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School violence, teen shootings, and similar tragedies are a chronic problem affecting America’s youth, parents, teachers and communities. As this publication was being prepared, two new school shootings occurred in Santee and El Cajone, California, suburbs of San Diego, killing two and injuring dozens more. Just a year ago, young Kayla Rollind was shot to death by a 7-year-old classmate at her elementary school in Mount Morris, Michigan. Few can forget the highly publicized shootings in Littleton, Colorado; Springfield, Oregon; West Paducah, Kentucky; Jonesboro, Arkansas; or Pearl, Mississippi, to name only a few. In the last several years, these high profile tragedies have resulted in more than 33 deaths and numerous wounded. Yet, for all the attention these horrors receive, they are a rarity and only scratch the surface of the chronic violence in schools and communities that affects America’s youth. The Office of the Surgeon General has identified youth violence as an epidemic, which has diminished in recent years but remains a critical issue for public health.

While the overall youth crime rate, and the homicide rate in particular, has been dropping since 1994 (homicide down 34% since 1993), the level of violence remains unacceptably high. For example, the percentage of students in grades 9 through 12 who were threatened or injured with a weapon on school property has remained constant in recent years. A downward trend in juvenile crime cannot detract from that fact that violence casts a pervasive shadow over America’s schools and youth.
Indeed the reports of attacks, harassment, weapons and so on have become so frequent and familiar as to seem commonplace and a part of the rhythm of daily life. The frequency and increasing severity of these events give pause to many parents, educators, community leaders and politicians, and motivate them to take action to curb the tide of violence that affects our schools and communities.

Clearly, states have a vested interest in providing a strong and secure education system, an interest that society has long recognized as one of its most compelling. In *Brown v. Board of Education* (1954), the Supreme Court observed:

> "... Education is perhaps the most important function of state and local governments... It is a principal instrument in awakening the child to cultural values, in preparing him for later professional training, and in helping him to adjust normally to his environment... It is doubtful that any child may reason-ably be expected to succeed in life if he is denied the opportunity of an education."

For this reason, school officials have a strong obligation, both moral and legal, to respond to undisciplined youths whose behavior potentially threatens the welfare and safety of the other children in attendance. This is particularly true in light of the fact that students do not have a fundamental right to a public education under the Constitution. As a general notion, the exercise of the privilege to a free and public education carries the corollary responsibility of the student to comply with reasonable rules, regulations, and requirements duly authorized by school authorities. Violation of these rules and regulations may be addressed by a variety of disciplinary methods.

Violence in schools raises a variety of legal issues regarding prevention, intervention and response to crisis. This guidebook seeks to outline the major legal issues faced by schools, including:
- School liability for violence
- Search & seizure, threats of violence
- Zero tolerance policies
- Use of student records

The following pages are broken down into sections which provide a brief overview of the key rules and guidelines for school officials and teachers in the given issue area. Endnotes for each section are located at the end of the publication as a guide for any additional research that may be necessary.

We hope that this information will prove a valuable resource to teachers and administrators who face these issues on a daily basis. While the research into these areas was comprehensive and exhaustive, we have endeavored to present guidelines in the most concise manner possible. As the title suggests, this publication is a starting point and general overview, which we hope will be useful to all teachers, school administrators, parents and students.

Please note that the guidelines and information presented in this document focus on the legal issues implicated by violence (shootings, assault, battery, and sexual assault, etc.) or the imminent threat of violence (verbal threats, possession of a weapon, etc.). Due to space considerations and the breadth of legal issues involved, this primer does not address other school safety issues such as gang activity and corollary student free speech rights, drug use and possession (except as specifically noted), theft, robbery, or other activities that do not involve actual physical harm or the threat of harm to students, teachers or administrators. Of course, we recognize these issues are interrelated and any separation of these concerns is artificial. Accordingly, we have endeavored to identify where connections with these issues exist and refer the reader to other publications for guidance.
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Generally, schools cannot guarantee safety for all students or teachers while at school. Yet, schools do have a duty to provide reasonable supervision of students and maintain the safety of the school grounds, especially since students are required to be at school under compulsory attendance rules. Acts of violence involving schools may place the school, its administrators or governing body at risk of civil or constitutional claims when violence occurs. However, even where a school may have a duty to supervise, the school will not be liable for sudden, spontaneous violence. “Spontaneous or planned acts of violence by students on school grounds do not create liability on behalf of the school board if the school ground is otherwise well supervised.”
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End Notes

1This section outlines the school’s potential for liability under civil or constitutional claims when violence occurs.

2Spontaneous or planned acts of violence by students on school grounds do not create liability on behalf of the school board if the school ground is otherwise well supervised. Courts support this rule for a variety of reasons usually observing that spontaneous violence is not foreseeable, that additional security measures are unlikely to prevent such violence in any case, or that the violent act is an intervening cause of the injury to the victims.

Previous incidents in same location

A school may have a duty to supervise a particular area of school grounds depending on whether similar acts have occurred in that area previously. The recency, frequency, location and nature of the prior crimes will be factors in determining whether the crimes establish a duty to supervise. Common sense dictates that a school will be liable if a person is injured in an area where attacks of the same type occur often. Please note, however, that courts in some states have concluded that only
similar crimes in a given location create a duty to supervise, while in other states they indicate a school may be liable where there is a generally high level of violence at a school or the school is in a high crime area.

Time and location of incident
Liability may depend on the time and location of the incident. For example, a school may be liable for violence suffered by students while in the school parking lot, or while on their way to and from the school grounds. Normally, however, a school will not be liable where an incident occurs off-campus, during non-school hours, and is not related to school sponsored activities. For example, a school incurred no liability for the assault of a young female student after an evening of drinking at a local bar and the activity had no relation to school sponsored events, or where an elementary school student wandered from school grounds and was subsequently kidnapped and murdered. See Case at a Glance: Chavez v. Tolleson Elementary School District (Arizona, 1973).

Attacker's dangerous propensities
A school will be liable where it fails to safeguard other students or teachers from someone with a known propensity to violence. School officials must warn intended and identifiable victims where serious danger from a known suspect exists, and the warning must be specific and complete.

School Safety Plans
Comprehensive school safety plans are an integral part of school management, yet the decision to adopt and implement a plan may not protect a school from potential liability. A school may be held to a greater standard to ensure supervision and safety where it adopts a school safety plan. Courts have held schools liable in such circumstances under the belief that a school increases efforts to curb violence, it assumes a greater duty to supervise students and persons on school grounds in part because people rely on the provisions of the plan to protect them.

Please note that the opposite is true as well. In light of current youth violence levels, liability will be asserted where a

On the morning of September 17, 1973, a puppy walked through the open door of a fifth grade classroom at Tolleson Elementary School. Unit Two, causing a disturbance among the students. The teacher inquired if the dog belonged to anyone in the class, and Regina asked if she could take the puppy home. The teacher sent Regina to the to the Principal’s office with the dog to get permission. The school office is located inside the school grounds some 30 feet away from the classroom. On arrival at the office with the dog, Regina was instructed by the school secretary to place the dog outside the office along the breezeway and to return to her classroom. Regina did not argue with the secretary and left the office with the puppy. A custodian, a fellow student and a passerby observed Regina leaving the office. Regina’s fate after leaving the office was detailed in the tape-recorded statement of her abduction. The teacher who was later convicted and sentenced for her murder. Cuffie stated he abducted Regina outside the school grounds and took her to a field six miles from the school where he killed her. Her body was found some three months later in a field a few miles from the school. Regina’s parents sued the school district for wrongful death.

The trial resulted in a jury verdict for Regina’s parents, which was overturned by the trial judge because they failed to establish that the school could have reasonably foreseen that Regina would be kidnapped and killed as she traveled between her class and the office.

The Arizona Court of Appeals upheld this decision on the grounds that there were insufficient facts to indicate that school personnel should have been aware of the potential of criminal conduct in the area of the school. The court stated “the heinous criminal conduct involved here, while shocking, is clearly in the category of the unforeseeable. If it were otherwise, it would defeat the very purpose and the routine of daily life would be burdened by insufferable fear and inaction.” Consequently, where the school could not reasonably foresee that Regina would leave the school grounds without permission and therefore be abducted and slain, they were not liable for her death.

School Liability

In addition, school attendance, while compulsory, does not create a special relationship that requires a school to shoulder responsibility for the entire personal lives of students, or for any harm that might befall them. Ultimately, parents retain custody and the primary responsibility for children and their well-being. In short, compulsory attendance laws do not create a custodial relationship between a school and a student that imposes a duty on the school to protect the student from harm.

2. State Created Danger
A school may be liable under the Constitution for harm to a student by a private actor or employee, if the school’s actions “created” the danger of possible harm. Generally, liability will depend on several factors:

1) The environment created by the school must be inherently dangerous;
2) The school officials must know it is dangerous; and
3) School officials must have used their authority to create or maintain the harmful conditions.

Constitutional Claims
American courts are very reluctant to extend constitutional protection to situations covered by state civil liability rules. Readers are urged to contact their local school counsel for specific advice regarding constitutional liability and substantive due process concerns raised by violence in schools.

Generally, constitutional claims rest on three theories of school liability, very similar to those outlined above:

1) Whether there is a “special relationship” creating a duty to protect students from harm;
2) Whether school policies reflected a “deliberate indifference” to the constitutional rights of students; and
3) Whether the school failed to provide adequate security.

Mere inaction is not sufficient. A claim of constitutional liability will fail absent some proof that actions by the school caused the danger and the possibility of harm. Accordingly, schools have not been held liable constitutionally in a variety of circumstances:

- Where school officials received complaints that a teacher was sexually involved with students and did not discipline the teacher.
- Where students were killed by random shooting at a school dance,
- Where a student was killed by a non-student trespasser,
- Where the school knew of the violent propensities of a student who later killed a fellow student.

Please note that while these examples may be disturbing, they focus on constitutional liability; the schools involved may have suffered state civil liability in these cases. Consequently,
the reader is urged to contrast these examples with cases dis-
cussed above that assess civil liability for failure to protect
against an individual (teacher or student) with known propen-
sity to violence.

3. Harm Inflicted by School Employees or Officials

Where a school employee inflicts harm on a student, that act
may be viewed as a constitutional violation. If so, supervisory
officials and school boards may be liable under the Constitution
if they allowed a practice or policy of deliberate indifference to
the constitutional rights of students and the policy or practice
caused the harm.

These scenarios usually involve the sexual assault or physical
injury of a student by a teacher, although some cases address
student on student harm.

Typically, school officials are held
legally responsible where they have received several complaints
about inappropriate or dangerous acts and responded inade-
quately, i.e. they took no action, or they suppressed or con-
cealed the complaints.

The primary issues in this area revolve around the following
questions:

1) Whether protection from a particular kind of harm is a
   constitutional right;
2) Whether the accused teachers or employees are acting
   “under color of” state authority when they commit the
   alleged acts; and
3) Whether the officials’ indifference actually caused or
   contributed to the harm.

Unfortunately, this area of the law is highly unclear so gen-
eral guidelines are difficult to offer. School officials are urged to
consult with their local school legal counsel for advice regarding
any specific questions or circumstances.

Workers Compensation

Injury to students or school personnel presents the potential
that school districts may face liability under worker’s compen-
sation statutes.

Generally, injury on the job will be compensable if the like-
lihood of injury was increased by employment, either due to the
nature of the job or because of the susceptibility to injury asso-
ciated with the work environment. Schools have been held
liable in a variety of circumstances, including, for example:
where a teacher was required to accept a student with known
violent and aggressive tendencies into the teacher’s class despite
his or her objections, where a teacher attempted to restrain a
violent student, where a teacher was asked to chaperone a
school athletic event without proper training, and where a
teacher was assaulted by a member of a student’s family.

Defenses to Claims against Schools

Schools may argue that they are not liable for violent acts
of students or non-students either on or off campus. They may
assert governmental immunity, official immunity, intervening
or supervening causes, contributory negligence or assumption
of risk by the victim. For the sake of space, these defenses are
not reviewed in detail here. Please consult with your school
attorney regarding any specific questions or situations.
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Checklist - School Liability

1. School personnel should exercise the same degree of
care as a reasonably prudent parent in the supervision
of students.
2. School personnel will be liable where they can
reasonably be expected to foresee the potential danger
of a situation resulting in injury to a student,
regardless of whether they actually did or not.
3. A higher standard of care may be expected during
activities with a higher foreseeable level of risk, such as
field trips, excursions involving students, laboratories,
physical education classes, and contact sports.
4. All school personnel have a responsibility to ensure
that school grounds and buildings are safe for student
use.
5. School officials should provide supervision for
students on school grounds or at school related
activities, before and after the school day.
6. Unacceptable behavior by teachers and administrators
should be clearly stated in a school or district policy
with restrictions on any actions that may be
considered assault and/or battery or intended to cause
emotional harm, especially in cases involving physical
punishment.
7. Schools should develop a culture and set of values that
place a high premium on respect for the dignity of
every individual involved in the school community
and require workshops and seminars periodically to
ensure that school personnel are aware of safety and
liability issues.
8. Schools must keep personal information regarding
students confidential except where sharing that
information is required by law, but school officials
must operate in good faith with no intent to harm a
student’s reputation.
9. Board of education members may be held liable for
their individual acts that result in the violation of a
student’s rights.
The level and variety of school violence may place significant pressure on school officials to use a range of methods to intercept guns and weapons in schools or to respond to threats of violence. These methods may include metal detectors, random searches of lockers or individuals, or individual searches of students suspected of wrongdoing. Administrators and teachers may rely on tips from other students, camera surveillance and, in some instances, strip searches. This section outlines the basic legal rules in each of these areas.

Search and Seizure

Generally, school officials may search a student “if the search is justified at its inception and is conducted in a manner reasonably related in scope to the circumstances.”

The reasonableness standard is intended “to ensure student’s rights will be invaded no more than necessary to maintain order in schools,” not to authorize all searches conceivable to school officials.

A search will be justified where there are reasonable grounds for suspecting a search will reveal contraband, or evidence that a student is violating school rules.

The permissible scope of a search depends on whether the measures used are reasonably related to the objective of the search and not excessively intrusive given the age and sex of the student and nature of the infraction. General exploratory or sweep searches are usually impermissible under constitutional standards.

Accordingly, school officials may inspect a student’s bag (purse, backpack, duffel) and clothing for hidden weapons, cigarettes and drugs where they have reason to do so (e.g. a tip that appears to be reliable, observation of materials associated with drug use, bulges in clothing characteristic of weapons). As additional examples, school officials may search a student for weapons where they notice a bulge in a student’s clothing characteristic of knives and the officials received an anonymous tip that a student had a weapon. Security officers may frisk a student and proceed on reasonable suspicion resulting from the stop. Searches may be conducted where a student does not possess the proper school pass and acts excited, aggressive or exhibits other signs of potential drug use when confronted by school officials.

Reasonable suspicion by school officials may rest on numerous other factors, including:

- Possession of cigarette rolling papers commonly associated with marijuana use.
- Faltering and nervous behavior by a student without a pass in a school restroom frequently used for narcotics activity.
- Previous misconduct and unusually heavy use of public telephone.
- Furtive gestures.
- Drug paraphernalia observed through a car window.
- Weapons observed through a car window.
- Observation of a request to sell drugs or actual sale of pills.
- Observation of students smoking and the odor of marijuana.
- Record of concealed weapons combined with suspicious behavior.
- Bulging pockets and possession of a large sum of money.
- Reports of sale of firecrackers or other explosive materials.
... their identification through the use of a profile because the profile provides the officers with reasonable suspicion to stop a suspect. 37 Generally, individuals may be searched based on factors giving rise to reasonable suspicion are also part of a profile “does not somehow detract from their evidentiary significance...” 38

Based on this background, a profile may well be an acceptable method of identifying students who may present a risk to the safety of a school and may be stopped for additional questioning. The profile, however, should not stand alone as the only factor justifying a search. School officials might use a profile to stop students to inquire about their activities, but probably need other suspicious behavior or other corroborating information in order to conduct a full search of the student’s person or property. A school official needs reasonable grounds for suspecting a search will reveal contraband, or evidence that a student is violating school rules under the circumstances. A profile march on a student tells the school official nothing regarding the presence of contraband or whether a student is violating school rules in a specific instance, so it should not be the only basis for the search or detention of a student.

Risk Factors - “Profiles”

In some circumstances, a list of risk factors for youth violence or a profile of a potentially dangerous student may be used as grounds to stop a student for questioning or to search his or her possessions or person. There is no specific legal rule, such as a Supreme Court decision, addressing the use of risk factor lists or profiles in the school setting. The general rule discussed above in conjunction with the guidelines on the use of drug courier and passenger profiles used in airports provide some direction for the use of a profile in a school.

The Supreme Court has expressly approved the use of “probabilistic” profiles in the airport setting to identify potential drug couriers or terrorists. 39 In these circumstances, the fact that lists of factors giving rise to reasonable suspicion are also part of a profile “does not somehow detract from their evidentiary signficance...” 40 Generally, individuals may be searched based on their identification through the use of a profile because the profile provides the officers with reasonable suspicion to stop a suspect. 41

Profiles are treated as an objective and useful tool and are valid so long as they leave no room for subjective interpretation by airline personnel or security authorities, and are not applied in a discriminatory fashion. 42

Based on this background, a profile may well be an acceptable method of identifying students who may present a risk to the safety of a school and may be stopped for additional questioning. The profile, however, should not stand alone as the only factor justifying a search. School officials might use a profile to stop students to inquire about their activities, but probably need other suspicious behavior or other corroborating information in order to conduct a full search of the student’s person or property. A school official needs reasonable grounds for suspecting a search will reveal contraband, or evidence that a student is violating school rules under the circumstances. A profile march on a student tells the school official nothing regarding the presence of contraband or whether a student is violating school rules in a specific instance, so it should not be the only basis for the search or detention of a student.

Lockers Searches

Generally locker searches are permissible as a function of the orderly administration of a school. Schools should adopt and carry out a policy informing students that the school owns the locker and may search it from time to time. 43

A locker search should not extend to a student’s private articles, such as jackets, purses, and backpacks, within the locker. The student rightly considers these items private and a school official must possess individualized reasonable suspicion to search them. 44

Metal Detectors

Metal detector searches also appear permissible under constitutional standards. Although individualized suspicion is normally required for a search, general searches are permissible where the search is minimally intrusive and the individual has a low reasonable expectation of privacy, such as at the entrance to a school. Metal detector searches are valid where notice (a post-ed sign, for example) has been given stating that such searches will be conducted at that school, and where a school policy governs the search. 45

Allegations of previous illegal activity (as old as six months) may contribute to the reasonable suspicion, particularly where new incidents of suspected illegal behavior are present. Strip searches in cases of imminent physical harm to students or school personnel are probably justified especially where weapons are involved. Imminent circumstances would mean that a student presents an immediate and impending threat to himself or others, such as where a student threatens to use a weapon the student appears to possess (as indicated by a characteristic bulge in clothing, for example) but is detained before he or she can carry out the threat.

The important issue to remember is that as the intrusiveness of the search increases, so does the concern regarding whether the search is reasonable. School officials must consider the age and sex of the student involved. Accordingly, if school officials plan to make a student disrobe to locate contraband items, they are encouraged to pursue an exhaustive search of possible alternative locations for the contraband item (weapon/drugs), establish other grounds to search the student possessed the item (a reliable witness, or the elimination of all other


In September 1999, school and safety officials at Westland High School in Galloway, Ohio, noticed a partially concealed Smith and Wesson .44 magnum gun protruding from under the front driver’s side seat of a car owned by Stephen Koser, a 17-year-old student at the school. Subsequent investigation by school officials and a sheriff’s deputy confirmed that the gun was a plastic toy gun that had a bright orange tip which had been covered from view.

When Koser was asked to return to the Assistant Principal’s office, he became belligerent and hostile, and refused to return to school. Eventually, he was persuaded to return to the building, but on the walk back, he began to use profanity, was disruptive and started to make veiled threats. During the time he spent in the office, Koser made threatening statements such as: “This is how I solve my problems.” “I’ll want to bring a real gun to school, I would have brought a gun and blown holes in this mother, “I get rid of my problems,” and “every dog has his day and you’ll get yours.” Koser said to the Deputy, “If you take your gun and badge off, you want to get froggy, leap,” which was interpreted a direct threat and an attempt by Koser to instigate a fight.

Koser was suspended and subsequently expelled for the remainder of the academic term based on possession of a “look-a-like gun” on school property, use of repeated profanity, disruptive behavior, and threats directed at school officials. The suspension was challenged by Koser’s mother, Jerrie Turner, but subsequent-ly upheld throughout appeals to school authorities, the local school board, and the courts.
Threats of Violence

Students sometimes will threaten to hurt or shoot fellow students out of frustration, fear or a genuine intent to harm. Distinguishing between mere bravo or destructive impulses, constitutionally protected speech or threats, is a delicate matter. (See Case at a Glance: Turner v. South-Western City School District.)

Threats of violence and protected speech may be separated, however, and genuine threats should be dealt with discipline for the students uttering them. Whether a school may discipline a student for a threat rests on whether it can reasonably be inferred that the threat is a serious expression of intent to harm or assault another person.44 A student may be punished where he/she has “directly and unambiguously threatened physical harm” to a fellow student or teacher.45

Accordingly, students’ speech rights may be limited where they infringe on the rights of others to be secure and left alone, such as disrupting class-work, causing substantial disorder or invading the personal rights of others.46 Students have been appropriately suspended or expelled for voicing threats of violence in a variety of circumstances, including:

- Threatening to shoot a high school guidance counselor if a class schedule was not changed.47
- Threatening to rape a teacher and the teacher’s daughter and bragging to other students about the threats.48
- Threatening to shoot a high school guidance counselor if a class schedule was not changed.49
- Threatening to shoot a high school guidance counselor if a class schedule was not changed.50
- Verbal assault of school officials and using “veiled threats” after an erroneous identification of a gun in a student's car.51

(See Case at a Glance: Turner v. South-Western City School District, inset above.)

Finally, school conduct codes should clearly identify the behavior related to threats that could result in discipline. This will provide teachers, students and parents with an enforceable understanding of the appropriate conduct in school.

Camera

Technology increases the ability of school officials to monitor the activity of the student population through advanced camera and recording systems. The key question is whether a student has an expectation of privacy in the area being filmed. Accordingly, photographing public areas such as buses, hallways, classrooms, and cafeterias is permissible, while the use of a camera in a gym locker room or bathroom is normally unacceptable.52

Use of Evidence Gathered in a Search & Rumlifications of Searches without Reasonable Grounds

Assume that a school official searches a student and retrieves a weapon without first establishing reasonable grounds to do so (thereby violating constitutional protections). Under ordinary circumstances, the exclusionary rule would prohibit the use of the weapon as evidence against the student in any subsequent criminal or delinquency proceedings against him. The exclusionary rule provides that “evidence may not be used in a criminal trial if it was the product of illegal police conduct.”53 So, the question arises, does the exclusionary rule apply in the school setting?

Three federal courts have held that the exclusionary rule applies to school disciplinary proceedings to assure protection of student's constitutional rights.54 Accordingly, under this interpretation a weapon discovered in an unreasonable search could not be considered in an expulsion hearing.

However, several federal district courts during the last ten years have held that the exclusionary rule does not apply, allowing the unlawfully obtained evidence to be considered in school disciplinary proceedings.55 There is no Supreme Court decision on record, and consequently, no overall guiding legal rule on this point. Consequently, school officials are urged to consult with competent local legal counsel for an understanding of the rule in their area and advice regarding any specific questions or circumstances.

In addition, evidence or information gathered as a result of the search of a student may be kept in the student's education record or school disciplinary record. Readers are referred to the "Use of Student Records" section of this guide where the legal requirements affecting student records are discussed.

Defenses to Claims Against Schools

Some students and their families will challenge the validity of the actions of school officials in conducting searches and otherwise managing school safety and operations in compliance with constitutional standards. Schools may assert standard defenses allowed to them, including: governmental immunity, official immunity, failure to state a claim, and substantive defenses to constitutional claims. For the sake of space, these defenses are not reviewed in detail here. Please consult with your school attorney regarding any specific questions or situations.

Checklist - Search & Seizure

- A student’s freedom from unreasonable search should be carefully balanced against the need for school officials to maintain order, discipline and protect health, safety and welfare of all students.56
- A decision to conduct a school search should be based on reasonable grounds for believing it will produce evidence of misconduct or contraband (drugs, weapons, stolen property) and consider factors such as the need for the search, the student’s age, history and record of behavior, the gravity of the problem, and the need for an immediate search.57
- Arbitrary searches, general sweep searches or mass shakedowns are not reasonable and are illegal.
- Teachers and school officials should document their preliminary observations, sources of information, tips, investigative steps or other evidence that led to reasonable grounds for a search.
- The information leading to school searches should be independent of police activity. Probable cause and a search warrant must accompany searches involving law enforcement.
Zero tolerance policies generally require mandatory suspension or expulsion for students caught possessing a weapon, engaging in violent behavior or using/possessing drugs. In many cases, the use of such policies is clearly necessary: a student brings a gun to school and threatens to use it against a fellow student or teacher. However, this is not always the case. Increasingly, reports show that students have been suspended or expelled for apparently trivial mistakes, including:

- Bringing a gun, owned by a student’s police officer father, to school for show and tell.56
- Pointing a finger at another student and saying “bang.”57
- A seven-year-old boy bringing a nail clipper to school.58
- Turning in a gun brought to school by another student.59

In addition to these extremes of application, the question of racial bias arises in the implementation of zero tolerance programs. A study in Michigan, for example, established that African-American students were suspended and expelled from school at a rate 250% greater than white students.60 This higher rate would only be appropriate if African-American students committed crimes at a rate 250% greater than white students.

Clearly then, adoption and application of zero tolerance policies has ventured into unexpected and uncertain territory. These developments raise important civil liberties issues regarding the right to an education and due process. The following review will outline the basic legal issues raised by zero tolerance policies.

**Zero Tolerance: Suspension & Expulsion**

Zero tolerance policies in the various states draw much of their inspiration from the federal Gun Free Schools Act of 1994 (GFSA). In essence, the GFSA requires each state receiving federal funds under the Elementary and Secondary Education Act to expel, for a period of not less than one year, any student found with a weapon on school grounds.61 Weapons may include firearms designed to propel a projectile by an explosive reaction, including starter guns, the components of any such device, silencers or other destructive devices such as bombs, poison gas, grenades, rockets, missiles or mines.62 The GFSA should be distinguished from the Gun Free School Zones Act (1990), which prohibited the possession of a weapon or firearm within 1000 feet of a designated school or school property. The Gun Free School Zones Act was overturned in 1995 by the U.S. Supreme Court as a violation of Congress’ power under the Commerce Clause of the Constitution. Subsequently amended with greater findings, the revised Gun Free School Zones Act (1996) maintains a prohibition against the possession of a firearm or weapon in a place a person knows or should reasonably know is a school zone, but does not address zero tolerance policies.63

Under the 1994 Gun Free Schools Act (GFSA), federal funds may be denied to states that fail to adopt a zero tolerance policy for firearms. The GFSA allows local school officials to modify firearm-related expulsion requirements on a case by case basis, but does not define modification or outline the circumstances under which such modifications would be appropriate.64
Suspension for off-campus activity
A student generally may be disciplined for off-campus conduct if school authorities can show that the student's actions have a direct and immediate effect on either school discipline or the safety and welfare of students and staff. Usefulness, if the off-campus activity involves two or more students from the same school then a sufficient connection will be established to warrant school discipline. However, this type of direct connection is not required.

Due Process - Suspension & Expulsion
It is clear that certain procedural requirements must be followed if a student is to be suspended for a substantial period of time or expelled from a school. The Supreme Court noted in a famous line from the case of Tinker v. Des Moines School District that students do not "shed their constitutional rights at the school house gate." The Supreme Court held in a later case, Goss v. Lopez, that a student's legitimate entitlement to a public education [is] a property interest which is protected by the Due Process Clause and may not be taken away for misconduc- tion without adherence to the minimum procedure required by that clause."

Suspensions
In cases involving suspensions of ten days or less, a student must be provided with the following due process:
1) Oral or written notice of the charges against him/her;
2) An explanation of the reasons for the charges, i.e. the evidence; and
3) An opportunity to present his/her side of the story.

The requirement of a hearing does not mean it must be as formal as a trial: an informal review of the evidence will be sufficient. In addition, no delay between notice to the student and the hearing is necessary, since a school official "may informally discuss the alleged misconduct with the student minutes after it has occurred."
Generally, notice and a hearing must precede a student’s removal from school, except where the student presents an imminent threat to himself or the safety of others. Emergency situations justifying the immediate suspension or expulsion of a student may include conduct that:

1) Seriously disrupts the academic atmosphere of the school,
2) Endangers other students, teachers or school officials, or
3) Damages property.

In emergency situations, a two-step approach may be employed:
1) Immediately impose a temporary suspension or expulsion,
2) Enforce a permanent expulsion after the proper notice and hearing.

In these scenarios, notice and a hearing must be provided as soon as practicable. Notice should be sent to the student’s parents within 24 hours of a decision to conduct disciplinary proceedings, and a hearing should be held within 72 hours (three days) of the student’s removal.

Due Process Checklist for Suspensions:
- Determine whether applicable state law imposes any special requirements or procedures regarding the suspension of students or the imposition of other minor disciplinary measures.
- Follow school board policies or procedures regarding the suspension of students or the imposition of other minor disciplinary measures.
- If the student is disabled, comply with any applicable special procedures.
- Determine who has authority to suspend a student or impose discipline.
- Regularly inform students and parents of disciplinary policies, including zero tolerance.
- Determine whether the alleged misconduct is a proper basis for suspension.
- Promptly provide the student oral or written notice of the specific misconduct of which he/she is accused and the proposed disciplinary measure.
- If the student denies the misconduct of which he/she is accused, provide the student an explanation of the evidence that the education institution has against him.
- Allow the student the opportunity to present his/her side of the story. Provide adequate time with no interruptions.
- If the student’s presence endangers persons or property or threatens disruption of the academic process, immediately remove the student from school, but provide notice and a hearing as soon as possible.
- Inform local juvenile justice and law enforcement authorities that the student has been removed for endangering persons or property.
- Impose the proposed disciplinary measure unless the student adequately refutes the misconduct of which he is accused.
- Notify the student’s parents or guardian of the school’s actions, including the charges against the student, a description of the evidence, the length of the suspension, any conditions for the student’s return to school (e.g., a parent conference) and information on appeal of the suspension.
- Parents or guardians should be notified immediately by phone, followed by written notification by registered mail.
- If requested by the student or parent, review the action taken, under applicable procedures.

Due Process Checklist for Expulsions:
- Determine whether applicable state law imposes any special requirements or procedures regarding the suspension of students or the imposition of other minor disciplinary measures.
- Follow board policies or procedures regarding the suspension of students or the imposition of other minor disciplinary measures.
- If the student is disabled, comply with any applicable special procedures.
- Determine who has authority to suspend a student or impose discipline.
- Regularly inform students and parents of discipline policies, including zero tolerance.

Preliminary Procedures
- Determine whether the alleged misconduct is a proper basis for an expulsion.
- Notify the student and/or his/her parents or guardians, in writing, of the misconduct of which he is accused, the factual basis of the charges, the specific provisions of any student disciplinary code allegedly violated, the right of the student to a hearing and procedures to be followed at the hearing, the right of the student to be represented by an attorney or other counsel, whether a hearing must be requested or whether it has been or will be scheduled automatically, and provide the
Creating a safe school environment requires extensive communications among schools, law enforcement and social service agencies. Such cooperation involves significant record-keeping about the presence of an alleged perpetrator, the type and severity of an alleged violent incident, the identity of all witnesses involved, and the identities of other students and school personnel who were the subject of any inappropriate behavior. The appropriate use of these records is essential for schools and the educational process.

Family Educational and Privacy Rights Act (FERPA)
The confidentiality of student records (educational, medical and disciplinary) has long been regarded as a compelling state interest, requiring courts, state agencies and school boards to take the initiative to protect the identities of students. The leading legal framework on the appropriate use of student records is the Family Educational and Privacy Rights Act (FERPA). Generally, FERPA allows schools to collect information concerning disciplinary action taken against a student for conduct that "poses a significant risk to the safety or well-being of that student, other students or other members of the school community." In addition, schools may disclose that information to teachers or school officials who have a "legitimate educational interest in the behavior of the student." Accordingly, a school may track the type and severity of violent incidents through regular reports included in a student's education record. These records would be considered disciplinary records because they involve reports of actual incidents of behavior requiring disciplinary action. Moreover, to the extent these records are maintained by a law enforcement office within the school, they will be considered law enforcement records, similar to crime reports that include investigations and the results of psychological tests used for diagnostic purposes.

Sharing Disciplinary Records
Juvenile education and medical records are generally regarded as confidential, even after being provided to other agencies in accordance with law, and may be sealed in court proceedings despite a presumption that such proceedings are open to the public and media. The delicate matter of reporting student information to an outside agency or another school or institution is addressed directly by FERPA. It is important to note that a school is not required to disclose information relating to wrongdoing by a student, but schools have the discretion to do so. FERPA governs both the request for information received by a school and the school's voluntary interest in providing information to an outside agency, such as law enforcement, social service agencies, or mental health counseling services. Consequently, the following guidelines apply where a school receives a request for student information or where the school may wish to volunteer student information.
Generally, a school that discloses a record must take three steps before releasing the record:  
1) Make a reasonable attempt to notify the parent or the student;  
2) Provide a copy of the record that it proposes to release; and  
3) Provide a hearing if requested.

Schools or Educational Institutions  
A school may disclose information to another school or institution that the student is attending if the student is enrolled or receives services from the other institution, and the preceding conditions are met. Student disciplinary records may be shared between schools attended by the student in question, with the appropriate notice to parents. This flexibility for schools is specifically addressed in the federal legislation, recognized by many state courts, and normally a benefit to the student.

Non-School Agencies or Organizations: Law Enforcement & Social Service Agencies  
FERPA generally restricts access to student records by non-school individuals or organizations. Generally, funds will be denied to any school that allows disclosure of student records without written consent from the parents with a few exceptions. The statute's exceptions allow disclosure of even personally identifiable information from educational records without the consent of the student or parents under the following circumstances:  
• To state or local juvenile justice officials;  
• To organizations conducting educational studies;  
• In health and safety emergencies;  
• Disciplinary records.  

These exceptions are sufficiently broad, for example, to allow possession of a criminal defendant's school records by a prosecutor when the records had no apparent relation to the case being prosecuted.

Risk Factor/Behavioral/Threat Assessments: "Profiles"  
FERPA also controls the use of information regarding particular acts or issues, including violent acts, drug possession, weapons possession, destruction of property, disruptive behavior and psychological or mental health assessments of students at risk for violence ("profiles"), as described below.

Violent Acts  
FERPA allows the reporting of violent acts such as homicide, rape, assault, or the imminent threat of such acts. Information regarding such actions by students may be reported voluntarily by the school or upon request by an outside agency.

Drug or Weapons Possession  
FERPA allows the reporting of information related to the possession of drugs or weapons by students on school grounds, voluntarily or at the request of outside agencies.

Anti-social or Disruptive Behavior  
To the extent disruptive or anti-social behavior includes the destruction of property or vandalism it may be reported to law enforcement, voluntarily or on request. Other forms of anti-social or disruptive behavior that do not fall into any of the previously mentioned categories will require notification to and consent of the student’s parents before the information can be released to a third party. This type of behavior might include, yelling in class, name-calling, disrespect for teachers or other school officials, bullying, intimidation, or similar behavior that does not reach the level of destruction of property or assault of fellow students or school personnel.

Use of Student Records  
Risk Factor/Behavioral/Threat Assessments: "Profiles"  
FERPA does not address this area directly and does not provide an exception for this type of information in a student's record. Therefore, the release of information on student achievement, behavioral or academic history, personal interests, extracurricular activity or similar background information on a student is governed by the general provisions of FERPA, meaning the release must be accompanied by notification and consent of the student's parents or guardians. Both the U.S. Department of Education and the Federal Bureau of Investigations (U.S. Department of Justice) have expressed grave reservations about the use or misuse of profiles in schools, so extreme caution is recommended. Please contact the Department of Education at www.ed.gov/offices/OESE/SDFS or www.treas.gov/uss/index.htm?ntac.html; or the FBI at www.fbi.gov/library.htm for additional information.

State Law  
State law also affects whether a school is required to report information regarding a student's conduct or may exercise discretion on such matters. Generally, federal statutes and state law require schools report to law enforcement officials on any criminal or violent acts (assault, homicide, child abuse) or possession of weapons or drugs. Property damage, vandalism, and destruction of property may or may not come under the a state reporting requirement. In addition, internal school board policies based on state or local requirements may govern these areas, and readers are urged to contact local legal authorities to determine the specific rules in their community.

Response to release of student records  
Schools will not be liable in a civil suit by students or parents for FERPA violations, primarily due to the exclusive remedies by the Secretary of Education provided in the federal statute. FERPA may create, however, a right actionable under civil rights statutes. American courts are split on this issue so readers are advised to contact their local school counsel for guidance in this area. It is clear, however, that administrative remedies need not be exhausted for a person to bring suit against a school under civil rights laws.
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Checklist - Student Records

- Recognize that the student may always seek appropriate judicial relief.
- Schools should adopt policies and procedures consistent with the requirements of FERPA. Students, parents, and legal guardians should be informed of their rights under this act.
- Accurate student records should be maintained. Student records should include the name, title, date, description of educational interest, specific records examined, and the place of examination.
- Any corrections or adjustments to student records should be dated and initialed by the person responsible, with the knowledge and approval of school officials.
- School personnel should avoid labeling children.
- Disciplinary information in student records should be specific regarding the infraction committed - time, place, and witnesses, as appropriate. The student should be informed of the information recorded and provided a copy as appropriate.
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