Literature Review

Literature Review – School Discipline

By Sarah Bishop, M.A., Morgan Craven, J.D., Deanna Galer, Terrence Wilson, J.D., Paige Duggins-Clay, J.D.

September 2022

IDRA EAC-South

Contents

Serving 11 states and D.C., the IDRA EAC-*South* is one of four federally-funded centers that provide technical assistance and training to build capacity to confront educational problems occasioned by discrimination on the basis of race, national origin, sex and gender, and religion.

Intercultural Development Research Association
5815 Callaghan Road, Suite 101 • San Antonio, Texas 78228 • 210-444-1710 • eacsouth@idra.org • www.idra.org/eac-south

Authors
Sarah Bishop, M.A., Morgan Craven, J.D., Deanna Galer, Terrence Wilson, J.D., Paige Duggins-Clay, J.D.

The contents of this publication were developed under a grant from the U.S. Department of Education. However, these contents do not necessarily represent the policy of the Department of Education, and you should not assume endorsement by the federal government.

Overview

Schools should be spaces where students feel safe and welcome, actively engage with learning, and strive for success. Discipline policies and practices should reinforce these values, particularly safety and belonging. Unfortunately, ineffective discipline practices that punish students harshly and take them away from the classroom – like suspensions, alternative school placements, corporal punishment, referrals to law enforcement, and expulsions – are prevalent in U.S. schools. These practices are incredibly harmful to students. Students can fall behind academically, face social and emotional consequences, disengage from school, and lose trust in the adults tasked with educating and protecting them. Furthermore, traditionally underserved students are more likely to face harsh punishments and the resulting negative consequences (Rudd, 2014; Maxime, 2018).

Purpose of This Technical Assistance Package

This technical assistance package is designed to help school leaders and educators identify ways to proactively build safe and trusting communities and end their reliance on approaches to discipline that are harmful to students.

Throughout the toolkit, we use the term “challenging behaviors” to capture a number of behaviors exhibited by adults and students in schools. These challenging behaviors can include:

- Violations of school rules and community expectations that are designed to keep the campus safe and orderly;
- Age-appropriate behaviors that require redirection and support;
- Behaviors that are manifestations of underlying challenges, like hunger, bullying, trauma, mental health needs, or an unaddressed need for other services; and
- Behaviors that cause harm to other individuals and the community, like physical violence, bullying, or harassment.

These behaviors must be addressed by educators and school leaders swiftly and appropriately.

This toolkit also addresses the persistent disparities in the administration of school discipline that target students of color, students with disabilities, and LGBTQ+ students. These troubling disparities demand interventions for the educators and administrators who are determining how and who to punish. It is critical to remember that disparities in punishment may be a reflection of adult bias and lack of training, rather than an indication of the prevalence of challenging student behaviors.

Overview

This toolkit is not designed to urge schools to ignore adult or student needs or allow harmful or unsafe situations to escalate. Rather, it is designed to provide proactive, research-based strategies that enable every member of a school community to feel welcome, included, and safe.

Why We Must Focus on Pulling Students In, Not Pushing Them Out

Student discipline practices have a significant impact on the lives and academic careers of all students, in large part due to the link between discipline, student engagement and time spent in the classroom as an active and welcome participant. When a student gets "into trouble," there is an opportunity for the impacted student to either feel that they are included and respected or shut down and excluded at school (Pufall Jones, et al., 2018).

When school and educator responses to student behaviors communicate respect, trust, and attention, students are more likely to feel respected and exhibit positive behaviors. When responses dismiss the student's perspective and simply impose punishment, students are more likely to feel alienated and disconnected (Pufall Jones, et al., 2018).

Addressing challenging behaviors in a meaningful and supportive way is a critical part of building safe and welcoming schools. It is also crucial for schools to transform their approach to discipline so they can address discriminatory policies and practices that target certain groups of students.

Data confirms that students of color, students with disabilities, and LGBTQ+ students are disproportionately subject to punitive and exclusionary discipline practices (Fabelo et al., 2011; Losen & Martinez, 2013; Skiba, Michael, & Peterson, 2002; Suh, Suh, & Houston, 2007; OCR, 2021). Students of color, particularly Black students, and boys are often treated differently and more harshly for similar behaviors or discipline offenses (Eberhardt & Okonofua, 2015). This could constitute a violation of students' civil rights (OCR, 2021).

Craven (2021) reported that racial disproportionalities in punishment are particularly acute for discretionary, subjective, or vague "offenses," like "disorderly conduct" or "disruption of class." She cites one study of almost 1 million Texas children that found that "97% of school punishments were not mandatory and that racial disparities in punishments were only present when adults had the discretion to identify and punish behaviors" (Council of State Governments Justice Center, 2011). Other studies confirm that it is adult bias, school practice, and poor policy – not student behavior – that lead to racial disparities in punishment (Eberhardt & Okonofua, 2015).

Educators and advocates must find ways to productively engage students regardless of their

Overview

race, gender, national origin or religion. In fact, educators and advocates must work closely with students and families to ensure schools are places that uplift, rather than punish, those aspects of students' identities.

Much of the existing research about the discipline gap offers educators and advocates practical ways to mitigate implicit bias and discipline students more equitably. While valuable for addressing systemic racism, this research often misses a larger point. Excluding students from the classroom is an ineffective and harmful intervention and should not be used except in the most extreme cases implicating student safety (e.g., interpersonal violence, bringing a weapon to school).

From very early on, classrooms should be welcoming spaces where students feel safe and loved, engaged with the material, and motivated to strive for success. Punitive and exclusionary discipline send messages of shame and exile when students need acceptance and invitation. Three educators from the Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development (ASCD) put it this way: "We believe that all behavior is a form of communication: students are trying to tell us something with their actions that they may not have the words to say another way" (Smith, Fisher, & Frey, 2015, p. 29).

If we meet students where they are and together build an environment they want to be in, discipline becomes less of an issue, more time is devoted to the curriculum, students and teachers are engaged in deeper ways, and everyone's well-being increases.

With consistent, holistic approaches to education, we may more fully realize the promise of civil rights for all. There is no single "magic bullet" solution to curb behavioral disruptions; however, preventative strategies like those described in this toolkit can be initial steps to keep students and teachers healthy and classes on track.

Reviewing the Data

National data show that children who have been suspended or expelled are up to 10 times more likely to drop out of high school than their peers (Council on School Health, 2013). Exclusionary discipline practices not only take students away from their learning, but are also in violation of civil rights laws if they are found to target certain historically-marginalized groups (U.S. Department of Education, 2014). Educators must find ways to keep all students in class, engaged in learning, and in a climate where all students feel included and supported.

To address the alarming and disparate discipline data, the U.S. Department of Education and the U.S. Department of Justice issued a joint Dear Colleague Letter in 2014 alerting school agencies and school districts to re-examine their policies and practices in regards to school discipline and also issued the Guiding Principles: A Resource Guide for Improving School Climate and Discipline (Lhamon & Samuels, 2014). More recently, the U.S. Department of Education issued guidance related specifically to the disproportionate discipline of students with disabilities and indicated forthcoming guidance related to other student groups and how schools can avoid discriminatory discipline and policing of students (U.S. Department of Education, 2022).

Unfortunately, current U.S. school data show that equity does not exist within current disciplinary practices. The most recent school discipline data from the Office for Civil Rights reveal that boys, students of color, and students with disabilities were disproportionately punished in the 2017-18 school year (OCR, 2021).

- Data confirm that disciplining begins in the early years of schooling. Preschool children who are Black are suspended at high rates – these children are 18% of enrollment, but 43% of those who received one or more out-of-school suspensions. While boys represent 54% of preschool enrollment, they represent 83% of preschool children suspended once and 85% of preschool children expelled.
- In K-12 grades, Black students received one or more in-school suspensions (31%) and one or more out-of-school suspensions (38%) at rates that were more than twice their share of total student enrollment (15%).
- Latino students received one or more in-school suspensions (23%) and one or more out-of-school suspensions (22%) at rates that were under their share of total student enrollment (27%).
- Black boys received both in-school suspensions (20%) and out-of-school suspensions (25%) suspensions at rates more than three times their share of total student enrollment (8%) – the

Reviewing the Data

largest disparity across all race-ethnicity and gender groupings.

- Black girls were the only group across all races/ethnicities for girls where a disparity was observed. Black girls received in-school suspensions (11%) and out-of-school suspensions (13%) at rates almost two times their share of total student enrollment (7%).
- Black students are two times as likely to be referred to law enforcement or subject to a school-related arrest than white students.
- Girls of color are more likely to be suspended than white girls. Black girls comprise 12% of suspensions, more than girls of any other race or ethnicity and most boys.
- Black students accounted for 15% of the total student enrollment but 43% of all referrals to alternative schools.
- Students with disabilities are five times more likely to receive one or more out-of-school suspensions (25%) than their proportion of the student population (5%).
- Over 100,000 students were placed in seclusion, involuntary confinement, or were physically restrained. This includes almost 80,000 students with disabilities served by IDEA.
- Nearly 70,000 students were subjected to corporal punishment.

These data show that punitive discipline practices push already marginalized students, particularly Black students, students with disabilities, and students with intersecting identities, out of the academic environment. The Office for Civil Rights estimates that students across the country missed more than 11 million days of learning due to out-of-school suspensions (OCR, 2021). This is an unacceptable state of affairs that prevents these students from learning and being encouraged to reach their full potential.

Schools have the power to change these outcomes for students. Large rates of suspensions and expulsions tend to result from poor discipline and school climate policies, carried out by numerous administrators and teachers who are not provided enough support about how best to handle challenging behaviors in school. The issue of implicit bias also has a role to play in these numbers, and that too is an area where educators, students, and their families need to be given proper information and support.

Impact on Traditionally Underserved Students

Black Students

Research has shown that Black students are the most targeted population for unequal school discipline. Generally, Black boys are more likely to be punished for exhibiting “aggressive behavior,” while Black girls are more likely to be punished for perceived dress code violations and “disrespect” (Brownstein, 2015; Wirtz, 2021). Black students accounted for 45% of all days

Reviewing the Data

of instruction lost due to suspension. Those 11 million days of lost instruction translate to over 60 million hours of lost education in a single school year (Whitaker, 2018; ACLU, 2018).

In the 2017-18 school year, nearly 39% of students expelled (with educational services) were Black – a rate that was more than twice than their share of student enrollment (OCR, 2021). Black students were also 31% of students who served one or more in-school suspensions and 38% of students who served one or more out-of-school suspensions (OCR, 2021).

This disproportionality is also exacerbated by region. A 2015 report from the Center for the Study of Race and Equity in Education at the University of Pennsylvania found that, across 13 southern states, Black children account for roughly half of all suspensions and expulsions. This percentage is in stark contrast to the fact that these children represent less than a quarter of all students in U.S. public schools (Brownstein, 2015). In 132 of southern districts, Black children were five times more likely to be suspended compared to white children (Brownstein, 2015) The disproportionality of discipline for Black students also contributes to the achievement gap – a loss of time, potential and funds (Whitaker, 2018).

Latino Students

Latino students are also impacted by zero-tolerance and exclusionary discipline practices. Exclusionary discipline is harshly experienced by Latino boys – one in five male Latino students is suspended before they enter high school (Bristol, Shirrell & Britton, 2021). On average, Latino students received 23% of all in-school suspensions and nearly 22% of out-of-school suspensions (OCR, 2021). Among middle school students, Latino youth are about two times as likely to be suspended or expelled than white youth, with boys being twice as likely as girls to receive these punishments (Kang-Brown et al., 2013).

Students with Disabilities

Students with disabilities are vulnerable to harsh disciplinary practices and are often overrepresented in the numbers. In the 2017-18 school year, students with disabilities accounted for about 68,000 of the 229,000 total students referred to law enforcement or who were arrested. Students with disabilities (under IDEA) made up about 13% of the total student population, but accounted for nearly 21% of in-school suspensions and nearly 25% of out-of-school suspensions (OCR, 2021). Racial disparities for students with disabilities are even more pronounced – Black students with disabilities (under IDEA) made up 2% of the school population in 2017-18 but accounted for 6% and almost 9% of in-school and out-of-school suspensions, respectively (OCR, 2021).

Reviewing the Data

Children with emotional conditions are also disproportionately suspended and expelled (Elias, 2013). States with the greatest number of days lost due to suspension for students with disabilities in the 2017-18 school year were New York (193,977); California (182,217); Florida (161,352); North Carolina (156,414); and Ohio (147,054) (OCR, 2021).

LGBTQ+ Students

Researchers, students, families, educators, and other advocates across the country have called for more research to better understand how discipline policies impact LGBTQ+ students. We know that LGBTQ+ students are at a higher risk of being bullied. Research also shows that they disproportionally face suspension and expulsion when compared to their non-LGBTQ+ peers (Arredondo et al., 2016). These students are found to face similar risks of lower academic achievement, dropout rates, and rates of incarceration as any other student groups who are subject to exclusionary discipline (Arredondo, et al., 2016). Because data for these students have not been as widely collected, it is difficult to get a true picture of how discipline practices really affect LGBTQ+ youth across the nation. Federal agencies, such as the Office for Civil Rights, are urged to focus on developing safe ways to collect sexual orientation and gender identity data collection beyond the current numbers about bullying and harassment.

Emergent Bilingual Students

Emergent bilingual students are often overlooked when it comes to school discipline research. These students are highly diverse and represent numerous language groups, though the most prevalent is Spanish. Despite the gap in research, the inequities these students face – from lower teacher expectations to limited chances to participate in gifted and advanced academic programs – show that these diverse students may be subject to an array of challenging educational practices. States with English-only education requirements tend to suspend emergent bilingual students at higher rates than those without English-only stipulations (Whitford, et al., 2019). Additionally, a 2015 study found that there was a 10% increase in suspension rates from elementary to middle school for emergent bilingual students (Whitford, et al., 2019).

Preschool Students

A 2016 policy statement by the U.S. Department of Health and Human Services and the U.S. Department of Education shows that preschool students are being suspended and expelled at alarmingly high rates, especially young boys of color (2016). In the 2017-18 school year, though Black preschool students accounted for 18% of preschool enrollment, they received 43% of one or more out-of-school suspensions (OCR, 2021). Preschool students with disabilities made up 23% of preschool enrollment in 2017-18 but were 57% of preschoolers who were expelled (OCR, 2021).

Reviewing the Data

Furthermore, these young students are often punished for minor, age-appropriate behaviors including “horseplay” or “fidgeting” (Craven, Johnson & Wilson, 2020). Young children should form healthy relationships with their schools, to promote growth and learning; however early childhood suspensions lead to increased likelihood of developing negative attitudes toward school and eventually dropping out (U.S. Department of Health and Human Services & U.S. Department of Education, 2016).

Exclusionary Discipline

Common punishments seen in schools include in-school and out-of-school suspensions, alternative school placements, expulsions, corporal punishments, and referrals to law enforcement. Some schools also use what is often referred to as informal, or "shadow" discipline, which refers to punishments like shaming, classroom exclusion, or early parent pick-ups that may push students out of their classrooms and cause harm similarly to traditional punitive discipline methods but that are often not captured by data.

Such exclusionary policies have an overall negative impact on students and are disproportionately used to punish students of color, students with disabilities, and LGBTQ+ youth (Maxime, 2018; Craven, Johnson & Wilson, 2020). Often these punishments are discretionary and used in response to behaviors that should be addressed with other, research-based strategies.

Discipline policies that were allegedly designed to limit dangerous behavior via suspensions and expulsions have increasingly been applied to non-dangerous student behaviors (Pufall Jones, et al., 2018; Maxime, 2018). Specifically, educators have been encouraged to punish students for minor violations, including tardiness, "disrespect" and cell phone usage, to maintain order and compliance in schools (Pufall Jones, et al., 2018).

The use of punitive and exclusionary discipline does not lead to positive educational or social outcomes. Rather, these practices increase the likelihood of poor academic and social outcomes, including grade retention and dropout (Castillo, 2015; Maxime, 2018; Craven, Johnson & Wilson, 2020). Controlling for socioeconomic status, school and race, studies have found that suspension is negatively associated with grades and test scores (Pufall Jones, et al., 2018). In the 2017-18 school year, students missed 11,205,797 days of school due to out-of-school suspensions. Black students missed 4,671,301 or 41.7% of these days, Latino students missed 2,227,751 days or 19.9%, students with disabilities served under IDEA missed 2,733,792 or 24.4%, and emergent bilingual students missed 726,912 days or 6.5% (OCR, 2020).

Additionally, there is an increased likelihood of justice system involvement for students who have been subject to suspension and expulsion (Kang-Brown, et al.,2013). A 2011 Texas study found that students who were suspended or expelled for a discretionary offense that did not include a weapon were almost three times as likely to be involved in the juvenile justice system the following academic year (Council of State Governments, 2011).

Schools and students need reformed disciplinary programs that reinforce positive behavior and

avoid harsh punitive measures to create safer and more productive learning environments (Kang-Brown, et al., 2013).

Zero Tolerance Policies

Some of today's data reflect the "zero tolerance" movement that swept through U.S. schools in the 1990s with the presumption that it would make schools safer. As the American Psychological Association (APA) explains, zero tolerance was originally used for drug enforcement, but it expanded into public schools as a policy of automatic punitive and exclusionary consequences for student infractions, regardless of severity or circumstances (2008).

The intent of "zero tolerance" was to remove students from the academic environment at the first sign of a challenging behavior in order to deter other behaviors in the future and prevent disruptions to other students. However, these zero tolerance policies are ineffective and harmful. They put students at risk academically and many times are used for non-violent offenses, including vague behaviors, such as "disrespect" or "willful disobedience." Instead of changing challenging behaviors and making classrooms safer, zero tolerance policies have compromised the academic and social success of students and destabilized entire learning environments.

In its 2008 report, the APA's Zero Tolerance Task Force provided a comprehensive look at this type of discipline and issued the following findings on zero tolerance (APA, 2008).

- Though any level of violence in schools is unacceptable, zero tolerance research has not proven that these policies have made schools safer.
- There is no evidence that zero tolerance has increased the consistency of school discipline.
- Schools with higher rates of suspension and expulsion have less satisfactory climate ratings.
- Suspension tends to lead to higher instances of misbehavior and suspension in students who have already been subject to this punishment.
- Suspension has been linked to a higher likelihood of dropping out or not graduating on time.
- Parent opinions about zero tolerance have been varied and inconsistent. They tend to support these measures if they feel their students are unsafe, but they also turn against them if they know that disciplinary practices are preventing students from learning.

The report stated that a growing body of research points to the fact that adolescents mature at a slower rate than previously thought. Thus, if a student's misbehavior does not pose a threat to safety, dire consequences are not appropriate in even a neurological, developmentally appropriate sense. Such punishments can have negative long-term effects on students.

The use of punitive and exclusionary discipline practices, including under zero tolerance policies, has led to increased referrals to the juvenile and adult criminal legal systems for infractions that

Zero Tolerance Policies

were once handled in the school environment. This practice led to the term school-to-prison pipeline.

In 2016, IDRA conducted an analysis as a supplement to its annual attrition study comparing the trend lines for attrition rates to those of discipline data for the state of Texas. The study found that zero tolerance policies likely contributed to high attrition rates of Black and Latino students in Texas public schools. The historical high attrition rate for each race-ethnicity group parallels the period when zero tolerance policies gained momentum in Texas. Lower attrition rates for each group coincide with Texas' legislative attempts to relax zero tolerance approaches under specific circumstances. (Johnson, R.L., Oct. 2016b)

Overall, the consensus after decades of zero tolerance is that these policies do not significantly create a safer, more secure learning environment for public school students. In fact, a lack of alternatives to punitive discipline impacts students of color and leads to poorer educational outcomes and higher rates of poverty, unemployment, and the potential for incarceration. There is growing consensus that disciplinary programs that reinforce positive behavior and treat infractions on a case-by-case basis are what is necessary to reform school discipline and create a better learning environment (Kang-Brown, et al., 2013).

Our classrooms should be welcoming spaces where students feel safe and loved, are engaged with the material, and strive for success. Punitive and exclusionary discipline send messages of shame and exile when our students need acceptance and invitation.

Disciplinary Alternative Schools

Rather than sending expelled students home, some states have established alternative schools for disciplining students. Such programs are considered temporary holding facilities, with little or no intentional assistance for students to deal with underlying issues or to keep up with their schoolwork and transition back to their primary school. In 2017-18, Black students accounted for 15% of the total student enrollment but 43% of all transfers to alternative schools (OCR, 2021).

IDRA examined the disciplinary alternative education program (DAEP) in Texas and found the following (Cortez, 2009):

- Students as young as 6 years old were removed from their kindergarten classes and sent to DAEPs for "discipline" problems.
- Four out of five students referred to Texas DAEPs were not there because of serious offenses that required punishment under the law, but for "local discretion" – the code for disciplinary problems that can range from chewing gum to talking back to a teacher to bringing cold medicine to school.
- Fifty percent of students placed in DAEP were Latino students, and 25% were Black students. Special education students were disproportionally referred, and the majority were students in families with low incomes.
- Students spent an average of seven weeks in DAEPs, causing them to be further disconnected from their schools, friends, teachers and classes. Two months are almost impossible for students to make up, especially when they are labelled "disciplinary problems."

What used to be handled through classroom management became managed by removing and exiling students. No matter the challenging behavior, alternative school placements do not help and can actually increase the likelihood of school dropout.

Grade Retention and Discipline

Retaining students is a costly intervention that research shows is both counterproductive and unsuccessful (Johnson, P., Oct. 2016a). States pay upwards of $12 million annually to implement a practice that inevitably has long-term negative impacts on students' psychological, behavioral, economic and social well-being (West, 2012).

Retention of a student in the same grade from one year to the next usually occurs for one of three reasons: (1) poor performance on standardized proficiency or achievement tests at the end of specific years; (2) emotional immaturity that results in disruptive behavior; or (3) developmental immaturity resulting in learning difficulties, such as limited reading ability.

Retention supporters believe that students will "catch-up" given the opportunity to repeat the previous years' instruction or time to mature. Studies have proven however that in-grade retention is counterproductive and harmful to students in the long run.

The research is very clear: the effects of retention are harmful. As early as the 1930s, studies reported the negative effects of retention on academic achievement. Retention harms students academically and socially. According to retention research, 50% of students who repeat a grade do no better the second time, and 25% actually do worse (McCollum, 1999; Merrow, 2004).

Students are most likely to be retained in first grade, but they are overall more likely to be retained in first through third grades (Warren & Saliba, 2012). Research on secondary effects of retention have shown that retained students are 11 times more likely to drop out of school (Andrew, 2014).

As Johnson (2018) cautions, in-grade retention can be a civil rights issue. On average, Latino students across grade levels are over two times more likely to be retained than white students, and Black students are three times more likely. Additionally, emergent bilingual students are retained at disproportionate rates nationally. Students with disabilities are the most likely – 3.3 times more likely – to be retained in grade. (OCR, 2021)

In-grade retention has been linked to increased rates of disciplinary actions and limited access to rigorous educational programs for students of color (Jimerson, et al., 2005).

Corporal Punishment

Corporal punishment is still legal in 19 states where approximately 70,000 children were hit in school by an adult in 2017-18 (OCR, 2020). Currently, corporal punishment is allowed in public schools in Alabama, Arkansas, Arizona, Colorado, Florida, Georgia, Idaho, Indiana, Kansas, Kentucky, Louisiana, Missouri, Mississippi, North Carolina, Oklahoma, South Carolina, Tennessee, Texas, and Wyoming. Although they do not have corporal punishment laws, schools in Washington D.C., Nevada, New York and Washington also reported using corporal punishment in 2017-18.

This is a key racial justice and educational equity issue. Though they are not more likely to break school rules, Black students are more likely to be hit in their schools. In 2017-18, Black students made up 15% of the public school population but received 37% of all corporal punishments (OCR, 2020). Corporal punishment is even used on children – especially on students of color – as young as 3 years old.

As reported by national expert, Morgan Craven, in congressional testimony (Feb. 2022), corporal punishment is a particularly brutal form of punishment: “It involves spanking, paddling, slapping, and hitting, or otherwise inflicting physical pain on children – some as young as preschool age – allegedly as a form of discipline.”

Southern states are most likely to use corporal punishment. Ward, Petersen, Kupchik, & Pratt (2021) found connections between the likelihood of corporal punishment being used against Black children in schools today with a history of violence against Black people in these states. Students, particularly Black students, were more likely to be hit in school in the counties where higher numbers of lynchings occurred in the past.

LGBTQ+ students are also disproportionately punished, an indication not of their behavior but of adult bias enabled by policy and school practice. And students with disabilities are disproportionately punished, even though they may need different or additional supports and interventions.

Craven (Feb. 2022) outlines the specific harms caused by corporal punishment:

- **Corporal punishment does not teach nor lead to improved behavior.** It is associated with negative outcomes, poor behavioral and mental health, and reduced cognitive ability and self-esteem. Physical harm to students is not only an impediment to students’ growth, but it also is an equity concern that impacts students that have been underserved by the

current system.

- **Corporal punishment hurts students' academic outcomes.** Research shows that the use of corporal punishment in schools can limit the academic achievement of both the students being punished and the students who witness their peers punished (Dupper & Dingus, 2008). Analyses show negative impacts on cognitive functioning (MacKenzie, et al., 2012), lower performance on tests, and lower grade point averages for students who are hit in their schools (APA, 2021).
- **Corporal punishment causes psychological trauma.** Students who are hit may experience trauma and low self-esteem (Greydanus, et al., 2003). When they are hit in front of their peers, they can be emotionally humiliated, feel unsafe and disempowered, and struggle with life-long depression (Gershoff, 2017). As with other types of punitive discipline, corporal punishment may cause students to feel disconnected from their school communities and academic careers.
- **Corporal punishment causes physical harm.** Corporal punishment is designed to inflict physical pain. That is the entire purpose of the practice. Paddling, spanking, hitting, and slapping children can result in serious physical harm, including cuts, bruises, and broken bones (Gershoff, Purtell, & Holas, 2015). As one parent in Mississippi shared, the paddling her young daughter received in school was so extreme she could not sit down without being in pain for days. The mother took her daughter to a doctor (though the school advised her not to) who was horrified at the brutality of the beating the child endured in school (Nollie Jenkins Family Center, 2021).
- **Corporal punishment is ineffective and even counterproductive as a discipline or teaching tool.** There is no pedagogical value in hitting children. Research has shown that corporal punishment is not an effective way to improve behaviors (Gershoff, et al., 2018), may exacerbate behavioral challenges, and in some cases is used when students are exhibiting completely normal, age-appropriate behaviors. When schools rely on corporal punishment, they are not using other research-based strategies that support students and promote safer school climates.
- **Corporal punishment creates unsafe school climates, and it models violence to young people.** Schools that model violence as a way to address conflict (real or perceived) implicitly grant permission for students to use violence, as young people and later as adults. This can compromise interpersonal relationships (Terk, 2010) and perpetuate a culture where physical violence is seen as acceptable, particularly against people of color and people with disabilities who are disproportionately corporally punished.

Because of these well-documented harms, many professional organizations that focus on children's educational, psychological, and medical health have condemned the use of corporal

Corporal Punishment

punishment in schools (See Appendix A in Craven, Feb. 2022).

Additionally, many local, state, and national advocacy organizations that focus on ensuring equitable educational access and excellent outcomes for students have endorsed federal legislation to end corporal punishment in schools (See Appendix B in Craven, Feb. 2022).

Implicit Bias

Black students are disproportionately disciplined when compared to white students. One major factor that explains these differences is implicit bias, which is the mental process that leads to negative feelings and attitudes about others based on race, ethnicity, age and appearance (Rudd, 2014).

In the classroom, racial, ethnic, gender, language, socioeconomic status, students' disability classifications, and other aspects of identity can invoke unintentional assumptions. Implicit biases are embedded stereotypes that heavily influence our decision-making without our conscious knowledge. Implicit biases can be fueled by a variety of sources. There are institutional and individual biases both inside and outside of the classroom. Implicit bias is displayed in deficit attitudes toward students, lower expectations, a dismissive mindset, and lack of academic and emotional support for students of color. These biases create a hostile, unwelcoming and exclusionary learning environment (Stevens & Kim-Gervey, 2017).

Implicit bias can also result in lowered expectations for students of color based on assumptions that the students and their families do not value education in the same way it is valued by upper-and-middle class white families. This perception creates a stereotype of Black students, in particular, as disruptive and disrespectful (Rudd, 2014). Some adults may also respond to students' intersectional identities in different ways. For example, some adults may respond to Black girls differently than they would respond to either Black boys or other girls. All aspects and intersections of identity should be celebrated, but unfortunately are often subject to unique assumptions that may lead to disparities in punishment.

One of the consequences of implicit bias is that it can rob stakeholders of their sense of compassion and a connection to groups and individuals who suffer the burden of inequality (Rudd, 2014). Existing research points to implicit bias as playing a role in teacher expectations for academic success, which can lead to different treatment for students of color, including less praise and more disciplinary actions.

Lower expectations speak to the teacher and student dynamic and also have a part to play in discipline (Gershenson, et al., 2015). A study conducted by Seth Gershenson and his colleagues (2015) explored how implicit bias impacted students and educators of different races, particularly when the teacher was white and the student was Black. The study found that in such relationships, white educators demonstrated overall lower academic expectations for Black students. The research points to implicit bias as a factor in the results and urges researchers

and educators to study this bias to suggest interventions and help teachers confront their expectations for Black students so that they will contribute to higher educational attainment overall.

School Policing & School Safety

Many school districts across the country employ school-based police (sometimes referred to as school resource officers, or SROs) or contract with local law enforcement agencies to have a police presence in their schools. School-based police are often considered distinct from police officers, but in practice they have (and use) the exact same powers to arrest and use force against young people as other officers who police adults. School resource officers have arresting powers, nearly all (91%) are armed, and most carry tools for physical restraint such as handcuffs (Sawchuk, 2021). Data from the 2017-18 school year show that about 45% of schools had a school resource officer on campus at least once a week. Though officers are more common on secondary campuses, high profile violent events such as school shootings in the late 2010s have led to some states requiring school resource officers or other armed personnel in schools (Sawchuk, 2021).

School-based policing is a misguided response to legitimate school safety concerns. Critically, research refutes beliefs that police presence in schools serve as an effective safety measure. As Terrence Wilson (2020) discusses, stationing police officers in schools is ineffective and potentially hazardous to the mental and physical health of students, particularly students of color. Critically, schools that add school resource officers fail to see a statistically significant change in the rate of serious violent, non-serious violent or property crime (CRS, 2018; Chongmin & Gottfredson, 2011).

In fact, school-based police can destabilize school climates and cause disproportionate harm to students of color, particularly Black students, students with disabilities, and LGBTQ+ youth. Following are examples (Craven, June-July 2022).

- **Police contact can push students into the school-to-prison pipeline,** exposing them to issues – missed classroom time, grade retention, attrition, and contact with the juvenile justice and criminal legal systems – that can impact the likelihood they will graduate and enroll in college (Gottfredson, et al., 2020; Gottlieb & Wilson, 2019; Nance, 2016; Ryan, et al., 2018; Weisburst, 2018).
- **Black students, other students of color, LGBTQ+ youth and students with disabilities are disproportionately impacted** by the presence of school police. National data show that Black students are more likely than their peers to be arrested and referred to law enforcement in their schools, despite not being more likely to break school rules.
- **Higher arrest, suspension and expulsion rates are associated with a police presence in schools** (Homer & Fisher, 2019; Fisher & Hennesy, 2016). One study found a 6%

increase in exclusionary discipline rates, with a disproportionate increase for Latino and Black students and students from families with limited incomes, following an increase in resources for school policing programs (Weisburst, 2018).

- **Students can experience physical harm and trauma due to violent interactions with law enforcement officers** who are able to use tasers, pepper spray, and other weapons and force. Nearly 200 such incidents have been tracked across the country since 2007 (Alliance for Educational Justice, 2022). In a 2019 report, youth leaders documented over 60 cases since 2010 where students were injured through interaction with their school police (Advancement Project, 2019).

In addition to being harmful and ineffective, school investments in police personnel divert funds from critical services that address root causes of challenging behaviors and students' social and emotional needs. The population of law enforcement on public school campuses dwarfs that of support personnel such as social workers: nationally, schools reported having more than 27,000 sworn law enforcement officers compared to 23,000 social workers.

The student-to-counselor ratio is 444:1, indicating that counselors confront a massive workload 78% beyond what is recommended by professionals (ACLU, 2018). Fourteen million students currently attend a school with a police officer, but no school counselor, nurse, psychologist or social worker (Mann, 2019).

Investing in social support personnel, such as comprehensive school mental health personnel, who can intervene early is associated with fewer disciplinary encounters as well as increased engagement, and enhanced educational performance and graduation (U.S. Department of Education, 2021).

Despite these data showing harmful outcomes for students, more and more school districts are increasing school policing efforts. Although police officers have been present in schools for decades, the current expansion of school policing arises largely out of a response to school shooting incidents beginning with the 1999 Columbine High School shooting in Colorado (Brock, et al., 2018). After each high profile school tragedy, federal and state funds flow to schools for ineffective, expensive strategies that hurt rather than help children.

These policing functions are usually located in communities of color without relation to prevalence of criminal activities or other disruptions. Students in families with low incomes and students of color are much more likely to experience intense security conditions in their schools than other students, even when taking into account neighborhood crime, school crime and school disorder (Nance, 2013). As Craven (June-July 2022) observed, "This means that increasing law

enforcement as a response to school violence is often a policy decision based on the race of the students in the school, not on real safety concerns at a campus."

Disciplinary policies that increase contact with students and police officers are ineffective and harmful. They ignore the daily physical and psychological safety of students, particularly those who are most likely to have contact with law enforcement. Like other punitive strategies, referrals to law enforcement can cause students to miss important learning and social time with their teachers and peers; lead to trauma and disengagement from school; and increase the likelihood of grade retention, students dropping out, and contact with the juvenile and adult criminal legal systems.

Strategies in this Package

Reviewing Your Own Data and Planning for Reform

Continuous data review can lead to discussions with policymakers, administrators, teachers, staff and families. By examining an array of data, educators can identify root causes and then plan interventions to resolve problems. Data can reveal discipline practices that target historically-marginalized students (U.S. Department of Education, 2014). See the Local Data Collection and Analysis strategy document in this assistance package for details.

District, School and Community-Level Strategies

Many of the issues with discipline overuse, disparities and harms require systemic and community solutions. The District, School and Community-Level Strategies document in this assistance package gives guidance for setting clear, data-driven and equitable policy; ensuring clear, appropriate and consistent expectations and consequences; eliminating law-enforcement on campus; using asset based practices; maintaining a positive school climate; offering mental and emotional health resources on campus; and using proactive school systems for discipline management, such as restorative practice and positive behavioral interventions and supports; along with other systemwide solutions and strategies.

Classroom-level Strategies

Teachers are in the best position to create supportive school environments for their students. The Strategies to Approach and Improve Classroom Discipline portion of this assistance package gives guidance on maintaining positive classroom environments; building strong relationships; conducting engaging instruction; teaching social and emotional learning; and incorporating student-focused strategies.

Individual-level Strategies

Teachers and school administrators have a responsibility to support each of their individual students and uphold civil rights protections, and equitable and inclusionary practices. The Strategies to Improve Personal Approach to Discipline document in this assistance package gives steps and resources for educators.

Works Cited

ACLU. (2018). Race, Discipline, and Safety at U.S. Public Schools. American Civil Liberties Union. https://www.aclu.org/issues/juvenile-justice/school-prison-pipeline/race-discipline-and-safety-us-public-schools?redirect=issues/juvenile-justice/school-prison-pipeline/doing-math-devos

Advancement Project. (2019). We Came to Learn – A Call to Action for Police Free Schools. Alliance for Educational Justice. https://advancementproject.org/wecametolearn

Alliance for Educational Justice. (2022). #AssaultAtMap, Policy Free Schools, webpage. Advancement Project. https://policefreeschools.org/map/

American Psychological Association, Zero Tolerance Task Force. (December 2008). Are Zero Tolerance Policies Effective in the Schools? An Evidentiary Review and Recommendations. *American Psychologist,* 63 (9), 852-862. http://www.apa.org/pubs/info/reports/zero-tolerance.pdf

American Psychological Association. (2021). Corporal Punishment Does Not Belong in Schools. https://votervoice.s3.amazonaws.com/groups/apaadvocacy/attachments/APA_Corporal_Punishment_Fact-Sheet.pdf citing Gershoff, E.T., Sattler, K.M.P., & Holden, G.W. (2019). School Corporal Punishment and Its Associations with Achievement and Adjustment. *Journal of Applied Developmental Psychology,* 63, 1-8. doi:10.1016/j.appdev.2019.05.004

Andrew, M. (2014). The Scarring Effects of Primary-Grade Retention? A Study of Cumulative Advantage in the Educational Career." *Social Forces,* 93(2), 653-685.

Arredondo, M., Gray, C., Russell, S., Skiba, R., & Snapp, S. (2016). Documenting Disparities for LGBT Students: Expanding the Collection and Reporting of Data on Sexual Orientation and Gender Identity. The Discipline Disparities Research to Practice Collaborative, The Equity Project at Indiana University. http://indiana.edu/~atlantic/wp-content/uploads/2016/03/SOGI-Brief-Final.pdf

Bristol, T.J., Shirrell, M. & Britton, T. (2021). How Does Student-Teacher Matching Affect Suspensions for Students of Color? Brookings, Brown Center Chalkboard. https://www.brookings.edu/blog/brown-center-chalkboard/2021/10/11/how-does-student-teacher-matching-affect-suspensions-for-students-of-color/

Brock, M., Norma Kriger, N., & Miró, R. (February 2018). School Safety Policies and Programs Administered by the U.S. Federal Government: 1990-2016. U.S. Department of Justice. https://www.ncjrs.gov/pdffiles1/nij/grants/251517.pdf

Brownstein, R. (2015). Report Highlights Racial Disparities in School Discipline – Once Again. Southern Poverty Law Center. https://www.splcenter.org/news/2015/09/04/report-highlights-racial-disparities-school-discipline-%E2%80%93-once-again

Castillo, J. (2015). Tolerance in Schools for Latino Students: Dismantling the School to Prison Pipeline. *Harvard Journal of Hispanic Policy*. http://hjhp.hkspublications.org/2015/05/01/tolerance-in-schools-for-latino-students-dismantling-the-school-to-prison-pipeline/

Chongmin, N., & Gottfredson, D.C. (2011). Police Officers in Schools: Effects on School Crime and the Processing of Offender Behaviors. *Justice Quarterly*. https://www.tandfonline.com/doi/abs/10.1080/07418825.2011.615754

CRS. (2018). School Resource Officers: Issues for Congress. Congressional Research Service. R45251. https://crsreports.congress.gov/product/pdf/R/R45251

Cortez, A. (2009). Disciplinary Alternative Education Programs – A 2009 Update. IDRA. https://www.idra.org/wp-content/uploads/2017/09/DAEP_Final_March2009.pdf

Council of State Governments Justice Center. (2011). Breaking Schools' Rules: A Statewide Study on How School Discipline Relates to Students' Success and Juvenile Justice Involvement. https://csgjusticecenter.org/publications/breaking-schools-rules/

Council on School Health. (March 2013). Out-of-School Suspension and Expulsion. *Pediatrics,* 131 (3): e1000–e1007. https://publications.aap.org/pediatrics/article/131/3/e1000/30944/Out-of-School-Suspension-and-Expulsion

Craven, M. (February 16, 2022). Serving All Students – Promoting a Healthier, More Supportive School Environment, written testimony Presented to the U.S. House Committee on Education and Labor Early Childhood, Elementary, and

Works Cited

Secondary Education Subcommittee. IDRA. https://www.idra.org/wp-content/uploads/2022/04/Written-Testimony-Morgan-Craven-JD-IDRA-Feb-14-2022sm.pdf

Craven, M. (June-July 2022). The Facts about School-based Police. *IDRA Newsletter.* https://www.idra.org/resource-center/the-facts-about-school-based-police/

Craven, M. (September 2021). Stop the Bad; Do the Good – Hurting and Excluding Students Feeds the School-to-Prison Pipeline. *IDRA Newsletter.* https://www.idra.org/resource-center/stop-the-bad-do-the-good-hurting-and-excluding-students-feeds-the-school-to-prison-pipeline/

Craven, M., Johnson, P., & Wilson, T. (2020). Eradicating the School-to-Prison Pipeline Through a Comprehensive Approach to School Equity. *University of Arkansas at Little Rock Law Review,* 42 (4), 703.

Dupper, D.R., & Dingus, A.E.M. (2008). Corporal Punishment in U.S. Public Schools: A Continuing Challenge for School Social Workers. National Association of Social Workers, 243-250; Hyman, I. (1996). Using Research to Change Public Policy: Reflections on 20 Years of Effort to Eliminate Corporal Punishments in Schools. *Pediatrics.* 98(4), 818-821.

Eberhardt, J., & Okonofua, J. (2015). Two Strikes: Race and the Disciplining of Young Students. *Psychological Science.* https://journals.sagepub.com/doi/full/10.1177/0956797615570365

Fabelo, T., Thompson, M.D., Plotkin, M., Carmichael, D., Marchbanks III, M.P., & Booth, E.A. (2011). Breaking Schools' Rules: A Statewide Study of How School Discipline Relates to Students' Success and Juvenile Justice Involvement. The Council of State Governments Justice Center & The Public Policy Research Institute, Texas A&M University.

Fisher, B.W., & Hennesy, E.A. (2016). School Resource Officers and Exclusionary Discipline in U.S. High Schools: A Systematic Review and Meta-Analysis. *Adolescent Research Review.* https://link.springer.com/article/10.1007/s40894-015-0006-8

Gershenson, S., Holt, S.B., & Papageorge, N.W. (2015). Who Believes In Me? The Effect of Student-Teacher Demographic Match on Teacher Expectations. Upjohn Institute Working Paper 15-231. W.E. Upjohn Institute for Employment Research. http://dx.doi.org/10.17848/wp15-231

Gershoff, E. (2017). School Corporal Punishment in Global Perspective: Prevalence, Outcomes, and Efforts at Intervention. *Psychology, Health & Medicine,* 22(51), 224-239.

Gershoff, E.T., Goodman, G.S., Miller-Perrin, C., Holden, G.W., Jackson, Y., & Kazdin, A. (2018). The Strength of the Evidence Against Physical Punishment of Children and Its Implications for Parents, Psychologists, and Policymakers. *American Psychologist,* 73, 626-638. doi: 10.1037/amp0000327

Gershoff, E.T., Purtell, K.M., & Holas, I. (2015). Corporal Punishment in U.S. Public Schools: Legal Precedents, Current Practices, and Future Policy. Advances in Child and Family Policy and Practice (pp. 1-105). doi: 10.1007/978-3-319-14818-2

Gottlieb, A., & Wilson, R. (2019). The Effect of Direct and Vicarious Police Contact on the Educational Achievement of Urban Teens. *Children and Youth Services Review,* Vol. 103, 190-199. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.childyouth.2019.06.009

Gottfredson, D., Crosse, S., Tang, Z., Bauer, E.L., Harmon, M.A., Hagen, C.A., & Greene, A.D. (2020). Effects of School Resource Officers on School Crime and Responses to School Crime. *Criminology and Public Policy,* 19, No. 3. https://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/full/10.1111/1745-9133.12512?utm_content=PublicationUpdate&utm_medium=email&utm_source=govdelivery

Greydanus, D.E., Pratt, H.D., Spates, C.R., Blake-Dreher, A.E., Greydanus-Gearhart, M.A., & Patel, D.R. (2003). Corporal Punishment in Schools. *Journal of Adolescent Health,* 32, 385-393.

Homer, E., & Fisher, B.W. (April 2019). Police in Schools and Student Arrest Rates Across the United States: Examining Differences by Race, Ethnicity, and Gender. *Journal of School Violence,* 19(4):1-13. DOI:10.1080/15388220.2019.1604377

IDRA. (2016). Resources on Student Discipline Policy and Practice. http://www.idra.org/wp-content/uploads/2016/11/Student-Discipline-Policy-and-Practice-2016-Ed2.pdf

IDRA. (2016). Zero Tolerance Policies in Texas Push Black Students and Hispanic Students Away from School. https://www.idra.org/research_articles/zero-tolerance-policies-texas-push-black-students-hispanic-students-away-school/

Works Cited

Jimerson, S.R., Pletcher, S.M.W., & Kerr, M. (February 2005). Alternatives to Grade Retention. *Principal Leadership,* 11-15. https://www.naesp.org/sites/default/files/resources/2/Principal/2007/J-Fp30.pdf

Johnson, P. (April 2018). In-grade Retention National Trends and Civil Rights Concerns. *IDRA Newsletter.* https://www.idra.org/resource-center/in-grade-retention-national-trends-and-civil-rights-concerns/

Johnson, P. (October 2016). In-Grade Retention in the Early Years – What's Holding Children Back? *IDRA Newsletter.* http://www.idra.org/resource-center/grade-retention-early-years-whats-holding-children-back/

Johnson, R.L. (October 2016). Zero Tolerance Policies Likely Contribute to High Attrition Rates of Black Students and Hispanic Students. Texas Public School Attrition Study, 2015-16. http://www.idra.org/wp-content/uploads/2016/11/IDRA-Discipline-Article-2016.pdf

Kang-Brown, J., Trone, J., Fratello, J., & Daftary-Kapur, T. (2013). A Generation Later: What We've Learned about Zero Tolerance in Schools. Vera Institute of Justice, Center on Youth Justice. https://storage.googleapis.com/vera-web-assets/downloads/Publications/a-generation-later-what-weve-learned-about-zero-tolerance-in-schools/legacy_downloads/zero-tolerance-in-schools-policy-brief.pdf

Lhamon, C.E., & Samuels, J. (2014). Dear Colleague Letter on the Nondiscriminatory Administration of School Discipline. U.S. Department of Justice and the U.S. Department of Education. https://www2.ed.gov/about/offices/list/ocr/letters/colleague-201401-title-vi.html

Losen, D.J., & Martinez, T.E. (2013). Out of School & Off Track: The Overuse of Suspensions in American Middle and High Schools. The UCLA Center for Civil Rights Remedies at the Civil Rights Project.

MacKenzie, M.J., Nicklas, E., Waldfogel, J., & Brooks-Gunn, J. (2012). Corporal Punishment and Child Behavioral and Cognitive Outcomes through 5 Years-of-age: Evidence from a Contemporary Urban Birth Cohort Study. *Infant and Child Development,* 21(1): 3-33.

Mann, A. (2019). Why School Psychologists Are Worried About the Mental Health of America's Students. ACLU. https://www.aclu.org/blog/racial-justice/race-and-inequality-education/why-school-psychologists-are-worried-about-mental

Maxime, F. (2018). Zero-Tolerance Policies and the School-to-Prison Pipeline. Shared Justice. http://www.sharedjustice.org/domestic-justice/2017/12/21/zero-tolerance-policies-and-the-school-to-prison-pipeline

McCollum, P., Cortez, A., Maroney, O.H., & Montes F. (1999). Failing Our Children – Finding Alternatives to In-Grade Retention. IDRA.

Merrow, J. (March 21, 2004). Get Rid of Retention And Social Promotion. *Education Week.*

Nance, J. (2016). Students, Police, and the School-to-Prison Pipeline. *Washington Law Review,* Vol. 93, 919-987. https://scholarship.law.ufl.edu/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?article=1782&context=facultypub

Nance, J.P. (2013). Students, Security, and Race. *Emory Law Journal.* https://papers.ssrn.com/sol3/papers.cfm?abstract_id=2214202

Nollie Jenkins Family Center (https://nolliejenkinsfamilycenter.org/). (2021). A Virtual Briefing in Support of the Protecting our Students in Schools Act. https://edtrust.zoom.us/rec/play/Gg1U9TF4G6-AjP_jh4SXT3nTqDD4-iCZkNPBGY0Mnu0aWz5oAKECDg-68urZh5sMUI6VDrNpDRuRVJt6.f3RmjpaG6LhNs8rF

OCR. (2021). An Overview of Exclusionary Discipline Practices in Public Schools for the 2017-18 School Year. U.S. Department of Education, Office for Civil Rights. https://www2.ed.gov/about/offices/list/ocr/docs/crdc-exclusionary-school-discipline.pdf

OCR. (2020). Civil Rights Data Collection, 2017-2018. U.S. Department of Education, Office for Civil Rights. https://ocrdata.ed.gov/estimations/2017-2018

Pufall Jones, E., Margolius, M., Rollock, M., Tang Yan, C., Cole, M.L., & Zaff, J.F. (2018). Disciplined and Disconnected: How Students Experience Exclusionary Discipline in Minnesota and the Promise of Non-Exclusionary Alternatives. America's Promise Alliance.

Rudd, T. (2014). Racial Disproportionality in School Discipline: Implicit Bias is Heavily Implicated. Kirwan Institute. http://kirwaninstitute.osu.edu/wp-content/uploads/2014/02/racial-disproportionality-schools-02.pdf

Works Cited

Ryan, J.B., Katsiyannis, A., Counts, J.M., & Shelnut, J.C. (2018). The Growing Concerns Regarding School Resource Officers. *Intervention in School and Clinic,* Vol. 53, 188-192. https://scholarship.law.ufl.edu/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?article=1782&context=facultypub

Sawchuk, S. (2021). School Resource Officers (SROs), Explained. *Education Week.* https://www.edweek.org/leadership/school-resource-officer-sro-duties-effectiveness

Skiba, R.J., Michael, R.S., Nardo, A.C., & Peterson, R.L. (2002). The Color of Discipline: Sources of Racial and Gender Disproportionality in School Punishment. *The Urban Review,* 34(4), 317-342.

Smith, D., Fisher, D., & Frey, N. (2015). Better Than Carrots or Sticks: Restorative Practices for Positive Classroom Management. Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development.

Stevens, A.C., & Kim-Gervey, C. (2017). Chronic Absenteeism Report. Chief Education Office. http://education.oregon.gov/wp-content/uploads/2018/02/1174083_ChiefEd_Chronic-Absenteeism_2017-WEB.pdf

Suh, S., Suh, J. & Houston, I. (2007). Predictors of Categorical At-Risk High School Dropouts. Journal of Counseling & Development, 85(2), 196-203.

Teaching Tolerance. (2015). Code of Conduct: A Guide to Responsive Discipline. https://www.tolerance.org/sites/default/files/2017-06/TT-Code-of-Conduct-2015.pdf

Terk, J. (2010). Corporal Punishment. Archives. https://www.texmed.org/Template.aspx?id=5662

U.S. Department of Education. (2014). Guiding Principles a Resource Guide for Improving School Climate and Discipline. https://www2.ed.gov/policy/gen/guid/school-discipline/guiding-principles.pdf

U.S. Department of Education. (2021). Supporting Child and Student Social, Emotional, Behavioral and Mental Health Needs. Office of Special Education and Rehabilitative Services. https://www2.ed.gov/documents/students/supporting-child-student-social-emotional-behavioral-mental-health.pdf

U.S. Department of Education. (2022). New Guidance Helps Schools Support Students with Disabilities and Avoid Discriminatory Use of Discipline. https://www.ed.gov/news/press-releases/new-guidance-helps-schools-support-students-disabilities-and-avoid-discriminatory-use-discipline

U.S. Department of Health and Human Services & U.S. Department of Education. (2016). Policy Statement on Expulsion and Suspension Policies in Early Childhood Settings. http://www2.ed.gov/policy/gen/guid/school-discipline/policy-statement-ece-expulsions-suspensions.pdf

Ward, G., Petersen, N., Kupchik, A., & Pratt, J. (2021). Historic Lynching and Corporal Punishment in Contemporary Southern Schools. *Social Problems.* https://ccsproject.org/2021/05/20/article-historic-lynching-and-corporal-punishment-in-contemporary-southern-schools-social-problems-byward-petersen-kupchik-and-pratt/

Warren, J.R., & Saliba, J. (2012). First through Eighth Grade Retention Rates for All 50 States: A New Method and Initial Results. *Educational Researcher,* 41(8), 320-329. http://doi.org/10.3102/0013189X12457813

Weisburst, E. (2018). Patrolling Public Schools: The Impact of Funding for School Police on Student Discipline and Long-Term Education Outcomes. Education Research Center, University of Texas at Austin. https://texaserc.utexas.edu/wp-content/uploads/2018/11/21-UTA034-Brief-BPCAB-11.1.18.pdf

West, M.R. (2012). Is Retaining Students in the Early Grades Self-Defeating? Center on Children and Families. https://www.brookings.edu/research/is-retaining-students-in-the-early-grades-self-defeating/

Whitaker, A. (2018). Federal Data Shows Public Schools Nationwide Are a Hotbed of Racial Injustice. ACLU. https://www.aclu.org/blog/racial-justice/race-and-inequality-education/federal-data-shows-public-schools-nationwide-are

Whitford, D.K., Katsiyannis, A., Counts, J., Carrero, K.M., & Couvillon, M. (2019). Exclusionary Discipline for English Learners: A National Analysis. *Journal of Child & Family Studies,* 28(2), 301-314. https://link.springer.com/article/10.1007/s10826-018-1278-y

Wilson, T. (February 2020). At What Cost? A Review of School Police Funding and Accountability Across the U.S. South. *IDRA Newsletter.* https://www.idra.org/resource-center/at-what-cost-a-review-of-school-police-funding-and-accountability-across-the-u-s-south/

Wirtz, E.R. (2021). Racial Disparity in Educational Punishment. *Modern Psychological Studies,* 27(1), 1-23.