

THE STATE OF WISCONSIN

BEFORE

THE STATE SUPERINTENDENT OF PUBLIC INSTRUCTION

In the Matter of the Expulsion of

 P. J.

by Pardeeville Area School District
 Board of Education

DECISION AND ORDER

Appeal No.: 07 EX 06

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 Pardeeville Area School District Board of Education to expel the above-named pupil from the Pardeeville Area School District. This appeal was filed by the pupil and received by the Department of Public Instruction on March 20, 2007.

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 8, 2007, from the high school principal of the Pardeeville Area School District. The letter advised a

hearing would be held on March 13, 2007 that could result in the pupil's expulsion from the Pardeeville Area School District through the pupil's 21st birthday. The letter was sent separately to the pupil and his parents by 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 included copies of statements of three students alleging several instances that occurred at school in which the pupil threatened them, was overheard threatening others, and pushed or shoved students.

The hearing was held in closed session on March 13, 2007. The pupil and his parents appeared at the hearing without counsel. At the hearing, the school district administration presented evidence concerning the grounds for expulsion. The pupil and his parents were given the opportunity to present evidence, to cross-examine witnesses, and to respond to the allegations.

After the hearing, the school board deliberated in closed session. The board found 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 school board further 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 school board, dated March 15, 2007, was mailed separately to the pupil and his parents. The order stated the pupil was expelled through the first semester of the 2007-08 school year with an opportunity for early readmission at the beginning of the 2007 summer school session. Minutes of the school board expulsion 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 alleges that there was insufficient evidence to support the board's findings because the information provided to them was false. It has been repeatedly held that arguments concerning the sufficiency of the evidence are generally beyond the scope of review.

Leo P. v. Whitewater Unified School District, Decision and Order No. 351 (March 31, 1998); *Brent S. v. Mondovi School District Board of Education*, Decision and Order No. 290 (May 23, 1996); *Brad A. v. Boyceville Community School District Board of Education*, Decision and Order No. 233 (June 29, 1994); and *Taiwan O. W. v. Kenosha Unified School District Board of Education*, Decision and Order No. 186 (April 7, 1992). Further, a school board's findings will be upheld if any reasonable view of the evidence sustains them. *Leo P. v. Whitewater Unified School District*, Decision and Order No. 351 (March 31, 1998); *Daniel A. v. Mauston School District Board of Education*, Decision and Order No. 324 (May 8, 1997); *Courtney R. v. Germantown School District Board of Education*, Decision and Order No. 278 (March 21, 1996); and *Michael Ryan H. v. Clinton Community School District Board of Education*, Decision and Order No. 222 (March 10, 1994).

The district presented evidence of the threats through the investigating police officer and school officials. The officer and school officials testified as to why the information provided by the other students was reliable. The pupil and his parents were afforded an opportunity to question the officer and officials about the statements and their conclusions.

Hearsay is admissible in expulsion hearings and may be relied upon by school boards. *Racine Unified School District v. Thompson*, 107 Wis. 2d 657, 668, 321 N.W. 2d 334 (1982); *Timothy W. v. Greenfield School District Board of Education*, Decision and Order No. 315 (March 21, 1997); *Christopher W. v. Tomah Area School District Board of Education*, Decision and Order No. 247 (April 21, 1995); *Kathleen W. v. Tri-County Area School District Board of Education*, Decision and Order No. 130 (May 10, 1985). The State Superintendent has repeatedly found that a school board is permitted to consider and base its decision upon the testimony of a school official who relates the results of his investigation, including the

statements of other people, when there are factors establishing the reliability and probative value of such testimony. *Carlos M. v. West Allis-West Milwaukee School District Board of Education*, Decision and Order No. 242 (December 21, 1994); *Joshua S. v. D.C. Everest School District Board of Education*, Decision and Order No. 170 (June 22, 1990); *John C. B. v. Milwaukee School District Board of Education*, Decision and Order No. 116 (October 31, 1983).

The board was in the best position to resolve any conflicts in testimony between those of the police officer and school officials and the pupil. It is within the board's discretion to give weight to the evidence and arguments, as it deemed appropriate and to judge the credibility of witnesses. See e.g. *State ex rel. DeLuca v. Common Council*, 72 Wis. 2d 672, 242 N.W. 2d 689 (1976); *State ex rel. Wasilewski v. Board of School Directors*, 14 Wis. 2d 243, 111 N.W. 2d 198 (1961). See also *Jeremy B. v. Waukesha School District Board of Education*, Decision and Order 395 (August 16, 1999); *Tracy M. v. Random Lake School District Board of Education*, Decision and Order No. 244 (January 11, 1995); and *Kathleen W. v. Tri-County Area School District Board of Education*, Decision and Order No. 130 (May 10, 1985). A reasonable view of the evidence sustains the board's findings, and therefore will not be overturned.

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 F. J. [redacted] by the Pardeeville Area School District Board of Education is affirmed.

Dated this 15th day of May, 2007.



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