

AASA JOURNAL OF SCHOLARSHIP & PRACTICE



Research and Evidence-Based Practice Advancing the Profession of Education Administration

Spring Volume 16 No. 1

Table of Contents

Board of Editors	2
Sponsorship and Appreciation	3
Research Article	
Examining a University-Multiple District Sponsored Academy from the Perspective of Principal Supervisors	4
<i>by Pamela R. Hallam, EdD and David M. Boren, PhD</i>	
Research Article with Commentary	
Redefining School Discipline: Illinois and Other States' Responses to Negative Impact.	20
<i>by Tiffany Puckett, JD, PhD; Christopher Graves, MM; Lenford C. Sutton, MBA, PhD</i>	
Book Review	
<i>What Works May Hurt: Side Effects in Education</i>	48
<i>written by Yong Zhao, PhD</i>	
<i>reviewed by Christopher Tienken, PhD</i>	
Mission and Scope, Copyright, Privacy, Ethics, Upcoming Themes, Author Guidelines & Publication Timeline	53
AASA Resources	57

Editorial Review Board

AASA Journal of Scholarship and Practice
2019 - 2020

Editor

Kenneth Mitchell, *Manhattanville College*

Associate Editors

Barbara Dean, *AASA, The School Superintendents Association*

Ryan Fisk, *Manhattanville College*

Editorial Review Board

Sidney Brown, *Auburn University, Montgomery*

Gina Cinotti, *Netcong Public Schools, New Jersey*

Sandra Chistolini, *Universita`degli Studi Roma Tre, Rome*

Michael Cohen, *Denver Public Schools*

Betty Cox, *University of Tennessee, Martin*

Theodore B. Creighton, *Virginia Polytechnic Institute and State University*

Vance Dalzin, *School District of Oakfield, WI*

Gene Davis, *Idaho State University, Emeritus*

Mary Lynne Derrington, *University of Tennessee*

Daniel Gutmore, *Seton Hall University*

Gregory Hauser, *Roosevelt University, Chicago*

Thomas Jandris, *Concordia University, Chicago*

Zach Kelehear, *Augusta University, GA*

Theodore J. Kowalski, *University of Dayton*

Kevin Majewski, *Seton Hall University*

Nelson Maylone, *Eastern Michigan University*

Robert S. McCord, *University of Nevada, Las Vegas*

Barbara McKeon, *Broome Street Academy Charter High School, New York, NY*

Margaret Orr, *Bank Street College*

David J. Parks, *Virginia Polytechnic Institute and State University*

Joseph Phillips, *Manhattanville College*

Dereck H. Rhoads, *Beaufort County School District*

Thomas C. Valesky, *Florida Gulf Coast University*

Charles Wheaton, *Leadership Services, Granger, WA*

Published by

AASA, The School Superintendents Association

1615 Duke Street

Alexandria, VA 22314

Available at www.aasa.org/jsp.aspx

ISSN 1931-6569

Sponsorship and Appreciation

The *AASA Journal of Scholarship and Practice* would like to thank AASA, The School Superintendents Association, and in particular AASA's Leadership Development, for its ongoing sponsorship of the *Journal*.

We also offer special thanks to Kenneth Mitchell, Manhattanville College, for his efforts in selecting the articles that comprise this professional education journal and lending sound editorial comments to each volume.

The unique relationship between research and practice is appreciated, recognizing the mutual benefit to those educators who conduct the research and seek out evidence-based practice and those educators whose responsibility it is to carry out the mission of school districts in the education of children.

Without the support of AASA and Kenneth Mitchell, the *AASA Journal of Scholarship and Practice* would not be possible.



Examining a University-Multiple District Sponsored Academy from the Perspective of Principal Supervisors

Pamela R. Hallam, EdD
Chairperson,
Educational Leadership and Foundations
Brigham Young University
Provo, UT

David M. Boren, PhD
Director
School Leadership Program
Brigham Young University
Provo, UT

Abstract

Many universities partner with school districts in providing professional development for school leaders through a principal's academy. Since 2002, Brigham Young University and five local districts, representing approximately one-third of all of the students in the state of Utah, have sponsored the BYU Principals Academy to meet the professional development needs throughout the five-district area.

While previous research has focused on understanding the experiences and perceptions of academy participants, this qualitative study explored the views of participants' district supervisors, collected during a focus group experience. Participants were asked how the academy had impacted the district, how it could better meet districts' needs, how the university and districts could more effectively partner, and how its effectiveness could be accurately evaluated. Findings indicated the need for more intentional partnering between the university and districts: with recommendations to sharpen and clarify the program focus, co-create desired learning outcomes, and strengthen university-district communication.

Key Words

principal professional development, principal academy, principal institute, university-district partnership, leader development, principal supervisor

The field of educational leadership has long acknowledged a need for more targeted high-quality professional development for acting school principals.

Over 15 years ago the executive director of the National Staff Development Council (NSDC) declared:

The development of principals cannot continue to be the neglected stepchild of state and district professional development efforts. It must be standards-focused, sustained, intellectually rigorous, and embedded in the principal's workday. Nothing less will lead to high levels of learning and performance by all students and teachers (Sparks, 2002, p. 81).

Research conducted over the past decade by the Wallace Foundation (2011) has shown that principal leadership can and does influence student achievement. Louis, Leithwood, Wahlstrom, and Anderson (2010) describe the connection between principal leadership and student learning in the following way, "Leadership is second only to classroom instruction among all school-related factors that contribute to what students learn at school" (p. 9).

Other researchers suggest that nearly one fourth of all school-related effects could be accounted for by the leader's direct or indirect influence (Marzano, Waters & McNulty, 2005). The way in which a principal coordinates the interaction of these in-school factors can result in positive effects on student achievement (Robinson, Lloyd & Rowe, 2008). The Wallace Foundation (2011) reports that when school variables are considered separately, they generally have an insignificant effect on learning.

However, "The real payoff comes when individual variables combine to reach a critical mass. Creating conditions under which that can occur is the job of the principal" (p. 2). Leithwood and colleagues (2004) found that "there are virtually no documented instances of troubled schools being turned around without intervention by a powerful leader. Many other factors may contribute to such turnarounds, but leadership is the catalyst" (p. 5).

If principal leadership can and does make a difference in student achievement and principal leadership is catalyst for change in schools, then is critical to ensure that principals remain current in their practice. Bizzell (2011) makes this same case by suggesting, "if we accept that principals' leadership is second only to classroom instruction as a school factor impacting student achievement (Leithwood et al., 2010), there is value in knowing how those leadership behaviors can be developed" (p. 42).

Specific Needs for Principal Professional Development

Improving principal leadership skills must be an ongoing process in order to meet the needs of our increasingly complex schools. Barth (1993) states, "Being a learner, a lifelong adult learner, is the most important characteristic of a school leader and of a professional" (p. 219). Kochan, Bredeson and Riehl (2002) explain, "The school leader sets the tone, direction, and climate for learning. It is therefore imperative that the principal serve as a 'model learner' in their school" (p. 299).

While principals are still ultimately responsible for their own professional growth, districts and universities play a central role in providing ongoing support and development matched to every career stage (Alvy & Robbins, 2005; Anderson et al., 2004; Fink & Resnick, 2001; Stewart, Davenport, & Lufti,

2006). In 2013, the National Association for Secondary School Principals published a report entitled: *What the Research Says About the Importance of Principal Leadership*. In this document they recommend, “The content and focus [of principal professional development] should be individualized, with a tight link between principal evaluation and development opportunities ... and efforts should be made to provide development that is job-embedded” (p. 10). Spanneut and colleagues specified, “Principals need continuous opportunities to upgrade their knowledge and skills. Professional development opportunities should be tailored to the needs of the participants and geared to actual leadership roles” (2012, p. 26).

Finding practical ways to build the capacity of principals is paramount as it has been shown to impact the academic achievement of students and the overall quality of our schools. One approach for providing principal development with the above characteristics is for districts to partner with universities in sponsoring principal institutes or academies (Peterson, 2002).

Chapman provided some clear criteria to districts and universities interested in providing the most effective professional development to principals:

Vital to leadership learning is the interplay of a number of elements: study of the relevant theoretical disciplines and the substantive domains of professional knowledge and competence; critically reflective practice; engagement in field-based learning activities and peer-supported networks. A co-operative approach among learning providers is required to enable coverage of all elements (2005, p. 15).

The Brigham Young University Principals Academy (BYUPA) was initiated in 2002 as a unified way for the university and five local school districts to collaboratively support the learning and development of principals.

The BYU-Public School Partnership’s Governing Board consists of the superintendents from all of the five partner school districts, the CITES director, and the dean of the BYU’s McKay School of Education. Initially, the BYUPA was a four-year program focused on helping principals develop professional learning communities (PLCs) in their schools.

In 2003, the BYUPA was condensed into a two-year program, as most of the schools in the partnership had already developed successful PLC practices. In the current BYUPA structure, principals meet for approximately twenty days over a two-year period, with an emphasis on refining PLCs and increasing the leadership capacity of school administrators. Since 2002, over 400 principals and assistant principals have graduated from this program

Study Purpose and Research Questions

To strengthen BYUPA and in the process contribute to the research on principal professional development, we have conducted studies on participant and stakeholder viewpoints. Following research on past and current academy participants (Boren, Hallam, Ray, Gill, & Kuanchen 2017), we have expanded our perspective to consider the experiences and perceptions of principal supervisors, who react to the academy in terms of outcomes and results observed on the district level over many years of participation. From

these supervisors we have gained significant understanding that is guiding improvements in our Principals Academy function and outcomes.

More specifically, we asked the following research questions:

1. What impact has the BYUPA had on your district?
2. How can the university partner with district leadership in determining the primary learning outcomes of the academy?
3. How might the university and districts effectively partner in selecting participants, ensuring participation, supporting participants in applying their learning experience?
4. How should the effectiveness of the BYUPA be evaluated?

Methods

In seeking to gain clarity on these questions, we used purposive sampling, focus group interviews, with qualitative methods of analysis. Having over 16 principal supervisors who could have been included in this study, we employed a purposive, non-randomized, maximum variation sampling scheme with the intent to create a focus group that most closely represented the districts being sampled (Patton, 2002). We chose to stratify our sample by district (five participating), gender (male or female), and the school level supervised (elementary or secondary). Due to principal supervisors' schedules, our final focus group had fewer participants than we had initially hoped, but sufficient variation to make the results meaningful. The seven participants represented four of the five partnership districts, with a balance of elementary and secondary principal supervisors; one participant was female and six were male. (See Table 1)

Table 1

District Student Count, District Participation and Principal Supervisor Gender and Participation

Partnership Districts	Student Count (Total: 183,948)	Elementary Supervisors (n=4/9)	Secondary Supervisors (n=3/7)
District 1*	52, 509	Female 1* Female 2	Male 1 Male 2*
District 2*	77,457	Female 1 Female 2 Male 1 Male 2*	Male 1* Male 2
District 3*	14,679	Male 1*	Male 1*
District 4*	6,477	Male 1*	Male 1
District 5**	32,826	Female 1**	Male 1

*Participated in focus group

**Invited but unable to participate in focus group

We chose to use a focus group because “a group session has chemistry and dynamic that are more than the sum of its members’ comments ... The synergy in the group interaction usually prompts greater breadth and depth of information and comparison of views” than individual interviews (Carey & Asbury, 2012, pp. 11, 18). In preparation for the group session, we created a bank of semi-structured interview questions for data collection. Our initial qualitative analysis followed the basic framework proposed by Marshall and Rossman (1999) of organizing the data; generating categories, themes, and patterns; coding the data; testing emergent understandings and searching for alternative explanations; and writing the report.

We split our research team into two groups, tasking each to simultaneously organize the data and generate themes. A third independent group then sought to reconcile, summarize, and synthesize the work of these two into meaningful themes, patterns, relationships, and recommendations. We are confident that this quasi double-blind approach led us to the most important themes, patterns, and relationships identified by the principal supervisors participating in the focus group.

Results

While our qualitative analysis resulted in meaningful themes, patterns, and relationships, we chose to report our results by following the natural flow in which the principal supervisors

spoke about the various themes. We provide each research question, along with selected answers from supervisors, accompanied by supporting external research. We hope that this reporting process will allow readers to easily transfer these findings to their unique situations.

Research Question 1: What impact has the BYUPA had on your district?

Most of the district supervisors reported enthusiasm and appreciation for the impact the BYUPA has had and continues to have on the attending principals. Many spoke of it as a “career highlight” (B2), continuing that the “readings are on point, the guest speakers are enlightening, and the learning is cutting edge” (B2).

Networking

Our supervisors acknowledged that principals have a demanding role and often feel isolated and inadequate to handle the demands of the position thus networking has been one of the most valuable aspects of the BYUPA. “One of the greatest benefits aside from a new perspective is just the networking and collegiality that is built among the different schools and districts” (A2).

The safety of a place to discuss their challenges with principals who share them is seen as invaluable. A supervisor with a similar view stressed vulnerability and risks. “The principal’s seat can be pretty vulnerable, and now you have a group of colleagues as thinking partners, which I think is created through that PLC (professional learning community) model. They can ask questions in a risk-free environment” (C2).

Another stressed the value of exchanging solutions for shared challenges, referring to BYUPA as a “safety net [for principals] to realize that they are facing the

same challenges as others [and] can talk and find out what others are doing to make it work” (C1).

Principals themselves expressed the desire to collaborate and network with other principals, in responding to our previous study with current and former attendees (Boren et al., 2017) consistent with other findings in the literature (Browne-Ferrigno & Muth, 2004; Salazar 2007). Neale and Cone (2013) reported that nearly three out of four principals who attended the School Leaders Network indicated they had become stronger, more confident leaders as a result of learning with other principals (p. 5).

Reflection and engagement

One of the main reasons our supervisors supported the BYUPA is that it gives their principals time for “deep reflection, which we find as professionals is quickly gone ... [which] is critical as it helps principals begin to design a system in their building” (A1). Considering the complexity of the principals' daily work, if they are not given time and space for reflection, they may not reflect often enough—possibly not at all.

Perhaps contributing to principal supervisors' positive reaction to BYUPA is that it meets many of the criteria set forth by Chapman (2005) and others (Brown et al., 2002; Cardno, 2005) in supporting the needs of acting principals: study of relevant theories, critical reflective practice in peer-supported networks, and engagement in field-based practical learning, backed by time and resources from the district, with a cooperative approach among the university and local districts.

Principal supervisors gratefully acknowledged that most of these critical elements are already in place, and they also

provided some helpful recommendations for reinforcing, revisiting, or strengthening them while moving forward in implementing the professional learning process.

Improved principal practice

Several supervisors mentioned visible improvements in principal leadership practices among BYUPA participants. For example, “It helps our principals begin to design a system, how we align all of our practices instead of having isolated practices” (A1).

Similarly, “It provides that second go-around that really starts to solidify their learning” (C2). One supervisor summed it this way, “I think it takes their learning to another level because now they’ve had a few years of experience, they can add theory to their experience and then go back and enhance their practical work” (B1). Supervisors agreed that the biggest impact of the BYUPA was in the increased leadership capacity of their principals.

Research Question 2: How can the university partner with district leadership in determining the primary learning outcomes of the academy?

When asked if they could confidently articulate the primary learning targets of the BYUPA, supervisors’ immediate response was “no” or “probably not.” One supervisor added, “I think we could certainly say, but I don’t know if we’d get it correct” (B1). We asked them to try.

One respondent ventured to say, “To strengthen principal capacity through an immersion experience in literature from current trends in school leadership in a collaborative environment partnership wide” (B2). This comment was quickly followed by this statement: “I think if we could find agreement

on what those principal competencies are, that [agreement], if addressed in the academy, would strengthen all participants” (B1).

Focus and specificity

One supervisor suggested that a more clear, focused, simplified set of learning outcomes and materials would improve the academy.

As good as the material is in Principals Academy, it is a little bit of a hodge-podge right now. And so that it doesn’t become just people’s favorite energizing topic ... we could ask district leadership what are these domains of leadership that we want our principals to be developed in ... it would give the people running the BYUPA a better filter to pull materials through ... it would just be more purposeful (B2).

Suggestions about how to more narrowly focus the BYUPA and then move to the application stage were shared. One of our supervisors suggested a process to better utilize the districts in organizing and facilitating the learning their principals are experiencing in the BYUPA.

It would be healthy for the partnership districts to come together and define what we expect principals to know and to be able to do. And if we could come to a consensus on five or six domains, we would know that they are learning and getting work in those domains (B1).

Another expressed similar approval and gave an example:

I like this idea of developing proficiencies that we’ve identified and agreed upon among the partnering districts ... that participants will have mastered; maybe it’s a skill-based

proficiency around being PLCs [or another] leadership piece in the building (C2).

One supervisor summarized the needs for focus and enhanced partnership: If the BYUPA was able to “focus on a few things rather than 25 things ... mastering a few things would make [principals] feel empowered to continue to move forward with their work—linking towards that change process in their building” (A1). He concluded, “I think it would really just help us align our practices with your practices and really feel like it’s a partnership” (A1).

State standards

Clearly supervisors viewed the proposal for specifically defined domains for their principals' professional development in the BYUPA as a positive step. A brief discussion suggested that the state leadership standards might inform BYUPA, but not guide it.

One participant recommended:

“I think there ought to be at least some engagement with those standards to [discern if] we are wandering strange roads ... or aligned with what’s out there in terms of expectations for principals” (B1).

However, others cautioned to avoid letting the state standards drive the BYUPA curriculum:

“An awareness yes, to form the structural backbone I would say no. It would lose its inspirational quality. It would turn into an in-service then, and the turn-off meter would go way up if it was structured around the standards like that” (B2).

Another reminded the group of the diversity in the districts represented:

“We don’t want to get too pigeon-holed into specific areas; they need to be broad enough that they can be used across all districts” (C2).

Communication and collaboration

Another theme raised was that communication between the BYUPA administrators and districts had been inadequate. One participant expressed: “I’m not sure who’s in charge of determining what topics or ideas are going to be shared, and that’s, I guess, a lack of understanding on my part” (C1).

Another supervisor agreed and extended, “I feel similarly. And to take that a little further, if there was more communication, I think we would be able to provide better support for principals, both at the building level and also at the district level” (B2). Another noted similar lack of communication: “I would say the collaboration that I have is just with the principals who are involved and not coming through any kind of district channel” (A1).

The BYUPA seems to have drifted slightly from its original design as a collaborative effort between the university and local districts. The districts still support the BYUPA financially and philosophically, but as these comments reveal, district leadership has little substantive awareness of the BYUPA desired learning outcomes and a limited role in planning and delivering the program for achieving those outcomes.

Principal supervisors seem to agree that “effective training programs should be the joint effort of schools, government admins, and academics” (Wong, 2004, p. 142). As one supervisor expressed: “We need to align our

practices instead of having isolated practices because that is when you begin to see change” (A1). If the BYUPA and the partner school districts worked together to define desired outcomes and conduct program delivery, the benefits of this two-year professional development program could be magnified.

Research Question 3: How might the university and districts effectively partner in selecting participants, encouraging participation, and supporting participants in applying their learning experience?

Selection

Selection of BYUPA attendees has varied widely in the participating districts. Principal supervisors make selections in some districts, the district cabinet takes care of this in others, and the superintendent and assistant superintendent make these decisions in others. None of the districts have a formal application process.

Career stages

While some research suggests differentiated professional development programs for aspiring principals, newly inducted principals, and long-time principals (Wong, 2004), the BYUPA has not targeted their program toward principals at a particular career stage or in particular types of schools.

Thus, participating districts have varied in their views about who should attend. Some districts have limited their selection pool to acting principals, while others have seen some benefit in having their high-potential assistant principals and district office personnel attend. One supervisor explained, “It’s been very interesting to see that they do get something out of it [regardless of their] state.” (D1). Another supervisor specified, “We have allowed

assistant principals who are sharp, who are ready to take the material and contribute” (B2).

A few supervisors were a little more hesitant in sending assistant principals, but felt that attending did build enthusiasm for moving up to a principal position (C1). A supervisor explained his district’s policy, “I think even if you could cognitively know what the duties of a principal are ... until you are actually the principal you just have no idea what your role is ... we’ve only sent principals” (A2).

Objectives and outcomes

The apparent discrepancy in selection approaches may be partially due to an inaccurate or incomplete understanding of the intended learning outcomes of the BYUPA. When asked who should attend, one supervisor brought the discussion back to this situation: “It gets back to that mission and vision. What are the objectives that we’re trying to accomplish?” (C2). Another supervisor was more specific about this need:

[Clear objectives] would help us in our selection process as well, because then we would be able to look for those specific competencies and be able to say, “We feel like this is the right experience for this person” ... We want to get the right people in the seat so that we can bring those promising practices back to the district and have people that are ready (A1).

While current participants seem to have a positive experience, more clarity about program outcomes would likely allow districts and the university to better target individuals who would benefit from the program and further customize the experience in ways that

more effectively address the unique experiences of these leaders in their specific roles, career stages, and circumstances (Stewart, Davenport, & Lufti, 2006).

Participation and implementation

After inviting school leaders to participate in BYUPA, district supervisors have assumed that those invited to attend will participate fully in the academy for the good of their schools. “I think we’re just assuming they’re all there and present and engaged and prepared” (A1). In accordance with adult learning theories, supervisors are hesitant to dictate overly specific expectations that could potentially interfere with adults’ rich, self-directed learning (Knowles, Holton, & Swanson, 2011).

Previous research in this area would suggest that principals appreciate this low-stress approach; the same research also suggests that participants could erroneously view loose expectations as low expectations, resulting in spotty attendance and sub-par participation from some individuals (Boren et al., 2017). One of the supervisors demonstrated the pro-con: “Anyone that I would recommend, I would assume full engagement. I wouldn’t recommend them if I thought they would not attend or would not read [assigned materials]. But I don’t think we ever get a reporting back on attendance or engagement” (B1). The job of principal is also constantly subject to unexpected issues that require immediate attention, sometimes requiring the principal to miss a BYUPA session.

Supportive expectations

It would likely be easier for supervisors to set supportive expectations for participants if they accurately understood not only the purposes of the BYUPA, but the specific learning outcomes anticipated for each session and who had been able to attend. “It would be nice ideally to be

able to follow up with them afterward and know exactly what they learned, and ask some questions and get some feedback from them,” one supervisor explained (A2). Another filled in rationale:

If there was more communication about that, I think we would be able to provide better support for them, both in the building level and then also at the district level ... It gets back to that idea of taking the work that’s going on [in the BYUPA] and helping to make the transfer into practice (C2).

Another supervisor envisioned an even more active role:

I would love, as a supervisor, to have access to [the BYUPA] materials, even just be on the email list, or whatever you do as you prepare for them to come ... [so] we can become good thinking partners with those we supervise and really probe more deeply ... “Here’s the reading, what does that look like?” (A1).

Supervisors hope BYUPA will fulfill its potential to change principals’ practice and improve their learning. One felt participation should be a form of commitment:

It begs the question, “why take all the time out of the day and away from the buildings if we’re not helping them to build their capacity and then apply it?” ... I think that given the investment in this we definitely want to see some follow through, some application of this. It can’t be simply a kind of a feel good, living in the theoretical experience, if they don’t make that transfer to practice (C2).

This sentiment was supported by another supervisor, “There should be some type of collective commitment ... to determine what the actionable step is ... based on what your school needs are” (A1).

Another participant stressed that applying what they learn at Principals Academy is not a matter of *whether* the principal is going to make changes; it's a matter of choosing *which* applications will be most suitable for the individual school:

A tight-loose approach is critical because we have to differentiate ... allow for differentiation with those principals in their own buildings ... Perhaps on that one tight part you say, "You're going to take something away from this, and you gotta apply something in your building. We'll let you decide what that is, but take something away" (A2).

Supervisors would likely be able to provide clearer initial expectations and better support for meaningful implementation, if they understood specifically which outcomes were targeted in each session, were provided the topics and materials involved, and were apprised of who was able to attend and participate and who might need some make-up instruction and support.

Research Question 4: How should the effectiveness of the BYUPA be evaluated?

Participant improvement

One supervisor noticed that those who engaged more fully in the experience seem to experience more subsequent success; thus, noting success among participants would be one indication of impact.

I remember that we had one that did not take it seriously and then one that did. And just juxtaposing those two [we could see that] those that attend and take it seriously ... [have] scores of achievement and direction and culture of leadership in that building [which have] been at a higher level than those that haven't attended. It's hard to quantify that, but I think they're definitely better off for it (D1).

Another supervisor shared his perception that BYUPA participants definitely improve in their ability to lead schools: “You see increased capacity in principals' ability to lead learning ... Principals that participate in BYUPA go after learning better” (B1).

Other sources of feedback

One supervisor suggested, “If you're looking for ways to measure it, I think there are whole different tiers of feedback that you can get, or should get” (C2). This report implements one suggestion for feedback tiers: feedback from principals' supervisors. Additionally, gathering views of teachers, students, and other stakeholders regarding changes in principal leadership during and beyond the academy was also recommended. One supervisor suggested that reviewing improvement in the schools' student learning data over time may be the most objective and revealing data for evaluating a principal's academy (B1).

Another supervisor described how this might look: “We need to work more closely with our principals in helping them find those actions that are making that difference down to the classroom level with students, and ask for them to share evidence with us” (A1). If students learning over time doesn't improve, it is hard to make the case that the academy was effective (Hill, Hawk, & Taylor, 2001).

Admittedly, a lack of clearly stated learning outcomes makes it challenging to evaluate BYUPA's effectiveness. Each of the forms of feedback and evaluation referred to in this section rely primarily on supervisors' fuzzy perception that leadership has improved in ways that better support student learning. There seems to be a lack of clear, valid, reliable, and objective measures that would establish program effectiveness.

As one supervisor noted in discussing effective program evaluation: "It's all about the BYUPA outcomes. Coming back to your objectives" (C2). Establishing clear outcomes will allow program facilitators and partnership districts to co-design relevant measures of program effectiveness that will allow for continual program evaluation and improvement.

Conclusion

Principal supervisors see the BYUPA as a positive way for participants to network, reflect, rejuvenate, and increase in leadership capacity. They noted improvements evident in these principals' practice. Participants seem to benefit regardless of district, position, or career stage. But as one supervisor posited, "I just think there is greater potential that we have not yet tapped into" (A1).

Based on feedback from the supervisor focus group, one of the best ways to tap into that latent potential, would be for the university and districts to co-develop essential learning outcomes for BYUPA that align specifically with districts' needs. This co-development of outcomes would likely result in a healthy

balance of the theoretical from the university and practical from the districts.

Knowing these intended outcomes will allow principal supervisors to better select participants who will benefit in terms of those outcomes, nurture participants' growth while they are in the program, and facilitate implementation of program learning. Not only will this tighter program coordination improve communication between the university and districts, supervisors believe that it will contribute to greater capacity in individual participants and improve learning for students in the schools.

In addition, supervisors believe that districts and universities will benefit not only from co-creating desired learning outcomes, but also from working as full partners in all aspects of the planning, delivery, and evaluation of a university-multiple district principals academy.

The findings here point to many possibilities for improved university-district partnership in the BYU Principals Academy, and point to potential implications for others engaged in similar efforts. While these findings suggest some salient themes, we invite more diverse, widespread, yet targeted research on how different partnering structures, processes, practices, and outcomes impact principal development and student learning. This expanded understanding of principal professional development could help policy makers and system leaders looking to improve and scale principal development efforts that ultimately contribute to improved student learning.

Author Biographies

Pamela Hallam is an Associate Professor and Chair of the Educational Leadership and Foundations Department at Brigham Young University. She currently teaches Instructional Leadership, Collaborative Leadership for Change, and Human Resource Management. She started her career as a high school teacher, before becoming a middle school principal, and then moving into the district office as the director of curriculum and technology. Her areas of academic interest include the role of trust in educational leadership and schools, Professional Learning Communities, and collective efficacy, using qualitative methods. E-mail: pam_hallam@byu.edu

David Boren is an Assistant Professor and the Director of the School Leadership Program in the Educational Leadership and Foundations Department at Brigham Young University. He started his career in public education as an elementary school teacher, assistant principal, and then principal. He currently teaches Leadership for Learning Communities, Supervision, and Curriculum Theory and Practice. His research focuses on trust in schools, distributed school leadership, school leader preparation, and well-being in schools. E-mail: david_boren@byu.edu

References

- Anderson, S., Leithwood, K., Seashore Louis, K., & Wahlstrom, K. (2004). *How leadership influences student learning*. Retrieved from Wallace Foundation website: <http://wallacefoundation.org>.
- Alvy, H., & Robbins, P. (2005). Growing into leadership. *Educational Leadership*, 62(8), 50-54.
- Barth, R. S. (1993). Reflections on a conversation. *Journal of Personnel Evaluation in Education*, 7(3), 217-221.
- Bartoletti, J. (2013). Leadership matters: What the research says about the importance of principal leadership. Reston, Virginia: National Association of Secondary School Principals.
- Bizzell, B. E. (2011). *Professional development of school principals in rural Appalachian region of Virginia* (Doctoral Dissertation). Retrieved from ProQuest, UMI Dissertations Publishing. (DP19937).
- Boren, D. M., Hallam, P. R., Ray, N. C., Gill, C. L., & Li, K. (2017). Examining effective principal professional development through a university-district sponsored principal academy. *Educational Practice and Theory*, 39(2), 87-106.
- Brown, K. M., Anfara, V. A., Hartman, K. J., Mahar, R. J., & Mills, R. (2002). Professional development of middle level principals: Pushing the reform forward. *Leadership and Policy in Schools*, 1(2), 107-143.
- Browne-Ferrigno, T., & Muth, R. (2004). Mentoring in clinical practice: Role socialization, professional development, and capacity building. *Educational Administration Quarterly*, 40(4), 468-494.
- Cardno, C. (2005). Leadership and professional development: The quiet revolution. *International Journal of Educational Management*, 19(4), 292-306.
- Carey, M. A., & Asbury, J.-E. (2012). *Focus group research*. New York, NY: Routledge.
- Chapman, J. D., (2005). *Recruitment, retention, and development of school principals*. Policy Series, International Institute for Educational Planning. Retrieved from: <http://citeseerx.ist.psu.edu/viewdoc/download?doi=10.1.1.487.1614&rep=rep1&type=pdf>
- Fink, E., & Resnick, L. B. (2001). Developing principals as instructional leaders. *Phi Delta Kappan*, 82(8), 598 - 610.
- Hill, J., Hawk, K., & Taylor, K. (2001). Professional development: What makes it work? In SET 2, 12-15. Wellington, New Zealand: NZCER.

- Kochan, F. K., Bredeson, P. and Riehl, C. (2002), Rethinking the Professional Development of School Leaders. Yearbook of the National Society for the Study of Education, 101: 289–306. doi:10.1111/j.1744-7984.2002.tb00013.x.
- Leithwood, K., Louis, K.S., Anderson, S., & Wahlstrom, K. (2004). *Review of research: How leadership influences student learning*. Retrieved from Wallace Foundation website: <http://wallacefoundation.org>.
- Marshall, C., & Rossman, G. B. (1999). Designing qualitative research. Newberry Park, CA: SAGE Publications.
- Marzano, R. J., Waters, T., & McNulty, B. A. (2005). *School leadership that works: From research to results*. Alexandria, VA: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development.
- Neale E., & Cone M. (2013). Strong principal networks influence school culture. *The Learning Principal*, 8(3). Retrieved from www.learningforward.org
- Patton, M. Q. (2001). *Qualitative research and evaluation methods* (2nd ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.
- Peterson, K. (2002). The professional development of principals: Innovations and opportunities. *Educational Administration Quarterly*, 38(2), 213 - 232.
- Robinson, V., Lloyd, C., & Rowe, K. (2008). The impact of leadership on student outcomes: An analysis of the different effects of leadership types. *Educational Administration Quarterly*, 44(5) 635-674.
- Salazar, P. S. (2007). The professional development needs of rural high school principals: A seven-state study. *The Rural Educator*, 28(3), 20-27.
- Spanneut, G., Tobin, J., & Ayers, S. (2012). Identifying the professional development needs of public school principals based on the interstate school leader licensure consortium standards. *NASSP Bulletin*, 96(1), 67-88.
- Sparks, D. (2002). Designing powerful professional development for teachers and principals. Oxford, OH: National Staff Development Council.
- Stewart, H., Davenport, E. K., & Lufti, G. (2006). An analysis of the professional development needs and preferences of Jamaican school principals. *International Journal of Educational Reform*, 15(4), 436-449.
- Wallace Foundation (2011). *The school principal as leader: Guiding schools to better teaching and learning*. Retrieved from Wallace Foundation website: <http://wallacefoundation.org>.

Wong, P. M. (2004). The professional development of school principals: Insights from evaluating a programme in Hong Kong. *School Leadership and Management*, 24(2), 139-162.

Redefining School Discipline: Illinois and Other States' Responses to Negative Impact

Tiffany Puckett, JD, PhD
Assistant Professor
Department of Politics and Government
Illinois State University
Normal, IL

Christopher Graves, MM
Assistant Principal
Chicago Public Schools
Chicago, IL

Lenford C. Sutton, MBA, PhD
Chairperson
Department of Educational Administration and Foundations
College of Education
Illinois State University
Normal, IL

Abstract

Minority students and students with disabilities are disciplined disproportionately from their peers. Discipline has led to many negative consequences in the lives of youth in the United States, including the school-to-prison pipeline. In 2014, the U.S. Department of Education issued guidance encouraging school districts to develop policies that seek alternatives to exclusionary penalties. Some states, including the State of Illinois, have been proactive in revamping the state's discipline. In this paper, we will examine how the states are responding to the school-to-prison pipeline and the other negative effects of exclusions and suspensions. Additionally, this paper will examine the implementation of Illinois Senate Bill 100, from an administrator's point of view, to make recommendations for disciplinary strategies and possible policy revisions.

Key Words

school discipline, school-to-prison pipeline, zero tolerance

Introduction

The school-to-prison pipeline is prevalent in the United States (Kim et al., 2010). Students who commit infractions in school are increasingly ending up in the criminal justice system. The rise in schools' use of law enforcement officers has led to the criminalization of behaviors that traditionally were handled by school staff.

Zero tolerance discipline policies have also contributed to the school-to-prison pipeline. A recent study found that zero tolerance discipline policies are predictive of an increase in the proportion of students suspended (Curran, 2016). The increase was three times larger for African American students (Curran, 2016).

There is a correlation between exclusion from school and the ramifications later in life. Children perceive negative treatment in schools as a reflection on their character, and thus become more disengaged in school itself when this occurs (Rocque & Paternoster, 2011). There are many education advocacy organizations and legal associations committed to confronting the school-to-prison pipeline and the other negative impacts of suspension/expulsion. One way to address these concerns is to continue to redefine school discipline.

In March 2018, the U.S. Government Accountability Office released a report finding that Black students, boys, and students with disabilities were disproportionately disciplined (e.g., suspensions and expulsions) in K-12 public schools (GAO, 2018). In 2014, the U.S. Department of Education (2014) issued guidance to help school districts ensure that their student discipline policies and practices do not discriminate against racial and ethnic groups.

The U.S. Department of Education (2014) encouraged school districts to develop policies that seek alternatives to exclusionary penalties, with a goal to keep the students from missing time within the classroom.

Some states have been proactive in revamping the state's discipline policy through promoting legislation that supports alternatives to exclusionary penalties, culturally responsive discipline, and methods to encourage a positive school environment.

Illinois is one of those states. On September 15, 2016, Illinois Senate Bill 100 went into effect and significantly changed Illinois School Code and local school district discipline practices. The new discipline code eliminates zero tolerance policies, promotes discipline alternatives, and has put restrictions of suspension/expulsions.

The U.S. Department of Education Office of Civil Rights data from the 2013-2014 school year shows that overall minority student and students with disabilities are disciplined disproportionately from their peers (OCR, 2013). Discipline has led to many negative consequences in the lives of youth in the United States, including the school-to-prison pipeline.

The school-to-prison pipeline occurs when school policies end up pushing a student into the criminal system (Kim et al., 2010). Some have argued that implicit biases of teachers and police officers lead to the disparity in the number of minority students suspended and arrested in the school (Kennedy et al., 2017; Cumi et al., 2017; Thompson, 2016; Berlowitz et al., 2015; Crenshaw et al., 2015; Morris, 2007, Morris 2005).

One study found that “teachers and administrators indicated a widespread belief that violent forms of bullying were an intrinsic component of the culture of lower socio-economic Black youth” (Berlowitz et al., 2015, p. 14). Furthermore, the study finds that the beliefs “were assumed to be grounded in factors beyond the control of educators: ie., poverty, and wide-spread neighborhood violence.

Therefore, teachers and administrators were unlikely to explore the efficacy of zero-tolerance policies or possible alternatives” (Berlowitz et al., 2015, p. 14).

Scholars have argued that zero-tolerance policies have started a pattern of institutional racism (Smith, 2009; Bradley & Renzulli, 2011), overcriminalization of the classroom, and are ineffective and create many negative consequences (Smith, 2009). It is argued that radical reform may be the only thing that will break the school-to-prison pipeline (Berlowitz et al., 2015).

An American Bar Association report pointed out that a solution to the school-to-prison pipeline must focus “on ways to:

- (1) improve academic achievement and increase the likelihood that students will remain in school, graduate, and prepare to become positive, contributing members of our society,
- (2) decrease the number of suspensions, expulsions, and referrals to law enforcement; and
- (3) decrease disparities along racial and other lines relating to discipline and academic achievement” (Redfield & Nance, 2016, p. 12).

This radical reform has to take place at the state legislature level, as well as the local school district level.

State Legislatures’ Response to the Negative Impacts of School Disciplinary Action

Over the past years, there has been significant activity in the states related to school discipline law and policy. This study specifically looked at activity on the state legislative level. Several states have recently passed laws related to school discipline, and it will be interesting to look at the longitudinal impact to on the students and the local school districts.

The State of Illinois has taken action in trying to deal with the negative consequences of disciplinary actions and the school-to-prison pipeline.

In 2016, the State of Illinois legislatures passed Senate Bill 100, which drastically changed school discipline in the state of Illinois. Under the current law, school staff and administrators can only provide harsher disciplinary actions under certain circumstances.

The new bill also encouraged the use of other resources and other alternatives to deal with disciplinary situations within the school setting. Senate Bill 100 changed Illinois School Code, and specifically states the following:

Among the many possible disciplinary interventions and consequences available to school officials, school exclusions, such as out-of-school suspensions and expulsions, are the most serious. School officials shall limit the number and duration of expulsions

and suspensions to the greatest extent practicable, and it is recommended that they use them only for legitimate educational purposes. To ensure that students are not excluded from school unnecessarily, it is recommended that school officials consider forms of non-exclusionary discipline prior to using out-of-school suspensions or expulsions (105 ILCS 5/10-22.6 (b-5)).

Furthermore, Illinois law now eliminates zero-tolerance policies unless required by federal law and requires the establishment of a parent-teacher advisory board to help develop school discipline policies and policies related to bullying and school searches (105 Ill. Comp. Stat. § 5/10-22.6). Illinois school administrators are also limited in the usage of suspensions. School staff can give a student an out of school suspension of three days or less if “only if the student's continuing presence in school would pose a threat to school safety or disruption to other students' learning opportunities” (105 Ill. Comp. Stat. § 5/10-22.6 (b-15)).

Additionally, Illinois School Code states the following:

Out-of-school suspensions of longer than 3 days, expulsions, and disciplinary removals to alternative schools may be used only if other appropriate and available behavioral and disciplinary interventions have been exhausted and the student's continuing presence in school would either (i) pose a threat to the safety of other students, staff, or members of the school community or (ii) substantially disrupt, impede, or interfere with the operation of the school (105 Ill. Comp. Stat. § 5/10-22.6 (b-20)).

The new law is a step in the right direction to minimize the negative impacts of school discipline.

Illinois' neighbor, the State of Indiana, is attempting to make some changes regarding discipline. According to the U.S. Department of Education Civil Rights Data Collection (2013), during the 2013-2014 school year, more than 75,000 Indiana students were suspended. One in five black students was suspended compared to one in 20 white students. These suspensions were mostly for nonviolent offenses.

Currently, Indiana law allows for suspensions and expulsions when a student is engaging in unlawful activity on or off school grounds if the unlawful activity reasonably interferes with school purposes or educational function or the student's removal is necessary to restore order or protect persons on school property. The state law specifically states the following:

In addition to the grounds specified in section 14 of this chapter, a student may be suspended or expelled for engaging in unlawful activity on or off school grounds if:

- (1) the unlawful activity may reasonably be considered to be an interference with school purposes or an educational function; or
- (2) the student's removal is necessary to restore order or protect persons on school property; including an unlawful activity during weekends, holidays, other school breaks, and the summer period when a student may not be attending classes or other school functions (Ind. Code § 20-33-8-15).

In July 2017, Indiana House Bill 1152 (2017) was introduced. This bill if passed will require school districts to improve school discipline and behavior by developing a direct evidence-based plan. The plan may not contain zero tolerance requirements and must reduce disproportionality in discipline (Indiana House Bill 1152, 2017). The plan must also limit referrals to law enforcement (Indiana House Bill 1152, 2017).

Additionally, in 2015, the Indiana House Bill 1635 would have allowed grants to be provided to school boards to provide a school-wide program to include improved the school climate. Additionally, the bill required the Indiana Department of Education to develop guidelines for teachers to have successful classroom management strategies, including cultural responses methods and alternatives to suspension and expulsion. However, this bill did not pass (Indiana House Bill 1635, 2015).

The State of Arkansas is also attempting to make some changes. A 2016 report on Arkansas schools found that Arkansas punishes African-American students more harshly than their white peers (Ritter & Anderson, 2016). During the 2014-15 school year, for every 100 black students, there were 29 out of school suspension compared to each out of school suspension for a white student.

The African-American students are disproportionately represented in-school suspensions, out of school suspensions, and expulsions (Ritter & Anderson, 2016). Furthermore, African American students were more likely to receive corporal punishment (Ritter & Anderson, 2016).

This research took place after Arkansas passed Act 1329, which required the school districts to evaluate and report the number of

disciplinary actions based on subgroups and the rate of disparity for each subgroup (Arkansas Act 1329, 2013). That same Act disallowed the use of out of school suspension as a disciplinary measure for truancy (Arkansas Act 1329, 2013). In 2017, the State of Arkansas passed several bills that have changed their disciplinary policy.

Arkansas legislators passed a law that restricted when school districts can suspend or expel students in kindergarten through fifth grade. The law now specifically states the following:

- (2) The school district shall not use out-of-school suspension or expulsion for a student in kindergarten through grade five (K-5) except in cases when a student's behavior:
 - (A) Poses a physical risk to himself or herself or to others; or
 - (B) Causes a serious disruption that cannot be addressed through other means. (Ark. Code § 6-18-507(b)(2))

Additionally, the Department of Education is now required to report data concerning suspensions/expulsions and corporal punishment in their annual reports (Ark. Code § 6-18-516).

The State of California made changes to its state disciplinary laws in September 2014. This law limited suspensions and expulsions for students in pre-K to third grade and for those that have been willfully defying (Cal Edu. Code § 48900). At the time of its passage, willful defiance had been responsible for 43% of the suspensions (ACLU, 2014). The state suspension rate had a disproportionate impact on African-American students, LGBTQ students, and students with disabilities (ACLU, 2014). It should be noted that the law is only in effect until July 1, 2018.

In 2012, Colorado passed a measure to minimize the state's zero-tolerance disciplinary policies to only have expulsion mandatory for infractions that involve a student who is determined to have brought a firearm to school or possessed a firearm at school (Colorado Senate Bill 12-046, 2012).

The measure also promoted the use of measures to promote students staying in school (Colorado Senate Bill 12-046, 2012). In 2017, Senate Bill 17-1038 was introduced and attempted to further minimize negative disciplinary action. If passed, it would have officially banned schools from using corporal punishment (Colorado Senate Bill 17-1038, 2017).

In 2015, the State of Connecticut passed a law that disallowed the suspension and expulsion of children in preschool through second grade. These children can only be suspended or expelled if the conduct is of "a violent or sexual nature that endangers persons" (Conn. Gen. Stat. § 10-233c).

The State of Delaware has taken steps toward minimizing the impact of discipline policies. The 2013 -2014 Civil Rights Data shows that although African American students only made up 32% of the Delaware population, they made up 62% of all students suspended (OCR, 2013). Furthermore, although students with disabilities made up only 13% of the state's population, they comprised of 32% of all school students suspended (OCR, 2013).

Additionally, 98% of all suspensions during the 2013-2014 school year in Delaware were nonviolent (OCR, 2013). In 2017, the State of Delaware made changes to its zero-tolerance policies on weapons. House Bill 176 was passed giving school districts more discretion when suspending students on weapons violations—changing from a zero-

tolerance weapons violation policy to taking into consideration how the weapon was used (Delaware House Bill 176, 2017). In May 2017, Delaware Senate Bill 85 was introduced. This bill will require school districts to create a discipline improvement plan, evaluate school discipline policies, and monitor progress toward discipline goals (Delaware Senate Bill 85, 2017). There been no action on the bill.

The State of Maryland is making efforts in combating the school-to-prison pipeline. House Bill 1287 was signed into law in May 2017. The bill establishes a Commission on School-to-Prison Pipeline and Restorative Practices (Maryland House Bill 1287, 2017). In Maryland, on July 1, 2017, House Bill 425 also went into effect. The bill prevents suspensions and expulsions of students younger than third grade (Maryland House Bill 425, 2017). It also creates a 5-day maximum on suspensions and mandates alternatives to suspensions/expulsions (Maryland House Bill 425, 2017).

The State of Michigan has made similar strides in the right direction. The current law requires the school board to consider using restorative practices as an alternative or along with the suspension or expulsion (Mich. Comp. Laws § 380.1310c). Furthermore, in December 2016 the government signed a bill limiting the school districts zero-tolerance policies (Michigan House Bill 5618, 2016).

In the state of Oregon, school boards must adopt policies for discipline expulsion and suspension, and the law provides a long list of infractions that students can receive suspensions and expulsions for infractions including willful disobedience (Or. Rev. Stat. § 339.250). In 2015, Oregon passed a measure to limit the use of suspension and expulsions with children fifth grade and under (Oregon Senate Bill 553, 2015).

Oregon also passed, in 2015, a measure that prohibits the use of expulsion to address truancy (Oregon Senate Bill 556, 2015).

The current law now points out that schools must limit the use of expulsions to the following circumstances:

(A) For conduct that poses a threat to the health or safety of students or school employees; (B) When other strategies to change student conduct have been ineffective, except that expulsion may not be used to address truancy; or (C) When the expulsion is required by law (Or. Rev. Stat. § 339.250).

In New York, the current law allows suspension for insubordinate or disorderly or violent or disruptive conduct or conduct that otherwise endangers the safety morals health and welfare of others (New York State Consolidated Laws—Education § 3214).

In January 2017, the New York Legislature introduced multiple bills to its education committee that will change disciplinary actions for minor infractions and limit the use of long-term suspension (New York Bill A03873, 2017; New York Bill S03036, 2017). They will also require the use of alternative disciplinary measure and restorative justice approaches to help keep students in the classroom (New York Bill A03873, 2017; New York Bill S03036, 2017). There has been no recent activity on these bills. This is not the first time a bill of this nature was presented. A similar bill was defeated in 2015 (New York Bill A8396, 2015).

In 2017, several bills related to discipline were introduced in New Hampshire. The legislature passed House Bill 216, which requires educational assignments to be

provided to students on suspension (New Hampshire House Bill 216, 2017). Two other related bills were not passed. House Bill 270 would have established a committee to study suspensions and expulsions for middle school and high school, and House Bill 271 would have required the collection of data on suspensions and expulsions (New Hampshire House Bill 270, 2017; New Hampshire House Bill 271, 2017). In New Jersey, Senate Bill 2081 passed limited expulsions and suspensions for students that were in preschool to 2nd grade (New Jersey Senate Bill 2081, 2016).

The bill gave certain exceptions as well as required early detection and prevention programs aimed preschool through second grade (New Jersey Senate Bill 2081, 2016). In 2015, the Washington state legislature passed House Bill 1541, which put a cap on the length of expulsions to one academic term and required districts to provide services to students during any period of disciplinary expulsion (Washington House Bill 1541, 2015).

In 2016, the state of Rhode Island was successful in passing legislation related to the school-to-prison pipeline with the passage of House Bill 7056 and Senate Bill 2168. The bills required the review of discipline data to determine disparities in impact (Rhode Island House Bill 7056, 2016) and limited the instances of out of school suspensions requiring suspension to be served in school (Rhode Island Senate Bill 2168, 2016). Similar legislation had failed during the 2015 General Assembly.

Failed and Pending Attempts

During the recent years, many states have been unsuccessful in getting state laws changes in regards to disciplinary measures. Several states attempted to get legislation passed ending the use of corporal punishment (Kentucky House

Bill 393, 2017; Louisiana House Bill 497, 2017). It should be noted that at the same time in Louisiana, a bill was passed to end corporal punishment for students with disabilities (Louisiana House Bill 79, 2017).

During the 2016 legislative session, Minnesota legislators were unsuccessful in the passage of a bill that attempted to make non-exclusionary policies and practices the central focus of student discipline (Minnesota House Bill 3041, 2016). State legislators in North Carolina were unsuccessful in the passage of House Bill 1067. The bill was introduced to establish a study commission in connection with long-term suspension and dropout rates (North Carolina House Bill 1067, General Assembly 2015).

In Pennsylvania, during the 2015 and 2016 general assemblies, House Bill 590 was introduced. This bill would have required a commission to conduct the study on school discipline policies and laws and regulations, and advise the committee making final findings and recommendations (Pennsylvania House Bill 590, General Assembly 2015; Pennsylvania House Bill 590, General Assembly 2016). The bill never made it to a vote. In 2017, Texas Senate Bills 370 and House Bill 674 were introduced with the purpose of banning suspensions on students in grades kindergarten through third grade. These bills are still pending (Texas Senate Bill 370, 2017; Texas House Bill 674, 2017).

In Virginia, during the 2017 general assembly, there were three defeated bills related to student discipline (Virginia Senate Bill 995, 2017; Virginia Senate Bill 996, 2017; Virginia Senate Bill 997, 2017). Senate Bill 995 would have cut the maximum long-term suspension from 364 days to 45 school days. Senate Bill 996 would have banned long-term suspensions and expulsions except in cases of

physical injury or credible threat. Additionally, Senate Bill 997 would have banned suspensions and expulsions for kindergartners to fifth grade except in cases of certain crimes.

Lenient Suspension and Expulsions Policies

Many states have lenient suspension and expulsion laws and policies. In this case, 'lenient' meaning that there are minimal restrictions on the use of suspensions and expulsions by the states' school districts. The leniency can contribute to the disparity in the application of the disciplinary actions and other discriminatory practices.

The State of Alabama has been under criticism for its' school districts discriminatory discipline policies. Specifically, in Jefferson County, the public schools have been unable to discipline fairly. Jefferson County is currently under a 50-year-old Federal desegregation order and has been unable to achieve their goal of receiving unitary status because of the district's disparity in disciplinary practices (Crain, 2017).

More specifically, black students are more likely to receive the most severe behavioral consequences compared to their white peers (Crain, 2017). During the 2013-14 school year, 19,000 children were paddled; black and multiracial boys made a huge portion of the paddling (OCR, 2013). Currently, in the State of Alabama, the state law does not specifically give guidance to the language of discipline codes in regards to school disciplinary action.

The Alabama state statute is broad and vague. It does, however, provide that teachers have the right to use corporal punishment and a discussion of teacher immunity to civil liability (Ala. Code § 16-28A). Furthermore, the Alabama State Board of Education requires

school districts to develop school discipline policy that is provided to all school staff (Ala. Code § 16-28A). It is also important to point out that in Alabama there is currently a trust called the Alabama Children First Trust Fund that comes from tobacco sales. Of the funds, 22% are allocated to the Alabama State Board of Education; the Board is required to use portions of the trust money to create alternative school programs including ones related to school discipline, counseling programs, and social skills development programs (Ala. Code § 41-15B-2.2).

School districts in Georgia have been criticized as some of the worst contributors of the school-to-prison pipeline (Richey, 2016). During the 2016 legislative session, Georgia House Bill 135, Too Young to Suspend Act (2016) failed to pass. This bill would have eliminated suspensions and expulsions for students that were pre-K through third grade (Georgia House Bill 135, 2016). The state of Georgia is attempting to address the school-to-prison pipeline through the 2016 passage of Senate Bill 367. The main focus of the bill was to overhaul the criminal justice system.

However, it also required that Georgia State Board of Education set minimal requirements for hearing officers that oversee school discipline hearings (Georgia Senate Bill 367, 2016). The Georgia Board of Education is responsible for the development of training for the hearing officers (Georgia State Board of Education, 2017).

The law pertaining to suspensions and expulsions in the State of Georgia is somewhat lenient. It states that “a teacher shall have the authority to remove from his or her class a student who repeatedly or substantially interferes with the teacher's ability to communicate effectively with the students in the class or with the ability of the student's

classmates to learn, where the student's behavior is in violation of the student code of conduct, provided that the teacher has previously filed a report pursuant to Code Section 20-2-737 or determines that such behavior of the student poses an immediate threat to the safety of the student's classmates or the teacher” (Ga. Code Ann. § 20-2-738 (b)). Although the law is lenient, the state does have a policy that it is “preferable to reassign disruptive students to alternative educational settings rather than to suspend or expel such students from school” (Ga. Code Ann. § 20-2-735 (f)).

In the states of Alaska and Arizona, student suspensions and expulsions are allowed with limited restrictions. Alaska law states the following:

A school age child may be suspended from or denied admission to the public school that the child is otherwise entitled to attend only for the following causes:

- (1) continued wilful disobedience or open and persistent defiance of reasonable school authority;
- (2) behavior that is inimicable to the welfare, safety, or morals of other pupils or a person employed or volunteering at the school;
- (3) a physical or mental condition that in the opinion of a competent medical authority will render the child unable to reasonably benefit from the programs available;
- (4) a physical or mental condition that in the opinion of a competent medical authority will cause the attendance of the child to be inimicable to the welfare of other pupils;
- (5) conviction of a felony that the governing body of the district determines will cause the attendance of

the child to be inimicable to the welfare or education of other pupils (Alaska Stat. §14.30.045).

Arizona law states the following:

A pupil may be expelled for continued open defiance of authority, continued disruptive or disorderly behavior, violent behavior that includes use or display of a dangerous instrument or a deadly weapon as defined in section 13-105, use or possession of a gun, or excessive absenteeism. A school district may expel pupils for actions other than those listed in this subsection as the school district deems appropriate (Ariz. Rev. Stat. §15-841).

OCR data and local data show that minority students and students with disabilities in these states are more likely to be suspended and expelled (OCR 2013; Anchorage School District Profile, 2017) and some districts have been criticized for the disproportionality (Hanlon, 2017; Polleta & Cano, 2017).

Other states have very lenient suspensions and expulsion policies. In Mississippi, the Superintendent of schools and principal both have the power to suspend a student for “good cause” related to behaviors occurring on or off school premises (Miss. Code Ann. § 37-9-71). In Missouri, “the school board may suspend or expel a student for conduct which is prejudicial to good order and discipline in the schools or which tends to impair the morale or good conduct of pupils” (Mo. Rev. Stat. § 167.161).

In New Hampshire, any pupil may be expelled from school by the local school board for gross misconduct or for neglect or refusal to conform to reasonable rules of the school or for

an act of death and destruction or violence” (N.H. Rev. Stat. Ann. § 193:13).

In New Mexico, school districts are allowed to establish their own discipline rules and policies providing detail with sanctions that may include in-school suspension, suspension, or expulsion (N.M. Stat. § 22-54.3).

In North Dakota, students may be expelled due to “insubordination, habitual indolence, disorderly conduct or for violating weapons policies” (N.D. Cent. Code § 15.1-19-09). In Pennsylvania, a public school may temporarily suspend a student based on disobedience or misconduct (24 Pa. Cons. Stat. § 1318).

In South Dakota, the school board may suspend or expel from school any student for violations “of rules or policies or for insubordination or misconduct” (S.D. Codified Laws § 13-32-4).

In Virginia's current state law allow for suspension and expulsion for sufficient cause; not to include instances of truancy (Va. Code Ann. § 22.1-277).

Perceptions of Disciplinary Measures from the Role of School Administrator

The spectrum of challenges that children face in their daily lives impacts their ability to be successful in school. One common term for these barriers is ‘Adverse Childhood Experiences’ (ACEs). ACEs include a variety of household related matters such as mental health issues in the home, substance, physical, or emotional abuse, unstable family structures such as neglectful or absent guardians, and other developmental challenges (Perez et al. 2016).

When a student experiences four or more categories of childhood exposure, compared to their peers who had experienced none, they have a 4-to-12 times increased chance of exhibiting risky behavior such as alcoholism, drug abuse, depression, and suicide attempt, amongst other health-related issues (Felitti, 1998).

In addition to the incidents that directly affect the child, societal factors such as colorblindness, suppression of emotional and behavioral expression, and systematic differences in population due to various forms of diversity amongst others impact the neuroplasticity of the brain. This growing body of research, as prioritized by the Society for Research in Child Development and National Institute for Mental Health, has been highlighting how these myriad concepts impact and often inhibit normal growth and development of the brain (Causadias, 2013).

These adverse experiences contribute to many of the unwanted behaviors that students exhibit in schools. Disciplinary treatment and racial hostility, as reported by students of various ethnic backgrounds, can also lead to misbehavior.

A conflict in racial cultural values and the existence of stereotypes can lead to this mismatch in expectations, resulting in a perception of misbehavior on the part of adults, even when the students do not feel that they have violated rules.

In situations like these, the desired impact of a student learning from his or her 'mistakes,' taking ownership of behavior, and preventing it from recurring is less likely. This incongruity of culturally influenced expectations can lead to disengagement from school and ultimately a preference towards

criminal activity outside of the school (Rocque & Paternoster, 2011).

The very way that school is structured also either encourages or inhibits the ability of students to foster and develop healthy habits. It is imperative that schools consider the supports in place that directly address students when they struggle to manage behaviors (Baker et al., 2001).

In summary: When students misbehave, due to myriad influencing factors, underlying biases and cultural disconnects may prevent them from getting the help they need.

To ensure that students have their needs met in school, one place to start would be at the legislative level. Before and after legislation is enacted, the mere creation does not necessarily ensure a change in practice as related to underlying beliefs. Bias and treatment of students based on race and ethnicity, for example, has been bred into us for hundreds of years.

How this plays out in school, when a student misbehaves, is that the disciplinarian often resorts to extreme options, such as suspension. This has been a culturally acceptable 'go-to' solution that they know will likely not have the desired impact. Despite this, the exclusionary option may still be chosen to temporarily remove the problem (Noguera, 2003).

Though legislation and policy can be part of the solution, other factors need to be addressed before they are used as the driving force for improving outcomes. Codes of conduct that result from policy do not always have the desired impact of either reducing misbehavior or causing a supportive environment. In fact, written policies can at

times instead promote a punitive approach to misbehavior (Fenning et al., 2012). Policies that benefit one class, race, or another group of students over another can be perceived as covertly racist, beyond intent. If the intended policy does not address the mismatch in values and beliefs, it may instead reinforce the perception that the child is a menace to society and that these undesired behaviors are to be expected of him or her (Scheurich & Young, 1997).

These biases impact our ability to be fair and equitable in our actions, as evidenced by a disparity between suspension rates by race for the same behaviors exhibited. African American students are suspended significantly more than their white peers for 'disruption.' In situations like these, teachers make judgment calls whether or not the student's language is disrespectful, disruptive, or in some other way sufficiently unacceptable that the student should be referred to the office.

Furthermore, the principal must make a judgment whether the misbehavior is serious enough to merit school suspension. These factors give incredible power to adults who may believe that they are acting objectively, but underlying biases about expected behaviors reveal otherwise (Luna & Wright, 2016).

What Works and How to Implement Guiding Principles

In 2014, the U.S. Department of Education and the U.S. Department of Justice (2014) issued joint guidance to help school districts ensure that their student discipline policies and practices do not discriminate against racial and ethnic groups. The U.S. Department of Education (2014) encouraged school districts to develop policies that seek alternatives to exclusionary penalties, with a goal to keep the students from missing time within the classroom. Some states have been proactive in

revamping the state's discipline policy through promoting legislation that supports alternatives to exclusionary penalties, culturally responsive discipline and methods to encourage a positive school environment. Illinois is one of those states.

On September 15, 2016, Illinois Senate Bill 100 went into effect and significantly changed Illinois School Code and local school district discipline practices. The new discipline code eliminates zero tolerance policies, promotes discipline alternatives, and put restrictions of suspension/expulsions (Illinois Public Act 99-0456, 2016).

The U.S. Department of Education guidance laid out principles that school administrators should take into consideration when making decisions regarding school discipline policies and disciplinary actions. These guiding principles are presented in the context of school administration's implementation of Illinois Senate Bill 100 and Chicago Public Schools policy.

However, there is no 'one size fits all' approach to addressing the guidance of the U.S. Department of Education. What works for one community, legislator, administrator, teacher, or used on one student, may or may not work for another.

If we are constantly in the mindset that one prescribed approach is the best and will undoubtedly work, we are fooling ourselves. There must be room for determining the 'best practice' for each situation.

What follows is an attempt to calibrate what is recommended with what has worked in at least one community. These examples may work for others, but at the very least will serve as an example of an approach by which one could attempt to emulate or modify to meet

their similar yet unique needs. The resulting impact of the actions on the part of the school community has shown the ability to greatly reduce the occurrence and recurrence of misbehavior, and a greater chance that students will succeed in all aspects of their high school careers.

One of the most important recommendations from the ‘Guiding Principles’ issued by the U.S. Department of Education (2014) was that states, school districts, and schools implement the guidance in this document as they see fit.

Providing localized control for the extent to which this is implemented should involve professional judgment within the confines of legal obligation due to race, gender, and other forms of federal, state, and local regulation.

Beyond this, the guiding principles themselves are broken into three categories by which we can impact school cultures. Below are brief descriptions of these, including what works from the perspective of the school level where these have been implemented with positive outcomes, broken down principle by principle.

Guiding principle #1

The first principle describes prevention and a focus on improving general school climate. (U.S. Department of Education, 2014). Studies have linked the school climate to student behavior (Wu et al., 1982; Haynes et al, 1997; Irvin et al., 2004; G. D. Gottfredson et al., 2005; Wang, 2009; Gage, et al., 2016). School climate variables have been significantly related to student discipline. As early as 1982, researchers have concluded that “student suspension is a matter of student misbehavior, but it is more a matter of how the school treats its students” (Wu et al., 1982, p. 370).

A student’s positive perspectives of the school has been linked to a decrease in negative behaviors (Wang, 2009). Focusing on improving the general school climate can be initiated through the promotion of a school-wide ‘vision’, ‘mission’ or motto of some kind to align all actions of the school This should tie into both the school’s and district’s improvement plan or vision document, aligning perfectly (Luna & Wright, 2016).

The Chicago Public Schools Vision Statement serves as one type of this coalescing document, bringing together the needs and desires of a variety of stakeholders (Chicago Public Schools, 2017). Schools also often develop their own guiding documents such as a ‘school improvement plan,’ which should be aligned back to the greater mission and vision of the district, and potentially state initiatives as well (Van Der Voort & Wood, 2014, p. 6).

Also, within the first principle, is the method in which a school or district builds interventions. Multiple Tiered Systems of Support (MTSS), a term for a process commonly used to categorize interventions provided for students in schools at various levels of need, is a massive concept. MTSS at the school or district level should be all-encompassing, covering the entire range of options by which a school can support students.

On the surface, it would seem simple enough to build a list of interventions that looks comprehensive and follow the prescribed method of intervention when students struggle, to provide them with the needed support. Unfortunately, the real-world scenarios that students encounter in their daily lives in and out of school do not result in a prescribed method being followed. Myriad factors complicate the process, often resulting in customized paths towards success for students. Fortunately, the process of MTSS takes this

into account (if implemented with fidelity), understanding that all tiered levels of behavioral interventions should be adapted and tailored to the needs of the individual or a group of students (Benner et al., 2013).

Regardless of whether a state, district, or school implements MTSS, or Response to Intervention (RtI), or another of various forms of structured supports, the goal should be that the system built is comprehensive. As described above, factors beyond consequences and interventions, including policy, addressing bias, and influencing society must all be considered. In fact, without this multi-faceted approach, some inherent challenges will not be overcome. Without expanding the repertoire of options to use as alternatives to suspension, it's likely that exclusionary practices will continue to be utilized (Fenning & Johnson, 2016).

The most basic and fundamental level of tiered support is that of school-wide interventions. These 'Tier 1' strategies and celebrations should be implemented school-wide in a way that affects and benefits all students. Programs such as RtI and various incarnations of MTSS incorporate this as their base level. Posters describing expected behaviors, general social and emotional activities in all classrooms, and students remaining eligible for events like pep rallies based on agreed-upon criteria are all examples of ways in which schools promote a wall to wall positive culture through MTSS or RtI.

Beyond this basic level of intervention is what would be described in MTSS as 'Tier 2,' typically implemented as a group-type program or targeting a behavior exhibited by some students. An example of this would be a Structured Psychotherapy for Adolescents Responding to Chronic Stress (SPARCS) behavior management group for boys or girls who experience ongoing trauma. In general,

the point of group interventions such as this is to address behavioral trends as they emerge, responding to data and anecdotal observations.

Beyond 'Tier 2' group supports is the personalized approach of 'Tier 3.' Usually addressed one on one, 'Tier 3' supports are unique to each student. School-based personnel, serving in all types of capacities, help implement these structured supports. When 'Tier 1' school-wide and 'Tier 2' group supports do not prove to be successful or are deemed not to be the appropriate path to take for the individual, a custom-tailored plan should be developed. This can be done by an individual responsible for student behavior or as part of a team's collaboration possibly involving the collection of data to track the exact patterns of the behavior.

When striving to improve school climate and behavioral support strategies, consider the dual role at the school level held by mental health clinicians. While they provide direct services to students, they also have the opportunity to share their expertise with other staff, to help make them aware of what works and how to implement these interventions. At times, these clinical staff are the same ones implementing the individualized supports.

For example, a clinician with expertise in family counseling can be assigned to students whose home life is impeding school success. They often use tracking systems for monitoring the frequency of specific unwanted behaviors, to have accurate data that can then be monitored to determine the impact of an intervention implemented. One process for this, called a Functional Behavior Analysis (FBA), provides a safe, efficient, and effective means of identifying the factors surrounding challenging behavior in schools settings so that

it can be appropriately addressed (Davis et al., 2014).

Lastly, extending beyond the walls of the school is the role of the community. This exists in various forms, but a necessary step to utilize their resources is first to establish which Community Partners will serve which roles in the school. A community agent in Chicago, Communities United, aligns different neighborhood organizations to promote legislation and action towards equity of marginalized students. Their efforts include grassroots campaigns that build off of community interests and issues raised and use the power of collective voice and human experience to enact change (Communities United, 2017).

Guiding principle #2

The second guiding principle involves developing “clear, appropriate, and consistent expectations and consequences to address disruptive student behaviors” (U.S. Department of Education, 2014, p. 1). Studies have shown a positive link between defined schoolwide behavior programs and school discipline (Bohanon et al., 2006; Lassen et al., 2006; Freeman et al., 2016; Haydon & Kroeger, 2016). One study concluded that “PBS is an effective intervention in reducing student problem behavior in urban middle schools that have high rates of student misbehavior and that improvements can be sustained over a long period of time” (Lassen et al., 2006, p. 710).

Improvements in negative behaviors have been seen in Positive Behavior Support (PBS) programs in urban schools (Bohanon et al., 2006). Another urban high school study found a decrease in student problem behavior when school supports had active supervision, pre-correction, and explicit timing (Haydon & Kroeger, 2016) A more recent study found a link between the implementation of School-

Wide Positive Behavior Interventions and Supports (SWPBIS) at high schools across 37 states and improvements in behavior outcomes for all students (Freeman et al., 2016).

MTSS, the tiered system of supports listed earlier, should also be seen as an example of how school-wide expectations can be structured to adhere to principle #2. Implemented properly, this structure may involve consequences for students that are interpreted as ‘punishments.’

Though this may sound like it runs counter to a restorative approach, the consequences may be justified, even in the eyes of a restorative disciplinarian. If a litany of options is presented, then they can more easily become tailored to the infraction that occurs. These consequences should be paired with an intervention that teaches students to reduce the likelihood of recurrence of the undesired behavior (Mason, 2015).

It is important to make behavioral expectations explicitly clear to all stakeholders to avoid confusion or inconsistent implementation (Thomas, 2015). This process starts with a clear definition, stemming from a vision or mission. What policies and procedures will help achieve that mission or vision? Then, the articulation of a clear policy developed from that mission and vision needs to be created, communicated, and reinforced to all adults first and foremost. The teaching of school-wide expectations should follow this.

Having everyone clearly understand how and why a policy is being implemented avoids any misinterpretation that will only perpetuate the status quo of some students feeling that policies are unfairly being applied to them. Calibration and practice, by adults in groups or one-on-one with a trainer or

supervisor, helps to ensure that all are striving towards common implementation.

When one teacher believes that a certain type of behavior warrants a disciplinary referral and another does not, this disparity in expectations creates an unfair system. On the contrary, with every situation being unique, there is no way to guarantee that all students will be treated similarly since the associated factors with any infraction can influence the disciplinarian when choosing the appropriate consequence.

One way to assist with calibration is to have an activity during professional development that explicitly addresses this, such as ‘coding’ scenarios as different types of infractions in a student code of conduct. Following up on the training, a disciplinarian should then assist with ongoing calibration by clarifying to adults (and students, parents, and any other stakeholders as needed) why certain consequences are assigned or why certain behavior will or will not result in a given consequence.

Regarding the harshest of consequences, there has been a growing trend in both policy and practice to ensure that codes of conduct look beyond exclusionary practices as ‘go to’ consequences. In fact, documentation used by many parts of the country now explicitly state that these types of punishments should be used as a last resort only when all other options are exhausted (except for in certain extreme situations).

With ‘zero tolerance’ policies having been popularized in the 1980s and now on the decline, there has been ample research done on the effectiveness of this time period and what has resulted from arrests, expulsions, suspensions, and other forms of removing students from instructional time. The

consensus guidance of organizations such as the U.S. Department of Education and others in recent years is evidence that their guidance is based on research showing that the desired impact is not taking effect (Anyon et al., 2016).

Stated directly, suspensions alone do not reduce the recurrence of the types of behaviors that they are designed to address. In extreme situations such as law violations and when the safety of others is at risk, it may be more necessary than at other times to remove the student to an alternative location temporarily. Even in these situations, however, the perception of people beyond the offender plays a role, as well as the mental and cognitive abilities of the student offender.

A student in need of mental health supports for making a threat of harm to her or himself or others has a priority of receiving support for eliminating this atypical behavior through mental health services over a harsh punishment. Similarly, students with special cognitive needs may exhibit unwanted behaviors as manifestations of their disability, once again not justifying a harsh consequence as a primary punishment (Christle et al., 2004).

To aid in this process, regular evaluation of the referral process should take place. Evaluating the processes themselves and their resulting data to determine the effectiveness of the interventions is key.

For example, an In-School Personal Development (ISPD) session, which could involve a period of time where a student is removed from class with the explicit purpose of teaching them how to take ownership of their behavior and prevent a certain type of infraction from happening again, may or may not have the desired impact. If over time it is determined that the same students are ending up in the same situations, then alternatives

should be considered, or revisions to the process may be needed

Another factor of exclusionary practices that inhibits academic growth is that the associated loss of instructional time inevitably impacts academic achievement. Students missing out on this important foundation of their learning will suffer, and only perpetuates the likelihood that they will fall further behind and struggle in school (Losen et al., 2012). Though there is no way around this if these consequences are chosen, their ability to impede progress can be limited.

When students are taught academic content during an ISPD session, they are more likely to remain on track.

At the very least, time can be provided for students to work on classwork. Logistical issues may arise (how to acquire the work, deliver it to the student, sufficiently explain how to complete it, etc.), but regardless, it can be provided along with an adult in the room who can help support a student in need. At the very least, the instruction and work missed during ISPD should be provided to the student, to ensure access to an appropriate education is not denied due to the exclusion.

To determine which policies are implemented as alternatives to arrest, expulsion, and suspension, the role of the community is key. Involving families in the development and enforcement of policy provides the opportunity to see viewpoints not represented in the school as well as hear their perspective on the impact that these practices have (Davis, 2017).

Community hearings, presenting both evidence and case studies of what works and what does not, can help dispel and calibrate any side of the discussion, ranging from those in

favor of harsh practices to ‘enforce’ rules versus those who see the necessity of supports precluding punishment.

Guiding principle #3

The third guiding principle focuses on continually striving toward fairness and equity (U.S. Department of Education, 2014). Studies have shown that improving school equity promotes positive youth development (Haynes et al., 1997; Debnam et al., 2014).

This process involves cyclical planning, implementation, and reflection. To adequately achieve this, underlying assumptions regarding the what and why of policies and practices put into place must be challenged.

Training can be provided to introduce or reinforce restorative practices to stakeholders at all levels, to develop an understanding of the concept, and how it can be incorporated into all aspects of student supports (Johnstone et al., 2007).

The Chicago Public Schools Restorative Practices Toolkit serves as a resource to develop the understanding of school staff using key principles, rationale, and specific actionable strategies.

As a necessary condition for restorative practices, the power of building trust cannot be understated. When students develop and exhibit trust for adults who show care for them in schools, they are more likely to abide by rules and less likely to be defiant (Romero, 2014; Okonofua et al., 2016). Peer to peer trust can also either reinforce or undermine the social support structures for students (Ladd et al., 2014).

Before new learning such as the concept of restorative practices is introduced, it is important to address the underlying beliefs that

preclude our equitable intentions. Well-meaning decisions and plans can be undermined by these implicit biases bestowed upon us by society, our experiences, and unintentional influences.

It is possible to confront implicit bias through inclusive conversations that address how to overcome them (Shotter, 1998). The National Equity Project, for example, provides training for school leaders by building capacity to help develop school-level training that involves active listening and probing of core beliefs (von Frank, 2010).

If biases can be acknowledged for their presence and can remain part of the conversation, then the way in which revisions to policy and structures take place can be more equitable. As strategic as these can be (Crossley, 2013; Huber & Conway, 2015), at times they are done based with a priority on perception and feeling over hard evidence, thus making it more important for biases to be surfaced (Coburn et al., 2009).

A well-developed team at the district or school level that meets regularly can continue to revise existing structures by finding ways that they could be enhanced and can be the vehicle to implement this action.

Data collection and usage is instrumental to this process to ensure that accurate information complements the perceptions that can cloud facts (Park, Daly & Guerra, 2012). This localized team can use various software systems within the district to collect quantitative data and combine this data with qualitative observations and surveys, and summarize findings. Information can then be shared at community meetings and informally through conversations to promote a positive culture.

Adding these components together, a thoroughly involved process should evaluate root causes for disparities between desired outcomes and current states, then implementing improvements at all levels from policy to in schools (Wagner, 2014). This school-based team, armed with an equitable mindset and strong use of data, should be primed to see through to the root of a problem and be ready to implement systemic change.

To add a layer of complexity, perspective, and buy-in, involve various stakeholders (families, community partners, etc.) in the policy and procedure revision process (Barrett, A., 2014). Host community meetings and invite each type of stakeholder group. Remind all of vision and goals, present data, discuss actionable steps, and commit to action. Monitor the progress of the plan, and make revisions as needed, always staying focused on the vision created.

Implications and Recommendations

Consider the landscape of this country, in regard to how school discipline is addressed. There are variations in policy across our country. There are also variations in interpretation, implementation, and impact, due to the types of factors presented above. The ‘Guiding Principles’ (2014) should be viewed as a unifying vision for how to progress towards a more equitable model of discipline. Doing so would make strides towards fairness for all students, regardless of race, childhood experiences, or region of origin within this country.

Local actors (legislators, researchers, administrators, community agents, etc.) should band together to inspect, revise, and enact change. Numerous examples above show how this was done.

As needed, seek advice from those who have chartered this journey and come out successful in regards to implementing a progressive discipline policy. Though it's true that there is no 'one size fits all' approach to progress, nor language of policy, the stories of what has worked serve as potential paths to consider.

After acknowledging and confronting biases, as suggested above, consider deeply the true impact of policy and practice in place. If they serve only to reinforce the status quo of discrimination and segregation, then how do they potentially conflict with locally stated visions? These should be reflected upon, addressed, revised, and used as a compass to drive change.

A vision that falls under the umbrella of 'all children will succeed,' for example, is not readily achievable if policies in place negatively impact certain demographics of students over others. Similarly, the supports that are in place and those created as a result of legislation, policy, and local decision-making should specifically address these inequities. Then and only then can we truly hope to see a reduction in the school-to-prison pipeline.

To implement the guidance provided by the U.S. Department of Education, there are several practical steps that educators and school leaders can take, immediately. As stated above, whether it be from district leadership on down to the school level or vice versa, a team of dedicated professionals can convene to determine what professional learning would be necessary to confront biases.

The greater community should be involved in this planning process as well, even if to just give feedback on the current status of school climate. This planning alone is critical, to ensure that the plans are crafted in a way to

protect the emotional safety of the adults involved. If the ultimate goal is to avoid discrimination in the implementation of school policies, educators must be in a reflective, open-minded state when they engage in professional development around this issue.

Another immediate actionable step that practitioners can take is to continue to build relationships with students at the school, in any form, both integrated into the curriculum and as a la carte activities.

A fully integrated activity could include literature that features different ethnic groups and cultures and involves discussion where students reflect on how they would act or feel in a certain situation similar to that of characters from the story, to empathize.

A separate activity could involve students sharing likes and dislikes, and generally getting to know one another, facilitated by the teacher or by peers, with the teacher taking an active role in the discussion.

Yet another activity could focus purely on individual relationships, such as the "two by ten" activity, where teachers spend two minutes a day for ten days, getting to know a student and asking them about anything that's not directly related to the curriculum.

These authentic activities that tap into the personality of the students will help enhance the relationship and expose adults to the true character of all students, making it more likely to overcome bias and assumptions.

A third practical step for school staff would be to revisit and revise, as needed, all school structures around discipline. Set goals. If one goal is to maximize the amount of time that students are focused on instruction, then inspect structures to ensure that exclusion (such

as removal from classroom or suspension) is truly a last resort option. If the student is not disrupting the learning of others, when making a behavioral choice, do they need to have their behavior addressed at that moment, or could it wait until after the learning concludes? Consider whether or not the structures in place always couple a consequence with an intervention.

While the consequence may be necessary to show students that our choices come with consequences, it's more likely that the intervention (evidence-based) will reduce the recurrence of the undesired behavior.

Also, when revising these policies and procedures, do they reflect the equitable goals that are stated above? Do they result in a reduction of the disparity of students from different ethnic groups being referred? If all of these practical actions happen simultaneously, improvement should be evident.

Conclusion and Future Study

With the U.S. Department of Education's Guiding Principles having been released three years ago, there are further opportunities to study the impact of this landmark document. Some of the states listed in this paper (as well as others), including their local municipalities within, and countless school districts, have found success implementing interventions such as those listed in this paper.

The result has been undoubtedly a mixed impact on school culture. Sharing the sequence of these actions as well as the outcomes will help build a research base of 'what works' in terms of improving student discipline outcomes. While this research will never be comprehensive, this collaborative effort will help provide a rationale for stakeholders, including those that ultimately make decisions that impact legislation, policy, and ultimately the lives of youth.

Author Biographies

Tiffany Puckett is an assistant professor in the department of politics and government at Illinois State University in Normal, IL. E-mail: tspucke@ilstu.edu

Christopher Graves is assistant principal at a high school in Chicago, Illinois. He is also a doctoral student at Illinois State University's Department of Educational Administration and Foundations in Normal, IL. E-mail: cagrav1@ilstu.edu

Lenford Sutton is the chair of the department of educational administration and foundations at Illinois State University in Normal, IL. E-mail: lcsutto@ilstu.edu

References

Ala. Code § 16-28A.

Ala. Code § 41-15B-2.2.

Alaska Stat. §14.30.045.

Anchorage School District. (2017) Anchorage School District Profile – Overall Suspensions. Retrieved from <https://public.tableau.com/profile/asdk12#!/vizhome/BehaviorDashboardPublic/OverallDashboard>

Anyon, Y., Gregory, A., Stone, S., Farrar, J., Jenson, J. M., McQueen, J., Simmons, J. (2016). Restorative interventions and school discipline sanctions in a large urban school district. *American Educational Research Journal*, 53(6), 1663-1797. doi:10.3102/0002831216675719.

Arkansas Act 1329, 89th General Assembly (2013).

Ariz. Rev. Stat. §15-841.

Ark. Code § 6-18-507(b)(2).

Ark. Code § 6-18-516.

ACLU. (2014). An Important First Step in Fixing School Discipline in California. Retrieved from <https://www.aclunc.org/blog/important-first-step-fixing-school-discipline-california>

Baker, J. A., Derrer, R. D., Davis, S. M., & Dinklage-Travis, H. E. (2001). The flip side of the coin: Understanding the school's contribution to dropout and completion. *School Psychology Quarterly*, 16(4), 406.

Barrett, A. (2014). Partners in transformation. *Principal*, 94(1), 46-47.

Benner, G. J., Kutash, K., Nelson, J. R., & Fisher, M. B. (2013). Closing the achievement gap of youth with emotional and behavioral disorders through multi-tiered systems of support. *Education and Treatment of Children*, 36(3), 15-29.

Berlowitz, M. J., Frye, R., & Jette, K. M. (2017). Bullying and zero-tolerance policies: The school to prison pipeline. *Multicultural Learning and Teaching*, 12(1), 7-25.

Bohanon, H., Fenning, P., Carney, K. L., Minnis-Kim, M. J., Anderson-Harriss, S., Moroz, K. B., ... & Pigott, T. D. (2006). Schoolwide application of positive behavior support in an urban high school: A case study. *Journal of Positive Behavior Interventions*, 8(3), 131-145.

- Boyd, T. M. (2009). Confronting racial disparity: Legislative responses to the school-to-prison pipeline. *Harv. CR-CLL Rev.*, 44, 571.
- Cal Edu. Code § 48900.
- Causadias, J. M. (2013). A roadmap for the integration of culture into developmental psychopathology. *Development and Psychopathology*, 25(4pt2), 1375-1398.
- Chicago Public Schools (2017). Success Starts Here: Three Year Vision, 2016-2019. Retrieved from <http://cps.edu/sitecollectiondocuments/cpsvision.pdf>
- Christle, C., Nelson, C. M., & Jolivette, K. (2004). School characteristics related to the use of suspension. *Education & Treatment of Children*, 27(4), 509.
- Coburn, C. E., Touré, J., & Yamashita, M. (2009). Evidence, interpretation, and persuasion: Instructional decision making at the district central office. *Teachers College Record*, 111(4), 1115-1161.
- Colorado Senate Bill 12-046, 68th General Assembly (2012).
- Colorado Senate Bill 17-1038, 71th General Assembly, (2017).
- Communities United (2017). About Communities United. Retrieved from <http://communitiesunited.org/about-us>
- Conn. Gen. Stat. § 10-233c.
- Crain, T. P. (2017). Jefferson County schools must reduce discipline disparities to gain unitary status. AL.com. Retrieved from http://www.al.com/news/index.ssf/2017/01/Jefferson_county_schools_must.html
- Crenshaw K., Ocen P., Nanda J. (2015). Black girls matter: Pushed out, overpoliced, and underprotected. New York, NY: Center for Intersectionality and Social Policy Studies.
- Crossley, D. (2013). *Sustainable school transformation: An inside-out school led approach* London: Bloomsbury Academic, 2013.
- Cumi, K., Washington, A., & Daneshzadeh, A. (2017). Standing in solidarity with Black girls to dismantle the school-to-prison pipeline. In *The Power of Resistance: Culture, Ideology and Social Reproduction in Global Contexts* (pp. 221-241). Emerald Publishing Limited.
- Curran, F. C. (2016). Estimating the effect of state zero tolerance laws on exclusionary discipline, racial discipline gaps, and student behavior. *Educational Evaluation and Policy Analysis*, 38(4), 647-668.

- Davis, C. R. (2017). " Why are the Black kids being suspended?" An examination of a school district's efforts to reform a faulty suspension policy through community conversations. *School Community Journal*, 27(1), 159.
- Davis, T. N., Durand, S., Fuentes, L., Dacus, S., & Blenden, K. (2014). The effects of a school-based functional analysis on subsequent classroom behavior. *Education and Treatment of Children*, 37(1), 95-110.
- Debnam, K. J., Johnson, S. L., Waasdorp, T. E., & Bradshaw, C. P. (2014). Equity, connection, and engagement in the school context to promote positive youth development. *Journal of Research on Adolescence*, 24(3), 447-459.
- Delaware House Bill 176, 149th General Assembly (2017).
- Felitti, V. J., Anda, R. F., Nordenberg, D., Williamson, D. F., Spitz, A. M., Edwards, V., et al. (1998). Relationship of childhood abuse and household dysfunction to many of the leading causes of death in adults: The Adverse Childhood Experiences (ACE) study. *American Journal of Preventive Medicine*, 14, 245–258.
- Fenning, P.A., Pulaski, S., Gomez, M., Morello, M., Maciel, L., Maroney, E., Schmidt, A., Dahlvig, K., McArdle, L., Morello, T. and Wilson, R. (2012). Call to action: A critical need for designing alternatives to suspension and expulsion. *Journal of School Violence*, 11(2), 105-117.
- Fenning, P. A., & Johnson, M. B. (2016). Developing Prevention-Oriented Discipline Codes of Conduct.
- Freeman, J., Simonsen, B., McCoach, D. B., Sugai, G., Lombardi, A., & Horner, R. (2016). Relationship between school-wide positive behavior interventions and supports and academic, attendance, and behavior outcomes in high schools. *Journal of Positive Behavior Interventions*, 18(1), 41-51.
- Ga. Code Ann. § 20-2-738 (b).
- Ga. Code Ann. § 20-2-735 (f).
- Georgia House Bill 135, 2016.
- Georgia Senate Bill 367, 2016.
- Georgia State Board of Education. (2017). Board Rule 160-4-8-.15 – Student Discipline
Retrieved from <http://www.gadoe.org/External-Affairs-and-Policy/State-Board-of-Education/SBOE%20Rules/160-4-8-.15.pdf>

- Hanlon, T. (2017). Anchorage students with disabilities get out-of-school suspensions 3 times more often than peers. Retrieved from <https://www.adn.com/alaska/education/2017/06/18/anchorage-students-with-disabilities-get-out-of-school-suspensions-three-times-more-often-than-peers/>
- Haydon, T., & Kroeger, S. D. (2016). Active supervision, precorrection, and explicit timing: A high school case study on classroom behavior. *Preventing School Failure: Alternative Education for Children and Youth*, 60(1), 70-78.
- Haynes, N. M., Emmons, C., & Ben-Avie, M. (1997). School climate as a factor in student adjustment and achievement. *Journal of Educational and Psychological Consultation*, 8(3), 321-329.
- Huber, D. J., & Conway, J. M. (2015). The effect of school improvement planning on student achievement. *Planning & Changing*, 46(1), 56-70.
- Illinois Senate Bill 100, 99th General Assembly (2015).
- Ind. Code § 20-33-8-15.
- Indiana House Bill 1152, 120th General Assembly (2017).
- Irvin, L. K., Tobin, T. J., Sprague, J. R., Sugai, G., & Vincent, C. G. (2004). Validity of office discipline referral measures as indices of school-wide behavioral status and effects of school-wide behavioral interventions. *Journal of Positive Behavior Interventions*, 6, 131–147. doi:10.1177/10983007060080010301
- Johnstone, G., & Van Ness, D. W. (Eds.) (2007). *Handbook of restorative justice*. Taylor & Francis.
- Kennedy, B. L., Murphy, A. S., & Jordan, A. (2017). Title I Middle School Administrators' Beliefs and Choices about Using Corporal Punishment and Exclusionary Discipline. *American Journal of Education*, 123(2), 000-000.
- Kentucky House Bill 393 (2017).
- Kim, C.Y., Losan, D.J., & Hewitt, D. (2010). *The school to prison pipeline*. New York: New York University Press.
- Ladd, G. W., Ettekal, I., Kochenderfer-Ladd, B., Rudolph, K. D., & Andrews, R. K. (2014). Relations among chronic peer group rejection, maladaptive behavioral dispositions, and early adolescents' peer perceptions. *Child Development*, 85(3), 971-988.

- Lassen, S. R., Steele, M. M., & Sailor, W. (2006). The relationship of school-wide positive behavior support to academic achievement in an urban middle school. *Psychology in the Schools*, 43(6), 701-712.
- Losen, D. J., & Gillespie, J. (2012). Opportunities suspended: The disparate impact of disciplinary exclusion from school.
- Louisiana House Bill 79, (2017).
- Louisiana House Bill 497 (2017).
- Luna, B., & Wright, C. (2016). Adolescent brain development: Implications for the juvenile criminal justice system.
- Maryland House Bill 1287 (2017).
- Maryland House Bill 425 (2017).
- Mason, W. A. (2015). *Intervention Strategies to Decrease Discipline Issues in an Urban pre-K-8 Public School* (Doctoral dissertation, Walden University).
- Mich. Comp. Laws § 380.1310c.
- Michigan House Bill 5618 (2016).
- Minnesota House Bill 3041, 89th Legislature (2016).
- Miss. Code Ann. § 37-9-71.
- Mo. Rev. Stat. § 167.161).
- Morris E. W. (2005). "Tuck in that shirt!" Race, class, gender, and discipline in an urban school. *Sociological Perspectives*, 48, 25-48.
- Morris E. W. (2007). "Ladies" or "loudies"? Perceptions and experiences of Black girls in classrooms. *Youth & Society*, 38, 490-515.
- N.D. Cent. Code § 15.1-19-09.
- N.H. Rev. Stat. Ann. § 193:13.
- N.M. Stat. § 22-54.3.
- New Hampshire House Bill 216 (2017).
- New Hampshire House Bill 270 (2017).

- New Hampshire House Bill 271 (2017).
- New Jersey Senate Bill 2081, 217th Legislature (2016).
- New York Bill A8396, General Assembly (2015).
- New York Bill A03873, General Assembly (2017).
- New York Bill S03036, General Assembly (2017).
- New York State Consolidated Laws – Education § 3214.
- Noguera, P. A. (2003). Schools, prisons, and social implications of punishment: Rethinking disciplinary practices. *Theory into Practice*, (4), 341.
- North Carolina House Bill 1067, General Assembly (2015).
- Or. Rev. Stat. § 339.250.
- Oregon Senate Bill 553, 78th Legislative Assembly (2015).
- Oregon Senate Bill 556, 78th Legislative Assembly (2015).
- Park, V., Daly, A. J., & Guerra, A. W. (2013). Strategic framing: How leaders craft the meaning of data use for equity and learning. *Educational Policy*, 27(4), 645-675.
- Pennsylvania House Bill 590, General Assembly (2015).
- Pennsylvania House Bill 590, General Assembly (2016).
- Perez, N. M., Jennings, W. G., Piquero, A. R., & Baglivio, M. T. (2016). Adverse childhood experiences and suicide attempts: The mediating influence of personality development and problem behaviors. *Journal of Youth and Adolescence*, 45(8), 1527-1545.
- Polleta, M., Cano, R. (2014). Phoenix-area schools punish minority, disabled children at higher rates. *The Republic*. Retrieved from <http://www.azcentral.com/story/news/local/phoenix-education/2017/08/09/report-phoenix-area-schools-punish-minority-disabled-children-higher-rates/547390001/>
- Redfield, S. E., & Nance, J. P. (2016). The American Bar Association Joint Task Force on Reversing the School-to-Prison Pipeline Preliminary Report. Retrieved from https://www.americanbar.org/content/dam/aba/administrative/diversity_pipeline/stp_preliminary_report_final.authcheckdam.pdf
- Rhode Island Senate Bill 2168, General Assembly (2016).

- Rhode Island House Bill 7056, General Assembly (2016).
- Richey, Rashad. (August 2, 2016). Atlanta's School to Prison Pipeline Worst In Nation. *CBS Atlanta*. Retrieved from <http://atlanta.cbslocal.com/2016/08/02/atlantas-school-to-prison-pipeline/>
- Ritter, G., Anderson, K. (2016). School Discipline and Inequalities in Arkansas. Presentation for the Arkansas State Board of Education. Retrieved from <http://www.officeforeducationpolicy.org/school-discipline-and-inequalities-in-arkansas/>
- Rocque, M., & Paternoster, R. (2011). Understanding the antecedents of the “school-to-jail” link: The relationship between race and school discipline. *Journal of Criminal Law and Criminology*, 101(2), 633-662.
- Romero, L. S. (2015). Trust, behavior, and high school outcomes. *Journal of Educational Administration*, 53(2), 215-236.
- S.D. Codified Laws § 13-32-4).
- Shotter, J. (1998). Constructing 'enabling communities': Putting a new (dialogical) practice into our practices. *Concepts & Transformation*, 3(1), 171.
- Scheurich, J. J., & Young, M. D. (1997). Coloring epistemologies: Are our research epistemologies racially biased? *Educational Researcher*, 26(4), 4-16.
- School Code - Student Discipline, Illinois Public Act 99-0456, (2016).
- Smith, C.D. (2009). Deconstructing the pipeline: Evaluating school-to-prison pipeline equal protection cases through a structural racism framework. *Fordham Urb. LJ*, 36, 1009.
- Texas House Bill 674, 85th Legislature (2017).
- Texas Senate Bill 370, 85th Legislature (2017).
- Thomas, C. D. (2015). *The effects of implementing a positive behavior intervention support program on office discipline referrals* (Doctoral dissertation, Brenau University).
- Thompson, J. L. (2016). Eliminating Zero-Tolerance Polices in Schools: Miami-Dade Public School's approach. Retrieved from https://papers.ssrn.com/sol3/papers.cfm?abstract_id=2820411
- U.S. Department of Education, Office of Civil Rights (OCR). (2013). Civil Rights Data Collection (CCDC). Retrieved from <https://ocrdata.ed.gov/>

- U.S. Department of Education & U.S. Department of Justice. (2014, January 8). Notice of language assistance: Dear colleague letter on the nondiscriminatory administration of school discipline. Retrieved from <http://www.justice.gov/crt/about/edu/documents/dcl.pdf>
- United States Government Accountability Office (2018). Report to Congressional Requesters; K-12 Education: Discipline Disparities for Black Students, Boys, and Students with Disabilities. Retrieved from <https://www.gao.gov/assets/700/690828.pdf>.
- Van Der Voort, Geoffrey & Wood, Leslie. (2014). Assisting school management teams to construct their school improvement plans: An action learning approach. *South African Journal of Education, Volume 34, Number 3, August 2014, 34(3), 2-7.*
- Virginia Senate Bill 995, General Assembly (2017).
- Virginia Senate Bill 996, General Assembly (2017).
- Virginia Senate Bill 997, General Assembly (2017).
- von Frank, V. (2010). Coaches Root Out Deep Bias. *Journal of Staff Development, 31(4), 20.*
- Wagner, T. P. (2014). Using root cause analysis in public policy pedagogy. *Journal of Public Affairs Education, 429-440.*
- Wang, M. (2009). School climate support for behavioral and psychological adjustment: Testing the mediating effect of social competence. *School Psychology Quarterly, 24, 240–251.*
doi:10.1037/a0017999
- Washington House Bill 1541, 64th Legislature (2015).
- Wu, S. C., Pink, W., Crain, R., & Moles, O. (1982). Student suspension: A critical reappraisal. *The Urban Review, 14(4), 245-303.*
- 105 Ill. Comp. Stat. § 5/10-22.6.
- 24 Pa. Cons. Stat. § 1318.

What Works May Hurt: Side Effects in Education

Written by:

Yong Zhao, PhD
 Foundation Distinguished Professor
 Educational Leadership and Policy Studies
 College of Education
 University of Kansas
 Lawrence, KS

Reviewed by:

Christopher Tienken, PhD
 Associate Professor
 Department of Education Leadership, Management, and Policy
 Seton Hall University
 South Orange, NJ

If you watch television then you have probably seen commercials for prescription medication. The commercials all follow a similar sequence in which a need is identified, the medicine is introduced, the actors engage in some sort of a happy moment, and then the lawyer comes on to read a disclaimer with a litany of dangerous side effects.

Much of the rhetoric surrounding every education reform idea to come down the pike follows a similar sequence to that of advertisements for prescription drugs, but with one critical missing element: the disclaimer. I have yet to hear supporters of reforms like Common Core, standardized testing, charter schools, school vouchers, or merit pay provide a list of potential negative side effects to children or the public school system.

A critical information void exists for educators and public regarding the side effects

of education interventions. Yong Zhao fills that void for us with *What Works May Hurt: Side Effects in Education*.

Zhao expertly peels the school reform onion to reveal layer after layer of negative side effects. *What Works May Hurt* guides educators down an evidence-based memory lane of education reform's greatest hits including classics like DISTAR/direct instruction, Asian education, the No Child Left Behind Act, *Visible Learning*, the Reading First fraud, math wars, charter schools, school vouchers, and many others.

Show Me the Evidence

Zhao makes extensive use of the one thing that many education reforms lack: evidence. He documents the claims made by various reforms and programs and provides heavy doses of evidence to document the existing and potential negative side effects of each intervention.

Zhao reviews mountains of research on various programs and practices to bring clarity to the often murky underworld of education interventions, and he produces salient statements that set the record straight.

For instance, Zhao states, in plain language, that educators need to understand that interventions are not universally transferable from the place in which they originated: “The contexts in which a treatment is implemented can mediate its effect and cause adverse side effects. In one context, the treatment may result in its intended main effect, while causing harm in another context” (p. 99).

Context matters and educators should not assume that an intervention used in one country, state, or town will produce the same results in their district or school.

Making the Invisible Visible

Nowhere else is the issue of context more important than with John Hattie’s *Visible Learning*. Zhao does the best job to date presenting a review of the existing literature about *Visible Learning*, and he uses that review to dispassionately examine the claims made in *Visible Learning* and uncover the hidden side effects that are seldom discussed in the mainstream.

Although Hattie states in *Visible Learning* that his work is not intended to be a recipe, the way in which the findings and recommendations are presented have led countless educators and policy makers to adopt or encourage the use of single interventions in isolation and disregard others.

Clearly, context is not considered in the findings, thus giving educators and policy makers a false sense of security in the results.

Zhao points out that many educators

and policy makers view Hattie’s work as the premiere research on education interventions but cautions readers that all that glitters not gold:

Whether Hattie’s *Visible Learning* is education’s Holy Grail or pseudoscience is certainly a very important issue to explore. But the already widespread and possibly growing influence over education policies and practices around the world is cause for attention to a bigger problem: side effects on educational outcomes besides student achievement (p. 77).

Zhao provides an extensive and very accessible discussion throughout the book of why context matters for education interventions and how educators can consider context when making decisions. His presentation of the importance of context as it relates to education interventions is refreshing and insightful.

The influence of Hattie’s work cannot be understated. I myself have been in conversations with education leaders and policy makers who referenced Hattie’s work, support pseudo-scientific education reforms, and dismiss evidenced-based solution. I was recently engaged in policy discussion in which a bureaucrat dismissed the scientific results of small class sizes while advocating for isolated interventions like formative evaluation based only on two pages from Hattie’s *Visible Learning*.

The short and long-term impacts of small class sizes on closing the academic opportunity gap and student social development are clear when implemented according to the scientific recommendations (Finn, and Achilles, 1999; Krueger and Whitmore, 2002; Mosteller, Light, and Sachs, 1996). In fact,

small class size is one of only a handful of interventions that have a research base that has been consistently replicated: a hallmark of science.

Conversely, the influence of formative evaluation on student achievement is heavily dependent on the skill of individual teachers and on out of school factors like poverty. Poverty receives little attention in Hattie's work, yet it is the strongest mediating variable for most of the practices and programs he presents.

Thankfully, Zhao pushes the discussion of Hattie's work beyond academics, as he usually does, to remind us that schooling is about the development of the whole child. Like John Dewey (1902) before him, Zhao brings the discussion back to other important historic purposes of education: socio-civic development and personal development:

In other words, the effects of Hattie's list of factors, regardless of their validity, are effects on academic outcomes only. The effects on other educational outcomes were not studied. Thus, we have no idea whether the factors Hattie found to have large positive effects on achievement may negatively affect other outcomes, such as love of learning, or whether the ones Hattie found to have a negative effect on achievement actually may positively affect other outcomes, such as belongingness and citizenship (p. 78).

Zhao provides a review of the literature about another issue that threatens the validity of Hattie's work: methodology.

Zhao catalogs a basket of reviews that call into question Hattie's methods of conducting a meta-analysis of meta-analyses

and the statistics used to reach his conclusions and recommendations:

Hattie's averaging and comparison of effect sizes across different studies and interventions were inappropriate, essentially confusing apples and oranges ... It gets worse. Pierre-Jérôme Bergeron, a Canadian statistician at the University of Ottawa, charged Hattie with practicing pseudoscience (p. 77).

Zhao provides the much-needed warning label for *Visible Learning* that has been missing from the discussion. Hopefully it will cause education leaders to at least pause and consider the unintended consequences of basing a decision solely on the recommendations from *Visible Learning*.

Who's Choice?

What Works May Hurt provides what I think is one of the most useful reviews and discussions of school choice to be printed in the last decade. It leads readers through an overview of the impact on achievement, the role of student variability on effectiveness, the role of parent sophistication and capability to make informed choices and take advantage of those choices. Zhao distills school choice down to its most crucial issue: the evidence does not match the claims:

Judging from the evidence, school choice, just like all other educational interventions, is no panacea. It is subject to the law of aptitude-treatment interaction. Its effect is dependent on individual characteristics and contexts (p. 98).

Like all other claims of a miracle treatment in education, choice falls victim to its own lack of understanding about side effects

and context:

In the final analysis, the questions regarding any treatment thus should go beyond the usual “what is best” or “how the treatment can be made better.” An important additional question should be: Is the treatment best or better for whom, when, and why? according to Richard Snow (1991) (p. 91).

Miracles and Snake Oil

Unfortunately, educators themselves are part of the problem. There seems to be an engrained belief in the miracle intervention that will change the world and solve all of education’s perceived issues. And, unfortunately, a panacea does not exist. Educators need to customize solutions at the local level for the students they serve. The solutions do not lie outside the realm of education. The solutions

come about by studying the problems of education and solving those problems locally as John Dewey (1929) noted in *The Sources of a Science of Education*.

Zhao sends a clear message to educators that they must move beyond hoping for wonder drugs: “But education is still stuck in the age of snake oil. Not only is the belief prevalent that there is a panacea solution to all problems for all people, but there also is a general refusal, on the part of advocates, to believe their solution would do harm” (p. 115).

Zhao is right. Educators must stop believing in miracles and work toward locally customized solutions, and part of that work requires the due diligence to dig below the surface and understand the potential unintended consequences of interventions so that they can better understand that sometimes what works may hurt.

Reviewer Biography

Christopher Tienken is an associate professor at Seton Hall University in South Orange, NJ and an education consultant. He has ongoing research collaborations with colleagues at the Università degli Studi Roma Tre, Rome, Italy and the University of Catania, Sicily where he was named a visiting professor at both universities. Tienken has been a teacher, principal and K-12 assistant superintendent. His research interests focus on curriculum and assessment policy and practice at the local, state, national, and international levels. His most recent book, co-authored with Carol Mullen, is titled *Education Policy Perils: Tackling the Tough Issues*.

Tienken is the former editor of the American Association of School Administrator’s *AASA journal of Scholarship and Practice*.

References

Dewey, J. (1929). *The sources of a science of education*. New York: Liveright.

Dewey, J. (1902). *The child and the curriculum*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Finn, J. D., & Achilles, C. M. (1999). Tennessee's class size study: Findings, implications, misconceptions. *Educational Evaluation and Policy Analysis*, 21(2), pp. 97-109.

Krueger, A. & Whitmore, D. (2002). Would smaller classes help close the black-white achievement gap? In J. Chubb and T. Loveless (Eds.), *Bridging the achievement gap*. Washington, DC: Brookings Institute Press

Mosteller, F., Light, R., & Sachs, J. (1996). Sustained Inquiry in Education. *Harvard Educational Review*, 66, 4, 797-828.

What Works May Hurt: Side Effects in Education was written by Yong Zhao in 2018 and published by Teachers College Press, 176 pp, \$29.00 softcover.

Mission and Scope, Copyright, Privacy, Ethics, Upcoming Themes, Author Guidelines, Submissions, Publication Rates & Publication Timeline

The *AASA Journal of Scholarship and Practice* is a refereed, blind-reviewed, quarterly journal with a focus on research and evidence-based practice that advance the profession of education administration.

Mission and Scope

The **mission** of the Journal is to provide peer-reviewed, user-friendly, and methodologically sound research that practicing school and district administrations can use to take action and that higher education faculty can use to prepare future school and district administrators. The Journal publishes accepted manuscripts in the following categories: (1) Evidence-based Practice, (2) Original Research, (3) Research-informed Commentary, and (4) Book Reviews.

The **scope** for submissions focuses on the intersection of five factors of school and district administration: (a) administrators, (b) teachers, (c) students, (d) subject matter, and (e) settings. The Journal encourages submissions that focus on the intersection of factors a-e. The Journal discourages submissions that focus only on personal reflections and opinions.

Copyright

Articles published by AASA, The School Superintendents Association (AASA) in the *AASA Journal of Scholarship and Practice* fall under the Creative Commons Attribution-Non-Commercial-NoDerivs 3.0 license policy (<http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-nd/3.0/>). Please refer to the policy for rules about republishing, distribution, etc. In most cases our readers can copy, post, and distribute articles that appear in the *AASA Journal of Scholarship and Practice*, but the works must be attributed to the author(s) and the *AASA Journal of Scholarship and Practice*. Works can only be distributed for non-commercial/non-monetary purposes. Alteration to the appearance or content of any articles used is not allowed. Readers who are unsure whether their intended uses might violate the policy should get permission from the author or the editor of the *AASA Journal of Scholarship and Practice*.

Authors please note: By submitting a manuscript the author/s acknowledge that the submitted manuscript is not under review by any other publisher or society, and the manuscript represents original work completed by the authors and not previously published as per professional ethics based on APA guidelines, most recent edition. By submitting a manuscript, authors agree to transfer without charge the following rights to AASA, its publications, and especially the *AASA Journal of Scholarship and Practice* upon acceptance of the manuscript. The *AASA Journal of Scholarship and Practice* is indexed by several services and is also a member of the Directory of Open Access Journals. This means there is worldwide access to all content. Authors must agree to first worldwide serial publication rights and the right for the *AASA Journal of Scholarship and Practice* and AASA to grant permissions for use of works as the editors judge appropriate for the redistribution, repackaging, and/or marketing of all works and any metadata associated with the works in professional indexing and reference services. Any revenues received by AASA and the *AASA Journal of Scholarship and Practice* from redistribution are used to support the continued marketing, publication, and distribution of articles.

Privacy

The names and e-mail addresses entered in this journal site will be used exclusively for the stated purposes of this journal and will not be made available for any other purpose or to any other party. Please note that the journal is available, via the Internet at no cost, to audiences around the world. Authors' names and e-mail addresses are posted for each article. Authors who agree to have their manuscripts published in the *AASA Journal of Scholarship and Practice* agree to have their names and e-mail addresses posted on their articles for public viewing.

Ethics

The *AASA Journal of Scholarship and Practice* uses a double-blind peer-review process to maintain scientific integrity of its published materials. Peer-reviewed articles are one hallmark of the scientific method and the *AASA Journal of Scholarship and Practice* believes in the importance of maintaining the integrity of the scientific process in order to bring high quality literature to the education leadership community. We expect our authors to follow the same ethical guidelines. We refer readers to the latest edition of the APA Style Guide to review the ethical expectations for publication in a scholarly journal.

Upcoming Themes and Topics of Interest

Below are themes and areas of interest for publication cycles.

1. Governance, Funding, and Control of Public Education
2. Federal Education Policy and the Future of Public Education
3. Federal, State, and Local Governmental Relationships
4. Teacher Quality (e.g., hiring, assessment, evaluation, development, and compensation of teachers)
5. School Administrator Quality (e.g., hiring, preparation, assessment, evaluation, development, and compensation of principals and other school administrators)
6. Data and Information Systems (for both summative and formative evaluative purposes)
7. Charter Schools and Other Alternatives to Public Schools
8. Turning Around Low-Performing Schools and Districts
9. Large scale assessment policy and programs
10. Curriculum and instruction
11. School reform policies
12. Financial Issues

Submissions

Length of manuscripts should be as follows: Research and evidence-based practice articles between 2,800 and 4,800 words; commentaries between 1,600 and 3,800 words; book and media reviews between 400 and 800 words. Articles, commentaries, book and media reviews, citations and references are to follow the *Publication Manual of the American Psychological Association*, latest edition. Permission to use previously copyrighted materials is the responsibility of the author, not the *AASA Journal of Scholarship and Practice*.

Cover page checklist:

1. title of the article:
identify if the submission is to be considered original research, evidence-based practice article, commentary, or book review
2. contributor name(s)
3. terminal degree
4. academic rank
5. department
6. college or university
7. city, state
8. telephone and fax numbers
9. e-mail address
10. 120-word abstract that conforms to APA style
11. six to eight key words that reflect the essence of the submission; and
12. 40-word biographical sketch

Please do not submit page numbers in headers or footers. Rather than use footnotes, it is preferred authors embed footnote content in the body of the article. Articles are to be submitted to the editor by e-mail as an electronic attachment in Microsoft Word, Times New Roman, 12 Font.

Acceptance Rates

The *AASA Journal of Scholarship and Practice* maintains of record of acceptance rates for each of the quarterly issues published annually. The percentage of acceptance rates since 2010 is as follows:

2012: 22%
 2013: 15%
 2014: 20%
 2015: 22%
 2016: 19%
 2017: 20%
 2018: 19%

Book Review Guidelines

Book review guidelines should adhere to the author guidelines as found above. The format of the book review is to include the following:

- Full title of book
- Author
- Publisher, city, state, year, # of pages, price
- Name and affiliation of reviewer
- Contact information for reviewer: address, city, state, zip code, e-mail address, telephone and fax
- Reviewer biography
- Date of submission

Publication Timeline

Issue	Deadline to Submit Articles	Notification to Authors of Editorial Review Board Decisions	To AASA for Formatting and Editing	Issue Available on AASA website
Spring	October 1	January 1	February 15	April 1
Summer	February 1	April 1	May 15	July 1
Fall	May 1	July 1	August 15	October 1
Winter	August 1	October 1	November 15	January 15

Additional Information

Contributors will be notified of editorial board decisions within eight weeks of receipt of papers at the editorial office. Articles to be returned must be accompanied by a postage-paid, self-addressed envelope.

The *AASA Journal of Scholarship and Practice* reserves the right to make minor editorial changes without seeking approval from contributors.

Materials published in the *AASA Journal of Scholarship and Practice* do not constitute endorsement of the content or conclusions presented.

The Journal is listed in Cabell's Directory of Publishing Opportunities. Articles are also archived in the ERIC collection. The Journal is available on the Internet and considered an open access document.

Editor

Kenneth Mitchell, EdD

AASA Journal of Scholarship and Practice

Submit articles electronically: kenneth.mitchell@mville.edu

To contact by postal mail:

Dr. Ken Mitchell
Associate Professor
School of Education
Manhattanville College
2900 Purchase Street
Purchase, NY 10577

AASA Resources

- ✓ Learn about **AASA's books program** where new titles and special discounts are available to AASA members. The AASA publications catalog may be downloaded at www.aasa.org/books.aspx.
- ✓ **Join AASA** and discover a number of resources reserved exclusively for members. Visit www.aasa.org/Join.aspx. Questions? Contact C.J. Reid at creid@aasa.org.
- ✓ The **AASA School Safety and Crisis Planning Toolkit**, available to members, is comprised of a set of online resources to assist school districts before, during and after a crisis. This package features a myriad of resources as well as a select group of safety leaders throughout the U.S. who are ready to provide peer-to-peer guidance about a variety of crises, including shootings, hurricanes, tornadoes, floods, fires, suicides and other major disruptions that come without notice. For additional information, visit www.aasa.org/toolkits.aspx.
- ✓ The **AASA's Leadership Network** drives superintendent success, innovation and growth, shaping the future of public education while preparing students for what's next. It is the largest, most diverse network of superintendents in America. Passionate and committed, the Network connects educational leaders to the professional learning, leadership development, relationships and partnerships needed to ensure a long career of impact. For additional information on leadership opportunities and options visit www.aasa.org/LeadershipNetwork or contact Mort Sherman at msherman@aasa.org or Valerie Truesdale at vtruesdale@aasa.org.
- ✓ For information about the application for the **Edgar L. Morphet Dissertation of the Year-2019** visit www.icpel.org/grad-students.html. Deadline for application is April 28, 2019.
- ✓ **Upcoming AASA Events**
 - Southwestern Women in School Leadership Conference, a collaborative event hosted by AASA and National Institute for School Leadership**, June 6-7, 2019, Marriott Atlanta Airport. For information: www.aasa.org/SE-WISL.aspx.
 - National Principals Leadership Institute, 22nd Annual Summer Institute "Ramping up for the Next Decade," July 13-18, 2019, New York City.** For information: www.npli.org/#homepage
 - National Women's Leadership Consortium.** The 2019 meetings will be held in Alexandria, Va., May 14-16, 2019 and Oct. 21-23, 2019. www.aasa.org/women-consortium.aspx

AASA's ongoing academies, cohorts, consortiums, and programs are open for renewal (and if you're interested in attending this spring, let us know):

Urban Superintendents Academy

- Howard University: aasa.org/urbansuperintendent.aspx
- University of Southern California: <http://www.aasa.org/content.aspx?id=37483>

AASA National Superintendent Certification Program® - West Cohort

www.aasa.org/superintendent-certification.aspx

Aspiring Superintendents Academy®

www.aasa.org/aspiring-academy.aspx

National Aspiring Principals Academy 2019-2020

www.aasa.org/aspiring-principals-academy.aspx

Redefining Ready!

www.aasa.org/redefiningready.aspx

Early Learning

www.aasa.org/early-learn-cohort.aspx

Digital Consortium

www.aasa.org/DigitalConsortium.aspx

Personalized Learning

www.aasa.org/personalized-learning.aspx

Leadership Academy

www.aasa.org/AASALeadershipAcademy.aspx

STEM Consortium

www.aasa.org/stem-consortium.aspx

Innovation and Transformational Leadership Network

www.aasa.org/AASACollaborative.aspx

Impacted by the ESSA requirement to improve the lowest 5% performing schools? AASA has embarked on a new partnership with Talent Development Secondary (one of the premiere school turnaround organizations in the country, meeting the federal thresholds for evidence in multiple categories) to build a networked improvement community (NIC) of 20 districts with up to 40 CSI schools to participate in a rich school transformation initiative. To learn more visit: www.tdschools.org/2018/11/14/you-can-now-apply-for-the-tds-aasa-networked-improvement-community-nic

2019 Legislative Advocacy Conference, July 8-10, 2019, Hyatt Regency on Capitol Hill, Washington, DC

AASA 2020 National Conference on Education, Feb. 13-15, 2020, San Diego, Calif.