**Woodside Course/Program Enrollment and Discipline: Analysis**

**DISCIPLINE**

Convene a Team: Identifying Potential Disparities

1. Organize a Team – Dr. Betty Cobbs, Principal; Anne Jensen, Counselor; Christine Vo, Assistant Principal; Karen Miller, Reading Coach; Karen Johnson, Math Coach; Ashley Weiner, Math Support; Rachael Herrick, 1st grade teacher; Lisa Eldridge, 4th grade teacher; and Kristin Knott, Administrator Support Para Educator
2. List all Programs
	1. Highly Capable
	2. Discipline
3. Data Analysis preliminary findings and identified disparity issues -- Data provided is from 2018-19 school year and both reports contain different school enrollment counts
	1. **Discipline** disparity for the 1 student with in-school suspension,
4. Gender: Males represent 50.8% of the student body and 100% of the in-school suspensions -- over-represented (N=1). Females represent 49.2% of the student body and are under-represented with in-school suspension (N=0).
5. Ethnicity: Whites represent 46.7% of the study body and 100% of the in-school suspensions (N=1) -- over-represented. All other ethnic groups (Asian, Black, Hispanic, P. Islander and Two or More) are under-represented (N=0).
6. SWD: 10.5% of the students are in special education and represent 100 % of in-school suspensions (N=1) -- over-represented.
7. FRL: 34.6% of the students qualify for FRL and represent 100% of in-school suspensions (N=1) -- over-represented.
	1. **Discipline** disparity for the 4 identified students with out-of-school suspensions,
		1. Gender: Males represent 50.8% of the student body and 75% of the out-of-school suspensions (N=3) -- over-represented. Females represent 49.2% of the student body and 25% of the out-of-school suspensions (N=1) -- under-represented.
		2. Ethnicity: Whites represent 46.7% of the student body and 75% of the out-of-school suspensions (N=3) -- over-represented. Hispanics represent 24.3% of the student body and 25% of the out-of-school suspensions (N=1) -- over-represented. All other ethnic groups (Asian, Black, P. Islander and Two or More) are under-represented (N=0).
		3. SWD: 10.5% of students are in special education and represent 75% of out-of-school suspensions (N=3) -- over-represented.
		4. FRL: 34.6% of student population represent 75% of out-of-school suspensions (N=3) -- over-represented.
	2. **Preliminary Findings:**

White males in special education and who qualify for FRL are over-represented in school suspensions.

* Of the 34.6% students of poverty at WOE, 75% of the out-of-school suspensions are males (N=3 out of 4).
* 75% of the out-of-school suspended students are white males (N=3 out of 4)
1. Additional data
	1. SWIS – can look up individual students’ behavior referrals by location, motivation, time of day, day of week, time of year
	2. Panorama (grades 3-5) -- can look up social-emotional perception data by gender and ethnicity. We cannot access individual student data so would only be able to generalize. We can track goals and data for individual students through the Student Success Platform.
	3. EES (grades 4-5) – student perception data by gender and ethnicity; not by individual students
	4. OTG data – individual student information
	5. PBIS data for Tier 1, 2, and 3 behavior
2. Disparity issue, causes, and root causes
	1. Issue: White male of poverty are over-represented in suspensions
	2. Causes: aggression, low academics, changes in home environment
	3. Root Causes:
		1. Aggression: Lack of self-regulation, lack of social skills, low self-esteem
		2. Low Academics: poor work habits, poor attendance
		3. Changes in Home Environment: divorce, moving
3. Corrective Actions to Eliminate Disparities
	1. Lack of self-regulation
		1. Corrective Action: Second Step, MindUp, Zones of Regulation, Positive Discipline, PBIS, mentoring (including BBBS)
	2. Lack of Social Skills
		1. Corrective Action: Second Step, friendship groups, social groups
	3. Low Self-Esteem
		1. Corrective Action: “2X10” (adult “adopts” a student to give 2 minutes of attention for 10 days), Growth Mindset, mentoring program (BBBS)
	4. Poor Work Habits
		1. Corrective Action: iReady, extended day, tutoring, small group instruction
	5. Poor Attendance
		1. Corrective Action: school-wide attendance initiative (Every Day Counts), monthly attendance meetings with parents, public displays of attendance data, Check In/Check Out (CICO) with attendance secretary, before- and after-school enrichment activities
	6. Divorce
		1. Corrective action: small group or individual counseling
	7. Moving
		1. Corrective action: if move related to homelessness, work with family to arrange transportation so student can remain at WOE
4. Implementation Plan:
	1. PBIS Teams for Tier 1, 2, and 3 meet regularly.
	2. Corrective actions included in School Improvement Plan.

**Hi-Cap**

**Convene a Team: Identifying Potential Disparities**

1. Organize a Team – Dr. Betty Cobbs, Principal; Anne Jensen, Counselor; Christine Vo, Assistant Principal; Karen Miller, Reading Coach; Karen Johnson, Math Coach; Ashley Weiner, Math Support; EL Coach, Rachael Herrick, 1st grade teacher; Lisa Eldridge, 4th grade teacher; and Kristin Knott, Administrator Support Para Educator
2. List all Programs
	1. Highly Capable
	2. Discipline
3. Data Analysis preliminary findings and identified disparity issues -- Data provided is from 2018-19 school year and both reports contain different school enrollment counts
4. **Highly Capable** disparity for the 32 identified students identified for the program
5. Gender: 65.6% of males enrolled in the Hi-Cap program are overrepresented (N=21); and 34.4% of females enrolled in the Hi-Cap program are underrepresented (N=11).
6. Ethnicity: Asian students represent 15.2% of the student body and are overrepresented in Hi-Cap with 53.1% enrolled (N=17). Hispanic students represent 25.4% of the student body and are underrepresented in Hi-Cap with 0% enrolled (N=0). Whites represent 46.6% of the student body and are equally represented in Hi-Cap enrollment at 46.9% (N=15).
7. 504: 1.9% of students have a 504 and are underrepresented in Hi-Cap enrollment at 0% (N=0)
8. SWD: 10.6% of students are in special education and are overrepresented with 12.5% qualifying for Hi-Cap (N=4)
9. EL: 20.6% of student population are EL and are overrepresented with 25% qualifying for Hi-Cap (N=8)
10. FRL: 30.6% of student population qualify for FRL and are underrepresented with 6.2% qualifying for Hi-Cap (N=2)
11. Preliminary Findings:
12. White and Asian boys are more likely to qualify for Hi-Cap than Hispanic, Black, American Indian, Pacific Islander, and Two or More Races.
	* + 1. 14 of the 32 students in the Hi-Cap program qualify for special programs
13. Additional data
	1. No additional data needed. All assessments are provided by the district.
14. No additional data = no additional findings
15. Disparity issue, causes, and root causes
	1. Issue: Identifying highly capable characteristics in the students we serve.
	2. Causes: Lack of recognition, lack of communication to under-represented families, lack of referral
	3. Root Causes:
		1. Lack of Recognition of Characteristics of Hi-Cap Learners: need for training to recognize highly capable learner characteristics
		2. Poor Communication to Under-represented Families: not all parents are aware that they can refer their child for Hi-Cap testing
		3. Lack of Referral: teachers and parents don’t recognize that they can refer any child, even if they were not previously identified
16. Corrective Actions to Eliminate Disparities
	1. Lack of Training
		1. Corrective Action: professional development geared toward highly capable learner characteristics and strategies that support higher level learning
	2. Not all parents are aware that they can refer their child for Hi-Cap testing
		1. Corrective Action: post information on school website, share in newsletters and share during parent meetings/conferences
	3. Teachers and parents don’t recognize that they can refer any child, even if they were not previously identified
		1. Corrective Action: Professional development from district curriculum department for Hi-Cap learning about referral process and identifying Hi-Cap learners
17. Implementation Plan:
	1. Some corrective actions were already implemented this school year. CAST and LIF planning sessions have focused on planning instruction at higher levels for students who are at or above standard.
	2. Embed instructional strategies in next year’s School Improvement Plan to enhance higher level learning for students.