

Integrating School Counseling and Discipline Policies

North Greenville University

Brooke Campbell

INTD 4310 Senior Interdisciplinary Seminar B.S.

November 28, 2017

Abstract

Counseling services are shown to be beneficial for a range of issues including discipline, behavior management, preventing drop-out/recidivism, and any other emotional or social problems of students. Counselors generally work alongside teachers, school resource officers, and other administrators to meet the needs of students. Research shows the use of Zero Tolerance policies is ineffective; therefore, counselors need to advocate for students concerning discipline. The Zero Tolerance Policy needs to be reformed so that administrators can consider the totality of the circumstances, and as a result, reduce the high dropout rate and recidivism that is associated with suspensions/expulsions. Counseling services should be a mandatory facet of school's discipline policies so counselors can guide alternative discipline approaches (PBS/SWPBS) and more effectively address the underlying causes of student behavior.

Integrating School Counseling and Discipline Policies

The Zero Tolerance Policy (ZTP) plays a large role in school safety and stopping school violence because it provides a deterrent factor for other students and promptly removes those in violation from the school setting. However, ample research suggests the ZTP does not prevent violations and creates a negative school atmosphere. Revising the ZTP to be viewed on a case-by-case basis, in addition to counseling services, could improve school connectedness and the frequency of school suspensions/expulsions. There is a need to integrate educational perspectives with counseling perspectives and take into consideration the relationship between the school and juvenile justice system. Instead of abandoning the Zero Tolerance Policy altogether, school counseling services may provide an integral part of students' reentry process after suspension/expulsion and present an alternative to school discipline that focuses heavily on prevention.

Overview of the Zero Tolerance Policy

What is Zero Tolerance?

Gregory and Cornell (2009) define the Zero Tolerance Policy as a "highly structured disciplinary policy that permits little flexibility in outcome by imposing severe sanctions for even minor violations of a school rule" (p. 107). Gregory and Cornell view the ZTP as consistent with authoritarian discipline, instead of authoritative discipline which considers adolescent developmental needs. They also show why some support the ZTP by advocating that it removes dangerous students immediately and thus prevents school violence from occurring, but these claims have not been empirically tested (Gregory & Cornell, 2009).

The issue regarding the ZTP that has spanned over 20 years is not about whether to address school safety and discipline, but how most accurately to address these concerns. Skiba (2014) states that these school exclusion policies have dramatically increased the number of students put out of school for disciplinary reasons and has increased student contact with law enforcement. The major assumption of the ZTP is that a strong show of force can act as a deterrent to potentially disruptive students. Starting with the Clinton Administration's passing of the Gun Free Schools Act in 1994, zero tolerance for guns soon encompassed a broad range of offenses. Since the premise of zero tolerance is to treat all violations as needing severe interventions, the number of cases of punishments disproportionate to the offense grew. The greater question that the educational system must look at is the ZTP effectiveness. Skiba's opinion is that the ZTP is ineffective based on inconsistency of implementation, poor outcomes, and unfair application (harsh punishment, disparity between African American and other students, failure to consider disabilities, etc.) (Skiba, 2014).

Brownstein (2010) lists previous cases where punishments for the ZTP were for minor infractions. Brownstein brings up a critical outcome of the ZTP, there is a correlation between dropout and suspension/expulsion rates linked to ZT. Kids who are suspended are at a greater risk for dropping out— 30-50% of students suspended are suspended again. Schools with higher suspension/expulsion rates have lower ratings for school climate and school governance structures (Brownstein, 2010 & American Psychological Association, 2008). ZTP is a failed approach because it mandates predetermined consequences for violations regardless of the totality of the circumstances (Brownstein, 2010).

Juvenile Justice System Connections

Rodríguez (2017) calls for a reevaluation of the Zero Tolerance Policy because it is the main contributor to the school-to-prison pipeline; a phenomenon that criminalizes student misbehavior and then uses punitive consequences that push children into the prison system. These punitive consequences do not take into account the unique situation of each incident and instead follows a “one-size-fits-all” approach. Rodríguez (2017) calls for alternative measures to school discipline, which will be discussed later, that effectively deters future behavior, secures a safe school environment, and is also evidence based.

Skiba (2013) says there are serious effects from high levels of police presence in schools. The use of out-of-school suspensions has more than doubled since 1973 and tripled for African American students, who are more likely to get suspended/expelled compared to other students (Kim, Losen, & Hewett, 2010). The majority of school arrests or referrals are for misdemeanors or disorderly conduct. Skiba says this has resulted in heavy complaints by judges that the juvenile justice system’s courts are becoming “clogged up” with behaviors that could, and should be, addressed within the classroom (Skiba, 2013). Thompson (2016) adds that Zero Tolerance policies are a popular feature of both the U.S. Criminal Justice System and school discipline. Thereby, schools adopted a policy that was originally created for prisons.

Discipline Alternatives to the ZTP**The Basis for Change**

Noguera (2003) states that schools most frequently punish students with greatest social, economic, and academic needs. The enactment of the Zero Tolerance Policy has increased the

amount of students being suspended or expelled in the United States. This alone should be reason to take a second look at this policy.

Kajs (2006) proposes that a simple solution would be to give administrators more flexibility in making discipline management decisions, unless the offense is too serious and there is no discretion needed (firearm/drugs). Using alternative school discipline approaches could address fairness and consistency in a systematic process of progressive discipline management. Disciplinary management can be retributive, preventive, or rehabilitative. While discipline may have a negative connotation, in a school environment discipline can positively influence character development and establish a safe environment when administered correctly. Most student discipline comes in the form of a “student code of conduct” manual that provides information on the school’s discipline plan. These plans include federal and states laws and regulations, but they also include the individual school district’s policy. So essentially, there could be school districts within the same state that have a Zero Tolerance Policy and others that have alternative measures (Kajs, 2006). Ideally, these decisions should rely completely on affirmed and evidence based methods, but there are still schools who rely on the ZTP despite the lack of effectiveness. Regarding this inconsistency across school’s discipline strategies, it is not surprising that there are significantly higher out-of-school suspension and expulsion rates at schools whose principals favor the ZTP approach (Skiba & Rausch, 2006). This disparity between the form of discipline and the suspension/expulsion level should simply just not exist.

Positive Behavioral Supports

Gottfredson and Gottfredson (2001) provide a comprehensive account of schools’ current approaches to prevention and reduction of problem behaviors. They sampled 874 schools by

questioning principals on what their school had in place to promote school safety, prevent/manage problem behavior, and enhance school operation. Middle schools showed to have the highest rates of the use of suspension or expulsion. They found that the percentage of schools reporting “automatic” suspension or expulsion of students was significantly large. Unlike the Supreme Court ruling of *Goss v. Lopez* that stated students are rightfully automatically punished because they pose an immediate danger to school safety, they are being punished for violations such as tobacco use and other minor offenses (Gottfredson & Gottfredson, 2001).

Osher, Bear, Sprague, and Doyle (2010) state that external discipline responses present a short-term fix to often chronic or long-term problems. They surveyed alternatives such as school-wide positive behavioral supports (SWPBS) and social and emotional learning that are also evidence-based. SWPBS is a student-centered approach that aims to decrease problem behavior in schools and develop systems of support individually with teachers and throughout the entire school model. Numerous other studies show how school support can increase school safety and discipline. For example, Sugai and Horner (2002) state that the expansion and evolution of positive behavioral supports (PBS) has increased due to attention on school violence, lack of discipline and social behaviors in schools, and youth drug and alcohol use. The initial response, as mentioned previously, was the zero-tolerance approach; however, there is now a shift towards more preventative and positive approaches to address problem behaviors within schools. Positive behavioral supports have shown to be an effective, proactive, and comprehensive response to address the social issues facing educators today. PBS organizes empirically supported practices at the school, the classroom (instructional and behavioral management), a specific setting (playground, hallways, lunch rooms), and the individual student

levels (Sugai & Horner, 2002). Positive behavioral supports strive to improve the relationship between the student and school by providing a wraparound system at all levels.

An Interdisciplinary Perspective

Thus far, PBS and other discipline alternatives have shown to be viable options in place of the Zero Tolerance Policy (ZTP). These support models are implemented by a variety of administrators, but specifically school counselors who are trained in the behavioral, emotional, and social developmental needs of children. Research shows that the Zero Tolerance Policy is ineffective in preventing problem behavior and that counseling services are a necessary tool for prevention. Zero tolerance discipline is needed for only serious violations such as drug and firearm possession in order to protect a safe learning environment; as a result, more discretion should be given based on individual circumstances when discipline violations occur. In any discipline violation, whether in serious cases where zero tolerance is necessary or in minor cases, counseling services can provide both prevention and intervention of future violations. These services can reduce the likelihood of recidivism, lower the dropout rate following suspension/expulsion, and prevent problem behavior from even taking place, unlike with the ZTP. Education and counseling should work as a team to better meet student's needs, especially those students most at-risk. Counseling services aid in helping students learn positive behavior and assist in the transition back into school from suspension/expulsion; therefore, counselors are a viable tool for managing school-wide discipline and support strategies.

Integrating Counseling Services and Discipline

Hue (2007) considered the distinctions between guidance and discipline and how both function within a school organization. His theories focused on interactionism and social

constructionism. The study consisted of two Hong Kong secondary schools “B” and “E.” Hue found two school organization styles. School B had an organizational structure of a departmentalized workplace (consisting of a school ethos of students’ academic achievements should be above everything else), a disconnection of guidance and discipline, and discipline that emphasized conformity, obedience, and collectivism. In contrast, School E had an organizational structure of connectedness of guidance and discipline influenced by positive changes from the principal, whole person education, and a wholesome school approach. Students were viewed as individuals and not as a collective whole. Hue found that schools with different organization types tend to develop different forms of collaboration between guidance and discipline. Hue suggested schools view themselves as a system, create a culture where practitioners feel they belong, adopt a “team approach,” and transform roles of guidance and discipline teams into consultation agencies (Hue, 2007). Hue’s proposal is an interdisciplinary one because he advocates for forming a team that shares disciplines in order to improve school organization.

Bryan, Day-Vines, Griffin, and Moore-Thomas (2012) provide a counselor’s perspective on the increasing number of discipline referrals given to school counselors. They state that the National Model for school counselors is to promote overall academic, career, personal, and social development of all children regardless of their demographic characteristics and to dismantle barriers to student success (American School Counseling Association, 2005). This gives school counselors “compelling rationale” for understanding the how and why students need to receive counseling for discipline referrals. Currently, discipline does not encompass the roles of a school counselor but teachers may refer disruptive students to counseling for an alternative source of support. They found that teachers are referring students disproportionately to school

counselors for disruptive behavior, so counselors need to learn culturally relevant strategies such as building partnerships with families, how to develop culturally inclusive curricula, and implement positive behavioral supports. Their results suggest that teachers rely on student's contact with school counselors to address troubling behaviors in a measurable way (Bryan, Day-Vines, Griffin, & Moore-Thomas, 2012).

Teachers already rely on counselors to handle disruptive students, which can be an alternative form of discipline depending on the counselor's approach (PBS); therefore, their services should be utilized for those students who have been suspended/expelled as a result of the ZTP. Exclusive forms of discipline are not enough to address underlying behavior issues unlike counseling services can. Providing counseling as part of a school's discipline policy is common for college and universities. Kiracofe and Wells (2007) note that mandated counseling can be effective coupled with student counseling readiness inventories. There has to be a strategic and systematic implementation of counseling services provided to students with discipline problems otherwise counselors will quickly get overloaded with referrals (as Bryan, Day-Vines, Griffin, and Moore-Thomas stated) or students will not receive the necessary levels of support. Looking at the role of a school counselor from a new perspective to address this complex problem is a promising start.

The Relationship Between School Counseling and the ZTP

House and Sears (2002) assert that school counselors need to go beyond their current roles as helper-responders to become proactive leaders for the success of all students. They believe school counselors are taught to question beliefs, assumptions, and values that are behind school policies, structures, and actions. School counselors play a large part in education reform

because there is a need to advocate for students and marginalized groups instead of the school system itself (House & Sears, 2002). Research shows the effects of the ZTP, as a result, school counselors should advocate that there are deeper student needs that require attention like the reentry process and alternative discipline measures.

Unique roles of a school counselor can include working closely with school resource officers and enhancing school connectedness by personalized services. Riley (2000) states that school counselors are a school violence prevention resource. Counselors can work with law enforcement officials to offer efficient prevention efforts. The relationship between counselors and the school resource officer (SROs) should be a collaborative strategy. SROs are vital in obtaining information on and identifying students who are in the most need of attention and assistance. Lapan, Wells, Petersen, and McCann (2014) found that personalized school counseling services that are responsive to student needs enhanced school connectedness (the relationship between students and adults in school) and responsive school counseling services acted as a protective factor to reduce the negative effects that risk factors pose to school connectedness. They found that personalized and responsive school counseling services can significantly strengthen school connectedness. In their survey, counselor responsiveness was strongly related to every school connectedness measure.

The Centers for Disease Control and Prevention (CDC; 2009) also found that school connectedness is the strongest protective factor for promoting academic and nonacademic youth outcomes. They defined school connectedness as the “belief by students that adults and peers in the school care about their learning as well as about them as individuals” (CDC, p. 3). The College Board National Office for School Counselor Advocacy (2011) believe that with various

roles counselors fill within schools they also “ facilitate support services and mental health referrals for students. An effective counselor can help to ensure that students receive the supports and professional attention they need to succeed in school (pp.18).

The most convincing argument for integrating counseling services with discipline policy is Johnson, Sparks, Lewis, Niedrich, Hall, and Johnson’s (2006) study that examined effective counseling strategies for long-term suspended (LTS) students that have been removed from the school system for lengthy periods. LTS often precedes a downward spiral that leads to the student dropping out of school. These students are at-risk for academic failure and vulnerable to lack of services. They implemented the Effective Alternative Strategies (EAS) Program that gave North Carolina counselors the opportunity to work with LTS students. Their goal was to analyze the outcome data to determine the effectiveness of these services. Once EAS was implemented, six counselors were placed in this district to act as case-managers for LTS students. These counselors attended court hearings, worked with probation officers, helped with required paperwork, provided information of services, held training seminars, and put families in touch with community resources. The results of these efforts showed that there was a decline in recidivism (being suspended again) from 28% previously to only 8%, and an increase in reenrollment from 66% to 72% after EAS. The amount of contact the LTS student had with a counselor, the more likely they were to re-enroll and less likely they were to be suspended again (changed behavior). As a result of these findings, this particular district chose to keep the EAS program (Johnson, Sparks, Lewis, Niedrich, Hall, & Johnson, 2006).

An Interdisciplinary Perspective

In summary, Gregg (2000) outlines school counselors roles in light of the Zero Tolerance Policy. The common tendency for schools is to focus heavily on violence prevention by imposing zero tolerance laws, but overlook attending to the mental health needs of children and adolescents. The failure to provide mental health services to these students carries profound consequences to school safety. It is masking a complex problem that cannot be solved by punitive discipline. The aim of school counseling should be ensuring school safety and learning by *first* solving student's academic, emotional, social and personal problems before they cause school violence, alienation, or failure (Gregg, 2000).

Research currently looks at the benefits of alternative discipline compared to punitive discipline, but fails to consider the school counselor's roles in light of these changing approaches. Studies show the efficacy of positive behavioral supports, alternative school discipline, and counseling for students who are suspended/expelled, but does not specifically look at how school counselors can provide a new comprehensive discipline model built on evidence-based methods. The Zero Tolerance Policy is needed in the sense that there should be strict rules on anything that threatens school safety, but not needed for every student and in every situation— school counselors should advocate on this matter. This gap in the literature identifies how counseling services are not only a tool and resource used by schools to address discipline management, but needs to become a necessary and integrated part of the discipline process. Interdisciplinary teams are common in schools in many ways, but are rarely present in discipline management which is typically left up to administrators and school resource officers. Involving school counselors and developing an interdisciplinary team for discipline can provide additional

perspectives that are in the best interest of the student. According to Nissani (1997), a reward of interdisciplinary knowledge and research is filling in disciplinary cracks and solving complex problems. The role of a school counselor is changing, especially with discipline management. It no longer molds into the traditional roles, but is changing along with the student needs. The role of a school counselor must evolve in order to address these complex problems in ways that require an interdisciplinary approach. Nissani states “many complex or practical problems can only be understood by pulling together insights and methodologies from a variety of disciplines” (p. 5). This is especially true in regards to the school discipline process.

RQ: Instead of abandoning the Zero Tolerance Policy (education/juvenile justice) altogether, could school counseling services (counseling) provide an integral part of the students' reentry process and alternative to school discipline?

Hypothesis: It is hypothesized that school counseling services positively impacts students' reentry process and is a beneficial discipline alternative.

Methodology

Research Design and Analysis

A qualitative research design was used to examine school counselor's beliefs and attitudes concerning school discipline policies and the Zero Tolerance Policy. The first analysis was conducted on the statistical results of the Likert scale (eight questions). Then counselor's beliefs were examined by developing an overall understanding of where the participants were located regarding alternative discipline and punitive discipline policies (two questions).

Participants

The study was limited to school counselors (elementary/middle/high school) who completed the online survey (N=24). All participants in this survey were volunteers. Some participants were recruited using an online school counseling forum and other forms of social media. Twenty-one of the participants were female, 2 were male, and 1 was unidentified. The range for participant age was from 21 to 58 years old with the average being 37.8. The highest years of experience was 35 years and the lowest was 1 year. The average years of counseling experience was 9.8 years.

Procedures and Instrumentation

A survey was created that allowed participants to anonymously submit their answers (SurveyMonkey). Before answering questions, participants agreed to the terms of consent that stated their answers were confidential, they can voluntarily choose not to participate, and the purpose of the survey is for undergraduate research. A statement at the end of the consent page notified participants that by continuing they agree to consent and that they are certified school counselors. Questions were developed to place school counselors on a continuum with pro-Zero Tolerance and anti-Zero Tolerance as limits. At the end of the survey, participants viewed a thank you statement. Social media and other mediums (email) were used to distribute the survey.

Survey

Qualitative Likert Scale:

1	2	3	4	5
Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Neither	Agree	Strongly Agree

1. The Zero Tolerance Policy is an efficient and effective discipline policy.

2. I frequently counsel students for discipline violations and referrals.
3. There is a strong guidance and discipline relationship in my school.
4. Counseling services should be given to students re-entering school following a suspension or expulsion.
5. The Zero Tolerance Policy considers each individual student's circumstances when they are in violation.
6. Counseling services are a realistic alternative to school discipline.
7. I am in agreement with my school's discipline policies.
8. School counselors are ethically responsible for advocating for the student and not the school district.

Qualitative:

9. Please list your demographic information. 1. Sex 2. Age 3. Years in the counseling profession:

10. I think school discipline should be centered on:

Results

It was hypothesized that school counseling services can positively impact the student discipline process and is a beneficial discipline alternative. This was measured by school counselors' beliefs on the effectiveness of providing services to students with discipline violations. The results showed half (50%) of the participants indicated that they often counsel students for discipline violations and referrals. Approximately the same amount (46%) reported

the relationship between the guidance program and discipline process in their school is strong. More than half (63%) of the participants said they agree with their school's discipline policies. In addition to these findings, a significant amount of participants (83%) believe that counseling services are a necessity for students who are returning from suspension or expulsion, but a large amount (71%) did not view counseling services as a realistic discipline alternative. Only a few participants (25%) agreed that the Zero Tolerance Policy (ZTP) is an efficient and effective disciplinary policy. This can possibly be attributed to only (17%) of the school counselors who responded see the ZTP as fair by considering each individual student's circumstance and infraction. Most of the school counselors (80%) agreed that their role is to advocate for the students best interest and not the interest of the school district.

For the qualitative portion of the survey, participants were asked to fill in what they believe school discipline should be centered on (19 responded). Seven participants said it should be centered around the individual student, the nature of their infraction, and surrounding circumstances. Four participants mentioned safety should be the main concern. Four participants said it should be centered around restorative practices, restoration, or restorative justice. Three stated it should be centered around teaching appropriate behavior and skills. And one stated it should be centered around evidence-based practices.

Discussion

This survey supports current research that confirms the ineffectiveness of the ZTP and the need for alternatives. The results also support studies that express the benefit of counseling services for students re-entering school. However, most participants did not feel like counseling services could be a realistic discipline alternative and failed to support the last assertion of my

hypothesis. Previous studies (Osher, Bear, Sprague, & Doyle, 2010, Sugai & Horner, 2002, and Bryan, Day-Vines, Griffin, & Moore-Thomas, 2012) listed stated the importance of school counselors implementing PBS and student's mental health throughout the discipline process. There is a disconnection between what research shows to be beneficial discipline alternatives (that incorporate counseling services) and school counselor's beliefs on implementation.

The results of this survey show an incongruity between school counselor's beliefs on discipline and current discipline policies in public schools. Research indicates the ZTP ineffectiveness and also its failings (the majority of participants in this survey agree with these findings). There is a push towards evidence-based, student centered, discipline alternatives. The results show that most participants counsel students for discipline violations, but do not feel like their services are a realistic discipline alternative to what their school already has in place. This finding could possibly indicate that while counselors may feel like their services are needed for these students, the implementation of these services into the discipline process is not realistic. Why? The majority of the school counselors felt that school discipline should be centered around the individual student, but most policies in public schools are centered on maintaining school safety, social control, and behavior management.

Limitations

The fact that most of the participants agree with their school's discipline policies and feel that the relationship between guidance and discipline is strong could imply that these counselors work in schools that do not have the ZTP. To have so many participants agree that the ZTP is not effective but also state that they agree with their school's policy is an unanticipated result. The survey questions were not specific enough to account for this factor. For future research, limiting

the participants to schools who have zero-tolerance discipline can narrow the results further. Almost all of the participants believed that counseling should be given to students following suspension or expulsion. Research shows how these services can benefit these students and how they can be integrated into the discipline process; however, most participants did not see this as realistic. A possible explanation is that school counselors have other roles besides one-on-one counseling with students. Most schools have a disproportionate counselor to student ratio and there is simply not enough time or resources to provide every student that has a discipline violation with counseling services. It is not realistic because the average school system's structure for the discipline process does not incorporate or take advantage of what school counselors have to offer.

Finally, the last question in the survey questioned participants about whether they advocate for students or the school district. As expected, almost all participants agreed that they are ethically obligated to advocate for student's best interests and not the schools. Findings in this current field of research overwhelmingly affirm the importance of student's mental health and discipline policies that reflect this. For school counselors, there needs to be more advocacy on this problem in order for them to adequately meet the needs of students.

References

- American Psychological Association Zero Tolerance Task Force. (2008). Are zero tolerance policies effective in the schools? An evidentiary review and recommendations. *American Psychologist*, 63(9), 852-862.
- American School Counselor Association. (2005). *The ASCA National Model: A framework for school counseling programs*. Alexandria, VA: Author.
- Brownstein, R. (2010). Pushed out. *Education Digest: Essential Readings Condensed For Quick Review*, 75(7), 23-27
- Bryan, J., Day-Vines, N. L., Griffin, D., & Moore-Thomas, C. (2012). The disproportionality dilemma: Patterns of teacher referrals to school counselors for disruptive behavior. *Journal Of Counseling & Development*, 90(2), 177-190.
doi:10.1111/j.1556-6676.2012.00023.x
- Centers for Disease Control and Prevention. (2009). *School connectedness: Strategies for increasing protective factors among youth*. Atlanta, GA: U.S. Department of Health and Human Services.
- College Board National Office for School Counselor Advocacy. (2011). *School counselors literature and landscape review: The state of school counseling in America*. Retrieved from
<<http://media.collegeboard.com/digitalServices/pdf/advocacy/nosca/counselors-literature-landscape-review.pdf>>

- Gottfredson, G. D., & Gottfredson, D. C. (2001). What schools do to prevent problem behavior and promote safe environments. *Journal Of Educational & Psychological Consultation*, 12(4), 313-344.
- Gregg, S. (2000). School counselors: Emerging vanguards of student safety and success. Charleston, WV: Appalachia Regional Educational Laboratory (AEL).
- Gregory, A., & Cornell, D. (2009). "Tolerating" adolescent needs: Moving beyond Zero Tolerance Policies in high school. *Theory Into Practice*, 48(2), 106-113.
doi:10.1080/00405840902776327
- House, R. & Sears, S. (2002). Preparing school counselors to be leaders and advocates: A critical need in the new millennium. *Theory Into Practice*, 41(3), 154-162. Retrieved from <http://www.jstor.org/stable/1477236>
- Hue, M. (2007). The relationships between school guidance and discipline: Critical contrasts in two Hong Kong secondary schools. *Educational Review*, 59(3), 343-361.
doi:10.1080/00131910701427355
- Johnson, J. L., Sparks, E., Lewis, R. G., Niedrich, K., Hall, M., & Johnson, J. (2006). Effective counseling strategies for supporting long-term suspended students. *Professional School Counseling*, 9(3), 261-264.
- Kajs, L. T. (2006). Reforming the discipline management process in schools: An alternative approach to Zero Tolerance. *Educational Research Quarterly*, 29(4), 16-27.
- Kim, C. Y, Losen, D. J., & Hewitt, D. T. (2010). *The school-to-prison pipeline: Structuring legal reform*. New York, NY: New York University Press.

- Kiracofe, N. M., & Wells, L. (2007). Mandated disciplinary counseling on campus: Problems and possibilities. *Journal Of Counseling & Development*, 85(3), 259-268.
- Lapan, R. T., Wells, R., Petersen, J., & McCann, L. A. (2014). Stand tall to protect students: School counselors strengthening school connectedness. *Journal Of Counseling & Development*, 92(3), 304-315. doi:10.1002/j.1556-6676.2014.00158.x
- Nissani, M. (1997). Ten cheers for interdisciplinarity: The case for interdisciplinary knowledge and research. *The Social Science Journal*, 34(2), 201-216.
doi:10.1016/s0362-3319(97)90051-3
- Noguera, P. A. (2003). Schools, prisons, and social implications of punishment: Rethinking disciplinary practices. *Theory Into Practice*, 42(4), 341-350.
- Osher, D., Bear, G., Sprague, J., & Doyle, W. (2010). How can we improve school discipline? *Educational Researcher*, 39(1), 48-58.
- Riley, P.L. (2000). School violence prevention, intervention, and crisis response. *Professional School Counseling*, 2(4), 120.
- Rodríguez Ruiz, R. (2017). School-to-prison pipeline: An evaluation of Zero Tolerance Policies and their alternatives. *Houston Law Review*, 54(3), 803-837.
- Skiba, R. J. (2013). Reaching a critical juncture for our kids: The need to reassess school-justice practices. *Family Court Review*, 51(3), 380-387. doi:10.1111/fcre.12034
- Skiba, R. J. (2014). The failure of zero tolerance. *Reclaiming Children And Youth*, 22(4), 27-33.
- Sugai, G., & Horner, R. H. (2002). Introduction to the special series on positive behavior support in schools. *Journal Of Emotional & Behavioral Disorders*, 10(3), 130.

- Thompson, J. (2016). Eliminating Zero Tolerance Policies in schools: Miami-Dade county public schools' approach. *Brigham Young University Education & Law Journal*, (2), 325-349.
- Willert, J. & Willert, R. (2000). An ignored antidote to school violence: Classrooms that reinforce positive social habits. *American Secondary Education*, 29(1), 27-33.