To: Colt Gill, Dave Novotney.

From: Nancy Willard, Director of Embrace Civility in the Digital Age

         Email: nwillard@embracecivility.org 541-556-1145

Re: Integrating SB 548 and SB 12

Date: February 19, 2019

These are some thoughts on integrating SB 12 into SB 584. I think I heard that there are some discussions going on between Dave and the woman from Multnomah to shift some of the language to more mental health promotion. This is excellent!

Responsibilities

I also hope the language will broaden the responsibilities -- basically to what Dave said in his slide show would be done. I encourage you to simply add what was in recommendation 3 of the Advisory Committee report:

Restorative practices
Inclusive practices
Proactive behavior support/strategies for de-escalation of crisis
Trauma-informed practices
Culturally responsive and sustaining teaching/practices
Community, families, and student engagement/responsiveness
Social, cultural, and emotional learning
Bullying/harassment prevention
Bias-based bullying/harassment prevention
Youth suicide prevention
Child abuse prevention
Substance abuse prevention
Developmentally appropriate practices
De-escalation practices

For example in (4)(b) substitute this for the focus on violence, suicide, and bullying.

Risk Assessment

(3)(c) needs to be totally redone. This must shift from "threat assessment" to "risk assessment." This process should focus on identifying root causes and triggering events. There should be a range of specificity with which this assessment is implemented. Obviously the highest level would be a threat of school violence. At the lower level, this risk assessment should be conducted in the context of the potential of disciplinary code violations.

(Oh, I should add here. It is important to consider the research on "restorative practices." Check out this resource: https://www.wested.org/resources/restorative-justice-research-review/. And this study: https://www.rand.org/pubs/research_reports/RR2840.html. I have studied this issue in depth. I have read a lot of the underlying shame management research and all of the Institute for Restorative Justice's basic manuals. I have also studied a lot of the resources in Collaborative Problem Solving. As well as a lot of other research.

My opinion on how Restorative Practices and Collaborative Problem Solving can be improved is: Conduct a more effective risk assessment of all involved students (In bullying situations, this includes both the students being harmful and the students who are targeted -- who may have some challenges that are implicated in the situation.) Use the Collaborative Problem Solving challenges framework for identifying challenges -- this should be integrated into the risk assessment approach. Use a strengths inventory to identify the student's strengths. Use a student resiliency inventory to assess the level of the student's resilience. Incorporate Bandura's Mechanisms of Moral Disengagement to identify rationalizations that are getting in the way of the student who misbehaved accepting personal responsibility. Incorporation research from the Psychology of Influence to influence more positive behavior. Engage any student who misbehaved or who has challenges that have been implicated in the situation in Collaborative Problem Solving so that the student is engaged in developing strategies, that incorporate his/her/their strengths, to more to a more positive resolution and their own empowerment. Ensure any student who has engaged in wrongdoing takes specific steps to remedy the harm both to anyone individually harmed and to the school community. This is the approach that is presented in my book *Engage Students to Embrace Civility.*)

Basically, there is a need to combine what is in the SK Threat Assessment protocol with insight from OHA in their suicide tool kit. And go beyond this to also address substantial disruptions and other disciplinary matters.

Pilot Projects

If this is different from HB 2224, which I think it could be but everything is totally unclear, I suggest shifting the language related to pilot programs currently in SB 12 over to SB 584. Make it clear that these are at the exploration level -- because as that Brookings article stated, the "evidence cupboard" is dry. So these would be pilot programs designed to implement and assess new approaches to address identified concerns -- focusing on the same items in Recommendation 3. I would suggest including student voice as a component.

It would also be suggested to the legislature, that this is a recommended alternative to SB 180 -- which is designed to support only one program. Any approaches selected would have to include a stringent evaluation component -- because these implementations should be viewed as a way to improve practice.

Regional Student Councils

This section from SB 12 should also be incorporated in SB 584.

Information Resources

There is a provision in HB 2224, I would suggest considering shifting over to this -- or leave in HB 2224. This is the approach to create a website/data base of programs and practices -- also a way to link educators to emerging information. I would not want to see this omitted.

Resource Development

Note that there will necessarily need to be funding to create the new risk assessment approach. Sen Gelser also has a bill pending to create a report to address digital safety concerns. SB 489.

I suggest considering whether there are some other areas that could benefit from the development of a more substantive resource that pulls together insight into more specific recommendations. I think there should be comprehensive to advise schools on how to handle the substantial disruptions that are occurring at the elementary level. How about more significant guidelines for how to ensure cultural inclusion? What are the core foundational components to implement trauma informed practices -- positive staff student connections, self regulation, de-escalation, problem solving.

So I suggest that language be added to include this, with a line item in the budget.

YouthLine

I really, really think some serious consideration should be given to obtain funding specifically for Lines for Life to expand YouthLine statewide -- in conjunction with the ESDs.

We know that the vast majority of students are not reporting to the school if they are being bullied or harassed. We know that in the vast majority of school shooting incidents, others knew of information that if revealed could have stopped the situation. Like this is also true in relation to suicide, but I do not know specific data. Reporting of digital concerns is even lower. Students fear losing access to their devices.

Some of the concerns are developmental. Teens want to resolve their own problems. This also relates to the failure of schools to intervene effectively. They do not want to "rat on their friend" because they do not think that the way the school will handle the situation will help their friend. (My daughter's friend in high school was suicidal. She and others knew. They did not report because every time that concerns like this had been reported earlier resulted in making things worse for her friend. He took his life. She was devastated for years -- frequently suicidal on the day he suicided.)

I really, really think that the peer support approach is the ONLY way to address this. I think young people are going to be much more inclined want to talk to peers. So I would STRONGLY encourage you to consider this addition. If this is implemented, there would need to be a comprehensive evaluation component.