school semester?

Response: All remained on supportive action with the exception of Secrist.

RFI #2580 - What were the results of the Student Relations director's "evaluat[ion] of the efficacy and effectiveness of the PBIS program" at the schools at which targeted training was provided (Miller, Booth-Fickett, Roskrug, Valencia, Palo Verde, and Santa Rita)? Does the District intend to continue to provide targeted training to these schools, and if so, which schools and why?

Response: In SY2018-19, the District continued to provide targeted training and support to Miller Elementary School, Booth-Fickett and Roskrug K-8 schools, Valencia Middle School, and Palo Verde and Santa Rita high schools. The District targeted these schools for additional support based on evaluations of discipline data. The Student Relations director visited these schools at least two times during the school year and evaluated the efficacy and effectiveness of the PBIS program using a PBIS rubric. The rubric includes program context, program input, fidelity, impact, replication, sustainability, improvement, team description, and matrix.

The evaluation found that by the end of 2018-19, all the targeted schools had functioning PBIS teams and were using the PBIS matrix with fidelity in Tier I. For SY2019-20, the schools are ready to move towards functioning at a higher level through Tier II and III PBIS elements. As a result, the District will continue to provide support and training to these target schools in Tier II and III skills, program implementation and sustainability.

RFI #2581 - How many teachers were identified for additional "teacher support in areas like classroom management" as a result of frequent discipline referrals (see DAR at VI-137), and at which schools were they assigned?

Response: The District reviews site reports regarding where the most referrals come from, and PBIS/Coaching/Support efforts provided to teachers. But, the reporting form does not ask for specific teacher names or counts.

RFI #2582 - Please provide any analysis or assessment the District has conducted concerning why the rate of students with repeat infractions leading to suspension grew in 2018-19 to rates higher than those observed in the last three years (see appendix VI-16)?

Response: The district has not done any formal analysis but the increase in repeat offenders may be related to the increase in mandatory short-term suspensions for specific violations.

RFI #2583 - What does the District plan to do to address the increase in rates of students who are repeatedly suspended during the school year?

Response: The AR refers to repeat offenders, not necessarily “students who are repeatedly suspended” – so this question is not accurate in reference to the DAR. The increase in repeat offenders, as stated, is due in large part to the first year of mandatory short-term suspensions aimed at resolving underlying causes of drug, alcohol, and fighting violations by providing students shorter but more effective suspensions that involve an agreement to engage in restorative mediations or drug/alcohol counseling. As such, it is an expected increase in the first year. At the end of the first semester, the District will review the data for the first and second quarter to determine if this is a trend that requires specific steps to address, or if this was merely a one-year bump as the result of new policy.

RFI #2584 - How many students were referred to PICS in 2018-19? Please provide a breakdown, by race/ethnicity, of the number of referrals to PICs in pilot schools in the 2018-19 school year.

Response: Students are not referred to PICs. PICs provide a student a short time and a positive supportive environment to de-escalate if they are feeling angry, overwhelmed or in need of a time-out.

RFI #2585 - Did the District assess the effectiveness of PICs? What did the District learn in piloting PICs in 2018-19?

Response: The District evaluated PIC/ISI classrooms of pilot schools. It was determined that the District needed to standardize practice in all PIC classrooms. ISI/PIC teachers met and developed the “PIC/ISI Teachers Operators Manual.” This standardized practice throughout the District.

RFI #2586 - Did each TUSD school provide the District with monthly discipline reports in 2018-19 (*see* DAR VI-148)? If not, which schools failed to provide such reporting and what did the District do to address the issue?

Response: There were approximately 8 to 10 of schools who failed to comply with turning in monthly discipline reports. Doolen, Magee, Pistor, and Valencia were placed, in part, on a support action plan for lack of compliance with monthly reporting requirements. Schools that miss two or more submissions are placed on corrective action.

RFI #2587 - To what does the District attribute this increase in aggression and fighting incidents?

Response: The increase in aggression is related to the increase in the number of reported fighting incidents. Other aggression violations such as assaults have seen a major reduction. For example, assaults fell from 962 in 2016-17 to 654 in 2018-19.

The District attributes the increase in reported fighting incidents to the attention paid to this disciplinary violation in the revised Code of Conduct. Through professional development training and Student Relations support, schools were better able to identify fighting incidents resulting in fewer suspension days, increased restorative mediations, and more focused time on remedying the underlying causes of student conflict through restorative mediation.

RFI #2588 - What were the findings of the end-of-year discipline report as reflected in the presentation (appendix IV-21) in the slide on page 8? (The slide has four bulleted “findings”, e.g., “Inaccurate data reporting” and “elevation request process”, but Mendoza Plaintiffs cannot tell what those findings or conclusions were.)

Response: The bullets used in the slide are explained below:

- Interpretation of the violation: At times schools would incorrectly charge a student. They would either over charge or under charge. Example, a fight might be coded as assault or other aggression.
- DAF’s to Charlotte Brown: Occasionally DAF’s (Discipline Action Form) were not sent to MS Brown in a timely manner. A DAF is sent from a school to Student Relations anytime there is a suspension so that SR can review the action.
- Inaccurate Data Reporting: SR would check data being turned with data on Synergy/Clarity. There were some discrepancies. Inaccurate data reporting would be sent back to the schools for corrections.
- Elevation Request: Occasionally a disciplinary charge would be elevated without the proper documentation in the form of a signed “elevation Request” being sent to SR.

RFI #2589 - To what does the District attribute the fact that “discipline rates for SY 2018-19 across all groups increased slightly” from the previous year as reflected in Graph 6 in appendix VI-22?

Response: The slight increase in discipline rates is attributable to the increase in short-term suspensions.

RFI #2590 - To what does the District attribute the fact that “the number of students receiving an out of school suspension increased for all groups in 2018-19” from the previous year as reflected in Graph 6 in appendix VI-22?

Response: The 18-19 Student Code of Conduct made first time fighting and first time drug/alcohol incidents a mandatory suspension. In the past schools were not mandated to suspend for a first offense. However, the duration of these suspensions dropped dramatically.

RFI #2591 - How many of the total 938 one-day short term suspensions in 2018-19 were the result of the “Student Code of Conduct [revision] to include a one-day cooling off period for students agreeing to mediation or drug/alcohol counseling for first-time offenses” (DAR at VI-150)?

Response: Twenty-five percent of those one-day short-term student suspensions were related to mediation or drug/alcohol counseling dispositions.