

THE STATE OF WISCONSIN
BEFORE
THE STATE SUPERINTENDENT OF PUBLIC INSTRUCTION

<p>In the Matter of the Expulsion of</p> <p>G W</p> <p>by Janesville School District Board of Education</p>	<p>DECISION AND ORDER</p> <p>Appeal No.: 06-EX-09</p>
---	---

NATURE OF THE APPEAL

This is an appeal to the State Superintendent of Public Instruction pursuant to Wis. Stats. § 120.13(1)(c) from the order of the Janesville School District Board of Education to expel the above-named pupil from the Janesville School District. This appeal was filed by the pupil and received by the Department of Public Instruction on May 16, 2006.

In accordance with the provisions of Wis. Adm. Code § PI 1.04(5), this Decision and Order is confined to a review of the record of the school board hearing. The state superintendent's review authority is specified in § 120.13(1)(c). The state superintendent's role is to ensure that the required statutory procedures were followed, that the school board's decision was based upon one or more of the established statutory grounds, and that the school board was satisfied that the interest of the school district demands that the student be expelled.

FINDINGS OF FACT

The record contains a letter entitled "Notice of Expulsion Hearing," dated March 29, 2006, from the district administrator of the Janesville School District. The letter advised a hearing would be held on April 17, 2006 that could result in the pupil's expulsion from the

Janesville School District through her 21st birthday. The letter was sent separately to the pupil and her parent by certified mail. The letter alleged that the pupil engaged in conduct while at school or under the supervision of school authority which endangered the property, health, or safety of others. The letter specifically alleged that on March 27, 2006 she battered another student while on school grounds at Parker High School.

The hearing was held in closed session before an independent hearing officer on April 17, 2006. The pupil and her parent and grandparent appeared at the hearing without counsel. At the hearing, the school district administration presented evidence concerning the grounds for expulsion. The pupil and her parent were given the opportunity to present evidence, to cross-examine witnesses, and to respond to the allegations.

After the hearing, the independent hearing officer issued a written expulsion order finding that the pupil did engage in conduct while at school or while under the supervision of a school authority which endangered the property, health, or safety of others. The hearing officer also found that the interests of the school demand the student's expulsion. The order for expulsion containing the findings of fact and conclusions of law of the hearing officer, dated April 18, 2006, was mailed separately to the pupil and her parent. The order stated the pupil was expelled through end of 2006-2007 school year with an opportunity for early readmission at the beginning of the 2006-07 school year. On April 25, 2006, the school board met and affirmed the decision of the hearing officer. Detailed minutes of the expulsion hearing and minutes of the school board hearing are part of the record.

DISCUSSION

School districts are limited-purpose municipal corporations and have only such powers as are conferred specifically by statute or are necessarily implied therefrom. *Iverson v. Union Free*

High School District, 186 Wis. 342, 353, 202 N.W. 788 (1925). A school board's power to expel students derives from § 120.13(1)(c), which establishes certain categories of offenses that may be the basis for an expulsion and sets out specific procedures that must be followed in the expulsion process.

In reviewing an appeal of an expulsion decision, the Wisconsin Court of Appeals has stated that the scope of the state superintendent's review is limited to that set out in § 120.13(1)(c). In *Racine Unified School District v. Thompson*, 107 Wis. 2d 657, 667, 321 N.W. 2d 334 (1982), the court of appeals *in dicta* stated: "The superintendent's review, then, would be one to insure that the school board followed the procedural mandates of subsection (c) concerning notice, right to counsel, etc." *Id.* In a related context, the court of appeals ruled this dictum has now become "embedded in Wisconsin school law." *Madison Metropolitan School District (Lenny G.) v. Wis. D.P.I.*, 199 Wis. 2d 1, 543 N.W. 2d 843 (1995). It is, therefore, incumbent upon the state superintendent in reviewing an expulsion decision to ensure that the required statutory procedures were followed, that the school board's decision is based upon one of the established statutory grounds, and that the school board is satisfied that the interests of the school district demand the pupil's expulsion.

The appeal letter in this case alleges that the punishment was unduly harsh and was given without consideration of the information provided by the pupil and her grandmother, mother and close family friend. Since the authority to "approve, reverse or modify the decision" was conferred upon the state superintendent by 1987 Wis. Act 88, § 3, the state superintendent has consistently declined to modify the length of expulsions. *David D. v. Central High School District of Westosha Board of Education*, Decision and Order No. 429 (January 25, 2001); *Tony R. v. Lake Geneva Joint No. 1 School District Board of Education*, Decision and Order No. 294

(June 24, 1996); *Brandon H. v. DeSoto Area School District Board of Education*, Decision and Order No. 206 (May 3, 1993). The school board and hearing officer is in the best position to judge the demeanor of witnesses as well as to know and understand what its community requires as a response to school misconduct. It would be inappropriate for me, absent an extraordinary circumstance or a violation of procedural requirements, to second-guess the appropriateness of a school board's determination. I also note that if the pupil under goes an anger management assessment, complies with its recommendations and completes the TATE program (if an opening is available), she is eligible for early reinstatement at the beginning of the 2006-07 school year. In reviewing this case, I do not see the extraordinary circumstance or procedural violation that cause me to modify the pupil's expulsion period.

In reviewing the record in this case, I find the school district did comply with all of the procedural requisites. I, therefore, affirm this expulsion.


CONCLUSIONS OF LAW

Based upon my review of the record in this case and the findings set out above, I conclude that the school board did comply with all of the procedural requirements of §120.13(1)(c).

ORDER

IT IS THEREFORE ORDERED that the expulsion of G W by the Janesville School District Board of Education is affirmed.

Dated this 12th day of July, 2006.



Anthony S. Evers, Ph.D.
Deputy State Superintendent of Public Instruction