

EQUITY • QUALITY • COLLABORATION • COMMUNITY

DISCIPLINE IMPROVEMENT PLAN

Per <u>105 ILCS 5/2-3.162</u> and <u>Public Act 098-1102</u>, districts are required to submit a Discipline Improvement Plan. The Discipline Improvement Plan must be district board approved, placed on the district website, and submitted to ISBE by <u>June 1, 2022</u>.

DISCIPLINE IMPROVEMENT PLAN								
Name of School District/Charter School: Danville CCSD #118	School Year: 2022-2023	Board Approval Date(s): June 15, 2022						
School District/Charter School Address: Dr. David Fields Administrative Service Center	r, 110 E. Williams, Danvi	le, IL 61832						
Superintendent/Administrator Name: Dr. Alicia Geddis								
	21							
-								

isbe.net

100 N. First Street • Springfield, IL 62777-0001

Discipline Improvement Plan Team

Team Leader:

Molly Bailey Director of Special Education – <u>baileym@danville118.org</u>

Mr. John Hart Assistant Superintendent for Elementary Education- harti@danville118.org

Dr. Elizabeth A. Yacobi Assistant Superintendent for Secondary Education <u>– yacobie@danville118.org</u>

Team Members:

ISBE Discipline Plan Committee

District Instructional Leadership Team (DILT)

School Improvement Teams (SIPS)

Ownership in Education Committee

Student Support Services Personnel

	Discipline Improvement Plan										
1-Review of discipl	ine data:										
School District	Top 20% in Any Metrics	School Vear	Suspension Rate Eligibility	Suspension Rate	Top 20% in Suspension Rate	Expulsions Rate Eligibility	Expulsions Rate	Top 20% in Expulsion Rate	Racial Disproportionality Rate Eligibility	Racial Disproportionality Rate	Top_20% in Racial Disproportionality Rate
Danville CCSD 118	Yes	2016	Yes	43.158	Yes	Yes	0.793	Yes	Yes	2.251	No
Danville CCSD 118	Yes	2017	Yes	28.696	Yes	Yes	0.651	Yes	Yes	2.088	No
Danville CCSD 118	Yes	2018	Yes	46.612	Yes	No	0.000	No	Yes	2.550	No
Danville CCSD 118	Yes	2019	Yes	29.763	Yes	No	0.000	No	Yes	2.123	No
Danville CCSD 118	Yes	2020	Yes	25.025	Yes	No	0.000	No	Yes	1.960	No
Danville CCSD 118	No	2021	No	0.000	No	No	0.000	No	No	0.000	No

Other Data:

(See attached Danville High School discipline data, CRDC Data)

2-Data Analysis and Identified Trends:

- Behavioral incidences decreased in the 2020-2021 school year due to the COVID-19 pandemic. Most of our students were in remote learning from March 13, 2019 June of 2021. The 2021-2022 school year has brought to light the crisis our students have been living one where behavior regulation is most definitely an area of need.
- District 118 has been identified by ISBE as being eligible for racial disproportionality but has not been in the Top 20% of schools identified. This is an area that has also been identified in the Civil Rights Data Collection report. The plan reflects the same strategies to address this trend.
- While District 118 has really expanded alternative learning environments, (decrease in expulsion rate and incidence from 2016-2018), suspension rates remain a challenge.
- Danville High School Data shows increased incidences of loitering and cell phone infractions for the 2021-2022 school year. Physical Attack is the highest referral for expulsion. Freshman (who have not been in school in two years) hold the most discipline referrals.
- Violent behaviors (Physical attack) were noted to have increase during the 2021-2022 school year. Discussion around self-regulation was a topic among teams as students are struggling to regulate their behaviors in a structured environment.
- Finding alternative consequences to lesser behaviors is necessary (insubordination, loitering, cell phone usage). However, the district lacks alternatives to suspension. While we have some options in lieu of expulsion (alternative learning environments), we don't have options for students in lieu of suspension.
- In looking at district CRDC data, it does not appear that students with disabilities are suspended or expelled at higher rates than their peers.
 Students without disabilities have much longer suspensions than that of students with disabilities. Based upon the files we reviewed, it appears that students who are Black/African American or Two or more races receive more suspensions than peers.
- In reviewing district CRDC data, Violence without physical injury, insubordination, disrespect and drug offenses were the highest incidences.
- It is evident when reviewing CRDC data of individual cases that teams attempt many interventions with students, but when a student becomes violent or severe disrespect, the student is more likely to be suspended.

3-Potential Action Plan to Reduce the Use of Exclusionary Discipline and/or Racial Disproportionality:

- Utilize partnership with Dr. Kevin Tan, University of Illinois and Midwest PBIS to strengthen PBIS structures in all schools. Staff will need extensive coaching and systems development to support students who struggle with self-regulation.
- Provide extensive professional development for staff and administration on zones of behavior regulation (Special Education Support staff/District coaches).
- Provide Professional Development presented by Angela H. Mahome, M.D.
 - Dr. Mahome is a board-certified pediatric psychiatrist with expertise in ADHD and other mental health issues related to child development. For the last two-year, Dr. Mahome has worked in partnership with District 118, local pediatricians, students, and families.
 - Targeted populations include, but are not limited to nurses, teachers, school social workers and psychologists.
- Provide extensive parent training, utilizing Dr. Tan and other district resources (Community Engagement Specialist) to educate parents/guardians on self-regulation, routines, and the importance of daily attendance at school.
- Explore and develop alternatives to suspension as necessary. While Refocus and Recovery rooms exist at Danville High School and North Ridge Middle School, staffing remains a challenge. Development of comprehensive curriculums for Recovery Rooms staff with individuals who can help students learning coping skills.
- Professional development on classroom management involving: 1) Rules 2) Procedures 3) Consequences 4) Room Arrangements 5) Building Relationships and 6) Engaging Instruction.
- Professional development (consistent and coaching) on Trauma Based Training for all educational support staff.
- Regularly review building-level discipline data in SIP teams to ensure accuracy in reporting in SIS.
- Clarify and clean up discipline infractions in Skyward Student Information System which cause confusion among teachers and administrators reporting data to SIS.
- Specific instructional frameworks with Culturally Relevant Teaching indictors will be articulated consistently throughout the district schools.
- Additional staff development necessary to develop staff and community understanding of equity and cultural awareness.
- Develop strategies to support staff with decompressing after a behavioral event.
- Consistent communication in all district schools regarding the role of the teacher in classroom management and administrative role.
- Consistent approach for classroom support (BIST, Buddy Rooms, etc.)
- Utilize Home Interventionists in a different way mediate with parents and students (more of an educational role).
- Provide Parent/Student Counseling perhaps mandate it as part of resolution.
- Continue to utilize community-based student mentoring programs (It Takes a Village) to provide students with an adult role model and support person.
- Development of restorative practices within the school (i.e. restorative circles, Peer Court, etc.).
- Continue education and collaborative relationships with School Resource Officers.
- Based upon the results of the internal file review, change internal procedures to include a representative from the Special Education office in any meetings that may require a removal from school qualifying as a change of placement.

Discipline Data

2021-08-19 to 2022-04-14

Ranking over last 14 years:	11	13	8	9	12	10	1	6	5	2	4	7	14	3
	2008-2009	2009-2010	2010-2011	2011-2012	2012-2013	2013-2014	2014-2015	2015-2016	2016-2017	2017-2018	2018-2019	2019-2020	2020-2021	2021-2022
Dress Code Violation	0	0	0	762	422	426	2,767	23	83	2,515	70	164	24	362
Non-Dress PE	660	0	984	0	741	757	875	340	10					
Tardiness	858	468	847	316	447	887	6,383	1,242	2,707	1,258	3,903	1,167	375	6,024
Loitering	434	582	742	776	681	1,164	1,601	1,771	2,199	2,159	2,416	1,470	31	2,192
Insubordination	478	589	1,040	906	861	683	621	2,759	2,493	1,512	1,500	1,480	15	887
Possession Electronic Device	508	429	434	412	338	339	1,222	18	39	139	786	1,851	10	2,197
Drug &/or Tobacco Paraphernala	2	0	1	0	0	1	2		2		10	5	0	5
Altering Substance	16	15	19	11	11	7	14	15	29	30	20	38	2	28
Possession of Altering Substan	0	14	12	6	7	6	8	2	2	3	20	9	0	22
Possession or UseTobacco	13	6	13	6	7	4	19	13	7	5	16	27	11	39
Aggress Behavior or Acts	0	47	46	42	67	87	82						Printing of	
Aggress Behavior w/o PhyInjury								90	67	119	87	52	3	67
Disruption-Educational-Setting	295	200	294	447	339	416	439	730	702	522	685	609	37	307
Threatening-Intimidating Acts	58	65	88	84	98	101	80	A Transfer						
Threat-Int Acts w/o PhyInjury					E. A. Santa			107	103	123	173	77	4	19
Threat-Intim Acts w/phy Injury					-			1	1	0	4	0	0	2
Physical Attack	12	8	13	7	15	11	3							
Physical Attack w/o phy injury					HOL THE P			3	20	43	30	42	1	18
Physical Attack w/phys injury								3	7	1	3	6	0	0
Fighting	74	54	59	34	68	77	61			Sec. Con				
Fighting w/o physical injury								78	68	71	62	72	8	107
Fighting w/physical injury			a sale in the					1	0	0	0	3	0	0
everything else	2,412	2,292	2,261	2,768	1,543	1,545	2,103	2,506	1,622	4,883	3,198	2,420	124	1,055
Total Written	5,820	4,769	6,853	6,577	5,645	6,511	16,280	9,623	10,093	13,312	12,921	9,417	637	13,224



Suspensions





Illinois State Board of Education

Special Education Department

State Performance Plan (SPP) Indicator 4

Suspension/Expulsion Data Analysis and Self-Assessment Tool

District:	Danville School District No. 118					
Contact Person:	Contact Person: Molly Bailey, Director of Special Education					
Phone Number:	(217) 444-1080					
Email Address:	baileym@danville118.org					

State Performance Plan Indicator 4: Suspension/Expulsion

- 4A: Percent of districts identified by the State as having a significant discrepancy in the rates of suspensions and expulsions of children with IEPs for greater than 10 days in a school year; and
- 4B: Percent of districts identified by the State as having a significant discrepancy in the rates of suspensions and expulsions of children with IEPs of greater than 10 days in a school year by race and ethnicity and that have policies, procedures, and practices that contribute to the significant discrepancy and that do not comply with requirements relating to the development and implementation of IEPs, the use of positive behavioral interventions and supports, and procedural safeguards.

OVERVIEW OF REQUIREMENTS

This data analysis and self-assessment tool must be completed by all school districts identified by the State as having a significant discrepancy in the rates of suspensions and/or expulsions of students with disabilities for greater than 10 days in a school year and/or the rates of suspensions and/or expulsions of students in a racial/ethnic category. A district is determined to have a significant discrepancy if:

- Its suspension/expulsion rate is greater than the State Suspension/Expulsion Rate plus one standard deviation for <u>three consecutive years</u>, AND
- The district had at least five students with disabilities suspended or expelled more than ten days.

This data analysis and self-assessment tool is based upon the following requirements:

34 Code of Federal Regulations §300.170 Suspension and expulsion rates.

- (a) *General*. The SEA must examine data, including data disaggregated by race and ethnicity, to determine if significant discrepancies are occurring in the rate of long-term suspensions and expulsions of children with disabilities—
 - (1) Among LEAs in the State; or
 - (2) Compared to the rates for nondisabled children within those agencies.
- (b) Review and revision of policies. If the discrepancies described in paragraph (a) of this section are occurring, the SEA must review and, if appropriate, revise (or require the affected State agency or LEA to revise) its policies, procedures, and practices relating to the development and implementation of IEPs, the use of positive behavioral interventions and supports, and procedural safeguards, to ensure that these policies, procedures, and practices comply with the Act.

IDENTIFICATION OF NONCOMPLIANCE

As required by the Office of Special Education Programs (OSEP), ISBE must issue findings to LEAs that are not in compliance with 34 CFR §300.170 and ensure timely correction of noncompliance within one year. Based upon the established evaluation criteria, ISBE has the authority to identify school district policies, procedures, and practices that are not consistent with State and Federal requirements. Any district receiving a finding of noncompliance will be required to develop an improvement plan to address the area(s) of noncompliance. These districts must submit quarterly status reports on the activities included in the improvement plan, as well as documentation of any changes made to their policies, procedures, or practices as a result of the finding of noncompliance.

Data Analysis

Districts that have been identified as having a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions/expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year for children with IEPs (4A and/or 4B) are required to utilize discipline data for the last completed school year to complete the following analysis:

- 1. Disaggregate the following data sets using data from the last completed school year.
 - a. Total number and percentage of students enrolled in the district

Student Population	Total Number	Percentage of the Total Population
Students with Disabilities	899	16.73%
Students without Disabilities	4473	83.27%
English Learners (ELs) with Disabilities	27	0.50%

b. Number and percentage of students removed > 10 days

Attendance Center*	# of Students with Disabilities Removed > 10 Days	% of Students with Disabilities Removed > 10 Days	# of Students without Disabilities Removed > 10 Days	% of Students without Disabilities Removed > 10 Days
Edison Elementary	0	0%	0	0%
Garfield Elementary	0	0%	0	0%
Liberty Elementary	0	0%	0	0%
Mark Denman Elem	3	0.33%	1	0.02%
Meade Park Elementary	0	0%	0	0%

Northeast Elem Magnet	0	0%	0	0%
Southwest Elementary	0	0%	0	0%
South View Upper Elem	1	0.11%	14	0.31%
Kenneth D. Bailey Acad	0	0%	11	0.25%
North Ridge Middle Sch	2	0.22%	10	0.22%
Danville High School	10	1.11%	61	1.36%
Total	16		97	

* All schools/buildings within the district that removed students for more than 10 days should be included in this table. For example, if there are 15 schools/buildings in the district that removed students for more than 10 days, each of those buildings should be listed in this table.

c. Number and percentage of students removed > 10 days by race

Race/Ethnicity	# of Students with Disabilities Removed > 10 Days	% of Students with Disabilities Removed > 10 Days	# of Students without Disabilities Removed > 10 Days	% of Students without Disabilities Removed > 10 Days
White	0	0%	20	0.45%
Hispanic or Latino	2	0.22%	4	0.09%
American Indian/Alaska Native	0	0%	0	0%
Asian	0	0%	0	0%
Black or African American	12	1.33%	63	1.40%

Native Hawaiian or	0	0%	0	0%
Other Pacific Islander				
				0
Two or More Races	2	0.22%	10	0.22%

d. Number and percentage of EL students removed > than 10 days

English Learners	# of Students with	% of Students with	# of Students without	% of Students without
	Disabilities Removed >	Disabilities Removed >	Disabilities Removed >	Disabilities Removed >
	10 Days	10 Days	10 Days	10 Days
ELs	1	0.11%	0	0%
		iii.		

e. Number and percentage of students removed > than 10 days by grade

Grade	# of Students with Disabilities Removed > 10 Days	% of Students with Disabilities Removed > 10 Days	# of Students without Disabilities Removed > 10 Days	% of Students without Disabilities Removed > 10 Days
Kindergarten	0	0%	0	0%
First	0	0%	0	0%

Second	0	0%	1	0.02%
Third	2	0.22%	0	0%
Fourth	1	0.11%	0	0%
Fifth	0	0%	8	0.18%
Sixth	1	0.11%	6	0.13%
Seventh	0	0%	8	0.18%
Eighth	2	0.22%	11	0.25%

Ninth	6	0.67%	30	0.67%	
Tenth	3	3 0.33% 22		0.49%	
Eleventh	1	0.11%	9	0.20%	
Twelfth	0	0%	2	0.04%	

f. Number and percentage of students with disabilities removed > 10 days by disability:

Disability Category	# of Students with Disabilities Removed >	% of Students with Disabilities Removed >		
×	10 Days	10 Days		
Intellectual Disability	0	0%		
Orthopedic Impairment	0	0%		
Specific Learning Disability	4	0.44%		
Visual Impairment	0	0%		
Hearing Impairment	0	0%		
Deafness	0	0%		

Deaf-Blindness	0	0%
Speech or Language Impairment	1	0.11%
Emotional Disability	2	0.22%
Other Health Impairment	8	0.89%
Multiple Disabilities	0	0%
Developmental Delay	1	0.11%
Autism	0	0%
Traumatic Brain Injury	0	0%

2. Which offenses are students with disabilities being <u>suspended/expelled</u> for most? Please list the top three most common reasons for disciplinary removals for each race/ethnicity category for students with disabilities (SWD) and students without disabilities (SWOD). Please provide a key if using abbreviations and/or discipline codes. Provide definitions (handbook) of the infractions.

	1 st		2 nd		3 rd	
Race/Ethnicity	SWD	SWOD	SWD	SWOD	SWD	SWOD
White	Violence w/o phys Injury	Insubord ination	Insubordi nation	Violence w/o Phys Injury	Disrespe ct	Disrespe ct

Hispanic or Latino	Violence w/o Phys Injury	Insubord ination	Insubordi nation	Violence w/o Phys Injury	Drug Offenses	Loitering
American Indian/Alaska Native						
Asian	Gross Disobedi ence					6
Black or African American	Violence w/o Phys Injury	Violence w/o Phys Injury	Insubordi nation	Insubord ination	Drug Offenses	Disrespe ct
Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander		Insubord ination		Disrespe ct		
Two or More Races	Insubord ination	Violence w/o Phys Injury	Violence w/o Phys Injury	Insubord ination	Disrupt Educ Setting	Disrespe ct

File Review Results Summary

After completing the File Review Checklist, indicate:

- The number of student records marked Yes
- The number of student records marked No
- The number of student records marked Not-Applicable

File Review	Regulation	Number of Records	Number of Records	Number of Records
Item		Yes	No	N/A
1	34 CFR 300.530(b)	9	0	3
	34 CFR 300.536			(
2	34 CFR 300.530(a)	7	5	0
3	34 CFR 300.530(e)(1)	10	2	0
4	34 CFR 300.530(e)(1) (i)-(ii)	11	0	1
5	34 CFR 300.530(f)	4	7	1
6	34 CFR 300.530(d)(1) (i)-(ii)	3	4	5
7	34 CFR 300.530(f)(1)(i)	1	3	8
8	34 CFR 300.530(f)(1)(ii)	1	3	8
	34 CFR 300.530(f)(2)			
9	34 CFR 300.530(g)	1	11	0
10	34 CFR 300.530(g)(1-3)	1	9	0
11	34 CFR 300.530(b)(2)	2	9	1
12	34 CFR 300.530(d)(4)	3	6	1
13	34 CFR 300.501(b)	9	2	1
14	34 CFR 300.324(a)(2)(i)	10	2	0
15	34 CFR 300.324 (a)(3)(i);	9	2	1
	34 CFR 300.530(d)(4)			
16	23 IAC 226.230(b)	6	6	0
17	34 CFR 300.530(h)	11	1	0
18	34 CFR 300.530(h)	5	7	0
19	34 CFR 300.503	10	0	2
20	34 CFR 300.530(d)	12	0	0

Root Cause Analysis

After completing the data analysis and file review checklist, please answer the following questions and provide a thorough explanation to support the response.

- 1. Based on the above data analysis for suspensions/expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year for children with IEPs, what conclusions can you draw by:
 - a. Student population?
 - i. Are students with disabilities suspended/expelled at a higher rate than students without disabilities?
 - In looking at district data, it does not appear that students with disabilities are suspended or expelled at higher rates than their peers. Students without disabilities have much longer suspensions than that of students with disabilities.
 - ii. Are English Learners (Els) with Disabilities suspended/expelled at a higher rate than students without disabilities?
 - There is no evidence that EL students with Disabilities are suspended at higher rates than peers.
 - b. Attendance center?
 - i. Are the data evenly distributed across the district or are there particular school buildings that are experiencing higher rates of suspensions/expulsions for students with disabilities than others?
 - Secondary education, North Ridge Middle School and Danville High School, along with Mark Denman Elementary School have higher rates. Mark Denman Elementary is the largest elementary building, housing 700 students. It also has the highest population of special education students due to lifeskills and four cross-categorical rooms.
 - ii. Did the team determine any patterns that exist regarding removals?
 - Most suspensions were due to violence without physical injury, with the second being disruption to the learning environment.
 - c. Race/ethnicity?
 - i. Are the data evenly distributed across the district or are there particular racial/ethnic groups that are experiencing higher rates of suspensions/expulsions for students with disabilities than others?
 - Based upon the files we reviewed, it appears that students who are Black/African American or Two or more races receive more suspensions than peers.
 - ii. Did the team determine any patterns that exist regarding removals?
 - No patterns were identified.
 - d. Grade?
 - i. Are the data evenly distributed across the district or are there particular grades that are experiencing higher rates of suspensions/expulsions for students with disabilities than others?

- Students in ninth grade have higher rates of suspension than any other grade level in the district. The students in elementary have nearly zero suspension.
- ii. Did the team determine any patterns that exist regarding removals?
 - No pattern was evident.
- e. Disability category?
 - i. Are the data evenly distributed across the district or are there particular disability categories that are experiencing higher rates of suspensions/expulsions for students with disabilities than others?
 - Students qualifying with Other Health Impairment are suspended at higher rates, followed by Specific Learning Disability.
 - ii. Did the team determine any patterns that exist regarding removals?
 - No pattern was identified.
- f. Offense/infraction?
 - i. Are the data evenly distributed across the district or are there particular offenses that result in higher rates of suspensions/expulsions for students with disabilities than others?
 - Violence without physical injury, insubordination, disrespect and drug offenses were the highest incidences.
 - ii. Did the team determine any patterns that exist regarding removals?
 - It is evident when reviewing individual cases that team attempt many interventions with students, but when a student becomes violent or severe disrespect, the student is more likely to be suspended.
- 2. Based on the results of the student record reviews for children with IEPs who have suspensions/expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year, what conclusions can you draw regarding:
 - a. The development and implementation of IEPs?
 - i. Through the file review it was noted that the cases are not consistently handled. The BIP plan was typically already in place and not always reviewed at the manifestation determination meeting. The teams did not provide good evidence of using unique circumstances and evidence to make determinations. Also, students did not receive instruction on days 11+ of suspension.
 - b. The use of positive behavioral interventions and supports?
 - *i.* Almost all of the discipline files noted positive behavioral interventions, the IEP did not necessarily speak to them. PD is needed in FBA/BIP.
 - c. Procedural safeguards?
 - i. Procedural Safeguards are inconsistently given to parents in these cases.

Root Cause

Based on the data analysis and student record reviews, the team has determined the following to be the root cause(s) of the significant discrepancy in the rates of suspensions and/or expulsions of students with disabilities for greater than 10 days:

• The team discussed the root cause at length. Though we were unable to identify a single root cause, the team found a few areas in which we feel contribute to the suspension rates. First, many teams utilized 1–2 day suspensions for lesser behaviors, then when the student had a more significant behavior, the suspensions exceeded the 10–day mark.. Finding alternative consequences to lesser behaviors is necessary. Second, the district lacks alternatives to suspension. While we have some options in lieu of expulsion, we don't have options for students with disabilities in lieu of suspension. Finally, in the file review we noted that 4 of the students' files indicated a lesser suspension or alternative placement, but the suspension days were not changed in the system. So, those days all got recorded as suspension days though they were actually in a remote learning environment or back in the classroom.

Action Steps

Based on the district's root cause analysis, identify the immediate actions the district will take in order to address the discrepant rates of suspension/expulsion for students with disabilities (Indicator 4A and/or 4B). Districts should consider system factors that are related to their root cause(s) when determining activities for action steps (e.g., instruction, leadership, climate/environment, opportunity gaps, adult interventions, cultural responsiveness, etc.). List at least three NEW activities along with a brief narrative explaining how the district plans to implement each activity to address the discrepant rates of suspension/expulsion for students with disabilities for greater than 10 days. For each activity, indicate the person(s) responsible, timelines/monitoring dates, and evidence of implementation. NOTE: ISBE will request evidence of implementation if the district is issued a finding of noncompliance or is identified for Indicator 4 A/B in the future.

	Activity	Person(s)	Timelines/Monitoring	Evidence of
		Responsible (by	Dates	Implementation
		title)		
1	Based upon the results of the internal file review, provide training to staff	Director of	Summer and/or	Documentation
	regarding appropriate procedures regarding Functional Behavior	Special	2021-2022 School	of training (i.e.
	Assessments, Behavior intervention Plans, Manifestation Determinations	Education,	Year	attendance sign-
	and notification of Procedural Safeguards.	Assistant		
		Director of		

		Special Education, Special Ed. Instructional Coach		in, training materials, etc.)
2	Based upon the results of the internal file review, change internal procedures to include a representative from the special education office in any meetings that may require a removal from school qualifying as a change of placement.	Director of Special Education, Assistant Director of Special Education, Special Ed. Instructional Coach	On-going	Documentation of procedural changes
3	Regularly review building-level discipline data to ensure accuracy in reporting in SIS.	Building administrators and Director of Special Education	Monthly	Building level discipline data
4	Utilize partnership with Dr. Kevin Tan, University of Illinois and Midwest PBIS to strengthen PBIS	Director of Special Education	Summer and School Year 2021-2022	Documentation of training (i.e. attendance sign- in, training materials, etc.)