

#### WHY AN "INTERACTIVE" SESSION?

- Requested via feedback from last year.
- Practice makes perfect!
- Consideration of different perspectives strengthens decision-making.
- Thoughtful navigation of "hard" questions.





## IT'S YOUR TURN!

- Consider each situation carefully and identify the issue(s). What was handled correctly and what was handled incorrectly?
- Remember that perspective matters:
  - Did the school leader utilize good judgment and decision-making?
  - Does the governing board need to take any action? What's their role in the situation?
  - Should the authorizer be concerned? Did the school potentially violate the charter contract? What should their next steps be?
  - What's the parent perspective and how can the school best address any concerns while simultaneously meeting all other obligations?

# **PERSPECTIVE MATTERS!**









School Leader – primary concern is maintaining order and a positive school culture Governing Board member – accountable to numerous groups, including the authorizer, parents and the community

Authorizer – responsible for ensuring that schools act in accordance with their charter contract and established law

Parent – primary concern is his/her student





### THE SCHOOL

- Mountainview Preparatory Academy (MPA) serves a diverse yet affluent student body of only 353 students in grades 9-12.
- Students are taught utilizing a rigorous STEM-infused PBL curriculum.
- The school touts parent involvement and few discipline issues as evidence of its positive school culture.

- On Wednesday, October 3<sup>rd</sup>, the school leader, Dr. Rafferty, receives a report from one of the 11<sup>th</sup> grade teachers concerning student SG. The teacher reported that SG exhibited some noticeable bruising along his arms and hairline. When questioned about the bruises, the student was defensive and unable to explain the source of the bruising. Fearing a potential abuse situation and aware of her obligations as a mandated reporter, the teacher informs Dr. Rafferty immediately after 1<sup>st</sup> period.
- Dr. Rafferty is familiar with SG and his parents. SG is a well-liked football player with no academic or discipline issues. SG's father is the town's District Attorney and his mother serves as MPA's Operations Manager.
- Dr. Rafferty decides it would be prudent to discuss the situation with SG's parents before proceeding any further and makes a mental note to stop by the Operations office the following morning.
- SG's mother also noticed the bruising on her son, but assumed it to be from football practice. To be safe, Dr. Rafferty also places a phone call to SG's father and receives a similar response.
- However, when Dr. Rafferty speaks to the football coach, the coach is adamant that the bruising could not have been caused by practice because practice was canceled Monday and Tuesday due to weather.
- To be safe, Dr. Rafferty make a report to the proper authorities first thing Friday morning.
- SG's father alleges that Dr. Rafferty has committed a FERPA violation.

- Shortly after making the report regarding SG, Dr. Rafferty receives a call from an extremely angry parent.
- The parent alleges that her daughter, HB, was touched inappropriately by another female student, WL, without her consent. The parent stated that HB informed her of the incident which occurred when the Chemistry teacher stepped out of the classroom momentarily.
- After confirming that both HB and WL are in the same Chemistry class and also confirming that the teacher had stepped out of the class momentarily, Dr. Rafferty makes a report to the appropriate authorities.
- Dr. Rafferty then calls the parents of WL to let them know that their daughter would be expelled from school, effective immediately given MPA's zero-tolerance policy for physical altercation and sexual assault.
- WL is later proven innocent and the parents of WL file a lawsuit against MPA citing breach of due process and defamation.



- Following the expulsion of WL, several students target HB out of anger for her role in WL being expelled.
- A verbal altercation turns physical and student MK begins hitting HB multiple times. HB responds with a punch that allows her to separate from MK.
- The altercation drew the attention of nearby teachers and both HB and MK are sent to Dr. Rafferty's office.
- MK acknowledges her role in the altercation but HB maintains that her role was limited to that of self-defense.
- Nonetheless, citing MPA's zero-tolerance policy, both MK and HB are suspended for 3 days.

- On day 2 of MK and HB's 3 day suspension, the two meet in a public park for a rematch and invite other students from MPA to watch. HB and MK have an all out brawl, and the local city police quickly show up to break up the fight. MK and HB both are sent to the emergency room to receive medical care. MK managed to break HB's jaw, and she will need surgery to repair her injuries.
- The local police show up at MPA the day after the park fight to investigate and gather additional information about the fight that HB and MK had that led to their suspension (and the park brawl). The police officers request HB and MK's disciplinary records and any other information that would be helpful to their investigation.
- Would your answer change if it was the school resource officer conducting the investigation?

- The following day, Dr. Rafferty receives a call from the parent of a child that attends the afterschool program at MPA. MPA rents the facility to "Superstar," a group that provides performing arts instruction to students after school.
- The parent alleges that her child walked into a closet to find students FM and LR engaged in a clearly sexual act and subsequently informed a paraprofessional. The parent wants to ensure that both students will be expelled from the after-school program.
- Dr. Rafferty has no prior knowledge of this incident and immediately contacts the head of Superstar, Ms. Goldry. Ms. Goldry is also unaware of the incident and promises to follow-up with the paraprofessional working the previous day.
- The parapro discloses to Ms. Goldry that she was informed of the incident described and sought out the two students involved. The students, EK and BS, who are 13 and 14 respectively, did admit to engaging in inappropriate conduct; however, given that the conduct was consensual and ceased before the parapro witnessed anything, she did not feel it necessary to report the incident to the program's administrator.
- Dr. Rafferty follows up with the parent and lets her know that the situation has been appropriately handled and that Superstar will take additional precautions to ensure no similar incidents occur in the future.

- Dr. Rafferty receives a discipline report on student WT, who has committed an infraction that warrants corporal punishment.
- WT is brought to the office and the punishment is carried out accordingly.
- The following morning Dr. Rafferty receives a phone call from the very angry mother of WT. It turns out, that "WT" was actually student "WD". Therefore, punishment intended for WT was actually delivered to WD.
- To further complicate the situation, WD is on the school's "no paddle" list.



# SUMMARY

Sources for review:

- Mandated Reporter Law O.C.G.A. §19-7-5
- Henry County Board of Education v. S.G.
- Corporal Punishment O.C.G.A. § 20-2-730 et seq.