I. Program/Service Information

Name of Program or Services: Safety Intervention Plan

Question(s):
1) What are the common themes for students who have had a high incidence of restraints (10 or more during a year)?
2) Evaluate the relationship between worker compensation doctor’s visits due to injuries incurred during student behavior challenges and NCPI – Non-violent Crises Prevention Intervention Training

Personnel Responsible for Evaluation (list):
Joan Zavitsky, chair
Dr. Stephen Viola, University of Mo. – St. Louis
Dr. Laura Huff, Parent
Ms. Tara Morrow, Parent
Mr. David Pentz, Area Coordinator ABA
Ms. Stephanie Valleroy, Asst. Principal, Northview
Ms. Melanie Fitzgerald, Teacher ECSE
Ms. Susan Thomas, Behavior Facilitator

Date of Evaluation (Year/Duration): January 2005

Goal/Objective of Program/Services:
The goal of the safety incident intervention plan is to provide students and staff with a safe and orderly environment for learning.

Brief description of relationship between program goals, CSIP and MSIP Standards:
MSIP: Standard 6.6.1 Students and staff indicate they feel safe at school; Data is gathered on student violence and substance abuse, and is used to modify programs and strategies to ensure safe and orderly schools.
MSIP: Standard 6.7.3 The district has identified a set of instructional strategies designed to meet the assessed needs of students, and has made a long-term commitment to focus its professional development activities on implementing and reinforcing these strategies.
MSIP: Standard 7.1.3 The district ensures that all students with disabilities receive appropriate supports, services, and modifications (including related services, assistive technology, and positive behavioral interventions) to address their individual needs.
Rolling Plan: Goal IV – Maintain a safe and orderly school environment that is conducive to learning and teaching. Objective #2. Implement, by FY05, an Incident Intervention Plan [Action planning includes tracking mechanism for data review, training and implementation of positive behavior supports, functional behavior assessments, sensory supports and universals.]

Demographic Description of Program:
Location(s): Safety Intervention Plan is County-wide
Number of staff: All staff (administrator level, teacher level and paraprofessional level) are trained in the Safety Intervention Plan annually.
Participants: All staff (administrator level, teacher level, paraprofessional level)
Length of program/service: Board approved the policies JGAA “Crises Intervention and Restraint” on July 15, 2003. Safety Intervention Plan was initiated districtwide at the beginning of the 2003-2004 School Year.

II. Description of Stakeholders Engagement in Program Evaluation (check stakeholders utilized):
The stakeholders listed below reviewed the databases and information as part of the program evaluation committee meetings:
Parents on committee
SSD staff
University Professor

III. Evaluation Criteria for Programs/Services Offered (check type utilized)
Movement to LRE

IV. Data Collection Methodology (examples)
Student physical restraint forms reviewed for those involved in 10 or more incidents in a year.
Student profile – reviewed the level of service for students who were involved in 10 or more physical restraints in a year.
V. Results

Question #1:
Data Showed:
During the school year from July 2003–June 2004 we had 15 students with 10 or more restraints. Of the students 4 attended Purchase of Service Agencies. During this current school year from July 2004-Nov. 1, 2004 we had 4 students with 10 or more restraints. Of the students 3 were from the Purchase of Service Agencies.
A review of the physical restraint forms resulted in a finding of no common theme. Of the 122 students during July 2003- Nov. 2004 they have been involved in 209 restraints this year.

As a further follow-up to the 15 students who were involved in 10 or more physical restraints in 2003-2004 a determination of the level of service was reviewed for the current school year. 8 of the 15 students stayed at the same level of service; 5 moved to a more restrictive level of service; 1 moved to a less restrictive environment and 1 student made two changes one to a more restrictive setting and then back to a less restrictive setting.

The committee found no themes in the physical restraint forms. If one was to look at any theme it was that 5 of the students level of service changed.

Question #2:
Data Showed:
There were a total of 74 staff work injury reports, which occurred involving students submitted to SSD’s insurance that occurred between the dates of 1/03 –12/03. A review of the reports indicated 13 occurred immediately preceding or during a restraint and of the 13 injuries, 4 were injuries from bites.

There were a total of 87 staff work injury reports, which occurred involving students submitted to SSD’s insurance that occurred between the dates of 01/04-12/04. A review of the reports indicated 14 occurred immediately preceding or during a restraint and of the 14 injuries, 6 were injuries from bites.

There were a total of 27 staff work injury reports involving a restraint submitted during the period of 1/03 thru 12/04. Of the 27 staff six had not had not participated in NCPI training according to our records. A follow-up of those staff has shown that they have since attended NCPI training or have retired.
**Strengths of program/service**

- Number of students involved in physical restraints has decreased by 52% (from 253 students in SY ‘02-’03 to 122 students in SY ’03-’04).
- Number of students involved in physical restraints at the Special Education School Sites has decreased by 74% (from 171 students in SY’02-’03 to 44 students in SY’03-’04).
- Number of restraints students were involved in has decreased by 21% (from 953 physical restraints in SY ’02-’03 to 755 incidents of physical restraints in SY’03-’04).
- Of the 122 students involved in restraints during the SY’03-’04 there were only 15 students or 12% with 10 or more physical restraints.
- Number of staff trained and certified in Non-Violent Crises Intervention.
- The number of staff work injuries that occurred as a result of a physical restraint was 16% (27 of the 161) staff work injuries which involved students reported to insurance over the period of Jan. 2003-December 2004.

**Concerns regarding program/service**

- Review of the work injuries that occurred in which a student was involved only 27 of the 161 of the period of Jan. ’03 – Dec. ’04 occurred during a restraint. The other 134 staff work injuries did involve students. The common themes of those incidents involved staff breaking-up a fight, student biting a staff person or student head-butting a staff person.
  - Ambiguous definition of physical restraint versus environmental supports/restructuring the environment. For example is utilizing a study carol against the wall considered a restraint or restructuring the environment.

**Recommendations regarding program/service**

- Committee should be convened to revise Physical Restraint Form. Specific items to review and possibly revise are: require Director to sign-off on all forms which involve a physical restraint; see if the two different incident intervention forms for Special Education Schools and Partner District Schools be combined and made into one form; refine the definition of physical restraint; attach the behavior intervention plan with revisions when revised.
- Committee should be convened to revise benchmarks on regulation “Guidelines for SSD Physical Support Form” 8 .15a section #17 – add a benchmark to include team meeting to include a Behavior or ASD Facilitator; add to one of the benchmarks that the behavior intervention plan and its’ revisions should be attached.
- Safety committee should determine if additional training is needed to assist staff in those situations.
- Share trends of work injury reports of staff with the supervisor who works with NCPI Certified trainers for SSD. They should incorporate the information into their training modules.
- Share trends of work injury reports of staff with supervisor who coordinates New Paraprofessional and New Teacher training for SSD. They should incorporate the information into their training modules.
- 30 Day checklist administrators utilize when visiting classrooms should include a component on restructuring the environment.
- Interface with Manager of Risk Management and Insurance to determine if it is possible to have staff indicate on injury report forms if they have attended NCPI training.

VI. Action Plan for Recommendations as A Result of Program Evaluation

Person responsible to champion action plan
Timeframe for reporting updates to Board of Education

____________________________________  Date:_________
Signature of Administrator Responsible for Chairing Evaluation