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Introduction

School discipline has increasingly been in the spotlight among policymakers, practitioners, and the general public. The research evidence points to negative impacts of exclusionary practices like suspension on a host of student outcomes including achievement and attainment. Additionally, a robust body of work documents disparities in the use of exclusionary discipline. Students of color, students in special education, and boys disproportionately experience disciplinary exclusion.

School district codes of conduct capture school district discipline policy by outlining the infractions and responses that schools may leverage in response to misconduct. That said, codes of conduct are but one component of schools’ approach to discipline. As we acknowledge in this report, codes of conduct capture the official policy and recommendations of school districts with regard to discipline, yet they may mask great variation in implementation and practice at the local school and classroom level. Nevertheless, we argue that codes of conduct are important. They are frequently the primary form of communicating disciplinary policy to students and parents at the start of the school year and may serve as a reference for teachers and principals administering discipline throughout the year.

This report seeks to provide timely data on the condition of school district codes of conduct in the state of Maryland as well as how they changed in response to the 2014 revised state guidelines for codes of conduct. In the following report, we briefly describe the 2014 guidance on codes of conduct, how school district codes of conduct changed in response, and then provide district level data visualizations of each district’s respective code of conduct. Finally, we visually demonstrate how codes of conduct relate to the Black-White discipline gap. It is our hope that this resource serves as a jumping off point for more robust conversations around school discipline at both the state and local level.
Background

In 2012, the state of Maryland released a report outlining priorities and approaches for school discipline reform. This report, which culminated a two-year effort of examining school discipline in the state, recommended several different priorities, one of which was convening a working group to develop guidelines for school district codes of conduct.

In 2014, this workgroup released “The Maryland Guidelines for a State Code of Discipline”, a document that outlined recommendations for school district codes of conduct. The document defined 27 infractions, ranging from minor misconduct like dress code violations to serious misconduct like weapons (see Appendix A for a full list of infractions). In addition, the guidelines outlined 31 possible responses, ranging from classroom based responses like moving a child’s seat to exclusionary responses like suspension and expulsion (see Appendix B for a full list of responses).

The infractions and responses were organized into a five tier system with classroom and teacher responses at tier 1 and administrative and exclusionary responses at tier 5. Each infraction, in turn, was mapped onto a given tier or series of tiers. For example, as shown in Figure 1, the recommended response tiers for class cutting are tier 1 or 2 while the recommended response tier for a firearm violation is tier 5. The result of this tiered system were specific guidelines for infractions, responses, and which responses should apply to which infractions.

While the state guidelines provided recommendations for codes of conduct, it is important to note that strict adherence to the guidelines is not required. In fact, the state recommended a local implementation process that drew on local stakeholder input to develop codes of conduct for any specific district. As a result, local codes of conduct may codify greater or fewer numbers of infractions and responses and may vary in the responses defined for any given infraction. This policy report attempts to quantify and document such variation.

On page 6, we provide a visual representation of the state guidelines for codes of conduct. We arrange the 31 response options across the top and the 27 infractions down the side, creating a matrix that includes a cell for each infraction-response combination. We then populate the cells with a 1 if the state guidelines apply a given response to a given infraction and a 0 otherwise. Cells with a 1 are then highlighted in yellow. Further details on the process can be found in the methodological notes section.
The visualization of the state guidelines makes several things clear:

- First, the guidelines are very inclusive. For most infractions, almost every response option is presented as a possible response. Another way of saying this is that almost every response option can be applied to almost every infraction.
- Second, the handful of response options that apply to only a few infractions are the most severe and exclusionary. For instance, suspensions, expulsion, referral to alternative education, and referral for further action (which can include law enforcement) are visibly noticeable as being applicable for far fewer infractions than other response options are.
- Finally, firearms infractions are prominent as the one infraction with the fewest defined response options – likely a consequence of federal law that defines mandated responses to firearm infractions.

In the remaining sections of the report, we explore how districts changed their codes of conduct in response to these state guidelines as well as provide similar data visualizations of each district’s 2015-16 code of conduct, allowing for easy comparison to the state guidelines and other districts. We conclude the report with visualizations that compare district codes of conduct to racial disparities in out-of-school suspension.
State Guidelines for District Codes of Conduct Visualization

Responses

| Infractions                          | Behavioral Contract | Check-Out & Unexcused Absences | Classroom-based Responses | Community Service | Conflict Resolution | Exclusion | Functional Behavior & Educational Intervention Plan | In-School Removal/Exclusion | Parent/Guardian and Student/Teacher Conference | Referral to District Education Program | Referral to Alternative Education Program | Referral to Inappropriate Substance Abuse Counseling Services | Referral to Community-Based Outreach | Referral to In-House Mental Health Services | Referral to EBP Team for a Student not Eligible for EBP Services | Referral to EBP Team for a Student Eligible for EBP Services | Referral to Student Support Team for a Student with a 504 Plan | Referral to Student Support Team for a Student with an IEP | Referral to Student Support Team for a Student without a Disability | Removal from Extracurricular Activities/Sports | Suspension (In-School) | Suspension (Out-of-School) | Suspension (Out-of-State) |
|-------------------------------------|---------------------|--------------------------------|---------------------------|-------------------|---------------------|----------|---------------------------------|-----------------------------|---------------------------------|----------------------------------|----------------------------------|---------------------------------|-----------------------------|-----------------------------|---------------------------------|
| Class Cutting                       | 1                   | 1                              | 1                         | 1                 | 1                   | 1        | 1                              | 1                           | 1                              | 1                                | 1                                | 1                              | 0                           | 0                           | 0                              |
| Tardiness                           | 1                   | 1                              | 1                         | 1                 | 1                   | 1        | 1                              | 1                           | 1                              | 1                                | 1                                | 1                              | 0                           | 0                           | 0                              |
| Truancy                             | 1                   | 1                              | 1                         | 1                 | 1                   | 1        | 1                              | 1                           | 1                              | 1                                | 1                                | 1                              | 0                           | 0                           | 0                              |
| Disrespect                          | 1                   | 1                              | 1                         | 1                 | 1                   | 1        | 1                              | 1                           | 1                              | 1                                | 1                                | 1                              | 0                           | 0                           | 0                              |
| Disruption                          | 1                   | 1                              | 1                         | 1                 | 1                   | 1        | 1                              | 1                           | 1                              | 1                                | 1                                | 1                              | 0                           | 0                           | 0                              |
| Drugs/Code                          | 1                   | 1                              | 1                         | 1                 | 1                   | 1        | 1                              | 1                           | 1                              | 1                                | 1                                | 1                              | 0                           | 0                           | 0                              |
| Sexual Activity                     | 1                   | 1                              | 1                         | 1                 | 1                   | 1        | 1                              | 1                           | 1                              | 1                                | 1                                | 1                              | 1                           | 1                           | 1                              |
| Sexual Assault                      | 1                   | 1                              | 1                         | 1                 | 1                   | 1        | 1                              | 1                           | 1                              | 1                                | 1                                | 1                              | 1                           | 1                           | 1                              |
| Harassment - Sexual and Bullying    | 1                   | 1                              | 1                         | 1                 | 1                   | 1        | 1                              | 1                           | 1                              | 1                                | 1                                | 1                              | 1                           | 1                           | 1                              |
| Threat - to adult, student, educator| 1                   | 1                              | 1                         | 1                 | 1                   | 1        | 1                              | 1                           | 1                              | 1                                | 1                                | 1                              | 1                           | 1                           | 1                              |
| False Alarm/ Bomb Threat           | 1                   | 1                              | 1                         | 1                 | 1                   | 1        | 1                              | 1                           | 1                              | 1                                | 1                                | 1                              | 1                           | 1                           | 1                              |
| Academic Dishonesty                | 1                   | 1                              | 1                         | 1                 | 1                   | 1        | 1                              | 1                           | 1                              | 1                                | 1                                | 1                              | 1                           | 1                           | 1                              |
| Theft                               | 1                   | 1                              | 1                         | 1                 | 1                   | 1        | 1                              | 1                           | 1                              | 1                                | 1                                | 1                              | 1                           | 1                           | 1                              |
| Destruction of Property            | 1                   | 1                              | 1                         | 1                 | 1                   | 1        | 1                              | 1                           | 1                              | 1                                | 1                                | 1                              | 1                           | 1                           | 1                              |
| Alcohol                            | 1                   | 1                              | 1                         | 1                 | 1                   | 1        | 1                              | 1                           | 1                              | 1                                | 1                                | 1                              | 0                           | 0                           | 0                              |
| Inhalants                          | 1                   | 1                              | 1                         | 1                 | 1                   | 1        | 1                              | 1                           | 1                              | 1                                | 1                                | 1                              | 0                           | 0                           | 0                              |
| Drug/Controlled Substances         | 1                   | 1                              | 1                         | 1                 | 1                   | 1        | 1                              | 1                           | 1                              | 1                                | 1                                | 1                              | 0                           | 0                           | 0                              |
| Tobacco                            | 1                   | 1                              | 1                         | 1                 | 1                   | 1        | 1                              | 1                           | 1                              | 1                                | 1                                | 1                              | 0                           | 0                           | 0                              |
| Fighting                            | 1                   | 1                              | 1                         | 1                 | 1                   | 1        | 1                              | 1                           | 1                              | 1                                | 1                                | 1                              | 0                           | 0                           | 0                              |
| Serious Bodily Injury              | 1                   | 1                              | 1                         | 1                 | 1                   | 1        | 1                              | 1                           | 1                              | 1                                | 1                                | 1                              | 0                           | 0                           | 0                              |
| Truaspassing                       | 1                   | 1                              | 1                         | 1                 | 1                   | 1        | 1                              | 1                           | 1                              | 1                                | 1                                | 1                              | 0                           | 0                           | 0                              |
| Inappropriate Use of Personal Electronics | 1             | 1                              | 1                         | 1                 | 1                   | 1        | 1                              | 1                           | 1                              | 1                                | 1                                | 1                              | 0                           | 0                           | 0                              |
| Explosives                         | 1                   | 1                              | 1                         | 1                 | 1                   | 1        | 1                              | 1                           | 1                              | 1                                | 1                                | 1                              | 0                           | 0                           | 0                              |
| Firearms                           | 0                   | 0                              | 0                         | 0                 | 0                   | 0        | 1                              | 1                           | 0                              | 1                                | 0                                | 0                              | 0                           | 0                           | 0                              |
| Other Guns                          | 1                   | 1                              | 1                         | 1                 | 1                   | 1        | 1                              | 1                           | 1                              | 1                                | 1                                | 1                              | 0                           | 0                           | 0                              |
| Other Weapons                      | 1                   | 1                              | 1                         | 1                 | 1                   | 1        | 1                              | 1                           | 1                              | 1                                | 1                                | 1                              | 0                           | 0                           | 0                              |
| Arson/Fire                         | 1                   | 1                              | 1                         | 1                 | 1                   | 1        | 1                              | 1                           | 1                              | 1                                | 1                                | 1                              | 0                           | 0                           | 0                              |
Summary of District Changes Following the Revised State Guidelines for District Codes of Conduct

Finding 1: After the release of the state guidelines, district codes of conduct included more response options, on average, per infraction than before.

- Prior to the revised state guidelines, district codes of conduct listed, on average, about 8 response options per infraction. These ranged from 3 responses for firearm infractions to 11 response options for harassment. After the release of the state guidelines, infractions averaged almost 15 response options per infraction, ranging from about 5 response options for firearm infractions to almost 19 response options for harassment.
- The result of this shift is that, on average, school personnel have more recommended response options at their disposal for any given act of misbehavior after the state guidelines were released than before. In theory, this gives school personnel more flexibility to exercise discretion in administering discipline.

Finding 2: The increases in response options were generally driven by less exclusionary responses, though the number of infractions to which in-school suspension (ISS) was an option also experienced a relatively large increase.

- Responses such as referring a student to the student support team, conducting a functional behavioral assessment and intervention plan, holding a parent conference, or recommending students meet with counselors or resource specialists experienced the biggest increase in the number of infractions that they applied to.
- Suspensions and expulsions experienced the smallest changes in the number of infractions they applied to, except for in-school suspension which applied to almost 6 more infractions on average after the revised state guidelines.

Finding 3: Districts generally chose distributions of response options at higher tiers than those recommended by the state guidelines.

- This likely reflected the fact that the state guidelines tended to recommend almost all response options for all infractions. Districts tended to omit some lower tier responses, making their average response tier higher. That said, it is important to note that higher tiers are not necessarily more punitive or exclusionary as tier 5 responses include responses like restorative practices.
District Level Codes of Conduct Visualizations

In this section of the report, we present district level data visualizations that highlight district codified responses for given behavioral infractions and their alignment with the state guidelines. For each school district in the state with available data, we present a matrix of infraction-response combinations. For each cell, we indicate whether the district’s code of conduct recommends the given response for the given infraction (1 = yes, 0 = no).

In addition to documenting the infraction-response combinations, we visually demonstrate the alignment of the districts’ codes of conduct with the state recommendations. Cells highlighted in green represent cases where the state recommends a response for a given infraction but the district does not. Cells highlighted in orange represent cases where the state does not recommend the response for a given infraction but the district does. Cells that remain white indicate alignment between the district’s code of conduct and the state guidelines.

A few important caveats should be made regarding the interpretation of these figures:

- First, the matrices are derived from the 2015-16 school year codes of conduct. In some cases, codes of conduct may have been revised since the 2015-16 school year. We recommend that readers refer to the most recent codes of conduct for further examination of districts’ discipline practices.

- Second, the state guidelines for codes of conduct are just that, guidelines. They are recommendations, and districts are under no legal obligation to adhere perfectly to them. In fact, the state encouraged local reflection and revision in the implementation process. Consequently, alignment or misalignment with the state guidelines are not inherently good or bad. The comparison to the state guidelines are meant to facilitate easier local conversation about school codes of conduct and discipline.

- Third, the practices codified in district codes of conduct reflect written policy and not necessarily practice. It is likely that schools in some districts use disciplinary responses that are not codified in their code of conduct. Likewise, it is likely that some districts codify responses that are rarely used in practice. We note that, in some cases, districts’ codes of conduct only detailed more serious responses (like suspension). It is likely that these districts, however, use other less exclusionary approaches despite their lack of presence in the code of conduct.

- Finally, the codes represent the best judgement of the researchers. Details on the coding process can be found in the methodological notes section, but we recognize that, in some cases, local interpretation
of text in the code of conduct may differ from that of the coding team.

On the following pages, we provide visualizations of the district codes of conduct. We begin by showing all the codes of conduct on a single page in alphabetical order. Then, we show all the codes of conduct on a single page arranged by the school districts’ 2015-16 out-of-school suspension rates. While these “bird’s eye” views do not allow for the reading of specific infraction-response categories, they allow for a view of the variability in alignment with state guidelines as well as trends in the alignment of the codes of conduct with suspension rates.

Following these two overview pages, we then present each district’s code of conduct visualization on a single page. We note that for three districts, 2015-16 codes of conduct were either unavailable or did not allow for a coding of infraction-response combinations. For all districts, we include at the top off each page the out-of-school suspension rate, the in-school suspension rate, the Black-White discipline gap as measured by a relative risk ratio, the Black-White discipline gap as measured by a percentage point difference, the average number of responses per infraction, and the average number of infractions per response.
Bird’s Eye View of District Codes of Conduct Visualizations

Clear differences in alignment with the state recommendations and variation across districts are apparent.
Visualizations Arranged by Out-of-School Suspension Rate

There is no clear relationship between alignment to state guidelines and out-of-school suspension rates.
Allegany County Public Schools

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>OSS Rate</th>
<th>ISS Rate</th>
<th>Black-White OSS Gap (Relative Risk Ratio)</th>
<th>Black-White OSS Gap (% Point Difference)</th>
<th>Average # Responses per Infraction</th>
<th>Average # of Infractions per Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5.9%</td>
<td>1.9%</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>14.9 % points</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Responses

Code of Conduct not Available

District reports that a district wide code of conduct was eliminated prior to the 2015-16 school year. Guidance on discipline is now contained in various district policy/regulation documents and individual school handbooks.

State recommends for infraction but district does not codify

State does not recommend for infraction but district does codify

Notes: OSS and ISS rates represent % of students experiencing the response in the district as reported to the federal government's Civil Rights Data Collection for the 2015-16 school year. The visual matrix represents policies in place in the district's 2015-16 high school code of conduct with a 1 representing the presence of a given response for a given infraction and a 0 representing the lack of that response for the given infraction. In practice, the use and non-use of certain practices within the district may differ from what is codified in the code of conduct, so this matrix represents only the written policy as embodied in the code of conduct.
# Anne Arundel County Public Schools

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>OSS Rate</th>
<th>ISS Rate</th>
<th>Black-White OSS Gap (Relative Risk Ratio)</th>
<th>Black-White OSS Gap (% Point Difference)</th>
<th>Average # Responses per Infraction</th>
<th>Average # of Infractions per Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5.0%</td>
<td>4.8%</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>7.8 % points</td>
<td>22.0</td>
<td>19.2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Responses

| Behaviors | Class Cutting | Truancy | Dissrespect | Disruption | Dress Code | Sexual Activity | Sexual Attack | Harassment - Sexual and Bullying | Threat - to adult, student, extortion | False Alarm/ Bomb Threat | Academic Dishonesty | Theft | Destruction of Property | Alcohol | Inhales | Drugs/Controlled Substances | Tobacco | Fighting | Serious Bodily Injury | Trespassing | Inappropriate Use of Personal Electronics | Explosives | Firearms | Other Guns | Other Weapons | Anxiety/Fire |
|-----------|---------------|---------|-------------|------------|------------|----------------|--------------|---------------------------------|-------------------------------------|------------------------|-----------------|--------|--------------------------|---------|--------|--------------------------|----------|----------------------|------------|---------|-----------|-------------|-----------|
|           | 1              | 0       | 1           | 1          | 1          | 1              | 0            | 1                              | 1                                   | 1                      | 1                | 1      | 1                        | 1       | 1      | 0                        | 1        | 1                    | 1          | 1       | 1          | 1           | 1         |

### Infractions

Notes: OSS and ISS rates represent % of students experiencing the response in the district as reported to the federal government’s Civil Rights Data Collection for the 2015-16 school year. The visual matrix represents policies in place in the district’s 2015-16 high school code of conduct with a 1 representing the presence of a given response for a given infraction and a 0 representing the lack of that response for the given infraction. In practice, the use and non-use of certain practices within the district may differ from what is codified in the code of conduct, so this matrix represents only the written policy as embodied in the code of conduct.
### Baltimore City Public Schools

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Infractions</th>
<th>Responses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>State recommends for infraction but district does not codify</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State does not recommend for infraction but district does codify</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Notes:
- OSS and ISS rates represent % of students experiencing the response in the district as reported to the federal government's Civil Rights Data Collection for the 2015-16 school year. The visual matrix represents policies in place in the district's 2015-16 high school code of conduct with a 1 representing the presence of a given response for a given infraction and a 0 representing the lack of that response for the given infraction. In practice, the use and non-use of certain practices within the district may differ from what is codified in the code of conduct, so this matrix represents only the written policy as embodied in the code of conduct.
### Baltimore County Public Schools

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>OSS Rate</th>
<th>ISS Rate</th>
<th>Black-White OSS Gap (Relative Risk Ratio)</th>
<th>Black-White OSS Gap (% Point Difference)</th>
<th>Average # Responses per Infraction</th>
<th>Average # of Infractions per Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3.7%</td>
<td>0.2%</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>4.0 % points</td>
<td>19.9</td>
<td>17.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Responses

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Behaviors</th>
<th>OSS Rate</th>
<th>ISS Rate</th>
<th>Black-White OSS Gap (% Point Difference)</th>
<th>Average # Responses per Infraction</th>
<th>Average # of Infractions per Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Class Cutting</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>19.9</td>
<td>17.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Truancy</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>19.9</td>
<td>17.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dress Code</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>19.9</td>
<td>17.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sexual Activity</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>19.9</td>
<td>17.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harassment, Sexual &amp; Bullying</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>19.9</td>
<td>17.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Threat to Adult, Student, Extortion</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>19.9</td>
<td>17.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>False Alarm, Bomb Threat</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>19.9</td>
<td>17.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tobacco</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>19.9</td>
<td>17.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Larceny</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>19.9</td>
<td>17.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Theft</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>19.9</td>
<td>17.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drug/Control Substances</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>19.9</td>
<td>17.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alcohol</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>19.9</td>
<td>17.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Incest</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>19.9</td>
<td>17.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Explores</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>19.9</td>
<td>17.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Firearms</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>19.9</td>
<td>17.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Guns</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>19.9</td>
<td>17.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Weapons</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>19.9</td>
<td>17.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arson/Fire</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>19.9</td>
<td>17.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Infractions

| Infractions | State recommends for infraction but district does not codify | State does not recommend for infraction but district does codify |

Notes: OSS and ISS rates represent % of students experiencing the response in the district as reported to the federal government’s Civil Rights Data Collection for the 2015-16 school year. The visual matrix represents policies in place in the district's 2015-16 high school code of conduct with a 1 representing the presence of a given response for a given infraction and a 0 representing the lack of that response for the given infraction. In practice, the use and non-use of certain practices within the district may differ from what is codified in the code of conduct, so this matrix represents only the written policy as embodied in the code of conduct.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Calvert County Public Schools</th>
<th>OSS Rate</th>
<th>ISS Rate</th>
<th>Black-White OSS Gap (Relative Risk Ratio)</th>
<th>Black-White OSS Gap (% Point Difference)</th>
<th>Average # Responses per Infraction</th>
<th>Average # of Infractions per Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3.3%</td>
<td>3.5%</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>5.5 % points</td>
<td>15.4</td>
<td>13.4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Notes:** OSS and ISS rates represent % of students experiencing the response in the district as reported to the federal government’s Civil Rights Data Collection for the 2015-16 school year. The visual matrix represents policies in place in the district’s 2015-16 high school code of conduct with a 1 representing the presence of a given response for a given infraction and a 0 representing the lack of that response for the given infraction. In practice, the use and non-use of certain practices within the district may differ from what is codified in the code of conduct, so this matrix represents only the written policy as embodied in the code of conduct.

### Infractions

| Behaviors | Class Cutting | Tardiness | Truancy | Disrespect | Disruption | Dress Code | Sexual Activity | Sexual Assault | Harassment - Sexual and Bullying | Threat - to adult, student, extortion | False Alarm/ Bomb Threat | Academic Dishonor | Theft | Destruction of Property | Alcohol | Inhalants | Drugs/Controlled Substances | Tobacco | Fighting | Serious Bodily Injury | Threatening | Inappropriate Use of Personal Electronics | Exploitation | Firearms | Other Guns | Other Weapons | Arson/Fire |
|-----------|---------------|-----------|---------|------------|------------|------------|----------------|----------------|---------------------------------|-----------------------------------|------------------------|-------------|-------|------------------------|---------|----------|-----------------------|----------|----------------|------------------|-----------|-----------|-------------|-----------|
|           | 1             | 1         | 0       | 1          | 0          | 0          | 0              | 1              | 0                               | 0                                 | 0                      | 0           | 0     | 0                      | 0       | 0        | 0                      | 0        | 0            | 0               | 0         | 0         | 0             | 0         |

**State recommends for infraction but district does not codify**

**State does not recommend for infraction but district does codify**
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Infractions</th>
<th>OSS Rate</th>
<th>ISS Rate</th>
<th>Black-White OSS Gap (Relative Risk Ratio)</th>
<th>Black-White OSS Gap (% Point Difference)</th>
<th>Average # Responses per Infraction</th>
<th>Average # of Infractions per Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>State recommends for infraction but district does not codify</td>
<td>3.8%</td>
<td>4.9%</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>6.5 % points</td>
<td>19.7</td>
<td>17.2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes: OSS and ISS rates represent % of students experiencing the response in the district as reported to the federal government’s Civil Rights Data Collection for the 2015-16 school year. The visual matrix represents policies in place in the district’s 2015-16 high school code of conduct with a 1 representing the presence of a given response for a given infraction and a 0 representing the lack of that response for the given infraction. In practice, the use and non-use of certain practices within the district may differ from what is codified in the code of conduct, so this matrix represents only the written policy as embodied in the code of conduct.
### Carroll County Public Schools

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Infractions</th>
<th>OSS Rate</th>
<th>ISS Rate</th>
<th>Black-White OSS Gap (Relative Risk Ratio)</th>
<th>Black-White OSS Gap (% Point Difference)</th>
<th>Average # Responses per Infraction</th>
<th>Average # of Infractions per Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Class Cutting</td>
<td>3.1%</td>
<td>0.8%</td>
<td>3.3%</td>
<td>6.3 % points</td>
<td>3.9</td>
<td>3.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tardiness</td>
<td>0.8%</td>
<td>0.8%</td>
<td>0.8%</td>
<td>0.8 % points</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>0.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Truancy</td>
<td>0.8%</td>
<td>0.8%</td>
<td>0.8%</td>
<td>0.8 % points</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>0.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disrespect</td>
<td>0.8%</td>
<td>0.8%</td>
<td>0.8%</td>
<td>0.8 % points</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>0.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disruption</td>
<td>0.8%</td>
<td>0.8%</td>
<td>0.8%</td>
<td>0.8 % points</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>0.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dress Code</td>
<td>0.8%</td>
<td>0.8%</td>
<td>0.8%</td>
<td>0.8 % points</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>0.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sexual Activity</td>
<td>0.8%</td>
<td>0.8%</td>
<td>0.8%</td>
<td>0.8 % points</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>0.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sexual Assault</td>
<td>0.8%</td>
<td>0.8%</td>
<td>0.8%</td>
<td>0.8 % points</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>0.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harassment: Sexual and Bullying</td>
<td>0.8%</td>
<td>0.8%</td>
<td>0.8%</td>
<td>0.8 % points</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>0.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Threat - to adult, student, ejection</td>
<td>0.8%</td>
<td>0.8%</td>
<td>0.8%</td>
<td>0.8 % points</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>0.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>False Alarm/ Bomb Threat</td>
<td>0.8%</td>
<td>0.8%</td>
<td>0.8%</td>
<td>0.8 % points</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>0.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academic Dishonesty</td>
<td>0.8%</td>
<td>0.8%</td>
<td>0.8%</td>
<td>0.8 % points</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>0.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Theft</td>
<td>0.8%</td>
<td>0.8%</td>
<td>0.8%</td>
<td>0.8 % points</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>0.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Destruction of Property</td>
<td>0.8%</td>
<td>0.8%</td>
<td>0.8%</td>
<td>0.8 % points</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>0.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alcohol</td>
<td>0.8%</td>
<td>0.8%</td>
<td>0.8%</td>
<td>0.8 % points</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>0.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Injuries</td>
<td>0.8%</td>
<td>0.8%</td>
<td>0.8%</td>
<td>0.8 % points</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>0.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drug/ Controlled Substances</td>
<td>0.8%</td>
<td>0.8%</td>
<td>0.8%</td>
<td>0.8 % points</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>0.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tobacco</td>
<td>0.8%</td>
<td>0.8%</td>
<td>0.8%</td>
<td>0.8 % points</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>0.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fighting</td>
<td>0.8%</td>
<td>0.8%</td>
<td>0.8%</td>
<td>0.8 % points</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>0.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Serious Bodily Injury</td>
<td>0.8%</td>
<td>0.8%</td>
<td>0.8%</td>
<td>0.8 % points</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>0.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trespassing</td>
<td>0.8%</td>
<td>0.8%</td>
<td>0.8%</td>
<td>0.8 % points</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>0.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inappropriate Use of Personal Electronics</td>
<td>0.8%</td>
<td>0.8%</td>
<td>0.8%</td>
<td>0.8 % points</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>0.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Explosives</td>
<td>0.8%</td>
<td>0.8%</td>
<td>0.8%</td>
<td>0.8 % points</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>0.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Firearms</td>
<td>0.8%</td>
<td>0.8%</td>
<td>0.8%</td>
<td>0.8 % points</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>0.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Guns</td>
<td>0.8%</td>
<td>0.8%</td>
<td>0.8%</td>
<td>0.8 % points</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>0.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Weapons</td>
<td>0.8%</td>
<td>0.8%</td>
<td>0.8%</td>
<td>0.8 % points</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>0.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arson/Fire</td>
<td>0.8%</td>
<td>0.8%</td>
<td>0.8%</td>
<td>0.8 % points</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>0.8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Notes:
- OSS and ISS rates represent % of students experiencing the response in the district as reported to the federal government's Civil Rights Data Collection for the 2015-16 school year. The visual matrix represents policies in place in the district's 2015-16 high school code of conduct with a 1 representing the presence of a given response for a given infraction and a 0 representing the lack of that response for the given infraction. In practice, the use and non-use of certain practices within the district may differ from what is codified in the code of conduct, so this matrix represents only the written policy as embodied in the code of conduct.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cecil County Public Schools</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>OSS Rate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Notes:** OSS and ISS rates represent % of students experiencing the response in the district as reported to the federal government’s Civil Rights Data Collection for the 2015-16 school year. The visual matrix represents policies in place in the district’s 2015-16 high school code of conduct with a 1 representing the presence of a given response for a given infraction and a 0 representing the lack of that response for the given infraction. In practice, the use and non-use of certain practices within the district may differ from what is codified in the code of conduct, so this matrix represents only the written policy as embodied in the code of conduct.
### Charles County Public Schools

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>OSS Rate</th>
<th>ISS Rate</th>
<th>Black-White OSS Gap (Relative Risk Ratio)</th>
<th>Black-White OSS Gap (% Point Difference)</th>
<th>Average # Responses per Infraction</th>
<th>Average # of Infractions per Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>6.7%</td>
<td>0.2%</td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>5.8 % points</td>
<td>20.7</td>
<td>18.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Infractions and Responses

**Infractions**

- Class Cutting: Black - White OSS Gap (%): 6.7%
- Tardiness: Black - White OSS Gap (%): 0.2%
- Truancy: Black - White OSS Gap (%): 2.7
- Disrespect: Black - White OSS Gap (%): 5.8 % points
- Dress Code: Black - White OSS Gap (%): 20.7
- Sexual Activity: Black - White OSS Gap (%): 18.0
- Sexual Assault: Black - White OSS Gap (%): 11.1
- Harassment: Black - White OSS Gap (%): 1.1
- Threat: Black - White OSS Gap (%): 1.0
- False Alarms/Bomb Threat: Black - White OSS Gap (%): 1.0
- Academic Dishonesty: Black - White OSS Gap (%): 1.0
- Theft: Black - White OSS Gap (%): 1.0
- Destruction of Property: Black - White OSS Gap (%): 1.0
- Alcohol: Black - White OSS Gap (%): 1.0
- Inhaling: Black - White OSS Gap (%): 1.0
- Drugs/Controlled Substances: Black - White OSS Gap (%): 1.0
- Tobacco: Black - White OSS Gap (%): 1.0
- Fighting: Black - White OSS Gap (%): 1.0
- Serious Bodily Injury: Black - White OSS Gap (%): 1.0
- Trepassing: Black - White OSS Gap (%): 1.0
- Inappropriate Use of Personal Electronics: Black - White OSS Gap (%): 1.0
- Explosives: Black - White OSS Gap (%): 1.0
- Firearms: Black - White OSS Gap (%): 1.0
- Other Guns: Black - White OSS Gap (%): 1.0
- Other Weapons: Black - White OSS Gap (%): 1.0
- Arson/Fire: Black - White OSS Gap (%): 1.0

**Note:** OSS and ISS rates represent % of students experiencing the response in the district as reported to the federal government’s Civil Rights Data Collection for the 2015-16 school year. The visual matrix represents policies in place in the district’s 2015-16 high school code of conduct with a 1 representing the presence of a given response for a given infraction and a 0 representing the lack of that response for the given infraction. In practice, the use and non-use of certain practices within the district may differ from what is codified in the code of conduct, so this matrix represents only the written policy as embodied in the code of conduct.
### Dorchester County Public Schools

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>OSS Rate</th>
<th>ISS Rate</th>
<th>Black-White OSS Gap (Relative Risk Ratio)</th>
<th>Black-White OSS Gap (% Point Difference)</th>
<th>Average # Responses per Infraction</th>
<th>Average # of Infractions per Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>12.7%</td>
<td>3.4%</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>14.9 % points</td>
<td>18.3</td>
<td>15.9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Infractions

- **State recommends for infraction but district does not codify**
- **State does not recommend for infraction but district does codify**

### Responses

- **Behavioral Contract**
- **Tobacco Usage**
- **Student Suicidal Ideation**
- **Inappropriate Use of Personal Electronics**
- **Exploitation**
- **Injuries**
- **Drug/Alcohol Use**
- **Trespassing**
- **Inappropriate Conduct**
- **Vandalism**
- **Weapons**
- **Firearms**
- **State recommends for infraction but district does not codify**
- **State does not recommend for infraction but district does codify**

### Notes:
- OSS and ISS rates represent % of students experiencing the response in the district as reported to the federal government's Civil Rights Data Collection for the 2015-16 school year. The visual matrix represents policies in place in the district's 2015-16 high school code of conduct with a 1 representing the presence of a given response for a given infraction and a 0 representing the lack of that response for the given infraction. In practice, the use and non-use of certain practices within the district may differ from what is codified in the code of conduct, so this matrix represents only the written policy as embodied in the code of conduct.
### Frederick County Public Schools

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>OSS Rate</th>
<th>ISS Rate</th>
<th>Black-White OSS Gap (Relative Risk Ratio)</th>
<th>Black-White OSS Gap (% Point Difference)</th>
<th>Average # Responses per Infraction</th>
<th>Average # of Infractions per Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3.2%</td>
<td>1.0%</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>6.3 % points</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Responses**

**Code of Conduct not Available**

District removed the code of conduct from student handbooks prior to the 2015-16 school year and placed guidance in district regulations. The current version of the code of conduct can be found in district regulation 400-8; however, we were unable to acquire the 2015-16 version.

Notes: OSS and ISS rates represent % of students experiencing the response in the district as reported to the federal government's Civil Rights Data Collection for the 2015-16 school year. The visual matrix represents policies in place in the district's 2015-16 high school code of conduct with a 1 representing the presence of a given response for a given infraction and a 0 representing the lack of that response for the given infraction. In practice, the use and non-use of certain practices within the district may differ from what is codified in the code of conduct, so this matrix represents only the written policy as embodied in the code of conduct.
### Garrett County Public Schools

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>OSS Rate</th>
<th>ISS Rate</th>
<th>Black-White OSS Gap (Relative Risk Ratio)</th>
<th>Black-White OSS Gap (% Point Difference)</th>
<th>Average # Responses per Infraction</th>
<th>Average # of Infractions per Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2.1%</td>
<td>1.1%</td>
<td><strong>Subgroup Enrollment Too Low for Reliable Calculation</strong></td>
<td><strong>Subgroup Enrollment Too Low for Reliable Calculation</strong></td>
<td>19.0</td>
<td>16.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Notes:
OSS and ISS rates represent % of students experiencing the response in the district as reported to the federal government’s Civil Rights Data Collection for the 2015-16 school year. The visual matrix represents policies in place in the district’s 2015-16 high school code of conduct with a 1 representing the presence of a given response for a given infraction and a 0 representing the lack of that response for the given infraction. In practice, the use and non-use of certain practices within the district may differ from what is codified in the code of conduct, so this matrix represents only the written policy as embodied in the code of conduct.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Responses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Infractions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**State recommends for infraction but district does not codify**

**State does not recommend for infraction but district does codify**
# Harford County Public Schools

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>OSS Rate</th>
<th>ISS Rate</th>
<th>Black-White OSS Gap (Relative Risk Ratio)</th>
<th>Black-White OSS Gap (% Point Difference)</th>
<th>Average # Responses per Infraction</th>
<th>Average # of Infractions per Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5.9%</td>
<td>4.7%</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>10.1 % points</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>3.2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## Responses

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Infractions</th>
<th>State recommends for infraction but district does not codify</th>
<th>State does not recommend for infraction but district does codify</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Behavior</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Class Cutting</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tardiness</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Truancy</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disrespect</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disruption</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dress Code</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sexual Harassment</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sexual Exploitation</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harassment: Sexual &amp; Relational</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Threats to Adults, Students, or Staff</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>False Alarm/Bomb Threat</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academic Dishonesty</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Theft</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Destruction of Property</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alcohol</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inhaling</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drugs/Controlled Substances</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tobacco</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fighting</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Serious Bodily Injury</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trespassing</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inappropriate Use of Personal Electronic Equipment</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Explosives</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Firearms</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Guns</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Weapons</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arson/Explosive</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes: OSS and ISS rates represent % of students experiencing the response in the district as reported to the federal government’s Civil Rights Data Collection for the 2015-16 school year. The visual matrix represents policies in place in the district’s 2015-16 high school code of conduct with a 1 representing the presence of a given response for a given infraction and a 0 representing the lack of that response for the given infraction. In practice, the use and non-use of certain practices within the district may differ from what is codified in the code of conduct, so this matrix represents only the written policy as embodied in the code of conduct.
Howard County Public Schools

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>OSS Rate</th>
<th>ISS Rate</th>
<th>Black-White OSS Gap (Relative Risk Ratio)</th>
<th>Black-White OSS Gap (% Point Difference)</th>
<th>Average # Responses per Infraction</th>
<th>Average # of Infractions per Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2.8%</td>
<td>0.5%</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>5.0 % points</td>
<td>15.7</td>
<td>13.6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Responses

- **State recommends for infraction but district does not codify**
- **State does not recommend for infraction but district does codify**

**Notes:** OSS and ISS rates represent % of students experiencing the response in the district as reported to the federal government's Civil Rights Data Collection for the 2015-16 school year. The visual matrix represents policies in place in the district's 2015-16 high school code of conduct with a 1 representing the presence of a given response for a given infraction and a 0 representing the lack of that response for the given infraction. In practice, the use and non-use of certain practices within the district may differ from what is codified in the code of conduct, so this matrix represents only the written policy as embodied in the code of conduct.
### Kent County Public Schools

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>OSS Rate</th>
<th>ISS Rate</th>
<th>Black-White OSS Gap (Relative Risk Ratio)</th>
<th>Black-White OSS Gap (% Point Difference)</th>
<th>Average # Responses per Infraction</th>
<th>Average # of Infractions per Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5.8%</td>
<td>9.6%</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>6.7% points</td>
<td>27.5</td>
<td>23.9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Responses

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Infractions</th>
<th>Responses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>State recommends for infraction but district does not codify</td>
<td>State does not recommend for infraction but district does codify</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes: OSS and ISS rates represent % of students experiencing the response in the district as reported to the federal government’s Civil Rights Data Collection for the 2015-16 school year. The visual matrix represents policies in place in the district's 2015-16 high school code of conduct with a 1 representing the presence of a given response for a given infraction and a 0 representing the lack of that response for the given infraction. In practice, the use and non-use of certain practices within the district may differ from what is codified in the code of conduct, so this matrix represents only the written policy as embodied in the code of conduct.
## Montgomery County Public Schools

### Rates

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>OSS Rate</th>
<th>ISS Rate</th>
<th>Black-White OSS Gap (Relative Risk Ratio)</th>
<th>Black-White OSS Gap (% Point Difference)</th>
<th>Average # Responses per Infraction</th>
<th>Average # of Infractions per Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.6%</td>
<td>0.3%</td>
<td>5.2</td>
<td>2.7 % points</td>
<td>23.5</td>
<td>20.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Notes

OSS and ISS rates represent % of students experiencing the response in the district as reported to the federal government's Civil Rights Data Collection for the 2015-16 school year. The visual matrix represents policies in place in the district's 2015-16 high school code of conduct with a 1 representing the presence of a given response for a given infraction and a 0 representing the lack of that response for the given infraction. In practice, the use and non-use of certain practices within the district may differ from what is codified in the code of conduct, so this matrix represents only the written policy as embodied in the code of conduct.

### Infractions

#### State recommends for infraction but district does not codify

- [ ] State recommends for infraction but district does not codify

#### State does not recommend for infraction but district does codify

- [ ] State does not recommend for infraction but district does codify

### Responses

- [ ] Responses

---

**Legend:**
- Green: State recommends for infraction but district does not codify
- Orange: State does not recommend for infraction but district does codify
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Prince George's County Public Schools</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>OSS Rate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.1%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Responses**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Behaviors</th>
<th>Class Cutting</th>
<th>Tardiness</th>
<th>Truancy</th>
<th>Disrespect</th>
<th>Disruption</th>
<th>Dress Code</th>
<th>Sexual Activity</th>
<th>Sexual Attack</th>
<th>Harassment - Sexual and Bullying</th>
<th>Threat - to adult, student, extortion</th>
<th>False Alarm/ Bomb Threat</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes: OSS and ISS rates represent % of students experiencing the response in the district as reported to the federal government’s Civil Rights Data Collection for the 2015-16 school year. The visual matrix represents policies in place in the district’s 2015-16 high school code of conduct with a 1 representing the presence of a given response for a given infraction and a 0 representing the lack of that response for the given infraction. In practice, the use and non-use of certain practices within the district may differ from what is codified in the code of conduct, so this matrix represents only the written policy as embodied in the code of conduct.
# Queen Anne’s County Public Schools

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>OSS Rate</th>
<th>ISS Rate</th>
<th>Black-White OSS Gap (Relative Risk Ratio)</th>
<th>Black-White OSS Gap (% Point Difference)</th>
<th>Average # Responses per Infraction</th>
<th>Average # of Infractions per Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2.0%</td>
<td>1.1%</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>4.4 % points</td>
<td>7.5</td>
<td>6.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## Responses

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Infractions</th>
<th>Responses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>- State recommends for infraction but district does not codify</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- State does not recommend for infraction but district does codify</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes: OSS and ISS rates represent % of students experiencing the response in the district as reported to the federal government’s Civil Rights Data Collection for the 2015-16 school year. The visual matrix represents policies in place in the district’s 2015-16 high school code of conduct with a 1 representing the presence of a given response for a given infraction and a 0 representing the lack of that response for the given infraction. In practice, the use and non-use of certain practices within the district may differ from what is codified in the code of conduct, so this matrix represents only the written policy as embodied in the code of conduct.
## St. Mary’s County Public Schools

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>OSS Rate</th>
<th>ISS Rate</th>
<th>Black-White OSS Gap (Relative Risk Ratio)</th>
<th>Black-White OSS Gap (% Point Difference)</th>
<th>Average # Responses per Infraction</th>
<th>Average # of Infractions per Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3.8%</td>
<td>0.2%</td>
<td>5.1</td>
<td>8.3 % points</td>
<td>8.9</td>
<td>7.7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Responses

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Infractions</th>
<th>State recommends for infraction but district does not codify</th>
<th>State does not recommend for infraction but district does codify</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Notes:
- OSS and ISS rates represent % of students experiencing the response in the district as reported to the federal government’s Civil Rights Data Collection for the 2015-16 school year. The visual matrix represents policies in place in the district’s 2015-16 high school code of conduct with a 1 representing the presence of a given response for a given infraction and a 0 representing the lack of that response for the given infraction. In practice, the use and non-use of certain practices within the district may differ from what is codified in the code of conduct, so this matrix represents only the written policy as embodied in the code of conduct.
## Somerset County Public Schools

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Infractions</th>
<th>Responses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>OSS Rate</td>
<td>ISS Rate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.8%</td>
<td>9.1%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Code of Conduct not Available

District handbooks do not contain disciplinary guidance with linked infractions and responses. District policy documents contain reference to a disciplinary grid; however, the grid provided by the district contained tiers of responses without links to specific infractions.

---

Notes: OSS and ISS rates represent % of students experiencing the response in the district as reported to the federal government's Civil Rights Data Collection for the 2015-16 school year. The visual matrix represents policies in place in the district's 2015-16 high school code of conduct with a 1 representing the presence of a given response for a given infraction and a 0 representing the lack of that response for the given infraction. In practice, the use and non-use of certain practices within the district may differ from what is codified in the code of conduct, so this matrix represents only the written policy as embodied in the code of conduct.
Talbot County Public Schools

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>OSS Rate</th>
<th>ISS Rate</th>
<th>Black-White OSS Gap (Relative Risk Ratio)</th>
<th>Black-White OSS Gap (% Point Difference)</th>
<th>Average # Responses per Infraction</th>
<th>Average # of Infractions per Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3.6%</td>
<td>0.3%</td>
<td>4.7</td>
<td>7.8 % points</td>
<td>25.4</td>
<td>22.2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes: OSS and ISS rates represent % of students experiencing the response in the district as reported to the federal government’s Civil Rights Data Collection for the 2015-16 school year. The visual matrix represents policies in place in the district’s 2015-16 high school code of conduct with a 1 representing the presence of a given response for a given infraction and a 0 representing the lack of that response for the given infraction. In practice, the use and non-use of certain practices within the district may differ from what is codified in the code of conduct, so this matrix represents only the written policy as embodied in the code of conduct.
## Washington County Public Schools

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Infractions</th>
<th>Responses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>State recommends for infraction but district does not codify</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Notes:
- OSS and ISS rates represent % of students experiencing the response in the district as reported to the federal government's Civil Rights Data Collection for the 2015-16 school year.
- The visual matrix represents policies in place in the district's 2015-16 high school code of conduct with a 1 representing the presence of a given response for a given infraction and a 0 representing the lack of that response for the given infraction. In practice, the use and non-use of certain practices within the district may differ from what is codified in the code of conduct, so this matrix represents only the written policy as embodied in the code of conduct.
# Wicomico County Public Schools

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>OSS Rate</th>
<th>ISS Rate</th>
<th>Black-White OSS Gap (Relative Risk Ratio)</th>
<th>Black-White OSS Gap (% Point Difference)</th>
<th>Average # Responses per Infraction</th>
<th>Average # of Infractions per Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>10.0%</td>
<td>4.3%</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>13.4 % points</td>
<td>3.9</td>
<td>3.4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## Responses

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>infractions</th>
<th>State recommends for infraction but district does not codify</th>
<th>State does not recommend for infraction but district does codify</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Notes:** OSS and ISS rates represent % of students experiencing the response in the district as reported to the federal government’s Civil Rights Data Collection for the 2015-16 school year. The visual matrix represents policies in place in the district's 2015-16 high school code of conduct with a 1 representing the presence of a given response for a given infraction and a 0 representing the lack of that response for the given infraction. In practice, the use and non-use of certain practices within the district may differ from what is codified in the code of conduct, so this matrix represents only the written policy as embodied in the code of conduct.
Worcester County Public Schools

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>OSS Rate</th>
<th>ISS Rate</th>
<th>Black-White OSS Gap</th>
<th>Black-White OSS Gap (% Point Difference)</th>
<th>Average # Responses per Infraction</th>
<th>Average # of Infractions per Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4.1%</td>
<td>6.9%</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>6.2 % points</td>
<td>9.0</td>
<td>7.8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes: OSS and ISS rates represent % of students experiencing the response in the district as reported to the federal government’s Civil Rights Data Collection for the 2015-16 school year. The visual matrix represents policies in place in the district's 2015-16 high school code of conduct with a 1 representing the presence of a given response for a given infraction and a 0 representing the lack of that response for the given infraction. In practice, the use and non-use of certain practices within the district may differ from what is codified in the code of conduct, so this matrix represents only the written policy as embodied in the code of conduct.

**Responses**

**Infractions**

- **State recommends for infraction but district does not codify**
- **State does not recommend for infraction but district does codify**
Racial Disparities in Out-of-School Suspension Use

Across the state, Black students are suspended out of school at higher rates than White students. The relative ranking of districts with regard to racial disparities in OSS use between Black and White students varies considerably, however, by whether the discipline gap is measured as a relative risk ratio (\( \frac{\% \text{ of Black students suspended}}{\% \text{ of White students suspended}} \)) or as a percentage point difference (\( \% \text{ of Black students suspended} - \% \text{ of White students suspended} \)).

A relative risk ratio presents the Black-White discipline gap in terms of the relative likelihood that a Black student experiences a suspension compared to a White student in a given district. For example, if 15% of Black students in a district experienced a suspension while only 5% of White students did, the relative risk ratio would equal 3. This suggests that, in the district, Black students are three times as likely as White students to be suspended. In contrast, the percentage point difference represents the difference in percentage points between the suspension rate of Black students and White students. In this example, the percentage point difference would be 10 percentage points.

Throughout this report, we present racial disparities in discipline as both a relative risk ratio and as a percentage point difference. We do not offer a recommendation on which approach is preferable, but rather suggest that considering both measures, along with the overall level of suspension in a district is important. For example, the relative risk ratio (3) of a district suspending 15% of its Black students and 5% of its White students is the same as the relative risk ratio (3) of a district suspending 3% of its Black students and 1% of its White students, though intuitively policymakers and educators may view these situations quite differently. Considering the percentage point difference (10 percentage points compared to 2 percentage points) or the overall levels of suspension therefore provides important nuance to the interpretation of racial disparities in discipline at the district level.

On the following pages, we display districts ranked in order of the Black-White discipline gap as measured as a relative risk ratio and measured as a percentage point difference. We then show district code of conduct visualizations ordered according to each measure of the discipline gap.
Racial Disparities in Out-of-School Suspension Use

As shown, the choice of measurement of the Black-White discipline gap has major implications for how districts are ranked in terms of equity in school discipline. Notably, Montgomery County Public Schools has either the largest racial disparity (as measured by a relative risk ratio) or the smallest racial disparity (as measured by a percentage point difference).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Black-White OSS Gap (Relative Risk Ratio)</th>
<th>District</th>
<th>Black-White OSS Gap (% Point Difference)</th>
<th>District</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5.2</td>
<td>Montgomery County Public Schools</td>
<td>14.9</td>
<td>Allegany County Public Schools</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.1</td>
<td>St. Mary’s County Public Schools</td>
<td>14.9</td>
<td>Dorchester County Public Schools</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.7</td>
<td>Talbot County Public Schools</td>
<td>13.7</td>
<td>Somerset County Public Schools</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>Howard County Public Schools</td>
<td>13.4</td>
<td>Wicomico County Public Schools</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>Harford County Public Schools</td>
<td>10.1</td>
<td>Harford County Public Schools</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>Washington County Public Schools</td>
<td>9.8</td>
<td>Cecil County Public Schools</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>Frederick County Public Schools</td>
<td>8.3</td>
<td>St. Mary’s County Public Schools</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>Wicomico County Public Schools</td>
<td>7.8</td>
<td>Talbot County Public Schools</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>Allegany County Public Schools</td>
<td>7.6</td>
<td>Anne Arundel County Public Schools</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>Queen Anne’s County Public Schools</td>
<td>6.7</td>
<td>Kent County Public Schools</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>Calvert County Public Schools</td>
<td>6.5</td>
<td>Caroline County Public Schools</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>Caroline County Public Schools</td>
<td>6.3</td>
<td>Frederick County Public Schools</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>Anne Arundel County Public Schools</td>
<td>6.3</td>
<td>Carroll County Public Schools</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>Dorchester County Public Schools</td>
<td>6.2</td>
<td>Worcester County Public Schools</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>Worcester County Public Schools</td>
<td>5.8</td>
<td>Charles County Public Schools</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>Carroll County Public Schools</td>
<td>5.5</td>
<td>Calvert County Public Schools</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>Somerset County Public Schools</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>Howard County Public Schools</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>Baltimore County Public Schools</td>
<td>4.7</td>
<td>Washington County Public Schools</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>Kent County Public Schools</td>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>Queen Anne’s County Public Schools</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>Charles County Public Schools</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>Baltimore City Public Schools</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>Cecil County Public Schools</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>Baltimore County Public Schools</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>Prince George’s County Public Schools</td>
<td>3.9</td>
<td>Prince George’s County Public Schools</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>Baltimore City Public Schools</td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>Montgomery County Public Schools</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. Black-White disparities in OSS calculated from OSS rates that represent the # of Black or White students that received one or more suspensions over the total enrollment of students of that race. All data is from that reported by districts as part of the 2015-16 Civil Rights Data Collection. Counties with fewer than 20 White or Black students enrolled are omitted due to an insufficient number of students to reliably report suspension rates.
Visualizations Arranged by Black-White Relative Risk Ratios

Racial disparities in discipline as measured by the relative risk ratio (\% of Black students suspended / \% of White students suspended) do not show a clear relationship with alignment of codes of conduct to state guidelines.
Visualizations Arranged by Black-White % Point Difference

Racial disparities in discipline as measured by the % point difference (% of Black students suspended - % of White students suspended) do not show a clear relationship with alignment of codes of conduct to state guidelines.

Dorchester County: 14.9
Wicomico County: 13.4
Harford County: 10.1
Cecil County: 9.8
St. Mary’s County: 8.3
Talbot County: 7.8
Anne Arundel County: 7.6
Kent County: 6.7
Caroline County: 6.5
Carroll County: 6.3
Worcester County: 6.2
Charles County: 5.8
Calvert County: 5.5
Howard County: 5.0
Washington County: 4.7
Queen Anne’s County: 4.4
Baltimore City: 4.2
Prince George’s County: 3.9
Montgomery County: 2.7
Summary

In conclusion, we summarize the key findings of this report and their implications for policy and practice. First, we find that, on average, districts did respond to state guidelines by revising their local codes of conduct. That said, there was great variability in the degree to which the resulting codes of conduct aligned with the state recommendations. Such alignment or misalignment is not, however, inherently good or bad. In fact, the state guidelines are so broad, recommending almost every response for almost every infraction, that district guidelines that are more narrowly designed may actually provide more concrete guidance on disciplinary practice than those that more closely adhere to the state guidelines.

With regard to the changes made, we note that districts tended to increase the availability of response options, particularly those that were not exclusionary in nature. While this may increase the availability of non-exclusionary responses to practitioners, it is important to note that exclusionary practices like suspension nevertheless remained as options for about as many infractions as they did before the state guidelines. Additionally, the frequency with which in-school suspension was recommended increased to apply to about six additional infractions, on average. This means that, while educators may have more available response options, the degree to which the state guidelines alter the use of exclusionary practices will likely depend largely on the implementation choices made in schools and classrooms.

The importance of local implementation is seen in the results that visually compare district codes of conduct to suspension rates and racial disparities therein. As we have shown, there were not clear relationships between alignment of district codes of conduct to state guidelines and overall out-of-school suspension rates or the Black-White discipline gap (measured either as a relative risk ratio or percentage point difference). Again, this points to the importance of considering the disciplinary practices as enacted at the school and classroom level.

Finally, though not the primary focus of this report, we note the stark differences seen in estimates of racial disparities in discipline when measuring the discipline gap in different ways. As policymakers and educators work to reduce the use of exclusionary practices and increase equity in school discipline, it is important to consider multiple measures of districts’ progress, as the conclusions drawn can differ depending on the measures used.

Much work remains to be done to ensure that students in Maryland have access to safe learning environments that minimize the use of exclusionary discipline. As districts and state leaders continue to work toward this goal, the district level data visualizations provided in this report provide one mechanism for rapid comparison of district policy to state guidelines and other districts’ policies. We hope that they spark continued conversation and reflection that ultimately improves students’ experiences in school.
Methodological Notes

In this section, we detail the methodological approach that produced the district code of conduct matrices as well as the estimates of changes in response to the revised state code of conduct recommendations. Note that the results presented in this report are part of a larger research project examining district responses to the revised state guidelines. More details can be found in the full research study.

Data

For each Maryland school district (n=24), we attempted to gather codes of conduct for both the 2013-14 and 2015-16 school years. These years were chosen purposefully to illustrate changes in codes of conduct from the year prior to the release of the state recommendations to one year after the release of the state recommendations (thereby giving districts time to have responded to and revised their own codes of conduct).

Codes of conduct were collected through internet searches of school district websites, through the use of the Internet Archive to access historical versions of district websites, and through direct requests to school districts. In general, we succeeded in collecting codes of conduct from almost all districts for both years; however, in some cases, codes of conduct were not accessible. As a result, results that describe average changes to codes of conduct in response to the state guidelines are based on codes of conduct for 21 of the 24 districts in the state. The omitted districts were Allegany County, Frederick County, and Somerset County. In cases where the code of conduct was differentiated by school level (primary or secondary), we coded the high school code of conduct. Consequently, readers should be advised that, in some cases, the code of conduct visualizations may differ slightly for elementary and middle grades students.

Methodology

With codes of conduct collected, we then created response-infraction matrices that provided binary indicators of whether a district's code of conduct applied a given response to a given infraction. Given variation in the number of infractions, responses, and organization of codes of conduct, we standardized the process by coding all codes of conduct relative to the state guidelines. The state guidelines outline 27 infractions and 31 responses and organize them in a five tier system.

For each district, we created a grid with 27 rows (infractions) and 31 columns (responses). Each district's code of conduct was then read and coded to the grid by one of the two primary researchers. We used an iterative process in which both researchers coded a common code of conduct, discussed discrepancies, and then made revisions to our coding scheme in response. As coding continued, there were regular discussions of the coding process and consensus meetings in ambiguous cases. After all
codes of conduct were coded to the grid, an additional round of coding took place in which the coded grids were compared back to the codes of conduct. Remaining coding errors and inconsistencies were identified, discussed, and remedied at this stage.

In some cases, districts codified responses or infractions outside of the state guidelines. In these cases, we documented the presence of these additional infractions or responses. We report on these elsewhere. We also note that, in some cases, codified infractions or responses do not perfectly adhere to the language of the state recommendations. While our methodological approach allows for consistency across districts in the coding of codes of conduct, we acknowledge that, in a few cases, there is a certain level of subjective decision-making. We encourage readers to compare codes of conduct to the official language of the state guidelines, which for infractions and responses can be found in appendices A and B of this document.

With codes of conduct coded, we then examined changes in response to the state guidelines by calculating the number of responses applied to a given infraction as well as the number of infractions that a given response applied to. Changes in the average number of responses give an indication of whether districts responded to the state guidelines by either increasing or decreasing the codified number of response options for given infractions. For instance, these estimates would pick up changes such as districts previously responding to an infraction of fighting with a limited set of responses, for example in-school or out-of-school suspension, but then expanding this set of responses to include additional responses like peer mediation, restorative practices, or counseling after the policy reform.

Calculating differences in the average number of infractions that a response is applied to speaks to which response options experienced expanded application and which were limited. For instance, a decrease in the average number of infractions to which suspension is applied would suggest districts were moving to a less exclusionary approach to discipline.

Disrespect
Making intentional and harmful gestures, verbal or written comments, or symbols to others. (e.g., verbal put-downs, cursing, talking back)

Being insubordinate: repeatedly or persistently disrespectful, in defiance of authority.

Disruption
Intentionally engaging in minor behavior distracting from the learning environment.

Intentionally and persistently engaging in minor behavior that distracts from the learning environment. (e.g., talking out of turn, throwing small items, horseplay)

Intentionally engaging in moderate to serious behavior that distracts from teaching and learning, and directly affects the safety of others. (e.g., throwing harmful items, sending incendiary texts / social media messages, disrupting a fire drill)

Dress Code
Violating dress code, after student has been warned.

Persistently violating dress code after student has been warned.

Sexual Activity
Engaging in inappropriate behavior of a sexual nature (e.g., indecent exposure, inappropriate texts of a sexual nature).

Sexual Attack
Intentionally engaging in behavior towards another that is physically, sexual aggressive.

Harassment, Sexual Harassment, Bullying
Engaging in harassment.

Engaging in sexual harassment. * (e.g., intentional unwelcome sexual advances, requests for sexual favors, other intentional inappropriate verbal, written, or physical conduct of a sexual nature)

Engaging in persistent bullying including cyberbullying.
**Threat (to adult, to student, extortion)**
Expressing—orally, in writing, or by gesture —intent to do physical harm to others.

Engaging in extortion: Using a threat (without a weapon) to get a person to turn over property.

Engaging in persistent threats or extortion.

**False Alarm/Bomb Threat**
Initiating a warning of a fire or other catastrophe without cause. (e.g., pulling a fire alarm or misusing 911)

Making a bomb threat or threatening a school shooting.

**Academic Dishonesty**
Plagiarizing, such as by taking someone else’s work or ideas (for students grades 6-12); forgery, such as faking a signature of a teacher or parent; or cheating.

**Theft**
Intentionally taking property without owner’s permission, where the taker is an elementary school student.

Intentionally taking property without owner’s permission.

Intentionally taking property without owner’s permission, where the theft is especially serious based on the listed factors.

**Destruction of Property**
Causing accidental damage.

Intentionally causing damage to school/other’s property.

Intentionally causing damage to school/other’s property, where the act is especially serious based on the listed factors.

**Alcohol**
Being under the influence of alcohol.

Using/possessing alcohol.

Distributing/selling alcohol.

**Inhalants**
Being under the influence of inhalants.
Using/possessing inhalants.

Distributing/selling inhalants.

**Drugs/Controlled Substances**
Unauthorized use/possession of non-illegal drugs.

Being under the influence of illegal drugs.

Using/possessing illegal drugs.

Distributing/selling non-illegal or illegal drugs.

**Tobacco**
Using/possessing tobacco/e-cigarettes.

**Fighting (attack on adult, attack on student)**
Intentionally shoving, pushing, or otherwise being physically aggressive toward another in the context of a fight. (e.g., body check; intentionally bumping; but NOT horseplay)

Intentionally engaging in a fight (which may be small, spontaneous, and short, and/or result only in minor, cuts, scrapes, bruises).

Intentionally engaging in a fight, which may be large, pre-planned, extended, and/or resulting in major injuries like a broken limb or otherwise especially serious based on the listed factors.

**Serious Bodily Injury**
Intentionally misbehaving in a way that unintentionally causes serious bodily injury.

Intentionally causing serious bodily injury.

**Trespassing**
Being on school property without permission, including while on suspension or expulsion. (Where an older family member is on school grounds to pick up younger siblings, that person should be asked to seek school permission. School should then grant permission.)

**Inappropriate Use of Personal Electronics**
Having out a personal electronic device, after student has been warned.

Persistently having out a personal electronic device, in defiance of school rules.

**Explosives**
Possessing an incendiary or explosive device or material or any combination of combustible or explosive substances, other than a firearm, that can cause harm to people or property. (e.g., firecrackers, smoke bombs, flares; but NOT “snap pops,” which should be treated as a disruption)

Detonating or threatening to detonate an incendiary or explosive device or material, including those described above.

**Firearms**
Possessing a firearm, as defined in 18 U.S.C. § 921. (e.g., handgun)

**Other Guns**
Possessing, using, or threatening to use a look-alike gun. (e.g., water guns)

Possessing, using, or threatening to use an unloaded / inoperable non-firearm gun. (e.g., pellet guns, BB guns)

Possessing, using, or threatening to use a loaded/operable non-firearm gun.

**Other Weapons**
Possessing an implement that could potentially cause injury, without intent to use it as a weapon.

Possessing an implement that could potentially cause injury with intent to use it as a weapon.

Using or threatening to use as a weapon an implement that is likely to cause serious bodily harm.

**Arson/Fire**
Intentionally setting or attempting to set a fire or helping others to set a fire without intent to or possibility of endangering others.

Intentionally setting a fire or helping others to set a fire with the intent to endanger others or with the result of destroying valuable property.
Appendix B: Responses Defined in the Maryland State Board of Education’s Code of Conduct Guidelines

**Behavioral Contract**
Correcting inappropriate or disruptive student behavior through a formal plan designed by school staff to offer positive behavioral interventions, strategies, and supports.

**Check-in with School Counselor/Resource Specialists**
Prompting students to have an informal check-in with a school counselor, resource teacher, school psychologist, school social worker, or coach who has a relationship with the student.

**Classroom-Based responses**
Prompting a student to reflect on her/his behavior using classroom strategies such as time-out, teacher-student conference, reflection chair, redirection (e.g., role play), seat change, call home, loss of classroom privilege, or apology letter.

**Community Conferencing**
Bringing together students, school staff, and others involved in a conflict to discuss the topic, resolve issues, and propose solutions. (E.g., "Daily Rap," "Morning Meetings")

**Community Service**
Allowing students to participate in an activity that serves and benefits the community. (E.g., working at a soup kitchen, cleaning up public spaces, or helping at a facility for the aged.)

**Conflict Resolution**
Using strategies to assist students in taking responsibility for peacefully resolving conflicts. Students, parents/guardians, teachers, school staff, and principals engage in activities that promote problem-solving skills and techniques, such as conflict and anger management, active listening, and effective communication.

**Detention**
Requiring a student to report to a designated classroom before school, during a free period, after school, or on the weekend for a set period of time.

**Expulsion**
Expulsion- The exclusion of a student from the student's regular school program for 45 school days or longer, which may occur only under the following circumstances:
(a) The superintendent or designated representative has determined that the student's return to school prior to the completion of the expulsion period would pose an imminent threat of serious harm to other students or staff.
(b) The superintendent or designated representative limits the duration of the exclusion to the greatest extent practicable.
(c) The school system provides the excluded student with comparable educational services and appropriate behavior support services to promote successful return to the student’s regular academic program. Code of Maryland Regulations (COMAR) 13A.08.01.11.(B)(2)

**Functional Behavior Assessment & Behavioral Intervention Plan**
A Functional Behavior Assessment gathers information about students’ inappropriate or disruptive behavior and determines approaches that school staff should take to correct or manage that behavior. The information is then used to develop a Behavioral Intervention Plan for the student. A Behavioral Intervention Plan offers positive behavioral interventions, strategies, and supports designed by school staff to correct inappropriate or disruptive schools behavior.

**In-School Removal/Intervention**
Removing a student within the school building “from the student’s current education program for up to but not more than 10 school days in a school year for disciplinary reasons by the school principal,” COMAR 13A.08.01.11(B)(4), but that is not considered an in-school suspension, because the student is “afforded the opportunity to continue to:
(i) appropriately progress in the general curriculum;
(ii) receive the special education and related services specified on the student's Individual Education Plan (IEP), if the student is a student with a disability in accordance with the law
(iii) receive instruction commensurate with the program afforded to the student in the regular classroom; and (iv) participate with peers as they would in their current education program to the extent appropriate.” COMAR 13A.08.01.11(C)(2)(a).

**Mentoring Program**
Pairing students with mentors (e.g., counselor, teacher, fellow student, or community member) who help their personal, academic, and social development.

**Parent Outreach**
Informing parents/guardians of their child’s behavior and seeking their assistance in correcting inappropriate or disruptive behavior.

**Parent/Guardian and Student/Teacher Conference**
Involving students, parents/guardians, teachers, school staff, and principals in discussion about the student’s behavior and potential solutions to address social, academic, and personal issues related to the behavior.

**Peer Mediation**
Employing a form of conflict resolution in which students serve as mediators and help their peers deal with and develop solutions to conflicts.

**Recommend for Further Action**
Recommending a student to building administrator(s) for long-term suspension, expulsion, referral to alternative education, or contact with law enforcement.
Referral to Alternative Education
Recommending a student to building administrator(s) for placement in an alternative education school, alternative education program, or alternative education placement.

Referral to Appropriate Substance Abuse Counseling Services
Referring a student to services both in and out of school, such as “MSAP,” a local health department, or community-based service for counseling related to substance abuse.

Referral to Community-Based Organizations
Referring a student for a variety of services, including after-school programming, individual or group counseling, leadership development, conflict resolution, and/or tutoring.

Referral to Health/Mental Health Services
Referring a student to school-based or community-based health and mental health clinics or other social services for the purpose of providing counseling and assessments to students in need. Students are encouraged to privately share issues or concerns that lead to inappropriate or disruptive behavior or negatively affect academic success, and discuss goals and learn techniques that help them overcome personal challenges. These services may include anger management classes and formal/informal behavior coaching.

Referral to IEP Team for a Student not Currently Eligible for Special Education and Related Services
Referring a student to the IEP team to determine if there is a need to conduct a special education evaluation to assess the student’s eligibility for special education and related services. This response should only be used if a student's behavior has not responded to other interventions and the behavior adversely affects a student's educational performance.

Referral to IEP Team for a Student Currently Eligible for Special Education and Related Services
Holding an IEP meeting for a student who is already eligible for special education services to determine if the IEP and/or behavior plan needs to be revised/updated to address interfering behaviors.

Referral to Student Support Team
Bringing together a team of teachers, principals, social workers, nurses, mental health clinicians, school psychologists, and external agency representatives under a case manager to help develop prevention and intervention techniques and alternative strategies designed to improve student outcomes. If the behavior does not improve after implementation of the plan created by the Student Support Team, the Team may request a placement review for alternative placement conducted by a Central Student Support Team.

Referral to a Student Support Team for a Student with a 504 Plan
Holding a Student Support Team meeting to review and revise a student's 504 Plan to address behavior by considering additional behavior supports.
Removal from Extracurricular Activities/Loss of Privileges
Revoking a student's right to participate in extracurricular activities, including sports and clubs, or revoking a student's right to participate in school events or activities, such as attending a field trip or participating in a school dance. If the behavior warrants this consequence, any monies paid by the student for the missed activity should be refunded.

Restitution
Requiring a student to compensate others for any loss, damage, or injury that has resulted because of a student's behavior. Compensation may be made monetarily or by a student's assignment to a school work project, or both.

Pursuant to the COMAR 13A.08.01.11(D), if a student violates a State or local law or regulation, and during or as a result of the commission of that violation damaged, destroyed, or substantially decreased the value of school property or property of another that was on school property at the time, the principal shall require the student or the student's parent or guardian to make restitution, after a conference on the matter with the student, the student's guardian, and other appropriate individuals. Monetary restitution may not to exceed $2,500 or the fair market value of the property, whichever is lesser.

Restorative Justice Practices
Employing interventions, responses, and practices designed to identify and address the harm caused by an incident, and to develop a plan to heal and correct the situation with the student who caused the harm.

Suspension (In-School)
Removing a student within the school building “from the student’s education program for up to but not more than 10 days in a school year for disciplinary reasons by the school principal.” COMAR 13A.08.01.11(B)(4):
In school suspensions require the following:
 a) “A student may not receive an in-school suspension “unless the student has been informed of the reason for the suspension and has been given an opportunity to respond before the suspension becomes effective.
 b) The school principal shall provide the student's parents with written notification of the in-school suspension action taken by the school.
 c) After 10 days of cumulative in-school suspension, the student, the student's parents or guardian, and the principal shall confer.
 d) The student’s school of current enrollment shall make provision for the student’s education during the period of in-school suspension.
 e) Local school systems shall develop policies pertaining to student's participation in extracurricular activities if the student receives an in-school suspension.
 f) Local school systems shall develop and implement a behavioral program of positive interventions to address the causes of behavior as part of an in-school suspension.”

COMAR 13A.08.01.11(C)(2).
**Suspension (Short Term, Out-of-School)**
Removing a student from the school building for a specified period of time that is 10 school days or less, according to current state law.
A student may not be suspended solely for attendance-related issues. MARYLAND ANNOTATED CODE, EDUC. § 7-305(b)1.
A suspension is a lawful absence, COMAR 13A.08.01.03, therefore suspended students must be given access to make-up coursework, COMAR 13A.08.01.05(5).

Students should be given full credit for course work in accordance with school policies that control completion of work for credit following other excused absences.

**Suspension (Long Term, Out-of-School)**
The removal of a student from school for a time period between 4-10 school days for disciplinary reasons by the principal COMAR 13A.08.01.11(B)(5).
A student may not be suspended solely for attendance-related issues. MARYLAND CODE ANNOTATED, EDUC. § 7-305(b)1.

A suspension is a lawful absence, COMAR 13A.08.01.03, therefore suspended students must be given access to coursework, COMAR 13A.08.01.05

**Suspension (Extended, Out-of-School)**
Extended suspension -The exclusion of a student from the student's regular school program for a period between 11 and 45 days, which may only occur under the following circumstances:
(a) The superintendent or designated representative has determined that:
   (i) the student's return to school prior to the completion of the expulsion period would pose an imminent threat of serious harm to other students or staff; or
   (ii) the student has engaged in chronic and extreme disruption of the educational process that has created a substantial barrier to learning for other students across the school day, and other available and appropriate behavioral and disciplinary interventions have been exhausted.
(b) The superintendent or designated representative limits the duration of the exclusion to the greatest extent practicable.
(c) The school system provides the excluded student with comparable educational and appropriate behavior support services to promote successful return to the student's regular academic program.

COMAR 13A.08.01.11 (B)(3).

**Student Court**
Referring students to a “court” of peer jurors to resolve conflicts.

Note. All descriptions of response quoted from (Maryland Guidelines for State Code of Discipline, 2014)