VOYCE's Groundbreaking Bill, SB 100, to Address "School-to-Prison Pipeline" Passes Illinois Legislature

A bill passed by the Illinois House of Representatives on May 20 will require sweeping changes in the use of punitive school discipline practices across the state. Senate Bill 100, which was approved last month in the Senate with bipartisan support, represents perhaps the most aggressive and comprehensive effort ever made by a state to address the "school-to-prison pipeline."

SB 100 prioritizes the creation of safe and orderly schools while seeking to address excessive use of the most severe forms of discipline. Under the legislation students can only be suspended, expelled or referred to an alternative school if all other "appropriate and available" alternatives are exhausted. In other words, suspensions and expulsions become the last resort, rather than the first response.

Additionally, the bill provides struggling students with academic and behavioral supports, and promotes fairness by holding public schools and charter schools to the same standards for school discipline. The final House vote count was 73 yes – 41 no, with broad support from both Republicans and Democrats. SB 100 is now awaiting the Governor's signature.

The effort to pass SB 100 was led by VOYCE (Voices of Youth in Chicago Education), a group of mostly high school students from Chicago. They created the bill in 2012 to address the impact of out-of-school suspensions and expulsions on their peers and schools. For over two years, dozens of students traveled regularly to the Capitol in Springfield to educate their legislators on how disciplinary practices were pushing students out of school and into the juvenile and criminal justice systems.

Dalia Mena, an 18 year old member of VOYCE from Steinmetz High School stated that, "For too long, harsh school discipline practices have contributed to the under-education and over-criminalization of young people, and especially youth of color," said Dalia. "Illinois legislators have demonstrated that by listening to students, we can create schools where all students are valued and supported in their learning. SB 100 makes Illinois go from one of the worst states when it comes to overusing exclusionary discipline, to being a national leader with a model for other states to follow."

Illinois has one of the widest disparities between suspended black and white students in the country, according to the Department of Education's Office of Civil Rights. In the 2012-13 school year, Chicago Public Schools issued 32 out-of-school suspensions for every 100 black students, compared to just five for every 100 white students. Overall, Illinois students lose over one million instructional days per year as a result of suspensions, expulsions and arrests.

"In schools all across our state, African-American students are disciplined more harshly than white students. As legislators, we saw that this was a serious problem—and that it required our immediate attention. We went to work engaging educators, administrators, parents, students and experts to help us build support for SB 100. Through that process and hard work, we have passed SB 100, a common sense solution to ending this disparity and making our schools safer and stronger. Thanks to SB 100, Illinois is a national leader with a model piece of legislation," said Senator Kimberly Lightford, chief sponsor of SB 100 in the Illinois Senate.

Many districts in Illinois had extremely high suspension rates. For example, there were 47 out-of-school suspensions for every 100 students in Thornton Township HSD 205 (South Holland), 36 for every 100 in Proviso Township HSD 209 (Forest Park), and 30 per 100 in Thornton Township HSD 215 (Calumet City).

Extensive research shows that overly harsh discipline approaches are particularly harmful to students of color and do not promote school safety or academic achievement. Last year, the U.S. Departments of Education and Justice issued joint guidelines on school discipline practices and warned against the discriminatory use of "zero-tolerance" policies on students of color and those with disabilities. The guidelines call on school districts to focus on creating positive school climates and to use suspensions and expulsions only as a last resort.
"For Illinois, SB 100 represents a step forward, that allows schools to maintain control, while providing guidelines for schools to follow so that our students remain in school and on track to graduate," said Representative Will Davis, chief sponsor of SB 100 in the Illinois House. "For far too long, the issue of overusing suspensions and expulsions has devastated the most vulnerable in our communities but today Illinois became a leader with SB 100 serving as a common sense solution."

To learn more about SB 100, click here. For more information, contact Jose I. Sanchez at jose@voyceproject.org or at (773) 827-6324.
School-Wide Positive Behavior Support and Response to Intervention

by George Sugai, Ph.D. University of Connecticut, Storrs OSEP Center on Positive Behavioral Interventions and Supports Center for Behavioral Education and Research

Schools are complex environments where the collective skills, knowledge, and practices of a culture are taught, shaped, encouraged, and transmitted. Teachers are challenged to provide effective and explicit instruction that maximizes students' acquisition of concepts, skills, and information, and students are challenged to remain attentive, responsive, and engaged to benefit from these instructional opportunities. These formidable goals are enriched and complicated by learners with diverse learning histories, unique strengths and limitations, and defining cultural influences. In addition, schools, families, and students continually must adapt to maximize benefits from the school experience.

In recent years, achieving these goals has required that schools a) increase instructional accountability and justification, b) improve the alignment between assessment information and intervention development, c) enhance use of limited resources and time, d) make decisions with accurate and relevant information, e) initiate important instructional decisions earlier and in a more timely manner, f) engage in regular and comprehensive screening for successful and at-risk learners, g) provide effective and relevant support for students who do not respond to core curricula, and g) enhance fidelity of instructional implementation (Sugai, 2007).

In response, a general problem-solving framework, Response to Intervention (RTI), has evolved to address these need statements. Although not new or limited to special education, RTI initially appeared as policy in the Individuals with Disabilities Education Improvement Act of 2004 (IDEA 2004), and it has conceptual and empirical foundations in, for example, applied behavior analysis, curriculum-based measurement, precision teaching, pre-referral intervention, teacher assistance teaming, diagnostic prescriptive teaching, data-based decision making, early universal screening and intervention, behavioral and instructional consultation, and team-based problem solving (Sugai, 2007). RTI has been described as an approach for establishing and redesigning teaching and learning environments so that they are effective, efficient, relevant, and durable for all students, families, and educators (Sugai, 2007). Specifically, RTI is shaped by six defining ADDITIONAL ARTICLES
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characteristics (Brown-Chidsey & Steege, 2005; Christ, Burns, & Ysseldyke, 2005; Fuchs & Deshler, 2007; Fuchs & Fuchs, 2007; Fuchs, Mock, Morgan, & Young, 2003; Gresham, 2005; Gresham et al., 2005; Kame'enui, 2007; National Association of State Directors of Special Education, 2006; Severson, Walker, Hope-Doolittle, Kratochwill, & Gresham, 2007):

1. **Universal screening**: Learner performance and progress should be reviewed on a regular basis and in a systematic manner to identify students who are a) making adequate progress, b) at some risk of failure if not provided extra assistance, or c) at high risk of failure if not provided specialized supports.

2. **Data-based decision making and problem solving**: Information that directly reflects student learning based on measurable and relevant learning criteria and outcomes should be used to guide decisions regarding instructional effectiveness, student responsiveness, and intervention adaptations and modifications.

3. **Continuous progress monitoring**: Student progress should be assessed on a frequent and regular basis to identify adequate or inadequate growth trends and support timely instructional decisions.

4. **Student performance**: Priority should be given to using actual student performance on the instructional curriculum to guide decisions regarding teaching effectiveness and learning progress.

5. **Continuum of evidence-based interventions**: An integrated and linked curriculum should be available such that:
   - A core curriculum is provided for all students;
   - A modification of this core is arranged for students who are identified as nonresponsive, and
   - A specialized and intensive curriculum is developed for students whose performance is deemed nonresponsive to the modified core. Elements of this continuum must have empirical evidence to support efficacy (intervention is linked to outcome), effectiveness (intervention outcomes are achievable and replicable in applied settings), relevant (intervention can be implemented by natural implementers and with high fidelity), and durable (intervention implementation is sustainable and student outcomes are durable).

6. **Implementation fidelity**: Team-based structures and procedures are in place to ensure and coordinate appropriate adoption and accurate and sustained implementation of the full continuum of intervention practices.

Although most RTI implementation efforts have focused on academic curriculum and instructional practices (e.g., early literacy and numeracy), applications of the RTI framework also are represented in the implementation of School-wide Positive Behavior Support (SWPBS) practices and systems (Sugai et al., 2000). A comparison of RTI applications in early literacy and social behavior reveals similarities within core RTI characteristics (see Figure 1).
Rtl Application Examples

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TEAM</th>
<th>EARLY READING/LITERACY</th>
<th>SOCIAL BEHAVIOR</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>General educator, special educator, reading specialist, Title 1, school psychologist, etc.</td>
<td>General educator, special educator, behavior specialist, Title 1, school psychologist, etc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNIVERSAL SCREENING</td>
<td>Curriculum based measurement</td>
<td>SSBD, record review, gating</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PROGRESS MONITORING</td>
<td>Curriculum based measurement</td>
<td>ODR, suspensions, behavior incidents, precision teaching</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EFFECTIVE INTERVENTIONS</td>
<td>5-specific reading skills phonemic awareness, phonics, fluency, vocabulary, comprehension</td>
<td>Direct social skills instruction, positive reinforcement, token economy, active supervision, behavioral contracting, group contingency management, function-based support, self-management</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DECISION MAKING RULES</td>
<td>Core, strategic, intensive</td>
<td>Primary, secondary, tertiary tiers</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 1: Comparison of RTI in Literacy and Social Behavior


A particularly important feature of SWPBS and RTI is an emphasis on prevention (see Figure 2), which has its roots in public health and disease control and occurs at three levels:

1. Primary tier prevention: All students are exposed to a core social behavior curriculum to prevent the development of problem behavior and to identify students whose behaviors are not responsive to that core.
2. Secondary tier prevention: Supplemental social behavior support is added to reduce the current number and intensity of problem behavior.
3. Tertiary tier prevention: Individualized and intensive behavior support is developed to reduce complications, intensity, and/or severity of existing problem behavior.

This three-tiered prevention logic has direct application to both academic and social behavior supports (Kame'enui, 2007; Lane et al., 2007; O'Shaughnessy, Lane, Gresham, & Beebe-Frankenberger, 2003; Sadler & Sugai, in press).
Although conceptualized as a three-tiered framework, this continuum of evidence-based practices of RTI and SWPBS applications is best represented as a blended integration that has relevance and application across the range of teaching and learning environments that exist in schools and communities. In Figure 3, examples of specific school-based behavioral interventions are organized in the traditional three-tiered framework but also are aligned along this integrated curriculum. If done properly, each practice should have decision rules for determining movement up and down the continuum based on student performance. The specialized nature of interventions and breadth of the continuum will vary by developmental level (e.g., early childhood/preschool, elementary, middle, high school), environmental constraints (e.g., small vs. large school), alternative programming (e.g., correctional school, hospital setting), and so on. For example, an intensive program for students with significant emotional and behavioral disorders might have a structured level system and token economy for all students that involves hourly social behavior progress monitoring and feedback associated with school-wide social skills (primary tier); a peer- or adult-based individualized behavioral contracting system with continuous prompting, monitoring, and feedback (secondary tier); and cognitive-behavioral counseling sessions every morning that are linked to psychopharmacological and person-centered process planning (tertiary tier).
Although applications of the RTI logic and SWPBS approach seem straightforward, research (Christ et al., 2005; Fairbanks, Sugai, Guardino, & Lathrop, 2007; Fuchs & Deshler, 2007; Gresham, 2005; Klingner & Edwards, 2006; Sandomierski, Kincaid, & Algozzine, 2007) has shown that school personnel need to continually rethink their practices in a number of areas.

In conclusion, RTI is a good framework and logic for organizing and increasing the efficiency with which evidence-based practices are selected, organized, integrated, implemented, and adapted. Examples and applications of the RTI logic are being developed, demonstrated, and tested in a number of academic content areas and in social behavior supports. As represented in SWPBS, RTI gives priority to the continuous monitoring of important student performance indicators in response to high-fidelity implementation of evidence-based practices. Timely screening and data-based decisions are encouraged so that more effective and efficient interventions can be provided for students whose behaviors are not responsive to core practices and interventions. Preventing the development and lessening the intensity of problem behavior must be a high priority of instructors seeking to maximize student learning and the impact of effective interventions. If done wisely in the context of other initiatives and interventions across classroom and nonclassroom settings, the possibility of improving student academic and social behavior outcomes can become a reality for all students.

1. How curriculum adoptions and instructional design decisions are made;
2. How special and general educators work together to address the needs of all students;
Tertiary Level Prevention

Positive behavior support is an application of a behaviorally-based systems approach to enhance the capacity of schools, families, and communities to design effective environments that improve the fit or link between research-validated practices and the environments in which teaching and learning occurs. Attention is focused on creating and sustaining primary (school-wide), secondary (classroom), and tertiary (individual) systems of support that improve lifestyle results (personal, health, social, family, work, recreation) for all children and youth by making problem behavior less effective, efficient, and relevant, and desired behavior more functional.

Resources

- Social judgments of integrated and segregated students with mental retardation toward their same-age peers
- Violence and youth: Psychology’s response

This summary report by the American Psychological Association’s Commission on Violence and Youth examines individual and societal factors that contribute to youth violence in the United States and offers intervention strategies to reduce such violence. It examines biological, family, school, emotional, cognitive, social, and cultural factors which contribute to violent behavior. The report reviews what psychologists have learned about the factors that accompany and contribute to youth violence. It recommends a variety of specific efforts to reduce youth violence through: (1) early childhood interventions; (2) school-based interventions; (3) heightened awareness of cultural diversity; (4) development of the mass media to be part of the solution; (5) limiting access to firearms by children and youth; (6) reduction of youth involvement with alcohol and drugs; (7) psychological health services.