Domain	1 (Hinders Retention)	2 (The Basics)	3 (Helps Retention)
Paperwork Requirements and Supports	1) No devoted due process time 2) Special educators required to use their prep time to complete due process paperwork 3) No professional development or training regarding paperwork 4) Changing expectations for paperwork 5) "Fear-based", punitive culture relating to due process compliance issues 6) Holding teachers accountable for other teachers' due process delays and/or errors 7) No language related to paperwork requirements and supports in the negotiated agreement	1) Ability to ask for sub days for paperwork but "paperwork days" come at a cost (sub plans, etc.) 2) Organized paid due process time on nights and weekends with coaching support 3) Ongoing professional development related to due process requirements 4) Due process facilitators to answer paperwork questions 5) Progressive discipline is used to address compliance errors 6) General/vague language related to paperwork requirements and supports in the negotiated agreement	1) Designated due process time within the teacher duty day (outside of prep time) 2) Compensation for attending IEP/evaluation meetings that occur outside the teacher duty day or during prep time 3) Compensation for due process paperwork done at home 4) Having a due process coordinator who is not an administrator and with whom special educators can comfortably raise questions or concerns 5) Mentoring for special educators new to special education or the district 7) Dedicated teams for initial assessments and reevaluations 8) Clerical support for scheduling IEP meetings and helping teachers track timelines 9) Robust and specific language related to paperwork requirements and supports in the negotiated agreement

Domain	1 (Hinders Retention)	2 (The Basics)	3 (Helps Retention)
Workload	1) No formula for weighing the differing needs of students when making teaching and case management assignments 2) Significant disparities in caseloads from one educator to another 3) Students are added throughout the year to a caseload throughout the year without consideration to impact on workload 4) Demands of the workload outweigh the ability to comply by the caseload's IEPs in violation of IDEA and compensatory minutes are not provided 5) No language related to workload in the negotiated agreement	1) District adopted a workload policy without any special educator input 2) District has a formula for determining workloads, but the formula is not shared or explained to teachers 3) When the workload outweighs the ability to comply with the caseload's IEPs, compensatory minutes are provided by the district in the summer, by a teacher who is not the case manager 4) General/vague language related to workload in the negotiated agreement	1) District has a detailed workload policy that addresses Specially Designed Instruction (including direct and indirect services), Inclusionary practices (including coteaching, supported instruction, and push-in services) and IEP Management (including coordination, management, progress monitoring, annual review, initial evaluation/ re-evaluation, functional behavior assessments and behavior intervention plans, and agency service coordination) 2) District develops its formula or policy in *collaboration* with special educators and shares it with them 3) District administration allows teachers to ask questions about how their caseload was determined and to request an adjustment 4) District provides additional compensation if a caseload increases dramatically during the school year 5) Robust and specific language addressing workload in the negotiated agreement

Domain	1 (Hinders Retention)	2 (The Basics)	3 (Helps Retention)
Student and Staff Safety	1) No comprehensive emergency/crisis plan, lockdown procedures, or plan and procedures that are not consistently followed 2) No crisis intervention team or means of communication amongst crisis team members 3) Lack of sufficient time for staff to plan and implement behavior intervention plans 4) Lack of time for staff to debrief after a crisis occurs 5) No ability for staff to take a break when a student has been in crisis for a long period of time 6) Lack of training for paraprofessionals and other staff regarding student specific disabilities and de-escalation techniques 7) Very few staff trained in de-escalation techniques, protective measures, and restrictive procedures 8) District prohibits staff from having any physical contact with students with disabilities, including in a crisis	1) District has an emergency/crisis plan and lockdown procedures, but it is not made accessible to all staff and training is infrequent or non-existent 2) A crisis intervention team exists but protocols are unclear and difficult to follow 3) Planning and implementing behavior intervention plans happens at the cost of teacher prep time or requires them to make sub plans 4) District follows restrictive procedure law and provides adequate training for appropriate staff in protective procedures and restrictive procedures 5) Protective gear is provided to staff as necessary 6) When a crisis team member is unable to meet with students, a sub is provided, and sub plans are expected to be prepared in advance 7) If a staff is injured when managing a crisis with a student, they are granted unpaid leave	1) District has an emergency/crisis plan and lockdown procedures that all staff are trained in 2) A crisis intervention team exists, including specific protocols with highly trained members 3) Planning and implementing time for behavior intervention plans is provided separately from prep time and if done outside of contracted hours provides compensation 4) District utilizes a comprehensive behavior management system for all students 5) Administrators are empathetic toward educators who work with violent students and take steps to support them when experiencing compassion fatigue 6) District is actively working with staff to lower the frequency and severity of staff injuries 7) District follows policies related to staff and student safety and ensures staff are aware of these policies, including the importance of documenting staff injuries 8) District is responsive to educator requests for additional paraprofessional support in

	9) No protective gear available to staff who are repeatedly experiencing physical assault by students 10) No one available to provide required services to students when crisis team member is unavailable due to crisis, so IEP minutes need to be made up 11) If a staff is injured when managing a crisis with a student, they are pushed to stay at work or required to utilize their sick leave if they need to be absent 12) No notification to teachers if a student in their class or on their caseload has a history of demonstrating violent behavior 13) No language related to student and staff safety in the negotiated agreement	8) Notification to teachers if a student in their class or on their caseload has a history of demonstrating violent behaviors is minimal 9) General/vague language related to student and staff safety in the negotiated agreement	situations involving students who demonstrate violent behaviors 9) Robust and specific language addressing safety in the negotiated agreement

Domain	1 (Hinders Retention)	2 (The Basics)	3 (Helps Retention)
Paraprofessional Management	1) District pay and benefit package for paraprofessionals is not competitive, leading to high turnover rates 2) District does not provide a means for paraprofessional voice to be heard, no meet and confer or option to provide feedback on the classified personnel handbook 3) District does not provide professional development to paraprofessionals 4) District expects special education teachers to manage the schedules and training of paraprofessionals without additional time, training, or compensation 5) No professional evaluations of paraprofessionals are completed	1) District provides a retention bonus for paraprofessionals annually 2) District provides meet and confer meetings with paraprofessionals yearly but little to no progress is made 3) District expects special education teachers to provide professional development to paraprofessionals 4) District provides one staff member per building that is responsible for managing the schedule and training of paraprofessionals without reducing the rest of their workload 5) The district expects special education teachers to complete professional evaluations of paraprofessionals annually 6) General/vague language related to paraprofessional	1) District provides a competitive pay and benefits package for paraprofessionals, which keeps up with the cost of living 2) District administration provide meet and confer meetings with paraprofessionals at least quarterly and take action based upon the received feedback 3) District provides robust options for paid professional development for paraprofessionals without adding to the workload of special education teachers 4) District provides one staff member per building that is responsible for managing the schedule and training of paraprofessionals and reduces their workload accordingly 5) Administration is responsible for completing professional evaluations of paraprofessionals at least annually 6) Robust and specific language addressing paraprofessional

	6) No language tied to paraprofessional management in the negotiated agreement	management is in the negotiated agreement	management in the negotiated agreement