

**Governor’s Statewide School Safety Task Force  
Student Well Being Workgroup  
SEPTEMBER 12, 2018, 2018 9:00 AM**

**Meeting Locations:**

<b>Office</b>	<b>Address</b>	<b>City</b>	<b>Meeting Room</b>
Department of Education	9890 S. Maryland Pkwy	Las Vegas	Bristle Cone Conference Room
Department of Education	700 E. Fifth St.	Carson City	Battle Born Conference Room

**SUMMARY MINUTES OF THE REGULAR MEETING**

*(Video Conferenced)*

**Agenda Item I: Call to Order; Pledge of Allegiance**

- Chair Tolles called the Meeting to Order at 9:08 AM
- Chair Tolles led the Pledge of Allegiance

**Agenda Item II: Roll Call**

**Task Force Members in Attendance:**

**In Las Vegas:**

- Dr. Leon Ravin - Dept. Health and Human Services
- Derek Krallman - Teacher Mack Middle School
- Katherine Dockweiler - Health Care Professional
- Pat Hickey – Charter School Association
- Pilar Biller - Teacher

**In Carson City:**

- Jill Tolles, Vice Chair - State Assemblywoman
- Katherine Loudon - Health Care Professional
- Bridget Peterson - School Board Trustee
- Caryn Swobe - Parent

**Video Conference:**

- Zack Robbins

**DEPARTMENT STAFF PRESENT:**

**In Carson City**

- Sylvia Verdugo, Executive Assistant to the Superintendent of Public Instruction
- Christy McGill, Director of the Office for Safe and Respectful Learning Environments

**LEGAL STAFF PRESENT:**

**In Las Vegas:**

- David Gardner, Deputy Attorney General

**AUDIENCE:**

**In Las Vegas:**

- Jacqueline Eddy

**In Carson City:**

- Coleen Lawrence
- Andrew Clinger

**Video Conference:**

- Mara Schiff, PhD
- Steve Kilgus, PhD

**Agenda Item III: Public Comment #1**

- Chair Tolles asked for public comment.
  - There was none

**Agenda Item IV: Approval of August 13, 2018 Meeting Minutes**

- Chair Tolles asked for comments. Since there were none, the Chair moved to approve the minutes.
  - Member Swobe seconded
  - The motion passed unanimously

**Agenda Item VI: Presentations and discussion regarding Student well-being and mental health**

- Member Peterson moved to exercise the flexible agenda and switch agenda items V and VI.
  - Member Ravin seconded
  - The motion passed unanimously
- Chair Tolles introduced the two presenters (Dr. Steve Kilgus and Dr. Mara Schiff), and asked Dr. Kilgus to present.
  - Dr. Kilgus went through a presentation (provided as [Item #6-Stephen Kilgus P.H.](#)). He discussed universal screenings and noted that it has an important role within MTSS since it allows schools to identify students who might need targeted support. All students should be evaluated, and it can be done at various times and intervals (1-2 times a year for example). Waiting 4-6 weeks into the school year is ideal. Regardless of when, the screening should be brief. At the preschool level, parents provide information; in Elementary school, teachers are looked to for information; in Middle/High school, it's really the students themselves who provide information. Various screening methods have been developed, but there are barriers to implementing these tools: time, lack of infrastructure for identified students, there needs to be a connection between intervention and screenings, and issues of consent and assent (the PBRA provides some guidance). To avoid those problems, targeted screenings might be the solution.
    - Chair Tolles asked Dr. Kilgus to go through the screening process using the provided SAEBRS Screenings for [students](#) and [teachers](#) that he helped design, which he agreed to do. Dr. Kilgus provided a quick summary of the two screenings and asked task force members to complete the student version.
      - Chair Tolles commented that the screening took about 3 minutes, and Member Peterson wondered if it might take longer for small children. Dr. Kilgus agreed with that, but noted that the student version was intended mainly for middle/high-school students.
      - Member Dockweiler commented that her elementary school (around 1000 students) had done the SRSS. That process had taken about 15 minutes. She commented that her school had built the infrastructure in the previous year, and she thanked Dr. Kilgus for his presentation.
      - Chair Tolles wondered to whom this screening would go. Dr. Kilgus noted that it depended on the system. The SAEBRS system can be done online and would be scored directly. SRSS usually requires manual scoring and an excel database.
      - Chair Tolles asked to be sent the scoring formula, and Dr. Kilgus responded that he would do so. Chair Tolles asked if SAEBRS was free,

and Dr. Kilgus noted that it was \$7.00 per student, per year at [fastbridge.org](http://fastbridge.org).

- Member Tolles asked Member Dockweiler how long it would take to analyze the data collected via hard copies. Member Dockweiler noted that their groupings would be done in half a day since her school was incorporating additional materials. Member Tolles asked if that information was internal or would be distributed to parents and students. Member Dockweiler noted that teachers would be informed of all scores, but students who needed additional supports would need to have active consent from their parents. Since the majority of the students will not be at risk, there is not necessarily anything to report back to parents.
- Director McGill wondered if the screening was universal or targeted, and Member Dockweiler noted that it was universal.
- Member Loudon commented that she was a fan of universal screenings. However, the main issues with parents was not doing work on the front end and keeping them informed after the screening. She asked Dr. Kilgus for advice on who keeps the data and where it might be stored. Dr. Kilgus noted that prior, during, and after the screening process parents needed to be kept informed by providing them with sample timelines, timelines for contact, and information on the types of decisions that would be made. Having data be controlled within the administrative group would be ideal. Teachers could have access to the data for their own classrooms.
- Member Swobe asked about the state as a whole. Is this screening being done across the state or just in individual schools? Member Loudon noted that Washoe County has done some screenings, but it's not universal. They do universal screenings for signs of suicide in middle school. Director McGill noted that it is really varied. Some districts are worried about universal screenings and only do targeted screenings. Member Swobe asked if the goal was to have every child screened. Director McGill responded that there were some parental concerns around that.
- Member Ravin noted that all universal screening methods have a high rate of false positives; he asked if those false positives would result in a stigma or a confirmation bias for students who are regarded differently by a teacher. Dr. Kilgus noted that a high sensitivity screening would result in false positives, but the rate for SABRES was very low. This would not result in automatically labeling students and would not result in a mental health label. A finding that a student was "needing intervention" was not an extremely negative label, but there is always some risk of influencing the ways that teachers interact with students. Dr. Ravin asked about the reliability of the scales when possible bias might exist in teachers who have preconceived expectations about certain students or student groups. Might it be better to have a more neutral individual involved? Can students be trusted to rate themselves without bias? Dr. Kilgus noted the importance of seeing research that would show that a screening worked the same for various groups. [Intensiveintervention.org](http://Intensiveintervention.org) is a site that coordinates reviews for screenings. His research has shown a low level of bias among teachers. Students, of course, have biases and looking at a wide array of materials is a way to go.
- Member Dockweiler asked Dr. Kilgus how long it would take to build infrastructure to do a screening. Dr. Kilgus responded that a 6-9 month runway would be enough.
- According to Member Loudon, pre-work with teachers could help reduce stigmas; educating parents/teachers about the interventions themselves can mean that some parents want interventions even if their child does

not score in a way that would warrant them. Dr. Kilgus agreed with those points, particularly regarding educating/training teachers. Teachers are observers of student behaviors, they are reporters of that information, and they are the main catalysts of the intervention process.

- Chair Tolles thanked Dr. Kilgus and transitioned over to Dr. Schiff.
  - Dr. Schiff loaded a presentation (marked [Item #6-Mara Schiff PH.D. Restorative Justice](#)). She noted that she had been working on issues of restorative justice for 25 years. Zero tolerance policies have been a failure. School suspension also results in lower achievement, and African American students (particularly those with learning disabilities) are more likely to be disadvantaged by these policies. Metal detectors and security guards don't necessarily make schools safer. Increased security can make students more worried about crime. Dr. Schiff outlined a five point school plan but focused on the first point regarding discipline policies/school climate. Restorative justice centers the needs of those harmed, holds individuals accountable, and creates a path forward. There are two ways to do this. Either build a whole school approach or a more incident focused approach. Whole school approaches focus on Tier 1 approaches (building values of respect, trust, inclusion, etc.) throughout a school. It can be time consuming at the beginning but can save time in the long term. Incident driven strategies focus on specific incidents and ensure that there is a plan moving forward. Restorative approaches are really about building relationships. Dr. Schiff presented several slides providing evidence illustrating the usefulness of the approach and asked for questions.
    - Dr. Ravin noted the potential of the approach and told a story about a child who brought vodka to school and was sent home rather than being kept in school via this approach. He asked Dr. Schiff what sort of time frame and approach does it take to get this right? Dr. Schiff replied that it is a time consuming process since it involves shifting an entire culture. It can take 2-4 or 3-5 years to fully implement a whole school approach, but targeted approaches can be done quickly. However, there has to be some amount of culture developed prior to starting a targeted program.
    - Member Krallman thanked Dr. Schiff and pointed out that he works in a middle school. He has spent six years building these programs. The challenge has been dealing with the mindset of instructors themselves. When children returned to the classroom, teachers still want some form of justice in a traditional sense. Dr. Schiff asked about the incorporation of teachers into the process. Are teachers brought into the conversation so that the students and teachers are building a relationship through the process? Dr. Schiff also asked about building restorative practices among the adults themselves. Are faculty coming together in a restorative way, or is the focus just on children? There needs to be interaction among faculty members as well.
    - Member Dockweiler asked how restorative practices might differ between elementary and middle/high school contexts. Dr. Schiff responded that elementary schools focused more on relationship building and engagement. The basic principles are the same; building a culture/climate based on respect, trust, loyalty, etc. It is just tailored to the developmental level of the schools, but it's the same message.
    - Member Hickey noted his background as a former legislator. He noted the comments of an African American teacher who wondered about the safety of educators within this sort of framework. He encouraged the taskforce to be mindful of potential unintended consequences of their decisions. Dr Schiff noted that there is not one approach that works for everyone. This should fit into an overarching model, and kids with serious mental health or drug issues might be better helped by another process. However, holding students accountable for their actions is different than punishment. Law enforcement could certainly be involved in serious cases, but that involvement would not prevent the inclusion of restorative practices to bring students back into the classroom.
    - Member Dockweiler asked about Dr. Schiff's experience working with administrators who are resistant to restorative practices. Dr. Schiff noted her

experience working with districts where it was clear that it was top down approach by districts and in other cases where it was being adopted on a school-by-school basis by interested principals. Usually after two or three days, she has been able to see resistant attitudes shift. There is a difference between reading about the process and actually experiencing it, and the experience can be very powerful. Most teachers and administrators are convinced when they see it actually working with students and teachers. Just reading a book is not enough. There needs to be training and infrastructure in place.

- Member Loudon related that the Washoe County School District has been implementing these practices, but there have been concerns surrounding violent incidents. How can a target of violence be supported in this sort of system? Dr. Schiff noted that it might not be appropriate in certain cases to bring students together right away. It is important to be prepared. Without a prepared safe environment, students won't feel safe. That's really a responsibility of the restorative justice team to work with parents and students to help create that. Building empathy in those who have done harm is important in order to change behavior, and restorative programs can really help with that. Sometimes kids don't see the impact of their actions, and when they hear about it their behavior can change. Sometimes we think safety can result from taking a violent child out of school, but that's not necessarily the case since the behavior has not actually changed.
- Member Billar asked about the school districts who had adopted this as a policy. What sort of training was involved? Dr. Schiff noted that Oakland started in one middle school. The results in that middle school resulted in a slow expansion. It was adopted as a district policy, and infrastructure was installed to support it. For example, they have constant training and permanent structures in schools. Orange County Schools decided to adopt this in middle schools; Dr. Schiff trained some 500 teachers for them. Those teachers are now training others since, after the middle schools, it rolled out to high schools. They have been doing that for some three years. Other districts offer one off trainings. Member Billar asked about state policy and funding. Dr. Schiff noted that states were slow on the uptake. Minnesota's Department of Education has a policy, but they are almost alone in that (Colorado is pretty good). Mainly it is done on the district level. However, there are no state-wide regulations that enforce restorative policies.
- Member Peterson noted that it was difficult to implement since teachers have negotiated agreements regarding training. Dr. Schiff agreed that professional development is difficult, but it's really up to the districts on what to prioritize. It might have to take some amount of time away from something else.
- Chair Tolles asked about implementation at the university level for prospective teachers. Dr. Schiff noted that it really was not being incorporated as much as she would like. It comes up, but she was not aware of any particular programs at a university (not to say that they don't exist). Chair Tolles asked if restorative justice forbids expulsion or suspension when it is necessary for student safety. Dr. Schiff noted that was really up to the districts. Each code of conduct is going to be different. The two are not mutually exclusive, but students need to know that the restorative process is actually working so that they are willing to invest the time and energy in that process.
- After some technical difficulties, Dr. Schiff returned to thank the Work Group for listening. Chair Tolles thanked her for her time as well.
- Director McGill noted that schools that have a MTSS or other framework make it easier to integrate Restorative Justice processes. As Member Peterson noted, time is short, and having a framework in place can be very helpful.
  - Member Swobe noted that these presentations confirmed that the Work Group was on the right track and that their recommendations were in line with the recommendations of the experts.
- Chair Tolles noted that three resources had been sent her way as optional homework. The

first is the Virginia Model of Risk Assessment, the second is the Colorado Model of Risk Assessment, and the third is an overall review of restorative justice in US schools from WestED.

#### **Agenda Item V: Discussion and Action regarding the Discussion and Action regarding Recommendation #5**

- Chair Tolles moved on to Agenda Item V and reviewed the purpose of Recommendation #5. She handed the conversation over to Member Swobe and referred members to the document that she and other members had provided (this was provided to the working group's members as [Item #5-Student Well-Being Recommendations #5 Outline](#)).
  - Member Swobe noted that this was a brief outline based on some of the materials sent to her by Director McGill. This was supposed to come from the superintendent of each district, so it needed to be tailored by them. Member Peterson did respond to Member Swobe's request for comments. She wondered about providing links that are more preventative in nature. Sites that discuss responsible use of technology for example. Very practical materials might be ideal. She noted a book, *The Self-Driven Child*, that talks about the erosion of social skills via technology.
    - Chair Tolles encouraged members to take a minute to read over the document.
    - Member Hickey noted that it was important to engage parents and being simple/using layman terminology would be helpful there.
    - Member Peterson recalled the conversation re. NDE's page of resources on physical infrastructure being included here (which Member Loudon agreed with). Perhaps requiring districts to have a tab on safety on their websites might be useful. She referenced "blue" writing" used by NDE, but it should have a friendly cartoon characters or other documents to make it visually more friendly.
      - Chair Tolles summarized the recommendations. Having a link under physical infrastructure for each district with information about who to contact at the district and state level. Director McGill noted that her office would be place to contact rather than Homeland Security. Chair Tolles noted that comments or questions about infrastructure would need to be answered as well. Having links to resources under Student Well Being (including SafeVoice along with an NDE page with links to resources that could be expanded/shifted) would be ideal. That page could deal with prevention, response, and recovery in three different tabs.
    - Member Peterson noted the need to provide warning signs on the actual letter so that parents might be spurred to use the links. She did not that might open a can of worms on what exactly to include.
    - Chair Tolles asked Member Hickey for suggestions on this. Member Hickey noted that he trusted the collective wisdom of the group. He agreed with Member Peterson that it should be parent friendly.
    - Member Billar noted that not all parents will have access to the website. Having actionable items (like speaking to a school counselor [with name and contact number]) should be included. Sending the document out in more than one language is very important as well.
      - Chair Tolles noted that the working group already agreed to send it out in multiple languages, and she reminded the working group that both districts and schools should have the ability to modify the document. The Chair asked if it should be more official, or if it should have images.
      - Member Swobe expressed her appreciation of the images but noted that it would need to be up to the districts.
      - Chair Tolles noted that images would need to be tailored to each school, that ADA compliance should be considered, and that copying costs need to be addressed as well. The Chair noted that resources for supporting well-being as well as acute warning signs should be included.
  - Director McGill noted that general warning signs were generally available. Statewide resources such as SafeVoice, district/school resources, the Crisis Call

Center, and Suicide Prevention line are all standard references to include as well. They have good websites, and these can be provided on NDE's website as well. How heavy on resources should this letter be?

- Member Peterson liked the ones that were mentioned.
- The Chair summarized the resources, and Director McGill added the Mobile Crisis resource to that list. The Chair mentioned that she did have LCB draw up a letter (not provided in advance) that included resources. She suggested including Netsmartz (dealing with safe internet use), school safety and climate grants, Bully Free Zone, WCSD Social & Emotional Learning (as a district resource), Prevent Child Abuse Nevada, and the Office for Safe and Respectful Learning Environments at NDE.
- Member Krallman asked for a digital copy, and Ms. Verdugo noted that it would be emailed out. That was confirmed by the Chair.
- Member Loudon suggested the National Association of School Psychologists as well as the national associations of School Counselor and Social Workers. Those sites have a lot of resources for parents. FEMA.gov/kids has a lot of comprehensive safety resources for parents as well. A definition of what a safe school actual is (perhaps including information from the US Department of Education) might be useful as well.
- Member Peterson noted that providing requirements on what makes a safe school might result in parents complaining that their school is not safe. Member Loudon noted that these requirements deal with issues like family engagement rather than items that cost money. It might help people understand that safe schools are not all about locked doors and security cameras. Member Peterson stated that she just did not want to set schools up for failure.
- Member Ravin asked for mental health resources; a suicide hotline for example. Chair Tolles noted that those items had been added/included (including 211).
- Chair Tolles wondered how much of this should be on the website and how much on the letter itself.
  - Member Peterson asked to include everything and then pair it down. The Chair noted that boiling this down to one page might be difficult but is necessary. She asked Director McGill if this was enough information to create a finalized draft, and Director McGill responded in the affirmative. The Chair noted that the draft would need to be provide before the next meeting (October 12<sup>th</sup>) so that only minor edits would need to be made. A final draft needs to be submitted on October 25<sup>th</sup>.
    - Member Hickey made a motion to put forth a draft at the next working group meeting
      - Member Peterson seconded.
      - The motion passed unanimously.

#### **Agenda Item VII: Future Meeting Agenda Items and Action items**

- The Chair noted that the working group would be meeting on October 12<sup>th</sup> at 9:00 AM to approve the final draft. She encouraged members to read the Virginia and Colorado models for risk assessment and the Restorative Justice Review. The final task will be to revisit the short and long term recommendations. She noted that Chair Erquiaga had clarified that they only had 5 recommendations. They should revisit the short term recommendations to determine if they want to replace any of them with the long term recommendations or stay with the original five. She advised the working group that she had advocated for an appendix of some sort where the long term recommendations would be included with the understanding that the Governor, legislators, or agencies might pick up some of them. The absolutely final five recommendations need to be determined at the last meeting.
  - Andrew Clinger noted that the short-term recommendations were really for this

administration, but the long-term recommendations could be picked up by the next administration and the Governor does have until December to finalize his priorities.

- Director McGill noted that her office has been working to bill mental health resources to Medicaid. Something that has come up from Clark County (and other districts) is that the Medicaid that funds Special Education does not allow for the billing of behavioral health. Fixing that would be ideal.
  - Coleen Lawrence with Moxy Health Policy noted that billing was currently limited to psychologists.
- Chair Tolles asked about creating a process for members to revise the long term recommendations. She noted that the issue of billing should be a separate agenda item for the next meeting. The excel spreadsheet should be reopened so that members can make changes. Any changes should be submitted to Ms. Verdugo by October 5<sup>th</sup>.

#### **Agenda Item VIII: Public Comment #2**

- Chair Tolles asked for public comment.
  - There was none.

#### **Agenda Item IX: Adjourn**

- Chair Tolles adjourned the meeting 11:30 AM.