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ABSTRACT

This study investigates two Illinois High School districts from the years 1986-2011 and their extra-curricular Codes of Conduct. It begins by reviewing the evolution and background history of extra-curricular Codes of Conduct in Illinois High Schools. The specific development, evolution, implementation, and changes to the Codes of Conduct in two Illinois high school districts are then examined.

The research questions of this study focus on four topics; what was the evolution of the Codes of Conduct at the two Illinois high School districts, who were the advocates and leaders for changes to the consequences of a Code of Conduct violation, what programs were developed to meet the needs of the students in violation, and the implications for school leadership.

An in depth look at the school board meeting minutes from all school districts involved is accompanied by oral histories from the stakeholders involved in the change process. Together those sources outline the development, implementation, and change processes undergone to the Codes of Conduct in the respective school districts. The study concludes with recommendations for school district leadership on the development of a Code of Conduct and the change process resistance they may encounter.
CHAPTER I
INTRODUCTION

The Illinois High School Association Board of Directors, in its policies
recommends that in the context of IHSA By-law 2.040, every member school
establish and maintain a local Code of Conduct, dealing with the problem of the
use of tobacco products, alcohol and other, illegal, mood altering and/or
performance enhancing drugs or chemicals by students who participate in school
athletic and activity programs. (IHSA Handbook, 2011, p. 105)

This policy was written under IHSA By-Laws 2.040 and 2.041 regarding the
sportsmanship of school representatives. By-Law 2.041 stated that:

students, school staff, boards of education, spectators, and all other
persons connected directly or indirectly with a member school shall
practice and promote the highest principles of sportsmanship and the
ethics of competition in all interscholastic relationships. The Executive
Director shall have authority to investigate allegations and incidents of
unsportsmanlike conduct or conduct which adversely affects the ethics of
competition in connection with interscholastic contests. (IHSA Handbook,
2011, p. 30)

These were the only recommendations and guidelines given to high schools
throughout Illinois to design and implement a code of conduct for students involved in
extra and co-curricular athletics and activities. Due to these vague recommendations, the
Codes of Conduct implemented throughout the state differed in language, structure, and substance according to many variables that were not well defined. Many variables, such as the detrimental conduct, interpretation of the alleged violation, penalties and consequences for the alleged violation for the student, varied from school to school and could differ for each applicable case.

The implementation of Codes of Conduct has gone from an era of no defined rules, in which school administrators and coaches were afraid of having “too many rules” in which participants could be caught and suspended, to zero tolerance rules, and finally to lengthy documents that needed to be deciphered by school administrators. As the language in the codes evolved over time from general behavior guidelines to defined expected behaviors that were to be followed at all times during the high school student’s four years both in and out of school, the pressure on school administrators to properly and fairly enforce the rules and delve out the intended consequences increased at the same time. This was in part due to the perceived increased importance placed upon high school athletics and the opportunity to receive an athletic scholarship to attend college. It was also in part due to the increased visibility of high school athletics and the notoriety of high school athletes not only in the local media, but also on a national level due to scouting services, high exposure camps and clinics, and the multitude of information available on the internet.

The Illinois School Code Section 24-24 stated that:

Teachers and other certificated educational employees shall maintain discipline in the schools. In all matters relating to the discipline and conduct of the schools and the school children, they stand in the relation of
parents and guardians to the pupils. This relationship shall extend to all activities connected with the school program and may be exercised at any time for the safety and supervision of the pupils in the absence of their parents and guardians. (Illinois School Code 105ilcs5, Section 24-24)

The board could develop and enforce reasonable rules of conduct and sportsmanship for athletic and extra-curricular school events. Schools had the right to develop and implement a code of conduct for those students involved in extra-curricular activities and athletics, but how these codes developed, and what was at the core of their development, was not defined by the Illinois School Code or the Illinois High School Association. The prohibited conducts and consequences that were given out to students were vague and varied widely among the many school districts in the State of Illinois. The purported role of a code of conduct was to dissuade improper conduct by students given the privilege to participate in extra-curricular activities that represented the school and the community.

When a violation did occur and consequences were handed out, a majority of Codes of Conduct instituted a penalty that involved the student being suspended from regularly scheduled games or contests. Even while being suspended from the games or contests, the student was required to participate in all scheduled practices. However, usually there was no plan for educational related activities for the student to reflect back on the violation and the behaviors that led to the violation. Nor were there prescribed steps to take to prevent another violation from occurring in the future. Some programs required a counseling session or an evaluation meeting with a professional counselor if the violation involved tobacco, drugs, or alcohol, but not usually if it involved other offenses such as theft, hazing, assault, or any other act, including felonies, that could
bring disrepute to the school or athletic program. There was not usually a differentiation of offenses and consequences according to the severity of the issue or violation involving the students, such as being in the possession of alcohol by a minor versus a driving under the influence offense that could result in bodily harm or the committing of a felony. The possible penalty a student could receive for these two varied offenses was usually the same in most widely used Codes of Conduct in Illinois public high schools, and the penalties were not usually up for review by the school or school administrator.

When a code of conduct was first recommended by the Illinois School Code and then reinforced by the By-Laws of the IHSA, the issues surrounding high school student-athletes and their conduct were far different than at the time this dissertation was written. The possible violations, issues, and peer pressure the students were facing in society at the time of the study were more prevalent and influential than ever before, and the pressure for schools to regulate student behavior, while not infringing on student rights, was becoming a contested issue in many schools. When students were found to be in violation of the school’s code of conduct, many parents answer was to transfer schools so students could continue to participate in athletics and activities. The Illinois State Board of Education became aware of the prevalence of transfers due to the violations and mandated that the penalties resulting from suspension of school and extra-curricular activities would be instituted at the school to which students transferred. This eliminated many of the transfers to other schools due to code of conduct violations and attempts to continue to participate in athletics or activities without a penalty or consequence being enforced. Many parents’ views of a code of conduct were supportive of the policies until their own student was caught in violation and the consequences applied. Then it was
their perception that the school was at fault, due to the prohibited conducts and consequences being too harsh and restrictive on students. The common statement was “I remember when I was a kid; this stuff went on all the time. Why do we have to be so hard on them? They are just kids.”

**Purpose of the Study**

This study examined two high school districts in the state of Illinois and the events, evolution, and rationale for changes made to the consequences of the violations outlined in their extra-curricular Codes of Conduct. It also reviewed the evolution of each Code of Conduct from development to current state to determine if implemented changes in consequences and rehabilitative procedures were what were best for students in violation. The study continued to examine the groups of stakeholders in each school community who were advocates and leaders that brought about changes in consequences in the Code of Conduct at each high school district. For the purpose of this dissertation, “best” is defined as the development and implementation of a process for counseling, education, rehabilitation, and change if a violation occurred. The interpretive frameworks applied to the historical study were the ethic of care used by Gilligan (1982); these ethics asserted that individuals should be valued and examined as unique persons, based on a desire that all individuals are treated with dignity and respect. Also applied to the historical study was the ethic of critique framework, through the examination of present policies, practices, and the structure of the current Codes of Conduct that they were unfair within existing social environments. Who was defining the problem, who was controlling the development of strategies to rectify the problem, and who was going to benefit from the examination of the problems with the policies and practices of the
Codes of Conduct (Starratt, 1991)? The ethic of critique framework also examined the voices not heard during the development and the implementation of Codes of Conduct at the selected high school districts, to determine if polices and structures were advantaging one group over the other (Shapiro, 2005).

**Research Questions**

The study will answer the following research questions:

1. What was the evolution of the code of conduct for the students from two separate school districts?
   - High School District A and High School District B. High School District A was considered to be one of the top high schools in the State of Illinois with a high per pupil expenditure, a high socio-economic status, and with standardized test scores that were one of the highest in the state. The second school was a district with low standardized test scores, average per pupil expenditure, and a low socio-economic status with a high minority population. This was High School District B.
   - What was the evolution of the consequences for the student when in violation of the code of conduct for each of the districts?

2. Who were the advocates and leaders for change in the evolution of the consequences of Codes of Conduct for each school district?
   - What were the arguments, impetus, and rationale for the change for the advocates and the leaders?
   - What were the obstacles that leaders faced in trying to effect the changes and what were the strategies utilized to overcome those obstacles?
there evidence of change being made to the code of conduct as a result of recognizing the obstacles?

- Which advocacy groups had a voice and utilized their influence to determine if the student was treated with dignity and respect, and was there evidence of the utilization of the ethic of care and the ethic of critique while examining, reviewing, and implementing the Codes of Conduct?

3. What programs were developed to meet the needs of the students who violated the code of conduct?

- Who were the leaders in defining the problem and their impetus for change when examining the development of strategies for the rehabilitative procedures?

- What were the obstacles faced by leaders when developing the rehabilitative procedures, and what strategies were developed to overcome the obstacles?

- Who were the leaders in determining the benefits for students when reviewing the strategies for the rehabilitative procedures, and was there evidence of the utilization of the ethic of care and the ethic of critique while examining, reviewing, and implementing the rehabilitative procedures?

4. What are the implications for today’s educational leaders?
Significance of the Study

The significance of this study was the historical relevance of the evolution of the consequences and implementation of extra-curricular Codes of Conduct in Illinois high schools, through the review of changes implemented in Codes of Conduct over their history in two different high school districts in Illinois that were on opposite ends of the spectrum determined by socio-economic status, percentage of minority students, and standardized test scores. The study also identified the advocates and leaders for change in consequences and reinstatement guidelines from both high school districts.

The rationale for the development and implementation of Codes of Conduct was to give students a set of guidelines to guide behavior regarding the problems of the use of tobacco, alcohol, illegal drugs, and/or performance enhancing drugs or chemicals. However, due to many issues facing students at the time of the study, the scope of the behaviors and consequences outlined and covered by Codes of Conduct increased and expanded. Educational leaders needed to be aware that student behavior in extra-curricular and co-curricular activities continued to be a critical topic in today’s schools.

This research will inform today’s educational leaders about:

1. The need to understand many of the changes in the consequences listed in Codes of Conduct over their history and their development from basic outlines describing behaviors of conduct expected of students in extra-curricular activities to lengthy documents outlining expected behaviors, consequences, penalties, and pre-requisites for the student’s return to participation.
2. The ability to make informed decisions on the proper development and implementation of a code of conduct that has the best interest of students as the basis of policies and procedures that are developed and implemented.

3. The need to professionally evaluate documents, policies, and procedures within their individual Codes of Conduct already in place to determine if they are concerned with care of the individual student, their individual dignity, and to determine if they are unfair to any person or groups.

4. The need to reflect on and critique if there are voices or groups of students not being heard when reviewing documents not only already in place, but also when developing and instituting new policies and procedures for guiding the behavior and consequences in a code of conduct.

5. The need to recognize those traits and characteristics of Codes of Conduct that take into account what is best for the students and to hear all the voices that are stakeholders in the proper conduct of students that are involved in extra-curricular activities.

6. The need to become familiar with the implementation of proper counseling and rehabilitative techniques and procedures for the reinstatement of students to interscholastic activity after acknowledging and serving the penalty for the outlined prohibited conduct.

7. The ability to utilize a preferred template when evaluating the existing code of conduct and to implement the desired changes according to the recommendations outlined in the template.
Methodology

This study used a historical documentary research methodology analysis of extra-curricular Codes of Conduct from two high school districts selected by socio-economic status, percentage of minority students, and standardized test scores. School District A was a high school district considered to be one of the top high schools in the State of Illinois according to per pupil expenditure, high socio-economic status, and with standardized test scores that were one of the highest in the state. The second was a high school district with low standardized test scores, average per pupil expenditure, and a low socio-economic status with a high minority population; this was High School District B.

The study gives a historical perspective of the evolution of the consequences contained in extra-curricular Codes of Conduct and who were the principal advocates for change, as well as the arguments and rationale for the changes to be made. The study also examined obstacles that were faced when attempting to implement changes in consequences and rehabilitative procedures. This study utilized primary and secondary sources to tell the story: the primary sources were school board reports, parent-student handbooks, committee reports, and documents dealing with the development and implementation of the consequences and rehabilitative procedures resulting from a code of conduct violation. Another primary source was a collection of oral histories from stakeholders, including teachers, counselors, faculty, and school administrators involved in the evolution of the consequences and rehabilitative procedures over the course of time, and what roles they played in the process. Secondary sources not directly from the time events occurred were also utilized to provide background information on the subject. The secondary sources also assisted the researcher by providing other sources and
avenues to help locate and utilize other primary sources. This study utilized additional dissertations, articles, books, professional journal articles, and newspaper articles to inform instructional leaders of resources available regarding extra-curricular Codes of Conduct.

**Brief History of Extra-Curricular Codes of Conduct in Illinois High Schools**

The purported role of the code of conduct was to dissuade improper conduct by students given the privilege to participate in extra-curricular activities that represented the school and the community. Athletics were supposed to be fun and also a significant part of a sound educational program, embodying high standards of ethics and sportsmanship, while developing good character and other important life skills (Josephson Institute, 2003). The codes were designed to promote values and hold young athletes accountable for misbehavior or violations (Koehler & Giebel, 1997). Code documents should define the positive expectations for coaches, parents, and athletes with common goals that reflected shared goals and a framework of principles agreed upon by all stakeholders (Underwood, 2009).

The Illinois High School Association Board of Directors recommended, in its policies:

- that in the context of IHSA By-law 2.040, every member school establish and maintain a local Code of Conduct, dealing with the problem of the use of tobacco products, alcohol and other, illegal, mood altering and/or performance enhancing drugs or chemicals by students who participate in school athletic and activity programs. (IHSA Handbook, 2011, p. 105)
This policy was written under IHSA By-Laws 2.040 and 2.041 regarding the sportsmanship of school representatives. By-Law 2.041 stated that:

students, school staff, boards of education, spectators, and all other persons connected directly or indirectly with a member school shall practice and promote the highest principles of sportsmanship and the ethics of competition in all interscholastic relationships. The Executive Director shall have authority to investigate allegations and incidents of unsportsmanlike conduct or conduct which adversely affects the ethics of competition in connection with interscholastic contests. (IHSA Handbook, 2011, p. 30)

These were the only guidelines given to administrators throughout Illinois on the development of extra-curricular Codes of Conduct that guided the behavior of athletes as representatives of the school. Most modern codes were reactive; punishment based documents that told athletes what we don’t want them to do, rather than pro-active, character-based documents supporting our young athletes (Underwood, 2009). The codes should communicate expectations and they should express what constitutes acceptable personal and social behavior (Koehler & Giebel, 1997).

**Definition of Terms**

**Extra-Curricular Activities** – Those activities that take place outside the scope of the regular school curriculum.

**Code of Conduct/Discipline Code** – The code of conduct is the set of rules and/or requirements used by the high school administration and staff to govern the conduct of student-athletes participating in extra-curricular activities (Haynes, 1972).
Ethic of Care – A principle that asserted individuals should be valued and examined as unique persons, based on a desire that all individuals are treated with dignity and respect. It desires to see that a person enjoys a fully human life (Gilligan, 1982).

Ethic of Critique – A process to examine and uncover which group has the advantage over others, how things got to be the way they are, and to expose how situations are structured and language is used to maintain the legitimacy of social arrangements. Who defines, who controls, and who is benefitting from these arrangements (Starratt, 1991). It enables the educator deal with the hard questions regarding social class, race, gender, and other areas such as: Who makes the laws? Who benefits from the law, rule, or policy? Who has the power? Who are the unrecognized and silenced voices (Shapiro & Stefkovich, 2005)?

IHSA – Illinois High School Association whose purpose is to provide leadership for the development, supervision, and promotion of interscholastic competition and other activities in which its member schools engage. Participation in such interscholastic activities offer students experiences in an educational setting which may provide enrichment to the educational experience (IHSA Constitution, 2011).

ISBE – Illinois State Board of Education provides leadership, assistance, resources and advocacy so that every student is prepared to succeed in careers and postsecondary education, and shares accountability for doing so with districts and schools. The three goals of the Illinois State Board of Education are:

GOAL 1: Every student will demonstrate academic achievement and be prepared for success after high school.

GOAL 2: Every student will be supported by highly prepared and effective
teachers and school leaders.

GOAL 3: Every school will offer a safe and healthy learning environment for all students (ISBE Website, 2011).

**Primary Source** – A source in which the creator was the direct witness or in some other way directly involved or related to the event” (Johnson, Burke, & Christensen, 2004).

**Secondary Source** – A source that was created from primary sources, other secondary sources, or some combination of primary and secondary sources. It is at least one step removed from direct contact, involvement, or relationship with the event being researched (Johnson et al., 2004).

**Oral History** – Consists of interviews that the educational historian may conduct with a person who has direct or indirect experience with or knowledge of the chosen topic (Johnson et al., 2004).

**Zero Tolerance Practices** – A school discipline policy enacted by school officials mandates predetermined consequences or punishment for specific offenses, regardless of the circumstances, disciplinary history or age of the student involved (Stader, 2004).

**Historical Research** – The process of systematically examining past events or combination of events to arrive at an account of what has happened in the past (Johnson & Christensen, 2004).

**Overview of the Chapters**

Chapter I includes a brief history of the rationale, development and implementation of extra-curricular Codes of Conduct in Illinois high school districts.

Chapter II is the review of related literature and includes:
1. Background and History
2. Types of Discipline
3. Legal Aspects
4. Rehabilitative Procedures
5. Ethic of Care/Ethic of Critique

Chapter III is the Methodology.

Chapter IV is the Presentation of Data and includes:

- The evolution of the consequences implemented for a code of conduct violation in High School District A (1985-2011). Who were the principal advocates and leaders for the change in consequences affecting the student? What were their arguments and rationale for changes? What were the obstacles and impetus for the changes?

- The evolution of the consequences implemented for a code of conduct violation in Illinois High School District B (1985-2011). Who were the principal advocates and leaders for the change in consequences affecting the student? What were their arguments and rationale for changes? What were the obstacles and impetus for the changes? What was their method of advocacy?

- Review of the extra-curricular Codes of Conduct of High School District A and High School District B for the implementation of counseling and rehabilitative techniques, and the procedures for the reinstatement of students to interscholastic activity after serving the penalty for the outlined prohibited conduct.
Chapter V includes the summary of the study and answers to the research questions. The chapter will also include implications for educational leadership and recommendations for further research.
CHAPTER II
REVIEW OF THE RELATED LITERATURE

Background/History of Extra-Curricular Codes of Conduct in Illinois High Schools

The purported role of a code of conduct is to dissuade improper conduct by students given the privilege to participate in extra-curricular activities that represent the school and the community. Athletics were supposed to be fun and also a significant part of a sound educational program, embodying high standards of ethics and sportsmanship, while developing good character and other important life skills (Josephson Institute, 2003). The codes were designed to promote values and hold young athletes accountable for misbehavior or violations (Koehler & Giebel, 1997). The document should define the positive expectations for coaches, parents, and athletes with common goals that reflected shared goals and a framework of principles agreed upon by all stakeholders (Underwood, 2009).

The Illinois High School Association Board of Directors, in its policies recommends that in the context of IHSA By-law 2.040, every member school establish and maintain a local Code of Conduct, dealing with the problem of the use of tobacco products, alcohol and other, illegal, mood altering and/or performance enhancing drugs or chemicals by students who participate in school athletic and activity programs. (IHSA Handbook, 2011, p. 105)
This policy was written under IHSA By-Laws 2.040 and 2.041 regarding the sportsmanship of school representatives. By-Law 2.041 stated that students, school staff, boards of education, spectators, and all other persons connected directly or indirectly with a member school shall practice and promote the highest principles of sportsmanship and the ethics of competition in all interscholastic relationships. The Executive Director shall have authority to investigate allegations and incidents of unsportsmanlike conduct or conduct which adversely affects the ethics of competition in connection with interscholastic contests. (IHSA Handbook, 2011, p. 30)

These were the only guidelines given to administrators throughout the State of Illinois on the development of extra-curricular Codes of Conduct that guided the behavior of athletes as representatives of the school. Most modern codes were reactive, punishment-based documents that told the student-athletes what we did not want them to do, rather than proactive, character-based guidelines supporting our young athletes (Underwood, 2009). Codes should communicate expectations and they should express what constituted acceptable personal and social behavior (Koehler & Giebel, 1997).

Athletic codes began to appear in the mid 1980’s in response to continued poor behavior exhibited by student-athletes in and out of school. There were many stories regarding high school and college athletes committing numerous crimes and running afoul of the law. Codes of conduct were in response to an athlete’s indiscretions and the school administration having a clear set of guidelines and rules to govern the offenders. High school athletics could serve a purpose beyond the present by the development of
certain life skills such as initiative, respect, and leadership (Holt, Tink, Mandigo, & Fox, 2008). Students who played sports could have a potential advantage not only within the high school, but also outside the school: they could develop a school connectedness that developed relationships that lead to increased social and academic success (Harrison & Narayan, 2003). However, there were many negative aspects involved with high school athletic participation. Many students and parents lost perspective on the role that athletics could take in a student’s life, with the lure of athletic scholarships and the importance of winning at all costs. The role of extrinsic rewards and motivation became very important, and the image of toughness could become a dominant role for students in and out of school. “In reality, sport does not inherently build character and, in fact, many sports programs may lead to negative, rather than positive, youth development” (Arthur-Banning, Wells, Baker, & Hegreness, 2009).

Codes of Conduct progressed from a statement of general rules to guide athletic participation in the high school setting to lengthy documents that outlined specific acceptable and unacceptable behaviors, expectations, and consequences. Many of the athletic codes outlined when and where the rules of behavior governed by the school applied. The code of conduct from Lyons Township High School District #204 specifically stated:

- participation in the extra-curricular program is a privilege and as such carries certain expectations beyond those found in a normal classroom situation. The students must abide by the following expectations for all four years in high school… seven days a week, twelve months a year,
whether or not school is in session for all four years. (Lyons Township
High School District #204 Student Handbook, 2011, pp. 49-50)

While some Codes of Conduct focused on the problems associated with drug, alcohol, and tobacco use, others referred to and included consequences for offenses such as stealing in and out of school, fighting and/or assault only during games and practices, and vandalism. These codes were only concerned with offenses punishable in a court of law and could be grounds for dismissal for students if caught and apprehended. Additional behaviors that were addressed in many Codes of Conduct of suburban school high school districts included creating a negative image and acts that were detrimental to either the school or its programs and might be subject to disciplinary behavior. These acts included bullying, gambling, hazing incidents, or any conduct that would constitute a misdemeanor under criminal laws.

Progressive levels of offenses were developed at numerous school districts to determine the level of discipline that would accompany a violation. A Level 1 or Level A offense included practice and school attendance issues, uncharacteristic or isolated cases of disrespect, pranks, unintentional accidents that inflict harm on a person or property, unsportsmanlike behavior at contests, cheating, and the use of unacceptable language or verbal abuse. Level II or Level B offenses included those related to alcohol, tobacco, tobacco products such as being under the influence, vandalism, participation in gangs, theft, and the hosting of a party for high school students at which alcohol, tobacco, and other drug violations are permitted. The use of anabolic steroids was included in most Codes of Conduct, and these behaviors usually demanded a more significant consequence depending on the number of times the student had violated the code. A few high schools
included a Level III offense, which defined and outlined the consequences for severe behaviors such as hate crimes, hazing, criminal assault, sexual assault, or those offenses that would be felonies under the law. Most districts included these types of offenses under Level II or Level B, and grouped them in with drug, alcohol, and tobacco violations, which in turn could penalize students in the same manner for having a pack of cigarettes as for driving under the influence of alcohol.

While athletic codes outlined acceptable and unacceptable behaviors, they also outlined how the violations would be handled and the consequences that came with each violation and any repeated violations. There were many variations in how the behaviors were defined; some schools categorized the violations by the perceived level of offense. Consolidated High School District #230 separated violations into three categories, A, B, and C. Category A violations were those regarding tobacco use and/or possession and attending a party or other gathering, including riding in a vehicle where alcoholic beverages and other controlled substances were being consumed by minors (Consolidated High School District #230 Athletic Handbook, 2011). Category B was the use, possession, buying, selling, bartering, or distribution of alcohol, or other drugs. Category C included gross disobedience other than drugs and alcohol, and the sanctions were based on the nature of the offense and the number of offenses (Consolidated High School District #230 Athletic Handbook, 2011). Other schools did not separate the offenses into levels of violation. New Trier High School listed the prohibited conducts in one category of statements that were listed in the student-athlete handbook. The conducts were defined in statements that student-athlete understood they were being subject to, but not limited by, the descriptions that were listed (New Trier Student-Athlete Handbook, 2011).
Other districts listed the prohibited behaviors in a straightforward approach with consequences for a violation for each of the prohibited behaviors. In these codes, there was no categorizing of offenses or defining of a level of seriousness for each of the various offenses; it was a one-size-fits-all approach to discipline. Most of these types of codes required immediate removal from a team if in violation of the code.

The consequences for prohibited conducts and unacceptable behaviors varied by each high school district and each individual code of conduct according to their level of violation. The codes that were reviewed had a progressive level of discipline according to the number of violations, while some included the nature of the offense. High School District #214’s Athletic Code (2011) contained two categories of violations with different levels of consequences for each category. Level B violations included, but were not limited to, minor involvement in bullying, harassment, and verbal abuse, representation or participation in a gang or gang like activity or misconduct, isolated pranks or acts, possession or use of tobacco, and being present where others were in violation of the code in the possession, selling, delivering, using, or under the influence of alcohol if a legal breathalyzer report of 0.00 was present. The consequences of a first time Level B violation included removal from the athletic team/activity, suspension from participation in/on the athletic team or activity for 25% of the scheduled contests or performances for each activity (High School District #214 Athletic Handbook, 2011).

Second offenses for a violation in most school districts were viewed as more serious, and would subject the student-athlete to any of the previously listed consequences along with a progressive penalty. Consolidated High School District #230’s Athletic/Activities Honor Code of Conduct (2011) contained three categories of
violations, and each level of violations contained three levels of progressive consequences. A second offense for a Category A violation for the use of tobacco or attending a party or other gathering and/or riding in a vehicle where alcoholic beverages and/or controlled substances were discovered, used, possessed, bought, sold, bartered, distributed, and/or were being consumed by minors would be: parent notification, suspension from the sport or activity based upon a pre-determined amount of games/contests or performances, approximately 20% of the scheduled activities or contests, which could carry over to the next season or the next year if the suspension was not completed during the season in which the student was participating. The student also was required to participate and complete a school-approved alcohol or other drug abuse assessment and follow all recommendations from that assessment at the expense of the student’s family. The student in violation was also required to attend practices with that group or team unless suspended from school (Consolidated High School District #230, 2011).

More serious violations of the Codes of Conduct included the use, possession, buying, selling, bartering, or distribution of alcohol and/or other drugs, the possession of weapons, hazing, vandalism, and other acts of misconduct that vary according to each school’s individual code. The consequences for second offenses also varied from school district to school district. In High School District #214, the consequences for a second violation were dependent on the level of violation. A Level A violation that was considered more serious would result in suspension from activities/athletics for one calendar year with the opportunity for reinstatement after one complete season. The terms for reinstatement included letters from the student, parents, dean of students,
counselors, and others familiar with the issues of the suspension. For a Level B violation, which were lower level offenses that included the possession of tobacco, if the first incident was being in the presence of others that were violating the code of conduct, circumstantial involvement or participation in the disruption of the co-curricular or instructional program, and other isolated acts or insubordination, a penalty was assessed for a suspension from 25% to 50% of contests and performances in each activity (High School District #214 Code of Conduct, 2011). Many second time violations of the respective Codes of Conduct were a suspension from athletic contests/activities for approximately 50% of the season, along with a referral to a school district approved substance abuse/counseling program at the expense of the parents that had to be completed before the student could be reinstated to the team. Students were also required to attend and participate in all practices during the terms of the suspension.

The penalties for third offenses contained in Codes of Conduct also varied from school district to school district. Penalties included suspensions from extra-curricular activities for the rest of a student’s high school career, suspension for one full calendar year, enrollment in an outside agency/hospital assessment program and the successful completion of the recommendations, loss of parking privileges, removal from any leadership position from within the school and the team, and reinstatement conferences with the activity or athletic director and the student assistance program director. Even with these recommendations being satisfied, the reinstatement of a student was not guaranteed and could be denied by the principal. Many school districts utilized a “three strikes, you’re out” approach, saying when students violated the code of conduct for a third time, depending on the severity of the offense; they could be suspended from
activities/athletics for the remainder of their high school career. If the third offense fell into a category that was determined to be less severe, then the suspension could range from a suspension of 50% of the contests/performances from the activity they were currently in, or the next season or activity in which the student would participate. However, if the offense fell into a category that was considered to be more severe, such as hazing, premeditated or intentional harm on a person, possession or the use of a controlled substance, engaging in gang-like activity, or possession of weapons or look alike, the consequences could range from the suspension of one calendar year to the suspension for the remainder of the student-athlete’s high school career with or without the opportunity for reinstatement.

Many of the Codes of Conduct allowed for a review or appeal process of disciplinary action once a code of conduct violation was found to have occurred. The process and the participants from the school administration leading the review process would vary by each school district from the principal acting alone to committees comprised of administrators, counselors, athletic/activity directors, some districts included student leadership from the school, and school board members. Few Codes of Conduct allowed for a review or appeal process on the third or fourth offense that resulted in the suspension from athletics or activities for the remainder of a student’s high school career. Another consequence related to a code of conduct suspension was the removal of a student from a leadership position. The New Trier High School Code of Conduct (2011) stated that the first violation of the code would result in a suspension of up to 50% of the season, not stating if this was contests or practices, and the removal

> when a penalty is imposed, the student offender will be removed from a leadership position (i.e., officer of the student council, leadership with any school sponsored club or activity, any class officer position, and any leadership on any athletic team) in any extra-curricular or co-curricular for the duration of the season/activity. (Lincoln-Way High School District #210 Athletic Code, 2011, p. 1)

There were multiple aspects involved in designing and implementing an extra-curricular code of conduct to guide the behavior of student-athletes in the modern high school. However, the research into the area of designing Codes of Conduct that were developed with what was best for student-athletes at the forefront of the decision making process was limited. High school athletic associations began recommending codes of conduct in the mid-1980’s due to a continuing trend toward aggressive behavior and speech within not only the classroom but also the athletic arena. The use of discipline in many forms, including Codes of Conduct, to address the appropriate behaviors continued to be an important but time consuming concern for school administrators (Sugai & Horner, 2002). Athletes were seen as role models who were supposed to behave in a certain way and show the others around them how to deal with adversity and challenges that would face them not only in athletics but also in life (Curry, 1996). This review of literature will begin with a discussion on the various types of discipline utilized in extra-curricular Codes of Conduct, including zero-tolerance policies, progressive discipline, exclusionary discipline, and proactive programs. It will then examine the legal
perspective regarding extra-curricular Codes of Conduct and the issues that have come about when developing, implementing, and enforcing the violations, consequences, and requirements to return to participation. The review will also address one of the main issues protecting Codes of Conduct and their enforcement: extra-curricular activities and participation in them are considered privileges, not a court protected rights. Next, the review will examine the content of the codes and the various avenues of rehabilitation and return to activity, and also the outcomes and consequences that resulted from a violation. The rehabilitative procedures reviewed will include suspension from activity, but still remaining part of the team, community service, school counseling, and outside of the school resources for substance abuse counseling. Finally, the review will examine the two frameworks that will be used as benchmarks to interpret and compare Codes of Conduct from the various schools districts. The first is to ensure that all students are treated as individuals, as unique persons, and that the codes account for their value, based on a desire that all individuals are treated with dignity and respect. The second framework will establish the need for a process to examine and uncover which group has the advantage over others, how things got to be the way they are, and to expose how situations are structured; it will show how proper language is used to maintain the legitimacy of social arrangements, as well as who defines, who controls, and who is benefitting from these arrangements (Starratt, 1991).

**Types of Discipline**

**Zero Tolerance**

School discipline was a very important issue in schools, and extra-curricular Codes of Conduct were an important tool when responding to improper behavior by
students involved in those activities. These disciplinary procedures were usually described in written policies and then communicated to students involved in athletics and activities and their parents. Most of the time, these codes focused on the negative aspects of consequences and penalties that students would serve to satisfy the changes in behavior that were requirements of the codes (Fenning, Theodos, Benner, & Bohanon-Edmonson, 2004). Zero tolerance was defined as “the policy or practice of not tolerating undesirable behavior, such as violence or illegal drug use, with the automatic imposition of severe penalties, even for first offences” (Potts, Njie, Detch, & Walton, 2003, p. 16). It was developed as a response to deter and control severe and violent behavior that was starting to appear in schools; it was a “get tough” response to help satisfy school boards and districts (Skiba & Peterson, 1999; Vavrus & Cole, 2002). It also gave school boards and principals flexibility to label any student behavior as undesirable, which was then subject to zero tolerance policies and penalties (Schoonover, 2009). The initial zero tolerance programs were based on a 1986 program that required the impoundment of any sea craft carrying or transporting drugs. Politicians and school leaders believed that the program would also work in the dangerous public schools (Skiba & Peterson, 1999). However, while adults may have been affected by the harsh consequences, there was not any research stating that children understood the consequences of zero tolerance policies. Research by the American Psychological Association’s Task Force on Zero Tolerance policies stated that adolescents before the age of 15 were psychologically incapable of understanding the full significance of their actions as they related to a mandated punishment (Schoonover, 2009). In spite of the research, many states adopted policies and procedures that demanded suspension and expulsion from school, sports, and
activities without providing an avenue for the teaching and reinforcement of positive behaviors. Many extra-curricular Codes of Conduct involved a suspension from the sport or activity for a designated amount of time and have evolved from a suspension for a full season to a percentage of the contests, depending on the severity of the offense and the number of violations. For example, in one Illinois district, suspensions could range from 10% of scheduled contests for the first violation of a school rule or tobacco use, to a suspension of 50% of scheduled activities for a second violation, to a suspension for a year, and eventually a termination of all extra-curricular opportunities for the remainder of the high school career (Lyons Township High School Student Handbook, 2010). Even though many Codes of Conduct employed a suspension from activities, games, and contests, many also required student offenders to continue to attend team and individual practices and team functions. Still, some school districts continued to employ a zero tolerance policy after one violation, and the student was suspended from that activity or sport for a full school year with no opportunity for reinstatement or rehabilitation.

**Exclusionary Discipline**

Due to the prevalence of zero tolerance policies in high schools, over 90% of United States public school districts had some type of zero tolerance policy in place; many of the consequences associated with a violation of a code of conduct were exclusionary in nature (Schoonover, 2009). While some suspensions and expulsions were the result of serious and dangerous behaviors, most of the suspensions were due to relatively minor incidents that did not threaten school safety (Skiba & Peterson, 1999). This could lead to even further negative consequences, as school suspensions had been found to be a predictor of a student dropping out of school. Studies found that the
relationship between suspensions from school and dropping out may not have been by accident, as some school administrators admitted to using school suspension as a way to get rid of particular students and to get troublemakers to leave (Skiba & Peterson, 1999). Morrison and D’Incau (1997) stated that student expulsion decisions were not only a product of student behavior, but were also driven by the educational philosophy, policies, and practices of a particular school system. Not only were these factors involved in the exclusion of students, the latest suspension data stated that African-American and Latino students were expelled at a significantly higher proportional rate than white students (Gordon, Piana, & Keleher, 2000). The exclusionary policies in place have shown to have negative implications and decreased positive student outcomes, including the loss of instructional time, increased isolation of students, the inability to stop or reduce inappropriate behaviors, and the failure to instruct students on the proper behaviors (Golomb, 2010). School administrators needed to not only keep the schools and students safe, but they also needed to implement written guidelines that provided flexibility to address dangerous students and the less dangerous behaviors (Stader, 2000).

**Proactive Programs**

While research found that high school athletes were less likely to be involved in school related and non-school related behavior issues and suspensions, the improper behavior of athletes in all levels, including high school, collegiate, and professional, could be seen on a daily basis throughout many media outlets. It was rare that we did not see taunting, bench-clearing fights, trash talking, and athletes being arrested on a daily basis (Koehler & Geibel, 1997). Other negative issues affecting high school athletics included alcohol, tobacco, and drug use, bullying, inappropriate use of social networking
sites, cyber-bullying, and sexual assaults. As exclusionary practices such as suspension and expulsion had been shown to be ineffective and negative, school leaders still needed to implement programs that provided instruction in promoting positive student behavior (Golomb, 2010). Codes of Conduct should clearly communicate the desired expectations of students and explicitly define what was acceptable personal and social behavior (Koehler & Goebel, 1997). The codes should focus on the implementation of policies and procedures that increased positive student outcomes and kept students in school and in athletics/activities that would, in turn, decrease negative student behaviors (Bohanon, Flannery, Malloy, & Fenning, 2009).

For example, one program was designed to challenge students to renew themselves, rebuild their self-confidence, and commit to learning by the development of a behavior contract called the Student in Good Standing Contract (Davidow, 2006). The contract outlined eight areas in which the student needed to gather information showing evidence of good character through positive acts in and out of school, academic achievement, and character references that were presented to a committee. The student was responsible for building and presenting the information to the committee, if they did not take the steps to present the information, they were suspended from activities, athletics, and social events (Davidow, 2006).

High schools continued to implement programs to develop character and to establish positive student-teacher relationships, help students with problems that were from outside the school, and offer resources to the students to offer support and a caring environment (Gregory & Cornell, 2009). The support for the students was vital to the programs, as this would convey respect and concern for the issues they may have been
facing in and out of school. When students received positive support and feedback from the school community, there was an increase in school safety and reduced aggression. Students would feel valued and respected if there was caring and support from the adults within the school community (Gregory & Cornell, 2009).

Another program designed for high schools to implement into a code of conduct and character education program was the Pursuing Victory with Honor initiative through the Josephson Institute of Sports Ethics (Josephson Institute, 2012). The program was available to schools and had many resources available to implement a character education program into the school and athletic program. Included with the program were principles and strategies to develop character within the school and athletic program based on the Six Pillars of Character: trustworthiness, respect, responsibility, fairness, caring, and good citizenship (Josephson Institute, 2012). The program outlined proper behaviors expected not only by the students, but also by teachers, coaches, administrators, and spectators at sporting events and in the community, and a sample code of conduct was provided for schools to use as a template for the initiation of a character education program. The foundation of the Pursuing Victory with Honor code of conduct was the Six Pillars of Character, and the desired behaviors were outlined and discussed. The program focused on the positive behaviors and the rewards of those behaviors, an explanation of prohibited conduct; the use of suspension or expulsion from a sport or activity was not included in the sample code.

There were other programs available to school administrators that were designed to instill and reward positive behaviors before the students violated a school code of conduct. One of these was the NAIA Champions of Character (2012) program. This
program was based on the Five Core Values: Integrity, Respect, Responsibility, 
Sportsmanship, and Servant Leadership (NAIA Champions of Character, 2012). There 
were resources available for not only the student-athlete, but also for coaches, athletic 
directors, parents, and schools boards to review and implement the program as the basis 
of their culture within their school (NAIA Champions of Character, 2012). Many 
programs focused on the development of leadership skills among student-athletes, feeling 
that the development of these skills would influence other students to display positive 
behaviors and refrain from violating the athlete code of conduct.

An organization that promoted character development, The Academy for Sports 
Leadership, recognized the Five Points of Team Leadership, as a way to develop student 
leaders not only within the sports teams but also within the school (Dobbs, 2011). One of 
the five points utilized to recognize and reward positive behavior from the students was 
called Focusing on Intentional Behavior. This focus included specific behavior required 
not only of students, but also of coaches and people within the athletic program; it 
included behaviors such as holding each other to a higher standard, stopping the practice 
of doing unproductive things, mobilizing teammates through challenge and support from 
others, inspiring shared purpose, establishing and rewarding clear performance goals and 
behaviors, maintaining high standards, and modeling desired actions and attitudes 
(Dobbs, 2011). Many more high school and collegiate athletic programs were turning to 
programs such as these to proactively address negative behaviors that could be exhibited 
by student-athletes. The positive expectations for coaches, parents, and athletes should 
be clearly defined with the common values expected by the school and administration, 
and reinforced proactively on a daily basis. According to Underwood (2009), the athletic
experience should be an extension of the classroom that gives student-athletes a chance to experience a perspective of character and moral decision-making that will prepare them for adult experiences.

**Legal Perspective**

When a violation of a code of conduct occurred, one of the questions that immediately developed in the mind of many parents was whether or not a school, athletic director, or coach could, under constitutional law, set standards of acceptable conduct for those students in extra-curricular activities and enforce them. Most parents were in favor of codes of conduct implemented in schools, until their student was caught under the guidelines of the code and subject to its consequences. Many felt that the parents should control the discipline of their child when they were outside of the school and when many of the prohibited behaviors occurred (Walters, 1998). Due to the fact that a college athletic scholarship and a potential professional sports opportunity could arise from high school athletic participation, opponents of the codes of conduct felt that students’ rights were taken away and that punishments given out were unfair and an infringement of their rights under the Fourteenth Amendment and the Due Process Clause (Bromirski, 2001). The Fourteenth Amendment stated no state shall deprive a person of life, liberty, or property without due process of the law (Alexander, 2005). To follow the Fourteenth Amendment, students must first be given proper notice, oral or written, regarding the alleged violation of the code of conduct; second, the student should be given an opportunity to tell their story and to be heard, and that the hearing must be conducted in a fair manner (Alexander, 2005).
Many parents and community members felt that many times this process was not followed in the correct manner and that students’ participation in athletics should be considered a right and not a privilege. The suspension of athletes from extra-curricular activities and the imposition of penalties was an emotional issue for the student, parents, and the school, and many felt that if the student was going to be deprived of their rights, they must be given due process that was outlined in the federal Constitution. However, the Supreme Court had not yet considered the due process rights of interscholastic athletes; the lower courts have been challenged with the issue and have used *Goss v. Lopez* 419 U. S. 565 (1975) as the starting point to analyze the case (Rubin, 1997). *Goss* (1975) stated that students that were faced with academic suspensions must be given due process of the law: first, they must receive proper notice, oral or written, regarding the alleged violation of the code of conduct; second, the student should be given an opportunity to tell their story and to be heard, and that hearing must be conducted in a fair manner (Alexander, 2005). Schools were concerned that the courts would find that the participation in extra-curricular activities would be considered a right and be held to the regulations of the due process clause. Most courts have sided with the school districts and held that the opportunity to participate in athletics was simply of constitutional dimension and that there was no property interest (Rubin, 1997).

One such case was *Sala v. Warwick Valley Central* (2009). In 2006, a student was suspended from the football team due to drinking alcohol; two weeks later, this same student was ticketed by the police for violating terms of his junior license, and he was then dismissed from the football team. The family filed suit, claiming the student’s due process rights were violated by both the coach and the school. The court ruled that the
plaintiff was afforded the opportunity to speak to the coach before and after the suspension (*Sala v. Warwick Valley Central, 2009*). The plaintiff was also represented by counsel in a meeting in which the student was offered the opportunity to present his side of the story and was given a letter that detailed the issues raised in the meeting and the right to appeal to the Board of Education. The court granted the motion to dismiss the student’s procedural due process claims, due not only to the decisions of the courts, but also to the practice of the New York State Commissioner of Education that stated no formal evidentiary hearing was required where the student athlete was dismissed on the basis of ‘conduct unbecoming of an athlete;’ the meeting with the parents with the appropriate school personnel was sufficient (*Latterell, N.Y. Ed. Dept. Dec. No. 13, 608, 1996*). The court also found that both the due process claim and the plaintiff’s claim that the student had an individual and constitutionally protected right to play football, was unfounded since it was well established that the Fourteenth Amendment does not protect a public education as a substantive fundamental right, citing *San Antonio Independent School Dist. vs. Rodriquez 1973* and *Plyler v. Doe, 1982* (*Sala v. Warwick Valley Central, 2009*).

Two cases heard in 2010 reaffirmed that athletic participation was a privilege and not a constitutional right. In *Natke vs. North Branch Area School District (2010)* a 16 year old baseball player was suspended for one-third of the season as outlined in the Athletic Code of Conduct for stealing a case of beer from a store and being charged with retail theft. The parents filed a lawsuit based on due process, equal protection, and breach of contract as created by the Athletic Code of Conduct. The federal court ruled that athletic participation was a privilege and not a constitutional right and that no equal
protection or contract violation occurred (NIAAA Website Paper, 2010). In another case, *Doe vs. Silsbee Independent School District* (2010), the U.S. Court of Appeals ruled that the district did not violate a cheerleader’s due process, equal protection, or free speech rights by removing her from the squad for failing to cheer for a member of the boys’ basketball team who allegedly sexually assaulted her but was not indicted (NIAAA Website Paper, 2010). In many cases, the courts continued to hold that extra-curricular activities were not considered a right under the federal Constitution. The Due Process Clause of the Fourteenth Amendment extended constitutional protection to those fundamental aspects of life, liberty, and property that rose to the level of a “legitimate claim of entitlement,” but the clause did not protect lesser interests or “mere expectations.” A student's interest in participating in a single year of interscholastic athletics amounted to a mere expectation rather than a constitutionally protected claim of entitlement. As decided in *Mitchell v. Louisiana High School Athletic Association*, 430 F. 2d 1155 (5th Cir. 1970), extra-curricular and athletic involvements fell “outside the protection of due process” (Johnson, 2011). Further, in *Vernonia School District v. Acton* (1995), the court was asked to review and rule on whether a school district’s suspicion less drug-testing policy for student-athletes violated the Fourth Amendment. The Court found the policy constitutional due to that student athletes voluntarily subject themselves to a greater degree of regulation than the normal student body by voluntarily choosing to out for the team. Students who voluntarily participate in school athletics have reason to expect intrusions upon normal rights and privileges, including privacy (Johnson, 2011).

While most courts ruled in favor of the school districts and stated that students participating in extra-curricular athletics did not have a constitutionally-protected due
process right to participate, when developing athletic Codes of Conduct, research supports that the student should be afforded procedural due process. This procedure should be in accordance with the procedures outlined in the school’s athletic code of conduct (Sawyer, 2000). The schools adopting and enforcing athletic Codes of Conduct should adhere to the following minimum requirements to be in compliance with procedural due process requirements:

1. All suspensions should be supported by probable cause that a violation has actually occurred. (Bonamo, 2004)

2. All the individuals accused of violating the code are given the opportunity to discuss the incident with school officials prior to being suspended. (Bonamo, 2004)

3. For those athletes facing longer suspensions, a timely, fact finding hearing for those students to contest their guilt should be provided. This would avoid heavy administrative burdens on the school administration prior to issuing suspensions, while still protecting the constitutional rights of the accused. (Bonamo, 2004).

**Rehabilitative Procedures and Consequences**

The Illinois High School Association Board of Directors, in its policies: recommends that in the context of IHSA By-law 2.040, every member school establish and maintain a local Code of Conduct, dealing with the problem of the use of tobacco products, alcohol and other, illegal, mood altering and/or performance enhancing drugs or chemicals by students
who participate in school athletic and activity programs. (IHSA Handbook, 2011, p. 105)

This policy was written under IHSA By-Laws 2.040 and 2.041 regarding the sportsmanship of school representatives. By-Law 2.041 stated:

students, school staff, boards of education, spectators, and all other persons connected directly or indirectly with a member school shall practice and promote the highest principles of sportsmanship and the ethics of competition in all interscholastic relationships. The Executive Director shall have authority to investigate allegations and incidents of unsportsmanlike conduct or conduct which adversely affects the ethics of competition in connection with interscholastic contests. (IHSA Handbook, 2011, p. 30)

While this was the only recommendation given to school districts and administrators regarding the development and implementation of extra-curricular Codes of Conduct, there was no direction on what the athletic code should include and how it should be constructed. Also missing was a recommendation on what constituted improper behaviors of student-athletes, and how a violation of what were accepted behaviors should be handled. Through trial and error, and many challenges by parents and lawyers, many athletic codes distinctly outlined acceptable and unacceptable behaviors; they also routinely explained how violations would be handled and the specific consequences that came with each violation and any repeat violations.

One of the more important parts of the code of conduct was the administration of the consequences that accompanied the violations for each offense. Most codes
suspended student-athletes from competing for a set length of time or number of contests, depending on the level of the offense and the number of offenses the student-athletes committed previously in that year or over their four years of high school. As part of the suspension, many codes of conduct required the student offender to attend and participate in all practices during the time of the suspension, which could be a percentage of the contests or a specified period of time. Examples of consequences and violations from sample Illinois high school districts are found below:

**First Violations/Offenses**

**Niles West Code of Conduct (2011).** Violations of the Code of Conduct ranged from the involvement of drugs, tobacco, and alcohol, to theft, vandalism, hazing, behavior that was detrimental to the good of the group or organization, and falsifying any of the information contained on any permit or permission from required by the activity or the sport (Niles West High School District #219 Code of Conduct, 2011).

**High School District #211 (2012).** High School District #211 stated that “a minimum penalty for the first violation of the possession/use of alcohol, tobacco, in any form or drugs will be 25% of the scheduled contests (Tournaments, multiples, invitationals, and double-headers count as one contest, at the participant’s level of competition)” (High School District #211 Student-Athlete Handbook, 2012, p. 7). While this particular code did not specifically address what the penalties would be for repeated offenses that were incurred by the same student, it did state that the student could be placed on probation for a specific amount of time, and the student could be dropped for the sport or activity for the remainder of the season and dropped from the sport or activity
for the remainder of student’s time in high school (High School District #211 Student-Athlete Handbook, 2012).

**Mundelein High School District Athletic Code of Conduct (2012).** The sanction for a first violation for the use or possession of tobacco, alcohol, and the illegal use or possession of drugs in any form, including steroids, stated that the athlete would be suspended for one calendar year from the date that the offense was reported to the athletic director (Mundelein High School District #120 Code of Conduct, 2012). The suspension could be reduced to 50% of the athletic season if the athlete completed a substance abuse program that was approved by the school district at the family’s expense. The 50% was usually based on the number of scheduled contests, it was rounded up to the nearest whole number, and it would carry over to the next sport season if not enough contests remained in that sports season (Mundelein High School District #120 Code of Conduct, 2012).

**Lyons Township High School Code of Conduct (2011).** First offences and consequences of the Student Activities Code of Conduct stated that students would not use or attend parties where there was underage drinking of alcohol, steroids, or controlled substances, as a suspension from all activities for ten percent of the competitive season or two events, whichever was less, with the student expected to participate in all practices and attend all contests during that time (Lyons Township High School Student Handbook, 2011). As part of the prerequisite to be eligible for a 10% suspension, the student offender was required to attend a school approved chemical education program; there was not any clarification if the program was to be paid for by the school or the parents, nor were any specifics regarding the program included. The consequences listed for the use
or possession of smoking or smokeless tobacco were the same: a ten percent suspension from all activities of the competitive season, except the requirement of the student to attend a school-approved chemical education program was not required as part of the approved consequences. For a tobacco offense, the offender was not required to participate in a chemical education program to be reinstated to the team or activity (Lyons Township High Student Handbook, 2011).

**Indian Prairie School District #204 Athletic and Activity Code of Conduct (2012).** The consequence for a first offense for prohibited substance use or possession, or if the student attended a party or gathering where alcohol or drugs were being consumed, was a suspension for four weeks from athletic/activity participation. If the student participated in a recommended substance abuse education program or an assessment program from a professional agency, the suspension can be reduced to two weeks (Indian Prairie School District #204, 2012). At the conclusion of the educational program/assessment, proper documentation needed to be provided to the school district and the recommendations of the program was required to be followed. If the offender did not want to obtain the assessment, the suspension remained at four weeks, and the student was not able to practice or participate in contests. A tobacco violation that included the use or possession of tobacco or smokeless tobacco products resulted in the suspension from two athletic contests or events (Indian Prairie School District #204, 2012). There was not a requirement for a substance abuse assessment or evaluation for a first offense tobacco violation, however, if there was a second or third violation for tobacco, there was a requirement for the student to complete a required education program (Indian Prairie School District #204, 2012).
Second Violations/Offenses

High School District #214 (2012). The consequences for a second violation ranged from a suspension of one calendar year with the opportunity for reinstatement after one complete season for a Level A violation, to a suspension from 25% to 50% of the contests or performances for a Level B violation. Level A violations included, but were not limited to, the possession, sale, delivery, use or being under the influence of any controlled substance, including alcohol and tobacco, look-alike drugs, and the possession of drug paraphernalia. Another Level A violation that caused confusion and challenges from students and parents was being present where others were in violation of the code covering the possession and use of controlled substances, including alcohol and tobacco. Level B violations included the possession or use of tobacco by students who were 18 years of age or older, and the first incident of being present where others were in violation of the behaviors outlined in the code and if a legal breathalyzer report of 0.00 was presented (High School District #214, 2012). Included in the consideration for reinstatement to the student’s sport or activity was a letter from a counselor supporting reinstatement; there was no specific language included that the student offender needed to attend or complete any substance abuse/rehabilitative counseling to be returned to the their sport or activity. However, within the consequences section outlined in the code of conduct, the guidelines stated that the intention of the consequences shifted from problem awareness (1st violation), to an emphasis on rehabilitation (2nd violation), to significant punishment (3rd violation) (High School District #214, 2012).

Consolidated High School District #230 (2011). This code of conduct determined the consequences for a 2nd violation depending on the level of violation and a
pre-determined number of dates, contests, matches, or performances: for a Category A violation it was approximately 20%, for a Category B violation it was approximately 50% of the scheduled contests or dates. A Category A violation included the use or possession of tobacco, as well as attendance at a party or gathering, including riding in a car where alcohol or controlled substances were being used, possessed, bought, sold, bartered, discovered, distributed, and/or consumed by minors. A Category B violation included the use, possession, buying, selling, bartering, or distributing of alcohol and/or other drugs.

As part of the consequences to be reinstated to the sport or activity for a second Category A or B violation, student offenders were required to participate and complete a school-approved alcohol or other drug abuse assessment, and to follow all recommendations from that assessment. The suspended student-athlete was required to participate in all practices during the time of the suspension unless that student was suspended or expelled from school during that suspension (Consolidated High School District #230 Parent-Student Handbook, 2011).

**Libertyville Community High School District #128 (2011)**. While many school districts utilized a suspension of 25%-50% of season contests, or a whole season, for a second violation, some districts, such as Community High School District #128, felt that a second violation of the code of conduct warranted a steeper penalty. A second offense of the Athletic Code resulted in the total exclusion from interscholastic athletics for the remainder of the athlete’s career. The athlete could petition to the Athletic Director for reinstatement, providing that at least one calendar year of suspension was completed from the date of the second infraction. Although it was not required for a second violation, a first violation required the successful completion of an approved substance
abuse program to reduce the game/contest suspension from 40% to 30%. This program was to be completed within 60 days of the Athletic Code violation, and documentation was required to be turned in to the Student Assistance Program Coordinator (Libertyville Community High School District #128, 2011).

Third Violations/Offenses

The penalties for a third violation of a code of conduct varied greatly according to school board policy and the level of offense as explained in many of the Codes of Conduct. Most districts required students with drug and alcohol violations to attend a drug/alcohol evaluation or assessment from an outside agency or hospital with their parent/guardian. To be reinstated to the team, students had to follow the recommendations that came from the assessment, at parent expense. The student and parent had to attend a reinstatement meeting with the athletic director and/or the student assessment program representative, and then the principal could reinstate the student’s eligibility. Other school districts feel that the third violation by a student-athlete was just a snapshot of what is going in that student’s life and there needed to be a full time focus on obtaining outside resources to change the prohibited behaviors.

Lyons Township High School Code of Conduct (2011). Lyons Township also suspended student-athletes for one complete calendar year for a third occurrence for drug, alcohol, and tobacco violations. There was no stipulation mentioned regarding the attendance at an educational drug and alcohol program when dealing with the third violation (Lyons Township High School Student Handbook, 2011).

New Trier Athletic Code (2011). On the third violation, New Trier High School suspended a student-athlete for the remainder of their high school career. There was an
option regarding the student in violation attending a recognized, community-based drug
and alcohol educational program; the program was voluntary and at student/parent
expense (New Trier Athletic Handbook, 2011). The suspension from the activity could
be reduced from attending the program, but there was no mention if the attendance at the
voluntary program could be applied to a third offense to reduce the penalty. Other school
districts that suspend students for the remainder of their high school careers that violate
the code of conduct for the third time include Mundelein High School and Lincoln-Way

**Lincoln-Way Community High School District #210 Code of Conduct (2011).**
In addition to a suspension from athletics and extra-curricular activities for the remainder
of their high school career, for a third violation, a meeting between the student, student’s
parent, and a Lincoln-Way counselor/administrator was held to discuss outside resources
that were available to address any problems that the student was having to continually

**Indian Prairie High School District #204 (2012).** Indian Prairie High School
District allowed for a fourth violation of their Code of Conduct for the use or possession
of tobacco and/or smokeless tobacco products, while Lyons Township High School
allowed for a third and fourth violation of certain offenses before the student was
suspended for the remainder of their high school career. Indian Prairie allowed for a
fourth violation of both the tobacco and alcohol, steroids, and controlled substance policy
before the student was unable to participate in extra-curricular opportunities for the
remainder of their high school career (Indian Prairie High School District #204, 2012;
Self-Reported Violations/Offenses

Self-reporting a violation was encouraged by most codes of conduct. Students that self-reported a violation of the school code of conduct for the first time could be subject to a lesser penalty, such as a reduction in the number of contests the player was suspended for, or no penalty at all. Many times, the school would still count the offense as a violation, and the student had to attend an educational program that was approved by the counseling department and school. The voluntary self-report could usually only be used one time during the high school student’s career (Glenbrook High School District #225, Athletic Code of Conduct, 2012).

Interpretive Framework

The Ethic of Care

The interpretive framework that will be applied to this historical study will be the ethic of care as defined by Gilligan (1982) that proposed the need to examine individuals as unique persons and their value, based on a desire that all individuals are treated with dignity and respect. The ethic of care was often compared to the ethic of justice, which was known as the main dominant moral framework utilized in schools (Bates, 2005; Gilligan, 1982). In her book, In a Different Voice, Gilligan (1982) challenged the stages of Lawrence Kohlberg’s Theory of Moral Development, as Gilligan began to notice varied moral approaches by girls and women. These approaches were unable to be recognized or labeled as immature by Kohlberg’s stages and analysis. Gilligan conducted her own research, including both male and female subjects, and assessed participant responses to hypothetical dilemmas, but also asked questions that would elicit morally significant issues and dilemmas from their own life experiences (Bates, 2005). Due to
this research, Gilligan believed there was an alternative to the ethic of justice framework that had been previously overlooked or trivialized by leaders. This alternative was the ethic of care.

Gilligan (1993) stated that the ethic of care was a relational ideal: that the vision was that the self and others would be treated as equal worth, that despite differences in power, things would be fair. The ethic of care was the vision that everyone would be responded to and included, that no one would be left alone or hurt (Gilligan, 1993). It was relationship-based, with responsibility to others with on-going dialogue and an attention to others with emotions, guiding moral thought and action. Based on her work, Gilligan claimed that men favored the ethic of justice while women favored the orientation of care, and that women were more connected to others and were concerned with maintaining relationships with others (Hurd & Brabek, 1997). However, Gilligan (1993) did find that, with maturity, both care-based and justice-based individuals used both frameworks when making moral decisions.

Noddings (1992) continued to develop the theory of the ethic of care within education. She stated that all the voices needed to be heard, and that they could not all be categorized into the ethical ways of justice, law, and rights (Shapiro & Stefkovich, 2005). There were other voices: concern, connectedness, relatedness, and caring that were important and should be heard and valued. Noddings (1992) advocated that students should be at the center of the educational process and that they needed to be nurtured and encouraged in the school setting (Shapiro & Stefkovich, 2005). Noddings (1992) stated that, “Caring is the very bedrock of all successful education and …. contemporary schooling can be revitalized in its light” (p. 27). Noddings felt that the current ways
schools were organized as large, bureaucratic, physical plants, failed to properly develop healthy, caring relationships that were crucial for the healthy development of children. Educators should respond to the needs of the children and the “cared for,” and not adopt universal policies that required coercion that produced resistance for parents and students and weakened relationships (Katz, Noddings, & Strike, 1999). “Engrossment,” or attention giving, was a necessary condition for caring; it did not need to be intense or pervasive in the life of the one-caring, but it must occur (Houston & Diller, 1988; Noddings, 1984).

Engrossment was a “feeling with” another person, not a “how would I feel in that person’s situation,” but a “what is that other person feeling” awareness (Houston & Diller, 1988). This engrossment occurred when one temporarily suspended the preoccupations of self so that another person could fill the field of attention. The person caring felt the displacement of motivation, the motive for the caring flowed in the direction of the other person’s needs and objectives, and then acted on their behalf (Noddings, 1988). This state of “motivational displacement” was the central tenant to the ethic of care. A person may feel engrossment with the person “cared for,” but to truly “care for,” an ethical commitment to act on behalf of the other must occur (Houston & Diller, 1988; Noddings, 1992). The dual state of engrossment and motivational displacement may or may not continue, depending on the relationship and the situation. Noddings (1992) stated that, in any case, caring “requires me to respond to the initial impulse with an act of commitment: I commit myself either to overt action on behalf of the cared for… or I commit myself to thinking about what I might do.” The growth of the cared-for is very important to the ethic of care; do the cared-fors feel cared for? Are
their legitimate needs considered? Are the relations of care enhanced or weakened? (Katz, Noddings, & Strike, 1999). If the intended receiver of care did not consciously receive care or did not respond, then care was incomplete, no matter the intention or action of the person providing the care (Bates, 2005). The one cared-for also had to contribute to the relationship by recognizing and responding to the caring; the contributions made by the one caring should be apparent to the one cared-for (Noddings, 1988).

An important factor in developing, repairing, and preventing breakdowns in relationships was genuine open and on-going dialogue. Genuine dialogue was open ended and ongoing in which both parties spoke and listened, working their way toward the resolution of the problem (Noddings, 2010). The roles of the care giver and the cared-for could change according to the situation and was used to identify needs, to learn what the cared-for was going through, or what the care giver was attempting to achieve, and then to work together on meeting the needs of the cared-for (Noddings, 2010). The dialogue within a true caring relationship was defined by an attention to the cared-for, not just the main topic of the discussion (Noddings, 2007). The dialogue may not end in a solution that satisfied the needs of the cared-for, but it should end in a way that continues the caring relationship (Noddings, 2010).

**The Ethic of Critique**

The ethic of critique framework will also be applied to the historical study through the examination of the present policies, practices, and the structure of the current codes of conduct to assess their fairness within the existing social environment. Many philosophers were not convinced by the type of logic and rationale promoted in the ethic
of justice (Freire, 1998; Giroux, 2003; Greene, 1988). They critiqued the laws and the social processes through which these laws were brought to fruition and how they were determined to be just. Rather than accept the words of those in power, these philosophers questioned and challenged the status quo, seeking to redefine and reframe the important issues that revolved around social inequities (Roubanis, Garner, & Purcell, 2008).

With the framework of Starratt (1991), this historical study sought to assess each code to determine the following: who defined the problems, who controlled the development of strategies to rectify the problems, and who benefitted from the examination of the problems with the policies and practices of the codes of conduct. Society consisted of different groups trying to gain control, and Starratt stated on the ethic of critique in educational administration:

The theme of critique forces the administrator to confront the moral issues involved with schools that disproportionately benefit some groups in society and fail others. Furthermore, as a bureaucratic organization, the school exhibits structural properties that may promote the misuse of power and authority among its members. (Starratt, 2004, p. 47)

The ethic of critique focused on identifying injustices in the institution and the institutions of society. It was a challenge to the status quo by seeking an ethic that would deal with the competing interests and inconsistencies, formulate the hard questions, and debate the issues that were challenging (Shapiro & Stefkovich, 2005). Due to varying interests and unequal power, privilege, language, or culture, the success of one group could come at the expense of the other (Behrns, 2005). Protecting the rights of all citizens and forcing groups to rethink and reform inequities in society was a focus of the
ethic of critique. Shapiro and Stefkovich (2005) stated that the ethic of critique should make us reflect on our real values and look at how our own morals had been changed and possibly corrupted by our experiences and environment. The identification and examination of bias and inequities in society regarding race, gender, social class and economics to benefit one group more than the other, was the central theme to the framework of the ethic of critique. This framework “provides a way for enabling the school community to move from a kind of naiveté about the way things are to an awareness that the social and political arenas reflect arrangements of power, privilege, interest, and influence” (Starratt, 2003, p. 142).

Moos (2008) stated that, besides the opportunity for action and participation in a school, “critique” was the most important ideal related to democracy in education. One of the central concerns for a democratic school was the use of critical reflection as an analysis to evaluate ideas, problems, and policies that were in place at the school (Furman & Starratt, 2002). School structures, policies, and procedures needed to be evaluated for the status quo by looking at what was wrong and unfair with policies and procedures. According to Shapiro and Stefkovich (2005), further questions that needed to be asked by educators included: Who makes the laws, policies, and procedures? Who benefits from those? Who has the power to make the laws, policies, and procedures? What needs to be changed? Who are the unrecognized and silenced voices that are not being heard? When those unrecognized and silenced voices were finally heard, the ethic of critique questioned how much it would upset the status quo. Critical theorists felt that the critique was important, but that there also needed to be action to bring about democracy.
Foster (1986) stated that critical theory “questions the framework of the way we organize our lives or the way our lives are organized for us.” The point of critique was to discover which group had the advantage over the others, how it got that way, and to show how language and various situations were made to keep things as they were (McCray & Beachum, 2006). Bureaucratic organizations, such as schools, contained many structural properties that developed and rewarded the misuse of power and authority (McKerrow, 2000). The use of ethical decision making based on inclusive discourse, rather than exclusive policies, would ensure that people were being treated as equals rather than a means to an end (McKerrow, 2000). Shapiro and Gross (2008) believed certain situations called for ignoring the rules and regulations already in place and asking if the rules, laws, procedures, or contracts were appropriate for this each case: Who made them? When were they made? And finally, above all, should they be followed in this case (Shapiro & Gross, 2008)? Critical theorists challenged the policies, procedures, and rules and would take a stand for and support moral and democratic practices in schools, and hoped to change students for the better (Giroux, 1994; Purpel, 1989). Foster (1986) stated that educational leaders should be “humanists that are not content with the status quo and hope to change individuals for the better and to improve social conditions for all” (pp. 17-18). Ideally, according to the ethic of critique, educational leaders would be empowerers who combined critical and feminine perspectives to develop a framework of care and work to maintain relationships, community, caring, and connection (Gilligan, 1982; Marshall, 1995; Noddings; 1992).
CHAPTER III

METHODOLOGY

Introduction

This study examined two high school districts in the state of Illinois and the events, evolution, and rationale for changes made to the consequences of the violations outlined in their extra-curricular Codes of Conduct. It also reviewed the evolution of each Code of Conduct from development to current state to determine if implemented changes in consequences and rehabilitative procedures were what were best for students in violation. The study continued to examine the groups of stakeholders in each school community who were advocates and leaders that brought about changes in consequences in the Code of Conduct at each high school district. For the purpose of this dissertation, “best” is defined as the development and implementation of a process for counseling, education, rehabilitation, and change if a violation occurred. The interpretive frameworks that were applied to the historical study were the ethic of care by Gilligan (1982), these ethics asserted that individuals should be valued as unique persons, based on a desire that all individuals are treated with dignity and respect, and the ethic of critique framework by Starratt (1991), which was used in the examination of the policies, practices, and structures of the current Codes of Conduct to determine if they were unfair within the existing social environment by looking at who was defining the problem, who was controlling the development of strategies to rectify the problem, and who was going to benefit from the examination of the problems with the policies and practices of the
Codes of Conduct. Through the use of a mixed methodology consisting of historical documentary research and oral history the study answers the following research questions:

1. What was the evolution of the code of conduct for the students from two separate school districts?
   - High School District A and High School District B. High School District A was one that was considered to be one of the top high schools in the State of Illinois with a high per pupil expenditure, a high socio-economic status, and with standardized test scores that were one of the highest in the state. The second school was a district with low standardized test scores, average per pupil expenditure, and a low socio-economic status with a high minority population. This was High School District B.
   - What was the evolution of the consequences for the student when in violation of the Code of Conduct for each of the districts?

2. Who were the advocates and leaders for change in the evolution of the consequences of Codes of Conduct for each school district?
   - What were the arguments, impetus, and rationale for the change for the advocates and the leaders?
   - What were the obstacles that leaders faced in trying to effect the changes, and what were the strategies utilized to overcome those obstacles? Was there evidence of change being made to the code of conduct as a result of recognizing the obstacles?
• Which advocacy groups had a voice and utilized their influence to determine if the student was treated with dignity and respect, and was there evidence of the utilization of the ethic of care and the ethic of critique while examining, reviewing, and implementing the Codes of Conduct?

3. What programs were developed to meet the needs of the students who violated the code of conduct?

• Who were the leaders in defining the problem and their impetus for change when examining the development of strategies for the rehabilitative procedures?

• What were the obstacles faced by leaders when developing the rehabilitative procedures, and what strategies were developed to overcome the obstacles?

• Who were the leaders in determining the benefits for students when reviewing the strategies for the rehabilitative procedures, and was there evidence of the utilization of the ethic of care and the ethic of critique while examining, reviewing, and implementing the rehabilitative procedures?

4. What are the implications for today’s educational leaders?

This chapter will describe the methodology that was used in this research study. The chapter will include the research design, sample selection, data collection procedures, data analysis, ethical considerations, limitations, and researcher biases.
Research Design

This study utilized a mixed methodology consisting of historical research and an oral history analysis of extra-curricular codes of conduct from two high school districts selected by per pupil spending, socio-economic status, and standardized test scores. School District A was a high school district considered to be one of the top high schools in the State of Illinois according to per pupil expenditure, high socio-economic status, and with standardized test scores that were one of the highest in the state. The second was a high school district with low standardized test scores, average per pupil expenditure, and a low socio-economic status with a high minority population; this was High School District B.

Cohen, Manion, and Morrison (2007) defined historical research as “… the systemic and objective location, evaluation, and synthesis of evidence in order to establish facts and draw conclusions about past events” (p. 191). The purpose of documentary research is to create knowledge by the study of sources and the application of theoretical frameworks (Johnson & Christensen, 2004). Historical research is “the process of systematically examining past events or combination of events to arrive at an account of what has happened in the past” (Johnson et al., 2004, p. 411). Historical research is not only the accumulation of facts, dates, and figures, but it is also the interpretation of the facts to communicate multiple points of view. Berg (1998) lists five reasons for conducting historical research:

1. To uncover the unknown.
2. To answer questions.
3. To identify the relationship that the past has to the present.
4. To record and evaluate the accomplishments of individuals, agencies, or institutions.

5. To aid in our understanding of the culture in which we live.

McCulloch (2004) stated that documentary research is “concerned mainly with documents that have been produced without any direct involvement on the part of the researcher, produced for other purposes and often with different priorities from those of the researcher” (p. 2). The researcher of this historical study ensured that the resulting narrative from the documentary research was based on evidence collected through the analysis of documents utilizing the theoretical framework of the ethic of care (Gilligan, 1982) and the ethic of critique (Starratt, 1991). By reviewing documents from a variety of sources, new stories were created and new ways of understanding the past were presented. The study presents an historical perspective of the evolution of the consequences contained in extra-curricular Codes of Conduct and who were the principal advocates for changes, as well as the arguments and rationale for the changes that were made. The study also examined the obstacles that were faced when attempting to implement the change in consequences and rehabilitative procedures.

**Primary and Secondary Sources**

This study utilized primary and secondary sources to tell the story. A primary source is one in which the creator was a direct witness or was in some way directly involved or related to the event. Examples of primary resources include diaries, original maps, songs, transcripts of oral interviews with a person who participated in the event, board meeting minutes, court decisions and arguments, and original photos (Johnson & Christensen, 2004). The primary sources in this study were school board reports, parent-
student handbooks, committee reports, and documents dealing with the development and implementation of the consequences and rehabilitative procedures resulting from a code of conduct violation. Another primary source was a collection of oral histories from stakeholders, including teachers, counselors, substance abuse professionals, and school administrators involved in the evolution of the consequences and rehabilitative procedures over the course of time, and what roles they played in the process.

Secondary sources not directly from the time events occurred were also utilized to provide background information on the subject. Secondary sources are those that are created from primary sources, other secondary sources, or some combination of primary and secondary sources (Johnson & Christensen, 2004). They are sources that are not directly from the time that the events occurred, and they are at least one step removed from direct contact, involvement, or relationship with the event being researched. The secondary sources in this study also assisted the researcher by providing other sources and avenues to help locate and utilize other primary sources. This study utilized additional dissertations, articles, books, professional journal articles, and newspaper articles to inform instructional leaders of resources available regarding extra-curricular Codes of Conduct.

Oral History

Johnson and Christensen (2004) defined oral history as interviews with a person who has had direct or indirect experience with or knowledge of the chosen topic. The Oral History Association went further to define oral history as a full field of study and a method of gathering, preserving, and interpreting the voices and memories of people, communities, and participants in past events. Charlton (1985) defined oral history as,
“the recording and preserving of planned interviews with selected persons able to narrate recollected memory and thereby aid the reconstruction of the past.” The value of an oral history could be found in the background given by people who were able to enrich the understanding of the issues being studied and by drawing parallels with those issues. Significant events can be discovered and enriched by giving a voice to observers of participants that would have otherwise remained silent (Kritsonis, 2008). Ritchie (2003) explained that, “oral history collects memories and personal commentaries of historical significance through recorded interviews that generally consists of an interviewer questioning an interviewee” (p. 19). The format of an oral history can be audio or video, and then transcribed, summarized, and indexed for use in research or any form of public presentation.

Baum (1978) defined oral history as:

1. A tape recorded interview, or interviews, in a question and answer format;
2. Conducted by an interviewer who has some, and preferably the more the better, knowledge of the subject to be discussed;
3. With a knowledgeable interviewee, someone who knows where of he or she speaks from personal participation or observation (sometime allowing a second hand account);
4. Subjects of historical (or community) interest; and
5. Accessible, eventually, in tapes and/or transcripts to a broad spectrum of researchers. (pp. 389-390)

Hoffman (1974) stated that an oral history’s
most important advantage… is that it makes possible the preservation of life experience of persons who do not have the leisure to write their memoirs… Interviews with people who have been foot soldiers in various important movements of social change but who have heretofore been unrecorded may now be preserved and hence their impact assessed.

(Hoffman, 1974, p. 26)

Oral history is a way to give a voice to those who historically have been silent, those that don’t know any better, don’t think about it, don’t know how to, or feel that what they have to say is not important. It is, at its core, a dialogue between the interviewer and the interviewee. Allesandro Portelli believed, “oral history refers to what the source and the historian do together at the moment of their encounter in the interview” (Shopes, 2012, p. 3).

The researcher conducted an oral history interview with those individuals from School District A and District B that were leaders in the evolvement of Codes of Conduct within their respective school districts. This included, but was not limited to, school administrators, athletic and activity directors, discipline coordinators, faculty, student assistance directors, and counselors. The Oral History Protocol (see Appendix B) was used to guide the oral history interviews of the selected representatives of each school district. The protocol consisted of an open-ended request to ask creative and probing questions that could lead to follow-up questions to create as complete a record as possible for the benefit of others. The interviewer worked to achieve a balance between the objectives of the project and the perspective of the interviewees. The protocol discussed the interviewee’s experiences with related probes designed to gain an understanding of
the past and the cost and effort involved in the development of extra-curricular Codes of Conduct within each school district. The researcher utilized the oral history interviews to gain first-hand knowledge of the participant’s roles and reflections, and to explore all areas of inquiry while encouraging responses to questions that addressed issues that may be have been a cause for concern to those involved in the development and changes to the extra-curricular Codes of Conduct. The researcher reviewed the informed consent form with all interviewees, detailing the purpose of the research, the reasons for conducting the interview, the process that was involved, their rights to the interviews including the transcription, editing, access, and expected dissemination of the research, the need for informed consent, and the right to terminate the interview at any time. The recordings remained confidential unless the interviewee gave permission via a signed legal release.

**Sample Selection**

The school districts selected for this study were selected by differences in standardized test scores according to PSAE score data, per pupil spending, and the percentage of minority students within the school district. High School District A was considered one of the top high schools in the State of Illinois according to per pupil expenditure, published standardized test scores that were one of the highest in the state, and had a lower percentage of minority students. High School District B had low standardized test scores, average per pupil expenditure, a high percentage of minority students, and was undergoing significant district organizational changes.

**Data Collection**

The researcher examined primary sources including school board reports, parent-student handbooks, committee reports, and documents dealing with the development and
implementation of the consequences and rehabilitative procedures resulting from a code of conduct violation. Another primary source was oral histories from the stakeholders, including teachers, counselors, faculty, substance abuse professionals, and school administrators involved in the evolution of the consequences and rehabilitative procedures over the course of time, and what roles they may have played in the process.

Oral histories were used as a primary source of data collection. The purpose of the interviews was to gain historical information of past events from the stakeholders, including parents, teachers, board members, committee members, and school administrators involved in the evolution of the consequences and rehabilitative procedures over the course of time, and what roles did they play in the process. A letter of introduction (see Appendix D) which described the purpose of the research was sent to those individuals who were identified as being involved in the process of the development, implementation, and changes to the extra-curricular Codes of Conduct. The letter specified the process, requirements, and selection criteria for the participant. Those that responded to the letter were contacted via email or phone by the researcher to set up a time to meet face to face for the oral history. The reasons for conducting the oral history, the process that was to be involved, and the need for informed consent was provided to the participant upon the receipt of interest in participating in the study. The participants were informed by the researcher that they were free to withdraw from the study at any time without any penalties. On the day of the interview, the researcher reviewed the Consent to Participate in Research (see Appendix A) and allowed for questions and clarifications of her or her rights. The interviewee was asked to sign the Consent to Participate in Research, which included that the interview will be audio taped.
The audio-tapings were stored for one year in the researcher’s home in a locked cabinet, and no other person had access to the cabinet. After the one year, all tapings were destroyed by the researcher. The researcher conducted a member check at the conclusion of the study. The member check allowed the respondents to clarify statements and verify if the statements made were accurate and their interpretation was correct. They had the right to remove any quotes or comments they did not want on record or to clarify any statements as needed without consequences.

Data Analysis

Ryan and Bernard (2003) discussed four tasks that are necessary to analyze data:

1. The researcher must look for themes and subthemes;
2. The researcher must chisel down the themes to what is significant for the study;
3. The researcher must use the themes to build a hierarchy of themes; and
4. The researcher must link all the themes together in order to establish a theoretical model.

The researcher reviewed relevant primary and secondary source artifacts and oral history transcriptions to identify themes and patterns that addressed the theoretical themes of the ethic of care (Gilligan, 1982) and the ethic of critique (Starratt, 1991). These themes arose from the oral histories and historical documents that were reviewed and analyzed to describe ideals and explain phenomena (Ryan & Bernard, 2003). The collection of data using multiple sources and multiple methods provided triangulation of the data (Hayes, 2000). A combination of current research, literature review, the
evaluation of primary and secondary document, and the results of the oral histories provided triangulation of the data for this study.

**Ethical Considerations**

The researcher took the necessary steps to protect all participants from harm and conduct an ethical research study. The participants were assured that their names and schools were not used when reporting the findings of the data. The Consent to Participate in Research was used to provide an explanation of the purpose of the study, transcription, and the issue of confidentiality. The participants in the study could decline to answer any question during the interview, and the participants could withdraw from the study at any time without penalty. The audio-tapings were stored for one year in the researcher’s home in a locked cabinet, and no other person had access to the cabinet. After the one year, all tapings were destroyed by the researcher. The transcriber contracted by the researcher signed a confidentiality agreement, which strictly prohibited the sharing of any information provided in the tapings in any form (see Appendix C). The researcher conducted a member check at the conclusion of the study. The member check allowed the respondents to clarify statements and verify if the statements made were accurate and their interpretation was correct. Participants had the right to remove any quotes or comments they did not want on record or to clarify any statements as needed without consequences.

**Limitations**

This research was subject to a number of limitations beyond the control of the researcher and the limited scope of the sample.
1. The schools studied were limited to two suburban Chicago high school districts in the State of Illinois, excluding Chicago Public Schools. Therefore, the findings of the study are those of the suburban high school administrators, counselors, and support personnel.

2. Due to time constraints and resources available, all the high school administrators, faculty, counselors, and support personnel stakeholders involved in the development, implementation, and adaptation of the extra-curricular Codes of Conduct were not available.

3. The results from the study are not generalizable to other high schools in urban or rural settings, or those outside the state of Illinois.

4. While most high schools in Illinois maintained an extra-curricular code of conduct, they were different in language, scope, implementation, and interpretation, thus the study may not be generalizable to all high schools.

   **Bias Minimization**

1. In the professional experience of the researcher, the researcher has observed ineffective development and implementation of extra-curricular codes of conduct.

2. To minimize bias, the researcher has eliminated the identification of the school in which subjects were an administrator in charge of the implementation and interpretation of extra-curricular Codes of Conduct.

3. The researcher attempted to put personal experience and connections aside that entered into the study, especially during the data analysis process.
4. The researcher’s experience in the development, implementation, and prescription of extra-curricular Codes of Conduct could have impacted objectivity.

To acknowledge and provide control of the listed biases, the researcher maintained a reflective journal to maintain researcher objectivity. The journal documented reaction to the primary and secondary source documents, questions raised, assumptions, contradictions, and personal reflections to understand their own biases and predispositions.

Summary

This chapter has explained the methodology of historical documentary and oral history that was used to gain an understanding of thoughts and perceptions of the school administrators, faculty, counselors, and support personnel as stakeholders involved in the development, implementation, and adaptation of extra-curricular codes of conduct. The researcher considered the limitations of the study and the biases that could exist, along with the outlining of data collection and data analysis procedures used in the study. The researcher hopes that the data collected will inform school administrators and compel them to review, analyze, and adapt their extra-curricular Codes of Conduct with the ethic of care (Gilligan, 1982) and the ethic of critique (Starratt, 1991) as the basis of their thinking.
CHAPTER IV
PRESENTATION OF DATA AND FINDINGS

Introduction

This study examined two high school districts in the state of Illinois and the events, evolution, and rationale for changes made to the consequences of the violations outlined in their extra-curricular Codes of Conduct. It also reviewed the evolution of each Code of Conduct from development to current state to determine if implemented changes in consequences and rehabilitative procedures were what were best for students in violation. The study continued to examine the groups of stakeholders in each school community who were advocates and leaders that brought about changes in consequences in the Code of Conduct at each high school district. For the purpose of this dissertation “best” is defined as the development and implementation of a process for counseling, education, rehabilitation, and change if a violation does occurs. The interpretive frameworks that were applied to the historical study were the ethic of care by Gilligan (1982), these ethics asserted that individuals should be valued as unique persons, based on a desire that all individuals are treated with dignity and respect. The ethic of critique framework was applied to the historical study through the examination of the present policies, practices, and the structure of the current Codes of Conduct that they are unfair within the existing social environment. Who is defining the problem, who is controlling the development of strategies to rectify the problem, and who is going to benefit from the examination of the problems with the policies and practices of the Codes of Conduct
The ethic of critique will also examine the voices not heard during the development and the implementation of Codes of Conduct at the respective high school districts, to determine if the polices and structures may be advantaging one group over the other (Shapiro, 2005).

**Research Questions**

The study will answer the following research questions:

1. What was the evolution of the Code of Conduct for the students from two separate school districts? High School District A and High School District B. High School District A was considered to be one of the top high schools in the State of Illinois with a high per pupil expenditure, a high socio-economic status, and with standardized test scores that were among the highest in the state. School District B had low standardized test scores, average per pupil expenditure, and a low socio-economic status with a high minority population.
   a. What was the evolution of the consequences for the student when in violation of the Code of Conduct for each of the districts?

2. Who were the advocates and leaders for change in the evolution of the consequences of Codes of Conduct for each school district?
   a. What were the arguments, impetus, and rationale for the change for the advocates and the leaders?
   b. What were the obstacles that the leaders faced in trying to effect the changes and what were the strategies utilized to overcome those obstacles?
      Was there evidence of change being made to the Code of Conduct as a result of recognizing the obstacles?
c. Which advocacy groups had a voice and utilized their influence to determine if the student is treated with dignity and respect, and was there evidence of the utilization of the ethic of care and the ethic of critique while examining, reviewing, and implementing the Codes of Conduct?

3. What programs were developed to meet the needs of the students who violated the Code of Conduct?
   a. Who were the leaders in defining the problem and their impetus for change when examining the development of strategies for the rehabilitative procedures?
   b. What were the obstacles faced by the leaders when developing the rehabilitative procedures and what strategies were developed to overcome the obstacles?
   c. Who were the leaders in determining the benefits for students when reviewing the strategies for the rehabilitative procedures, and was there evidence of the utilization of the ethic of care and the ethic of critique while examining, reviewing, and implementing the rehabilitative procedures?

4. What are the implications for today’s educational leaders?

   **Research Participant Sample**

   The school districts selected for this study were selected by differences in standardized test scores according to PSAE score data, per pupil spending, and the percentage of minority students within the school district. School District A was considered one of the top high schools in the State of Illinois according to per pupil
expenditure, had standardized test scores that ranked among the highest in the state, and served a lower percentage of minority students. School District B, reported low standardized test scores, had average per pupil expenditure, and served a high percentage of minority students, and was undergoing significant changes. Primary sources will include oral histories from the stakeholders and advocates, including substance abuse counselors, teachers, committee members, and school administrators involved in the evolution of the consequences and rehabilitative procedures over the course of time. Advocates were defined as those that spoke on behalf of the children that were affected by the implementation of the Code of Conduct. Also included were those who implemented any of changes that were put into place in response to concerns brought forward by advocates and stakeholders.

Data Collection

Oral histories served as a primary source of data collection. The purpose of the interviews was to gain historical information of past events from the stakeholders, including parents, teachers, board members, committee members, and school administrators, involved in the evolution of the consequences and rehabilitative procedures contained in the Codes of Conduct over the course of time, and to identify what roles they played in the process. A total of six stakeholders who were identified as being involved in the process of the development, implementation, and changes to the extra-curricular Codes of Conduct responded to the letter of introduction and were asked to participate by agreeing to tell their story in an oral history interview. Those that responded to the letter were contacted via email or phone by the researcher and set up a time to meet face to face for the oral history. The reasons for conducting the oral history,
the process involved, and the need for informed consent was provided to the participant upon the receipt of interest in participating in the study. The participants were informed by the researcher that they were free to withdraw from the study at any time without any penalties. The oral history interviews were conducted throughout the months of March 2013-January 2014. On the day of the interview the researcher reviewed the Consent to Participate in Research (see Appendix A) and allowed for questions and clarifications of participant rights. Prior to the interview, each participant was asked to sign the Consent to Participate in Research (see Appendix A), which included that the interview will be audio taped. After each oral history interview, the audio tape was transcribed verbatim and e-mailed to the respective participant for clarity and editing purposes. The participants had the right to remove any quotes or comments they do not want on record or to clarify any statements as needed without consequences.

**Presentation of Data**

**High School District A**

**Subject #1.** From High School District A, this participant served as a high school principal, but had previously held the positions of assistant principal, teacher, and coach.

The extra-curricular Code of Conduct began appearing in the school district in official school policy in 1986 (School District A Board minutes, September 8, 1986). However, the discussions toward having a written school policy began in 1974 as a response to more students challenging authority in the school and in society. Subject #1 states: “In the late 1960’s and 70’s more students and parents began to challenge the basic rules in place in the school and within their school teams and activities. The Code of Conduct for students was in response to inconsistent and uncoordinated efforts of the
school staff taking action in response to improper behavior by the students involved in extra-curricular activities” (Subject #1, interview, March 2013). The administration and staff decided to get together to develop a set of guidelines for everyone to follow for inappropriate behavior outside of the school that involved students involved in extra-curricular activities.

Prior to the development of a consistent set of rules and guidelines it was left up to the individual coaches and sponsors to handle the discipline within the team if a rule violation occurred, and the rules were different for each activity and sport. It was occasionally left up to a vote of the head coaches to determine if any discipline would be applied to student-athletes that violated the general team rules. This lead to coaches and parents “looking the other way” on some rule violations depending on the sport, who the coach was, and who the athlete was that was involved in the apparent violation (Subject #1, interview, March 2013). Due to this uncoordinated effort of the staff and the inconsistency of discipline being applied the administration and coaches within the school district determined that a consistent set of guidelines and rules was needed to accurately address inappropriate behavior by the student-athletes and those students involved in other extra-curricular and co-curricular activities.

Also driving the need for a clear and consistent set of guidelines for inappropriate behavior by the students involved in athletics and activities was the increase in litigation and the involvement of lawyers in the school environment. The lack of structure and consistency in the development and administering of rules and regulations regulating the behavior of the students involved in extra-curricular and co-curricular activities prompted High School District A school attorneys to determine that the district needed to develop a
clear and consistent set of guidelines, a list of inappropriate behaviors, and detailed consequences for those inappropriate behaviors that was written, incorporated into school policy and published in the student-parent handbook. A big step by the school to coordinate the efforts to hold those involved in extra-curricular activities accountable was taken in the spring and summer of 1974. Subject #1 explained, “The school district formed a Superintendent’s Advisory Committee that included stakeholders from the school including administration representatives: principal, assistant principals, deans, athletic director, non-curricular faculty, and coaches from selected sports” (Subject #1, interview, March 2013). The proposals from the committee were reviewed and presented to the school attorneys for proper language and structure that would be appropriate and defensible if challenged.

As the original Code of Conduct was implemented the committee saw the code as a policy and document that would be refined, evolve and change over time according to issues that came up and what the district could do to help the students. Subject #1 explained, “The driving force for the changes and adaptations to the Code of Conduct were generally internal; coming from the school administrators and coaches that were involved in the implementation, enforcement of the penalties, and reintroduction after the penalties back to extra-curricular activities as required for a violation of the behaviors outlined in the Code of Conduct” (Subject #1, interview, March 2013). This included the principal, deans, athletic director, and any resources that were made available to the students and parents as part of the requirements of the Code of Conduct. If concerns regarding what was contained in the Code of Conduct were brought to the school personnel responsible for the implementation of the code by parents or students involved
in the extra or co-curricular programs, those concerns were reviewed and addressed.

Subject #1 stated that the Code of Conduct should be approached from a positive direction rather than a negative. “The policy should stand for something: high standards, ethics, values, and beliefs. The code should be there to help the students not be punitive” (Subject #1, interview, March 2013).

One of the main issues that caused concern among the committee when the Code of Conduct was first implemented was to define the fair amount of contests for a student to be suspended for when they committed a violation. Initially, all of the violations of the behaviors outlined in the Code of Conduct required the same amount of game/contest suspensions from each of the individual sports, no matter the number of contests that were scheduled for that sport. If the football team played nine games and the softball team played 30 games, and the student in violation of the Code of Conduct was suspended for one game from each of the seasons, a student would be missing more of the football season than a student would from the softball season due to the total number of contests. This was initially rectified by suspending the student in violation of the Code of Conduct for a specific amount of time from the contests that were to be played during that time frame. An example for a first time violation of the Code of Conduct: the student offender would be suspended for a week, and a second violation would be for half the season. The differences in each sport or activity in the number of contests played in a week and for a half a season caused problems and challenges with this mode of determining the number of contests to suspend an athlete. The argument of the coaches and parents was that the number of contests that the student was to be suspended needed
to be equitable and should be based on many factors instead of just a number of games or
time frame due to the influence of many issues.

Through the research of other Codes of Conduct in place at other schools, and
communication and meetings with those involved in the Code of Conduct process,
including administrators, parents, coaches, and faculty, the change was made to go to a
system of the suspension of contests based on a percentage of the number of contests that
the sport activity had scheduled, according to the limits outlined in the Illinois High
School Association by-laws. The number of contests that the student was suspended was
dependent on the severity of the violation and the number of the violations that the
student had accumulated during the year or during their high school career. The first
violation usually incurred a suspension of 10% of the scheduled contests for that specific
sport, a second violation of the code resulted in a 40-50% of the scheduled contests,
while a third violation resulted in a suspension of one calendar year from their activity or
sport. Instead of being a zero-tolerance policy, student-athletes that violated the Code of
Conduct had two opportunities to violate the code and still be able to return to their sport
or activity for that season or sport. However, after the third violation, the student was
suspended for the year. Included in this suspension was the opportunity for rehabilitation
and counseling depending, on the violation in question.

Another issue regarding the Code of Conduct that was challenged during the
initial development and implementation of the behaviors and consequences for a
violation was the application of the rules for behavior during the summer, or when the
student was not in the sport or activity. “Many of the parents and even the coaches
thought the school district was overstepping their authority by having the students
involved in athletics and activities accountable for the rules for appropriate behavior in the Code of Conduct during the summer when school was not in session” (Subject #1, interview, March 2013). They felt that the parents should be responsible for their children’s behavior when not in school, and they would take care of the consequences, if any at all. The committee of stakeholders developing the code felt that the students involved in the extra and co-curricular programs represent the school and their sport on a year-round basis and, thus, should be expected to have high standards of behavior at all times, during their sport, the school year, and during the summer when school was not in session. It was determined that those students who violated the Code of Conduct in regards to tobacco, alcohol, and/or drugs at any time during the calendar year would be susceptible to the penalties listed in the code. They also would be offered the opportunity for a voluntary admission, where the student could admit to having an issue with substance abuse and the penalty of a suspension from the activity would be waived.

One of the important changes added to the Code of Conduct over time was the required counseling evaluation offered to the students that were in violation of the tobacco, alcohol, and other substance abuse issues, including all types of drugs. This change was implemented after challenges by the parents that the students were being suspended from their activities and sports for violating the Code of Conduct, but nothing was helping them deal with a possible substance abuse problem. After reviewing the recommendation, the administrative team, including in-house and outside counseling resources, implemented and required a counseling service referral for a Code of Conduct violation that involved any type of tobacco, alcohol, or drug and substance abuse issue (Subject #1, interview, March 2013).
**Subject #2.** From High School District A, this participant was an Athletic Director but had previously held the positions of teacher and coach. The subject described her leadership style as open and available as needed, the subject was considered to have an open door policy that helped people achieve their full potential. The subject felt that she was held to a higher standard, due to being one of the first females in the field of athletic administration. The subject felt that she was challenged early and often by the males in the department to make decisions that were considered to be contentious at that time in the field. “The Code of Conduct was developed due to the inequity of how students in different sports and different schools within the district were being disciplined and treated when they violated team rules” (Subject #2, interview, May 2013). There was no consistency to the penalties or the violations that occurred, which put a lot of pressure on the administration to make decisions on a student’s discipline with no guidelines or structure. This led to the administration and some coaches in both of the buildings to develop a document or Code of Conduct that defined the equitable treatment of athletes that committed violations of the specified behaviors. An outside source trained in the rehabilitation of teenage substance abuse was brought in to help develop and structure a Code of Conduct for those students involved in extra-curricular and co-curricular activities that were educational based. The core belief was that the students needed to change their decision-making skills and be taught strategies to deal with abusive behaviors that included tobacco, drugs, and alcohol. Subject #2 stated, “the consequences were to be instructional-based and not punitive in nature that denied the student the opportunity to participate in athletics or activities” (Subject #2, interview, May 2013).
While the initial Code of Conduct document was developed within the school by administrators and the outside source trained in the rehabilitation of teenage substance abuse, more and more people that were impacted by the document were included in the adaptations and revisions of the original document. This included administrators, coaches, teachers, and parents that were involved in the school and community, and it was usually yearly in its initial development years. Many of the prohibited behaviors, penalties, and consequences were changed when situations arose that needed to be addressed in the code. It was a constantly evolving document that was adapted to address any challenges or issues facing schools and students involved in athletics and activities. Subject #2 explained, “The main challenge of the Code of Conduct early on was that it singled out only the athletes, and other activities such as band and music were not under the same rules of conduct” (Subject #2, interview, May 2013). As the code was adjusted and adapted on a yearly basis, it was designed to include all extra and co-curricular activities. The administrators in the schools were very supportive of the development of a consistent Code of Conduct to define the prohibited behaviors and conduct of the students: they put the people in place to make it happen at the time. They knew it was time for the document and to have consistency within the programs and schools.

Some of the initial detractors to an overall Code of Conduct were the coaches of the teams. “The coaches thought they were dealing with it the best way possible; of course they did not see the big picture on how the lack of consistency between prohibited conducts and the consequences that were handed out caused dissension in the school and in the community that usually worked its way up to the administration” (Subject #2, interview, May 2013). Once the initial code was implemented the coaches found that the
decision making process was taken out of their hands and they actually enjoyed being out of the process. Although they did not agree with all the decisions and penalties that occurred, they did enjoy the consistency of the rules being applied to everyone, not only in the school, but in the district.

The main issue the parents had with the initial implementation of the Code of Conduct was the issue of confidentiality when violations occurred. There was an agreement with local law enforcement authorities to share information of students who committed violations, but also information from other sources was utilized to determine if a violation had occurred. The parents of those in violation of the code thought that the information regarding a Code of Conduct violation should be kept confidential and not shared with anyone at the school, much less the student’s coaches, counselors, or those involved in counseling sessions. Subject #2 stated that:

Many of those involved in the initial development and implementation of the code were concerned about confidentiality, but when the code was conveyed to the parents, students, and community, we had to develop a sense of trust that information was not going to be released or shared with anyone outside the circle of assistance for the students. The student-athletes that were going to be affected by the implementation of the Code of Conduct were the least difficult to convince that the code was going to be a document that could actually help them make quality decisions regarding their health and well-being. (Subject #2, interview, May 2013)

The student-athletes understood what was going on with the implementation of the Code of Conduct and they bought into it. “The hardest sell were the non-athletes involved in
other activities, they did not understand why the prohibited behaviors and consequences weren’t applied to all the students in the school” (Subject #2, interview, May 2013).

The initial Code of Conduct had very restrictive penalties; it called for those in violation of the behaviors outlined in the code to be suspended for the entire season or the remainder of the season if the violation occurred during their competitive season. This was one of the first changes to the initial code: the suspension penalty was changed to a specified number of weeks, and then to a suspension for a percentage of the season. The initial code did not have any educational programs or counseling included in the consequences; the committee viewed this as a problem. What were the students learning by being suspended? Just missing some practices, games, and contests did not guarantee that the students were learning anything about the mistakes they made and how to change their behavior. As the code changed each year, the committee included in the consequences that the student in violation had a choice: if they agreed to attend an educational/substance abuse program as part of the consequences, then the percentage of season/contest suspension was reduced. If they denied attending the program the consequences increased.

There were some years that there were not any requested changes in the code that was taken to the Board of Education. If the committee did not desire any changes, then no adaptations were made. The committee encompassed so many of the stakeholders from the community that there were really no obstacles to implementing change. “There was so much input from parents, student leaders from the schools, board members, faculty members, and staff that most of the pressing issues were taken care of when the committee met and adapted to the changing community and societal issues that were
facing the students” (Subject #2, interview, May 2013). If there were any challenges to the code that was in place, they were brought to the table when the committee was meeting and then any changes were taken to the superintendent and the Board of Education. Subject #2 believed

The Code of Conduct will never address the needs of all the students and it is difficult to construct a document that will develop rules for prohibited conduct, consequences, and penalties for every situation that occurs. It has to be a fluid document that is always changing and adapting to the needs of the students in the community that is educationally based and has what is best for kids as the core value it stands upon. (Subject #2, interview, May 2013)

The only thing that could be changed was how the code is initially conveyed to the students and parents. There was a pre-season meeting that was attended by the parents and the student who was going to be involved in extra-curricular activities and the code was described and explained in detail. At times, the meeting can take on a negative tone due to the information contained in the code and the possibility of suspensions and disqualification from athletics and activities. It was felt that at times this meeting would create an adversarial situation of the school versus the student-athlete when Subject #2 felt the need to create an atmosphere of trust and belonging that the school and program was there to be supportive of the student.

One of the programs developed as a result of the Code of Conduct was an educational support system that held a series of meetings with students that had violated the code and the parents. It usually consisted of four meetings, one with the student in
violation, one with just the parents of the student in violation, and two meetings together. The coaches were asked to be involved, but they denied that request due to confidentiality issues with what was going on between the student and their parents. Subject #2 states, “There was never any confirmation that this program made any difference in the students or parents that went through the program, it is doubtful that the students changed their decision making process just with four meetings” (Subject #2, interview, May 2013). However, it did make some of the stakeholders feel better about themselves and their conscience was clear that there was something in place that they could say was an educational program that addressed the needs of the students and was in response to the Code of Conduct. “What needs to be in place is a consistent educational program that assists and encourages the students to make quality decisions that affect their health and well-being” (Subject #2, interview, May 2013). Subject #2 felt that this type of program would help the students deal with stress from societal issues and other issues affecting teenagers by developing communication skills, trust, and coping skills. Subject #2 recommended that this program is implemented on a daily basis during the school day.

**Subject #3.** From High School District A, this participant served as the Student and Employee Substance Abuse Counselor, but had previously held the position of guidance counselor. Subject #3 felt at the time the initial Code of Conduct was being reviewed and changed there was great leadership at the top of the organization that truly had the best interest of the students at its core. The superintendent at the time was a great leader that preached having a flat organization that was not hierarchical in nature and valued the thoughts and ideas of all the people involved. Everyone that mattered in the
decision making process was given a voice and input in those decisions before they were made and applied in the school or community. This included the development, implementation, and adaptations to the extra-curricular Code of Conduct that was instituted and changed during the time period that the administrator was in charge.

The feeling at the time of the development of the Code of Conduct was that there needed to be more structure and consistency to the discipline of students involved in extra-curricular and co-curricular activities that were representing the school and community. “When discussion started regarding the development of a Code of Conduct, most coaches and sponsors of activities and athletics were left on their own to develop a standard of behavior that was acceptable to their team or activity, along with the consequences that were applied when the students violated the rules” (Subject #3, interview, April 2013). Every coach’s rules were different and there was no consistency among the programs in the individual school buildings, and differing penalties and consequences occurred between the schools in the district. This caused problems not only within the schools, but also in the community, when the rules, violations, and consequences were different and the severity of the consequences faced by the students depended on who the students was, if they were an important part of the team, who they were playing during the time of the suspension, and what power and influence the parents carried in the community. Subject #3 believed, “The school district needed the structure and the consistency of a defined set of prohibited behaviors, procedures, and consequences that included a component to help the students with the issues that they may be facing during high school” (Subject #3, interview, April 2013).
According to Subject #3, the committees believed the Code of Conduct should include an educational program or component that would force students and parents to have dialogue not only with each other, but also with professionals trained to deal with student substance abuse issues. The initial thought was to try and develop a program that would incorporate and involve a Code of Conduct that would apply to all the students in the school and the district. Due to the legal limitations of applying discipline to students for outside of school violations of prohibited behaviors, the committees concentrated on developing a code that was focused on students that were involved in extra-curricular and co-curricular activities. This focus on the student involved an educational program for the students, parents, and community that was voluntary if students violated the code and were to be suspended from their sport or activity. Subject #3 shared that the committees realized the unfortunate truth was that the school was only aware of about 5% of the problems in and out of the school that dealt with drugs and alcohol; the community had to take some responsibility for monitoring the behavior of their students. “After years of working with the school, administration, and the community, a strong, consistent Code of Conduct evolved from the process” (Subject #3, interview, April 2013).

The development process involved meeting three times per year with committees comprised of School Board members, district and school administrators, parents, and students in the community. Occasionally the meetings were a reaction to violations that occurred or behaviors by the students that needed to be addressed by changes in the existing Code of Conduct. The school district also had a reciprocating agreement with local police departments and shared information regarding behaviors by students in the community that should be addressed in the existing Code of Conduct. “The information
regarding the students’ behaviors and also what types of issues are affecting the community including, but not limited to, alcohol abuse, new types of drugs, gang activity, or new types of social media harassment, was shared between the school and the local law enforcement agencies and would drive changes to the Code of Conduct, or at least start the conversations” (Subject #3 interview, April 2013). Whenever changes to the code were implemented, they were communicated to the community, parents, teachers, coaches, and students by mailings and meetings. The parents were sent a newsletter outlining the changes that were being made to the code and the educational program that was to be implemented when a violation occurred. Staff was notified during meetings that occurred before the start of the school year and outlined the changes to the code that were made by the last committee. Parents and students that were involved in extra-curricular and co-curricular activities were notified of the existing Code of Conduct and changes in a meeting that occurred three times per year before the respective seasons. The new code was also included in the parent-student handbook that was available at the start of the school year. All parents and students were responsible for all the information that was included in the handbook.

Initially there was huge resistance from the district and school administration to implement the educational substance abuse program, while the parents on the committees were all for the program. “The parents believed that there should be a part of the program that should educate the students and not just suspend them from their sport or activity. The students on the committees wanted the educational program, but they also wanted the longest and strictest suspension from the sport or activity” (Subject #3, interview, April 2013). Once the educational program was implemented into the Code of
Conduct, the consequences, suspensions, and penalties were reduced by at least half if parents and/or students agreed to go through the assigned program. The main point of the educational program was to open the lines of communication between the student and the parents, to really see what was at the core of the substance abuse issue or violation of the code. Most of the time, meetings ended up being about relationships of parents and students, and how one or both of them were not being heard. Subject #3 felt, “The most important development of the implementation of the educational program was the increased communication between not only the parents and the student in violation of the code, but the increased communication between the school program and the students to develop strategies to address the issues of teenage substance abuse, suicide, and dealing with all pressures of being a teenager” (Subject #3, interview, April 2013). The substance abuse or destructive behaviors were seen to be just a symptom of what were really the issues affecting the teenagers in the community.

According to Subject #3, most of the times when parents were notified that their student had violated the Code of Conduct, there was a state of disbelief that there actually had been a violation. They were usually very surprised to learn of any substance abuse issues or problems with their student; the parents were usually caught off-guard and continued to deny that there was any issue. Subject #3 reported that many of the parents in the community believed in and supported the Code of Conduct until their own student violated it and was going to be suspended or required to go through the substance abuse program. Once the state of disbelief about the code violation faded, the issue became that it was none of the school’s business as to what had occurred outside of the school day. Many parents claimed it was a personal, family issue that they would take care of on their
own and there should not be a penalty for things that occurred outside of the school. Subject #3 also found that, when presented with the information, students knew and understood that they had violated the Code of Conduct and were going to face the consequences. Most of the negative behaviors Subject #3 experienced when dealing with the Code of Conduct came from parents whose students had violated the code and thought that the school was overstepping their boundaries by suspending students from activities and athletics for prohibited conducts that occurred mainly outside of the school.

The explanation that participating in extra-curricular and co-curricular sports and activities was considered a privilege and not a right and that the school can hold them to a higher standard of conduct was usually met with the threat of legal action against the school. Usually the discussion regarding the confidentiality of the code violation and the consequences resulting in suspension from the sport or activity in conjunction with the educational program would be sufficient to head off any legal action; however, some of the violation appeals did make it up to the principal and superintendent. (Subject #3, interview, April 2013)

Subject #3 found that coaches of students involved in athletics had mixed thoughts toward the Code of Conduct: not all of them agreed with having a set standard of behaviors, rules, and consequences since every situation was different with many variables. Some of the coaches were afraid to lose control of the situation of disciplining their students according to what they thought was best for that student at that time. While some coaches wanted the flexibility and responsibility of disciplining the students, many of them were happy to have a set standard of conduct and consequences that wouldn’t
change according to the status of the student or parents in the school or community, what game was coming up on the schedule, or what the relationship was with the student and coach. Anytime there were changes to the code Subject #3 found the coaches usually had some negative feelings toward the code itself and also to those that were implementing and applying the consequences to their student. Most of the negative feelings passed, as long as the code and its consequences were consistently and equally applied to all the sports and all the students.

The main obstacles to implementing changes to the code came from various people within the school, mainly due to the issue of confidentiality and their roles with the students. “The counselors, social workers, and school psychologist were the main obstacles to the implementation of any changes to the code, and this was due to the confidentiality of what was told to them by the students and the use of that information within the educational substance abuse program” (Subject #3, interview, April 2013). They felt that the Code of Conduct would compel them to divulge confidential information that was shared by the students with them during their meetings. This issue was addressed by an internal school committee that included an attorney for the school district and developed guidelines for school personnel on what information was confidential and what could be shared to ensure the safety of the students and the school. The coaches were not covered by the guidelines and could share information regarding behaviors of the students and possible violations of the Code of Conduct with school personnel and those responsible for administering and implementing the code.

Subject #3 felt the Code of Conduct in the district addressed most of the needs of the students, and that the development of the educational program was a huge step toward
helping the students, and not just suspending students from activities in which they were involved.

The codes need to be documents that are constantly changing and adapting to address the issues that are affecting the students. This includes programs for harassment, bullying, hazing, and social media issues that are so prevalent today and programs that deal with the students’ decision making process more so than just the issue of substance abuse. The students need to be presented with information on decision making and other social issues affecting them more often than just when they make a mistake and are forced to go through the educational program. There needs to be time in the school day that addresses these issues, even if it is for a minimal time, on a consistent basis throughout the school year. Also, why don’t we make the educational substance abuse program available to all the students throughout the day with trained counselors and social workers to deal with the issues facing the students today, not just the counselors being available to assist the students with college questions and applications? (Subject #3, interview, April 2013)

Subject #3 believed, as usual, the issue came down to the money available to implement these types of programs in the school day. Who was going to pay for the training, hiring, and development of the professionals that help students deal with the issues facing them in society today? The school culture today of increased academic achievement and high stakes testing, while helping some students academically and looking great in newspapers, left limited resources for support programs that would help
students deal with the pressures and issues facing them in today’s society (Subject #3, interview, April 2013).

**School Board Reports – High School District A.** The School Board of High School District A began looking into developing a district wide Pupil Discipline Policy in the spring of 1986, which led to the formation of a committee consisting of district and school administrators, faculty, staff and parents from the community to study the issue. The committee was given the responsibility of coming up with a district-wide policy for student discipline that defined student rights and responsibilities, student attendance policies, and student conduct procedures. The discipline committee reports and policies were first distributed to the Board of Education in the summer of 1986. The superintendent reviewed the writing of the report and the resulting revisions from the committee with the Board of Education, and some discussion ensued with the wording of some of the policies. The board approved to authorize the district administration to make changes that were discussed; the document would be given to the policy liaison committee for their final approval before reproduction, and then returned to the Board of Education for final action. The district wide Pupil Discipline Policy was sent to the Board of Education in the fall of 1986, and within the student conduct procedures was the district philosophy and policy on the use of drugs and alcohol by students in school curricular and extra-curricular activities. It was the district’s mission to eliminate and prevent the use of drugs and alcohol, utilizing the cooperation of parents, local elementary schools, community resources, and the services of district and school personnel. Included in the district-wide student conduct procedures was the first structured and defined Athletic Code of Conduct. The district’s beliefs were that the
students who were selected for the privilege of membership on the school’s teams should conduct themselves as responsible representatives of their schools. The athletic directors and coaches were to enforce the code and those found in violation were subject to defined and prescribed disciplinary actions contained in the code. Student behaviors were also to be under the guidelines of the code in or out of their respective seasons, whether or not they were in or out of uniform, and also if they were on or off campus. This was the first time student behavior in and out of school was to be monitored by school personnel; it was also the first time actions both in and outside of school was subject to the disciplinary procedures outlined in the Code of Conduct. The district felt that the personal connection coaches made with students gave them an opportunity to observe and assist students, and the district would support training and education in teenage substance abuse to help students and their families (School Board A meeting minutes, September 8, 1986).

The initial Code of Conduct for High School District A in 1986 listed four prohibited behaviors that, if committed, would lead to disciplinary action:

- falsification of a signature on school information;
- theft or vandalism of school property;
- repeated acts of unsportsmanlike conduct during the sport season in which the athlete is involved; and
- use or possession of tobacco (all forms), alcohol, marijuana, or any illegal drugs, look alike, or abuse of prescription/non-prescription drugs (School Board A meeting minutes, September 8, 1986).
The coach of each individual sport was able to establish additional rules that were applicable to their sport, such as attendance guidelines, dress at practices and games, and transportation rules.

In the original Code of Conduct of High School District A in 1986, the consequences for a violation were listed by the number of offenses that students incurred during their high school careers. The consequences for a first offense included a suspension for all athletic contests for two consecutive interscholastic events, or two weeks of the season, whichever was the greater number. The suspended student was expected to attend and participate in all practices during the time of the game or contest suspension. This penalty would stay in place even if the student participated in a drug or alcohol treatment program. If drugs or alcohol were involved in the violation, a mandatory meeting with the school District Student Assistance Coordinator, Athletic Director, parent or guardian, and the student was required before the student could resume participation in the sport. The student was not able participate in practice until the student’s coach at that time received notification from the Student Assistance Coordinator or Athletic Director that initial contact with the student had been made and the process for reinstatement was in motion. A student could utilize the voluntary admission guideline if the school was not aware of the violation and if the student had not previously used voluntary admission. The voluntary admission would not result in a two-week suspension from contests or events, but it would still count as a first violation for the student in violation. A mandatory meeting with the District Student Assistance Coordinator, Athletic Director, parent or guardian, and the student was still required as a provision to allow the athlete to seek help for a substance abuse problem.
A second offense for a student in violation of the Code of Conduct would result in a suspension from all athletic contests for six weeks when the student is actively participating/in-season. The student would be expected to practice for the duration of the suspension, and the suspension can carry over from one sport season to the other, and from one school year into the next to satisfy the terms of the suspension. The student must have completed the season during which the penalty was being served; if the student quit the sport and did not finish the terms of the suspension, the penalty was not fulfilled and will go to the next season in which the student participated. An additional consequence of suspension from all practices and contests for that season was implemented if the first and second offense occurred during the same season. There was no exception in the penalty or suspension, even if the student participated in the drug and alcohol treatment program. As with the first violation, when a second violation occurred that involved drugs or alcohol, a mandatory meeting with the school District Student Assistance Coordinator, Athletic Director, parent or guardian, and the student was required before the student could resume participation in the sport. The student was not able participate in practice until the student’s coach at that time received notification from the Student Assistance Coordinator or athletic director that initial contact with the student had been made and process for reinstatement was in motion.

A third or subsequent violation of the Code of Conduct resulted in a loss of athletic eligibility for one full calendar year from the determination of a violation. As with first and second violations if the third or subsequent violations involved drugs or alcohol, a mandatory meeting with the school District Student Assistance Coordinator, Athletic Director, parent or guardian, and the student was required before the student
could resume participation in the sport. The student was not able participate in practice until the student’s coach at that time received notification from the Student Assistance Coordinator or Athletic Director that initial contact with the student had been made and process for reinstatement was in motion (School Board A meeting minutes, September 8, 1986).

The new Code of Conduct defined that the penalties and consequences applied to student-athletes whether they were in or out of season and whether school was in or out of session at the time of the violation. The policy was in effect for one calendar year. The penalties also were cumulative in nature once the student and parent signed the Code of Conduct; the number of offenses did not start over with each school year or each sport for the student.

The district wide Pupil Discipline Policy was brought to the Board of Education meeting on September 8, 1986, and was discussed by the superintendent and the board members. The superintendent reported that the document had been reworked since the previous board meeting and was reviewed and approved by the Policy Liaison Committee. The policy was ready for reproduction and distribution to the students and parents, and there was discussion with the School Board about the procedures for reproduction and distribution of the document. It was decided that, besides inclusion in the parent-student handbook, a Code of Conduct meeting with parents and students should be held each sports season that explained and defined the newly instituted Code of Conduct. At those meetings there were school administrators and district personnel available to answer any questions that may arise regarding the policy. The policy regarding pupil discipline that contained the new extra-curricular Code of Conduct was
unanimously approved by the Board of Education and was adopted for the 1986-87 school year (School Board A meeting minutes, September 8, 1986).

The first discussion regarding changes to the Student Discipline Policy occurred the next year in response to recommendations from the Student Rules Review Committee. The superintendent outlined the steps that led to the approval to the district-wide Student Discipline Policy the previous year. Due to the implementation of the discipline policy the previous year, a Student Rules Review Committee consisting of students, parents, teachers, and administrators was formed to study the current policies and to recommend any changes to the Board of Education. The committee discussed with the board members areas of concerns and recommended changes to the implemented Student Discipline Policy. While no changes to the extra-curricular Code of Conduct were discussed or recommended at this time, the formation of the Student Rules Review Committee would meet on a consistent basis to study and review issues that came about from the Code of Conduct and recommend changes to the Board of Education.

The Student Rules Review Committee met on an annual basis to review the Student Discipline Policy and to recommend amendments to the policy to the Board of Education. In 1988, the committee recommended changes to the drug and alcohol section that added the language of “drugs or related paraphernalia and substances used for intoxicating purposes” (School Board A meeting minutes, April 25, 1988). As the substances and ways used by students to become intoxicated began to increase, and the possession of drug-related paraphernalia was recognized by the local Substance Abuse Coordinator and local authorities, the committee realized that these substances needed to
be included in the discipline policy so they were properly addressed if the behaviors were exhibited by students.

In 1990, the Student Rules Review Committee recommended the inclusion of a definition of tobacco products in the Student Discipline Policy that contained the extracurricular Code of Conduct that prohibited the use or possession of tobacco of all forms. “Tobacco products was defined to mean but not limited to cigarette, cigar, pipe, or tobacco in any other form including smokeless tobacco which is any loose, cut, shredded, ground, powdered, compressed, or leaf tobacco that is intended to place in the mouth without being smoked” (School Board A meeting minutes, August 27, 1990). As the use of smokeless tobacco increased among teenage males, the committee felt that the addition of a definition of the numerous tobacco products was needed to ensure that they were covered in the Code of Conduct.

The spring of 1992 brought about numerous recommendations for changes to Code of Conduct from the Student Rules Review Committee. The recommendations were first presented to the Policy Review Committee in May of 1992. At the June 15th School Board meeting, the superintendent presented the changes to the Student Discipline Policy to the Board of Education, and recommended its approval. After a short discussion by the board, the recommended changes to the Student Discipline Policy were approved by a unanimous vote of the Board of Education (School Board A meeting minutes, June 15, 1992).

The changes to the Code of Conduct were a significant change from the previous policies and procedures that had been in place for six years: this was in response to the recommendations of the Student Rules Review committee that was still comprised of
students, parents, teachers, and administrators that were given the responsibility of reviewing the Student Discipline Policy each year. Even though the recommendations from the Rules Review Committee were taken into consideration each year, the recommendations had to be reviewed by the District Policy Committee before they were taken to the Board of Education. The significant changes to the Code of Conduct in 1992 included a clear statement that the penalties for a violation of the code were cumulative over the student’s high school career, beginning when the code was first signed by the student. There was also the addition of Category I and II violations that were to be administered as separate categories; those violations would not accumulate on top of each other. A student could violate Category I behaviors multiple times and it would not count as a violation if the student then violated Category II behaviors. The committee believed that the code was too harsh when dealing with what was considered minor violations, and if students violated the prescribed behaviors, it should not count against them if they committed a Category II violation.

Category I violations included the following:

1. Falsification of a signature on the athletic permit card or physical form. If the fake signature was done by a parent or another student, the student whose physical or permit was falsified will be held accountable.

2. Acts of unsportsmanlike conduct as a representative of the school team such as cheating, fighting, or verbal abuse of coaches, fans, officials, or other players.

The consequences for a violation of Category I behaviors were:
1. A first offense led to a suspension from one athletic contest or one week of competition, whichever was greater. The student was expected to participate in all practices during the time of the suspension.

2. A second offense led to a suspension from three athletic contests or three weeks of competition, whichever was greater. The student was expected to participate in all practices during the time of the suspension.

3. A third offense led to a suspension from six weeks of competition with the student expected to participate in all practices during the time of the suspension.

4. A fourth and subsequent offenses led to a suspension from competitions for one full year for each violation.

The prohibited behaviors for what were now considered a Category II violation included:

1. Theft or vandalism while representing the school as a member of the team.

2. Use or possession of tobacco, alcohol, marijuana, or any illicit drugs or related paraphernalia, look-alike drugs, or the abuse of prescription/non-prescription drugs.

The consequences for a violation of Category II behaviors were now:

1. A first offense led to a suspension from two consecutive athletic contests or two weeks of competition, whichever was greater. The student was expected to participate in all practices during the time of the suspension. If drugs or alcohol were involved in the violation, a mandatory conference with the Student Assistance Coordinator, the Athletic Director, parents or guardian, and
the student was required before the student could return to the team. Previously, the Code of Conduct only required that a preliminary contact between the student and the Student Assistance Coordinator or counselor had occurred before the student could return to the team. Now the mandatory conference had to have occurred before the student was able to return to all team activities, including practice. A voluntary admission of a violation of the Code of Conduct would not result in the two-contest or two-week suspension, but would still count as a first offense. The student and parents would still have to meet with the Student Assistance Coordinator or counselor as part of the removal of the suspension, and the voluntary admission could not be utilized if the school was aware of the violation.

2. A second offense led to a suspension from six weeks of competition, whichever is greater. The student was again to participate in all practice sessions during the time of the suspension, and the suspension could be carried over from one sports season to the other. If the second offense occurred during the same sports season, the student would be suspended from all practices and contests for the remainder of that season. If drugs or alcohol were involved in the violation, a mandatory conference with the Student Assistance Coordinator, the Athletic Director, parents or guardian, and the student was required before the student could return to the team.

3. A third offense and further violations led to student suspension from athletic participation for one full calendar year, and if drugs or alcohol were involved in the violation, a mandatory conference with the Student Assistance
Coordinator, the Athletic Director, parents or guardian, and the student was required before the student could return to the team.

The revised Student Discipline Policy was distributed to the School Board members; the superintendent reported that the suggested changes had been incorporated into the document that was distributed and recommended its approval. The revised Student Discipline Policy that contained the changes and adaptations to the Code of Conduct was unanimously approved by the School Board and put into the policy manual for the school district (School Board A meeting minutes, June 15, 1992).

In June of 1994, the Student Discipline Committee recommended further changes to the Athletic Code of Conduct in response to the increased number of illegal and dangerous substances that were now prevalent in athletics and the community, and to social issues that were becoming prevalent in the country. Included in a Category II violation was the use, transfer, or possession of steroids, which were muscle-building agents that were becoming readily available to student-athletes and were illegal to possess and use. Language was also added that addressed the act of transferring of tobacco and tobacco products, alcohol, marijuana, steroids, or an illicit drugs, related paraphernalia, look-alikes, or abuse of prescription/non-prescription drugs. This addressed the issue of students who were acting as middle-men between students attempting to possess prohibited substances; if students were found to be transferring any of the prohibited substances from sources inside and outside of school, they were to found in violation of the Code of Conduct. The language of sexual or racial harassment of officials, players, coaches, or spectators was added to the Category I violation of unsportsmanlike acts while participating as a representative of school teams. These
changes were recommended to the Board of Education by the superintendent and unanimously approved for inclusion in the Student Discipline Policy (School Board A meeting minutes, June 13, 1994).

The School Board convened in June of 1996 to review recommended changes to the Student Discipline Code brought to them by the Policy Liaison Committee. The proposed changes included a defined philosophy of the Athletic Code of Conduct for the school district that outlined the code’s purpose and function. Much of the outlined philosophy had been included in the previous Student Discipline Policy as an introduction but had not been defined as a specific district philosophy behind the Code of Conduct for extra-curricular activities. The core of the philosophy of the Code of Conduct was that the selection to be on athletic teams was a privilege, and those students should conduct themselves as responsible representatives of their school and community. Those students that failed to meet the responsibilities of behavior and character outlined in the Code of Conduct would be subject to the consequences and penalties prescribed by the code. Added to the school district’s philosophy in 1996 was language that all reports of suspected violations by a student-athlete of the Code of Conduct would be promptly investigated, and, after an alleged violation had been verified by either school personnel, judicial, or law enforcement agency, the disciplinary consequences outlined in the Code of Conduct would be imposed. This would better define the process of how an alleged violation would be handled when school administrators were presented with a report of violation. The new philosophy would include the school district’s statement of purpose that they care about the student and how the Code of Conduct and the district can help the student and families deal with substance abuse and other problems. The school district
would provide education and awareness training on adolescent drug and alcohol abuse, and other adolescent issues for all those involved in the well-being of the student-athlete involved in the extra-curricular program. This included the school administrators, athletic directors, coaches, advisors, student-athletes, and their families as part of the caring aspect of the philosophy of the Code of Conduct (School Board A meeting minutes, June 10, 1996).

The revised Code of Conduct in June of 1996 included a defined category for the General Implementation of the Code of Conduct. It combined many of the general statements that were listed in the different areas of the code and put them all together in one area for easier reading and understanding by students and parents in the community. Now included in the General Implementation of the Code of Conduct section was the emphasis of:

1. When the student was under the guidelines of the code.
2. That the student was under the code once it was signed, both in and out of the sport season.
3. Category I and II violations were separate and would not accumulate on each other.
4. Consequences for multiple violations must be served consecutively and that the suspension for a violation could be carried over from one season, or one year, into the next.
5. The student must complete the season in which the penalty was being served; if the student quit the team, the full penalty carried over to the next sport in which the student would participate.
6. If a second violation occurred during the same sport season, the student would be suspended for the remainder of that sport’s season.

7. The athletic code is in effect through the entire calendar year and is a supplement to, not a replacement of, the School Discipline Policy.

The Code of Conduct in 1996 also included changes to the consequences to the first offense for a Category II violation that included the use, transfer, possession or abuse of tobacco (any form), alcohol, marijuana, steroids, any other illicit drug, drug paraphernalia, look-alike drugs, and the abuse of prescription/non-prescription drugs. In response to the recommendations of the Student Discipline Advisory Committee that students violating the code needed more supportive services to address issues facing them instead of only suspension from games, the school district implemented two programs to address adolescent risk taking behaviors. The first program was developed to address the risk factors that were identified in the student that violated the Code of Conduct that put the student at risk for alcohol and drug abuse, or other emotional illnesses. It consisted of four confidential sessions including the student and their family with a trained Student Assistance Coordinator that helped to identify, decrease, and eliminate those risk factors that put the student at risk through education and early intervention strategies. The district’s goals were to create, increase, and support opportunities for a safe and healthy experience and environment. Any students found to be in violation of any of the Category II behaviors were required to successfully complete this program, or another approved program at the family’s expense. If students in violation failed to complete any of the required substance abuse counseling sessions, they would be ineligible to compete in the athletic program until the program had been completed. The in-house substance
abuse counseling program was to be used when the violation was a first offense; if a second Category II violation occurred, then the student was required to attend an outside substance abuse assessment program. Before the student was able to return to the team and contests, they were to successfully complete the recommendations resulting from the assessment program.

The second program implemented in June of 1996 in response to student needs was a clinic program that met every nine weeks that dealt with the use and abuse of tobacco and tobacco products. If the student had a first offense that involved tobacco or tobacco products, the student was encouraged to participate in the cessation tobacco use clinic. If a second violation occurred that involved tobacco or tobacco products, the student was then required to attend the school sponsored clinic, or attend an approved program outside the school at their own expense. If the student failed to attend or complete the required program, they would not be allowed to participate in athletics until evidence of completion of the program had been presented to the school district (School Board A meeting minutes, June 10, 1996).

A significant change to the consequences for a second violation was instituted in conjunction with the implementation of the drug, alcohol, and tobacco use and abuse programs. The committee felt that if students in violation of the Code of Conduct were attending programs that addressed the issues of substance abuse in adolescents, then the penalty suspending them from athletics should be reduced as a reward to those students. As a result, the suspension from athletic competitions for a second violation of the Category II behaviors would be reduced from a six week suspension to a four week suspension plus a mandatory assessment and completion of an approved outside
substance abuse agency at parent expense. If the second offense involved tobacco or tobacco products, the suspension from athletic contests was also four weeks with the completion of the district-sponsored cessation of tobacco use clinic, or an approved program at the expense of the student and parents.

These changes and clarifications were brought to the Board of Education by a representative of the Policy Liaison Committee, and the superintendent recommended that the board approve the recommendations. The School Board voted unanimously to approve the recommended changes to the Student Discipline Policy, which included all of changes to the extra-curricular Code of Conduct (School Board A meeting minutes, June 10, 1996).

The district School Board met again in June of 1997 to review the recommendations from the Student Discipline and the Policy Liaison Committees. They recommended changes to the extra-curricular Code of Conduct Category II violations to better define the prohibited behaviors and expectations of the students. The previous code had listed as the prohibited behaviors as the use, transfer, possession, or use of any of the following:

1. Tobacco in any form
2. Alcohol
3. Marijuana
4. Steroids
5. Any other illicit drugs
6. Drug related paraphernalia
7. Look alike drugs

The new Code of Conduct included the language of prohibited behaviors as any act or intent to possess, use, obtain, manufacture, sell or distribute. Also added to the list of prohibited substances was the use of any illegal, controlled, or intoxicating substances. This was due to the increased use of various substances being utilized by the students in the community to become intoxicated, including cleaning agents, solvents, and other substances that were readily available to students at homes and businesses in the community. The language of “any substance purported to be or presented as an illegal, controlled, or intoxicating substance” was also added to the list of prohibited substances to address the increasing use of look-alike drugs and the purchasing of substances by students who believed they were buying drugs. Due to the increased use of prescription medication by both students and society in general, the committee advised that new language be added to address the amount of medication at school and in their homes. The prohibited substance list was changed from the abuse of prescription/non-prescription drugs to include all prescription/non-prescription drugs, when such a prescription/non-prescription drug was sold, distributed, possessed, and/or consumed by the student in a manner inconsistent with the prescription and/or the prescribed or directed purpose. Also added was a further clarification of the timeframe in which student-athletes were under the guidelines of the Code of Conduct while representing the school, and the extent of the consequences if a violation occurred. The Code of Conduct now stated that students who did not meet the expectations outlined in the code, regardless of the time and place, were subject to code consequences, in addition to school disciplinary consequences, including, but not limited to, in-school and/or out of school suspensions.
The School Board was presented with the recommended changes in June of 1997; the changes to the Student Discipline Policy, including the extra-curricular Code of Conduct were unanimously passed by the Board of Education for inclusion for the school year of 1997-98 (School Board A meeting minutes, June 23, 1997).

In June of 1998, the Student Discipline Policy Committee presented the Board of Education recommended changes to the Code of Conduct that centered on the consequences of long term tobacco use by students, and the school’s ability to enforce a year-round Code of Conduct. The School Board continued to hear about teenage tobacco use in the school and the out of school use of tobacco products such as smokeless tobacco from local Student Assistance Coordinators. After hearing all the information regarding these issues, the School Board unanimously voted to revise the Student Discipline Policy including the extra-curricular Code of Conduct as recommended by the Policy Committee (School Board A meeting minutes, June 22, 1998). School district and local Student Assistance Coordinators would be invited to future School Board meetings to further educate them on the issues regarding substance abuse and tobacco use by students in the school and community.

There were many changes to the language included in the Code of Conduct in 1998 that were due to many more challenges by parents when their students were in violation of the code. The Discipline Policy Committee had to go through the code to update and better define the policies, procedures, and consequences so that, when challenges did occur, the school administration was prepared with a well-defined policy. The major change implemented in 1998 was that the athletic Code of Conduct now became the extra-curricular Code of Conduct, and that all students involved in extra-
curricular activities, including band, chorus, and all IHSA activities, were now under the
guidelines of the Code of Conduct. Previously, the code had only applied to the students
that were involved in interscholastic activities, an issue that led to a lack of trust between
coaches and administration. The coaches felt if athletes were held to a higher standard
since they were representing the school, then all activities that were representing the
school also needed to be under the guidelines of the Code of Conduct (School Board A
meeting minutes, June 22, 1998).

The violations were also divided into two defined categories: Category I
violations were now called general offenses, and they were not limited to cheating,
fighting, sexual/racial harassment, verbal abuse of others, all violations that were in the
previous Code of Conduct. Now added to Category I violations were theft or vandalism
while in school or as a representative of the school sport or activity. Language was also
added that each situation will be managed on individual basis.

Terminology was also clarified and redefined. The terms “activity” or “athletic
team” were named as all co- or extra-curricular organizations which were operating at
that time or which may have been created after the policy was in effect. The term
“student” was also defined as any person, grades 9-12, who was enrolled in the high
school, including a student who was participating in a student activity during the summer
following their junior high graduation. The students involved in activities and athletics in
the school district were also under the guidelines of the state, conferences, and
associations in which the school was a member regarding student eligibility for student
activities.
The newly revised Code of Conduct also listed, in a specified order of importance, the Category I behavioral requirement for students when participating in athletics and activities. Previously, the behaviors were listed in a paragraph and it did not outline the expected behaviors of students. In its new form, the expected behaviors of the students were listed for easier reading and clarity for all stakeholders involved in the interpreting of the Code of Conduct. The revised Category I violations now appeared as:

1. Demonstrate respect for staff and students by appropriately interacting with others.

2. Refrain from engaging in or being a part to any acts of physical, sexual, or racial harassment; or verbal abuse of participants, contestants, officials, coaches, or sponsors or spectators.

3. Refrain from engaging in or being a party to acts of thefts or vandalism at any time.

4. Demonstrate respect for the environment in which they work by leaving all facilities and equipment in good condition.

5. Assume and abide by the responsibilities of membership in a group as established by the group and the sponsor.

6. Maintain academic responsibilities as defined by the IHSA.

7. Conduct oneself in an appropriate and responsible manner.

The changes to the language for the consequences of Category I violations included a clear definition that those consequences were for all offenses that occurred during school or school-related activities. There was also a statement added regarding the supervision of out-of-school activities by school officials that addressed the issue of a
Code of Conduct being in effect when students were not in school: school officials were not expected to supervise off campus or non-school activities; however, if a proven violation was brought to the public attention and brings discredit to the school district, then disciplinary consequences may be assigned. Violations that were hearsay or anonymously reported to the administration without the proper proof would not be considered to be violations to the code. However, if school or local law enforcement personnel presented proven information of a possible code violation, the school district would investigate and enforce the appropriate consequences (School Board A meeting minutes, June 22, 1998).

Multiple changes to the consequences for a Category I violation were also added in 1998. Previously, a first offense for a Category I violation resulted in a suspension from one game or athletic event, or one week of competition, while still requiring the student to participate in all practice sessions. The consequences for a first violation now subjected the student in violation to the following consequences;

1. Required conference with the Activities and/or Athletic Director

2. The student in violation was also subject to one or more of the following consequences:

   a. A conference with the sponsor or the coach.

   b. A conference with the student leaders on the team or activity and the coach or sponsor.

   c. A conference with the sponsor or coach, and parent.

   d. A conference with the sponsor or coach, Athletic Director and/or Activities director, and school dean.
e. Removal from participation in the immediate sport, activity, or performance.

f. Suspension from participation in the immediate activity or performance with the following guidelines:
   i. An offense which occurs while participating in an athletic contest will result in a suspension from the next athletic contest.
   ii. An offense which occurs while engaged in any other activity will result in a suspension from the next event in that activity.
   iii. An offense which occurs outside of either of the above described situations will result in a suspension from the next event, either athletic or activity.

g. Return home from field trip at parent or guardian expense.

h. Ineligibility from further field trips or contests (number to be determined by the situation).

i. Financial restitution.

j. Letter or letters of apology.

k. Community service.

l. Referral to school support personnel or groups.

m. Referral to outside agency.

n. Behavioral contracts.

o. Attendance contracts.

p. Other consequences deemed suitable for the situation.

q. Reduced amount of credit for service activities to school groups.
Changes were also made to the consequences for a second or subsequent violation of Category I prohibited behaviors. If a student did not meet the requirements of the Code of Conduct for a second or subsequent time, the student would be subject to the consequences listed above and/or a permanent suspension for all team, club, or organization activities as determined by the Activity or Athletic director. Previously, a second violation of a Category I behavior resulted in a suspension of competitions for three weeks or three contests, whichever was greater, while still being able to attend and participate in all practices. A third violation had led to a six week or six contest suspension and a fourth or subsequent violation led to a suspension from one year of competition for each violation. The inclusion of all clubs and activities under the new extra-curricular Code of Conduct required the Student Discipline Committee and the Board of Education to implement new guidelines and consequences that addressed not only situations that involved athletes, but all students involved in clubs and activities.

Category II violations were also reviewed and changed in June of 1998. The category of “violations” was changed to “Behavioral Requirements” of students. Students were now required to abstain from those behaviors the school district determined were in violation of the extra-curricular Code of Conduct. Also defined by the Code of Conduct in 1998 were specific behaviors regarding the use of tobacco and tobacco products. Students were to abstain from the possession, smoking, and use of tobacco and tobacco products which were defined as, but not limited to, cigarettes, cigars, pipes, or tobacco in any form. These forms included smokeless tobacco, which could be...
any loose, cut, shredded, ground, powdered, compressed, or leaf tobacco intended to be placed in the mouth without being smoked. The Code of Conduct also specifically stated that Category II behavioral requirements were in effect throughout the calendar year, whether or not school was in session.

The consequences for a Category II violation were also addressed and changed by the Student Discipline Committee and the Board of Education in response to the needs addressed by the committee that determined the focus needed to be on rehabilitative behaviors for students in violation of Category II behaviors. These behaviors included the attempt or intent to possess, use, manufacture, obtain, sell, or distribute any illegal, controlled, or intoxicating substance, drugs, alcohol, anabolic steroids, other related substances, or drug paraphernalia. This included prescription or non-prescription drugs which were sold, distributed, possessed, and/or consumed by the student in a way that was inconsistent with the prescription and/or its prescribed or directed purpose (School Board A meeting minutes, June 22, 1998).

Even though Category II behaviors and consequences were in effect throughout the calendar year, the committees determined that there should be different consequences when the student in violation was in or out of their respective season for their sport or activity. This was in response to community concerns that students were being unfairly penalized for their chosen sport or sports even though a violation could occur outside their season or in the summer and the penalty would not go into effect for a significant amount of time. They felt that more good would be done if the student who violated the Code of Conduct outside of their season served their penalty immediately by completing school approved community service projects. Also changed were the suspensions from
the activity or sport for those students committing an in-season violation of the Category II behavioral requirements. Previously, the suspension for a first time violation was the student in violation being suspended from two consecutive athletic events or from two weeks of competition, whichever was the greater. Under the revised Code of Conduct in 1998, a first time, in-season violation of the Code of Conduct would incur a two week or 20% of season suspension, whichever was less, from the activity or sport. The 20% suspension would be determined by the number of contests or performances each sport or activity would have for their respective season. An important change in language that was used to assist the student in violation was the inclusion of the “whichever is less” statement. This was included to show that the district was trying to help students return from violations, as long as they followed the guidelines that were outlined for an in-season first offense. The new guidelines were as follows:

1. First Offense Consequences:
   
   a. In-Season
      
      i. Conference with the Athletic and/or Activity Director.
      
      ii. Conference with the Coordinator of Student Assistance programs.
      
      iii. Successful completion of the school district student assistant program with student and parents or guardians.
      
      iv. A two week, or twenty percent of season, whichever is less, suspension form the activity or sport.
      
      v. If necessary the local police may be notified.
      
      vi. Student Admission.
   
   b. Out of Season
i. Conference with the Athletic and/or Activity director.

ii. Conference with the Coordinator of Student Assistance programs.

iii. Successful completion of the school district student assistant program with student and parents or guardians.

iv. Fifteen hours of approved service within the school within twenty days. Failure to complete this service within the twenty days will result in a two week, or twenty percent of season, whichever is less, suspension from the activity or sport.

v. Service hour arrangements must be made by students, and they must be approved by the Athletic and/or Activity director.

vi. If necessary the local police may be notified.

vii. Student Admission.

If the student admitted to a Category II, first-time violation that was unsolicited and unreported, given directly to a school official by the student or their parents or guardians, the penalty of the two week suspension or 15 hours of approved service would be waived. The violation would still count as a first-time violation and the student and parents/guardians would be required to complete the school district student assistance program. If students failed to complete the program, they would be suspended from contests or activities until the program was completed. If the school administration was made aware of, or will be informed of, the code violation by other means, including, but not limited to, judicial or law enforcement agencies, then the student admission waiver may not be used (School Board A meeting minutes, June 22, 1998).
Changes were also made to the consequences for a second violation of the Code of Conduct. In addition to the guidelines outlined for a first offense, a student that was in-season and a violation occurred for a second time for Category II behaviors, that student would be required to attend an outside substance abuse program from an approved agency or hospital at parent/student expense. The student needed to obtain an assessment and complete the recommendations from the substance abuse program to become eligible to participate in the sport or activity. If the violation included tobacco or tobacco products, the student in violation needed to complete an approved smoking/tobacco use cessation program approved by the school district and paid for by parent/student expense. If the student failed to complete the approved program, the student was not eligible to return to the sport or activity until the program was completed. A second violation would also result in a four week, or forty percent of the season, whichever is less, suspension from the student’s sport or activity. If the second violation occurred during the same season, in the same school year as the first offense, the student would lose eligibility for all practices and contests for the reminder of that season.

A second violation for a student outside of their respective season or activity would follow the previous guidelines, plus the student must obtain an assessment from an approved outside agency or hospital at parent expense. Students in violation must successfully complete the recommendations from the substance abuse program to become eligible to participate in their sport or activity. If the violation included tobacco or tobacco products, the student in violation would be required to complete an approved smoking/tobacco use cessation program approved by the school district and paid for at parent/student expense. If the student failed to complete the approved programs, the
student was not to be eligible to return to the sport or activity until the program was completed. In addition to attendance at the rehabilitation programs, the student in violation was required to complete thirty hours of approved service within the school within 40 school days. If students failed to complete the required 30 hours of service within the 40 days, they would be suspended for four weeks, or 40%, whichever is less, of their next sport or activity season. The police or local authorities may also be notified of the violation.

2. Second Offense Consequences:
   a. In-Season
      i. Conference with the Athletic and/or Activity director.
      ii. Conference with the Coordinator of Student Assistance programs.
      iii. Assessment from an approved outside agency/hospital and successful completion of the recommendations from the assessment at parents/guardian expense.
      iv. A second tobacco violation will require mandatory completion of an approved smoking cessation program at parent/guardian expense. If students fail to complete the program as determined by the Athletic or Activities director, they will be ineligible from the sport or activity until the approved program has been completed.
      v. A four week or forty percent of the season suspension (whichever is less) from the activity or the sport.
      vi. If necessary the local police may be notified.
vii. If the second offense occurs during the same season in the same school year, the student shall lose eligibility for all practices and contests for the remainder of the season.

b. Out of Season

i. Conference with the Athletic and/or Activity director.

ii. Conference with the Coordinator of Student Assistance programs.

iii. Assessment from an approved outside agency/hospital and successful completion of the recommendations from the assessment at parent/guardian expense.

iv. A second tobacco violation will require mandatory completion of an approved smoking cessation program at parent/guardian expense. If students fail to complete the program as determined by the Athletic or Activities director, they will be ineligible from the sport or activity until the approved program has been completed.

v. Thirty hours of approved service within the school within forty days. Failure to complete this service within the forty days will result in a four week, or forty percent of season, whichever is less, suspension from the activity or sport.

vi. Service hour arrangements must be made by the student, and they must be approved by the Athletic and/or Activity director.

vii. If necessary the local police may be notified.

A change to a third or subsequent offense included the language to further assist a student that may be in need of help even though it may have been determined by the
school administration a violation of the Code of Conduct did not occur. If, in the judgment of the principal or the principal’s designate, a violation did not occur but there is a reasonable basis to believe that prohibited alcohol, tobacco, or other drug use and/or possession may have occurred, then all information regarding the student and the possible violation would be given to the student’s counselor. Based on the information given to the counselor and in consultation with the counselor’s supervisor, a program designed to assist and address the student’s behavior may be set in motion. The counselor and the supervisor would then inform school administration and parents and/or guardians of the program that will be put in place to assist the student (School Board A meeting minutes, June 22, 1998).

In May of 1999, the Discipline Policy Committee recommended to the School Board a minor change to the extra-curricular Code of Conduct. There was an issue regarding students that had previously violated the Code of Conduct and had already completed the school district sponsored student assistance program for a previous offense. The recommendation from the Discipline Policy Committee was that if the in-house program had previously been completed, the student in violation, with the parents or guardians, must complete an assessment from an approved outside agency or hospital. The student and parent or guardian must also successfully complete the recommendations from the evaluation at their own expense. Proof of the completed assessment and the recommendations must have been submitted to the school district’s Director of Student Assistance programs. If the student did not complete the assessment and recommendations from the evaluation, he/she would lose eligibility in the sport or activity until the assessment and recommendations were completed. A School Board
member moved that they approve the recommendations from the Student Discipline Committee that were presented; the board voted unanimously to approve the recommendations (School Board A meeting minutes, May 24, 1999).

At the June 12th School Board meeting in 2000, in response to a significant hazing event involving high school athletes that occurred in a neighboring community that became national news due to videotaping of the incident, the Student Discipline Committee recommended to the School Board an addition to the Student Behavioral Requirements contained in the extra-curricular Code of Conduct. The committee recommended the addition of language that addressed the issue of hazing and initiation activities. The language added stated that students of the school district would refrain from engaging in, or being party to, any hazing activity. The students would also refrain from engaging in, or being a party to, any initiation that was not authorized or supervised by school officials. A violation of this behavioral requirement would be a Category I General Offense, and the consequences would be applied to all offenses that occurred during school or school related activities. However, if the violation was brought to public attention and brought disrepute to the school district, the student could be disciplined according the Code of Conduct. A first time violation of the newly instituted hazing and initiation violation would result in the following consequences:

1. Required conference with the Activity and/or Athletic Director.

2. The student in violation was also subject to one or more of the following consequences:
   a. A conference with the sponsor or the coach.
b. A conference with the student leaders on the team or activity and the coach or sponsor.

c. A conference with the sponsor or coach and parent.

d. A conference with the sponsor or coach, Athletic and/or Activities Director, and school dean.

e. Removal from participation in the immediate sport, activity, or performance.

f. Suspension from participation in the immediate activity or performance with the following guidelines:

   i. An offense which occurs while participating in an athletic contest will result in a suspension from the next athletic contest.

   ii. An offense which occurs while engaged in any other activity will result in a suspension from the next event in that activity.

   iii. An offense which occurs outside of either of the above described situations will result in a suspension from the next event, either athletic or activity.

g. Return home from field trip at parent or guardian expense.

h. Ineligibility from further field trips or contests (number to be determined by the situation).

   i. Financial restitution.

j. Letter or letters of apology.

k. Community service.

l. Referral to school support personnel or groups.
m. Referral to outside agency.

n. Behavioral contracts.

o. Attendance contracts.

p. Other consequences deemed suitable for the situation.

q. Reduced amount of credit for service activities to school groups.

r. Decrease or deny responsibilities within the sport or activity.

A second or subsequent offense of the hazing and initiation policy would result in the student being subject to any of the consequences applied to a first offense or a permanent suspension from all sport, club, organization, or team activities (School Board A meeting minutes, June 12, 2000).

The May 2001 School Board meeting brought about a minor revision to the Student Discipline Policy that defined the reciprocal reporting agreement with local law enforcement agencies. The following language was added to the policy: “Pursuant to Section 5/10-20.14 of the Illinois School Code the Board of Education has established and maintains a reciprocal reporting system between the school district and local law enforcement agencies regarding criminal offenses committed by the students” (School Board A meeting minutes, May 14, 2001). This included any information regarding offenses committed by students that were athletes at the school, and those reported offenses could be utilized as violations to the extra-curricular Code of Conduct. The School Board approved the recommended revisions to the Student Discipline Policy, with two abstentions by board members (School Board A meeting minutes, May 14, 2001).

An addition to Category II behavioral requirements regarding alcohol, tobacco, and other drug violations was made at the June 2002 Board of Education meeting. The
School Board reviewed changes to the Code of Conduct in response to dangerous and illegal behaviors exhibited by students in the community. The policy addressed the illegal act, attempt, or intent to possess, use, obtain, manufacture, sell, or distribute any illegal, controlled, or intoxicating substance, which now included inhalants. The term inhalant was reserved for the wide variety of substances—including solvents, aerosols, gases, and nitrites—that were rarely, if ever, taken via any other route of administration. Some examples of these substances included solvents such as paint thinner, lighter fluid, gasoline, correction fluids, and glue. Aerosol inhalants being used by teens were spray paint, hair sprays, and aerosol computer cleaning products. Gases used as inhalants included butane lighters, whipped cream aerosols, refrigerants, and nitrous oxide. Students found in violation by utilizing these substances would be subjected to the consequences of a Category II violation. The Category II offenses included student behavior at school, school related and non-school related activities, and were in effect at all times throughout the school year. Students would be subject to the consequences regardless of when or where the violation took place and were subject to the following consequences:

1. First Offense Consequences:
   a. In-Season
      i. Conference with the Athletic and/or Activity director.
      ii. Conference with the Coordinator of Student Assistance programs.
      iii. Successful completion of the school district student assistance program with student and parents or guardians.
iv. A two week, or twenty percent of season, whichever is less, suspension form the activity or sport.

v. If necessary the local police may be notified.

vi. Student Admission.

b. Out of Season

i. Conference with the Athletic and/or Activity director.

ii. Conference with the Coordinator of Student Assistance programs.

iii. Successful completion of the school district student assistant program with student and parents or guardians.

iv. Fifteen hours of approved service within the school within twenty days. Failure to complete this service within the twenty days will result in a two week, or twenty percent of season, whichever is less, suspension from the activity or sport.

v. Service hour arrangements must be made by students, and they must be approved by the Athletic and/or Activity director.

vi. If necessary the local police may be notified.

vii. Student Admission.

A second violation of the Category II required behaviors would result in the following consequences:

1. Second Offense Consequences:

   a. In-Season

      i. Conference with the Athletic and/or Activity director.

      ii. Conference with the Coordinator of Student Assistance programs.
iii. Assessment from an approved outside agency/hospital and successful completion of the recommendations from the assessment at parent/guardian expense.

iv. A second tobacco violation will require mandatory completion of an approved smoking cessation program at parent/guardian expense. If students fail to complete the program as determined by the Athletic and/or Activities Director, they will be ineligible from the sport or activity until the approved program has been completed.

v. A four week, or forty percent of the season, suspension (whichever is less) from the activity or the sport.

vi. If necessary the local police may be notified.

vii. If the second offense occurs during the same season in the same school year, the student shall lose eligibility for all practices and contests for the remainder of the season.

b. Out of Season

i. Conference with the Athletic and/or Activity Director.

ii. Conference with the Coordinator of Student Assistance programs.

iii. Assessment from an approved outside agency/hospital and successful completion of the recommendations from the assessment at parent/guardian expense.

iv. A second tobacco violation will require mandatory completion of an approved smoking cessation program at parent/guardian expense. If students fail to complete the program as determined by the Athletic
and/or Activities Director, they will be ineligible from the sport or activity until the approved program has been completed.

v. Thirty hours or approved service within the school within forty days. Failure to complete this service within the forty days will result in a four week, or forty percent of season, whichever is less, suspension from the activity or sport.

vi. Service hour arrangements must be made by students, and they must be approved by the athletic and/activity director.

vii. If necessary the local police may be notified.

A third and subsequent violations for the use of inhalants would result in the student being suspended from the sport or activity for one full calendar year. A mandatory conference with the Activities and/or Athletic Director and the District Coordinator of Student Assistance program, the parents or guardians, and the student offender was required for the student to be reinstated. If the school principal reviewed the case and it had not been proven that there was a violation of the Code of Conduct, but there was a basis to believe that the student may have an issue with alcohol, tobacco, or drug use, or possession may have occurred, all information regarding the student would be given to the student’s counselor. The counselor would evaluate the student and situation, and, in conjunction with the parents and the counselor’s supervisor, develop a program that would be appropriate for the student and the suspected substance use and/or abuse (School Board A meeting minutes, June 11, 2002).

Significant changes to the extra-curricular Code of Conduct were brought to the Board of Education April of 2004 by the superintendent in response to the
recommendations of the School Discipline Policy Review Committee. The committee focused on changes and adaptations to the alcohol, tobacco, and other drugs portion of the Code of Conduct and the inclusion of a third category of offenses and their consequences.

The first change was the inclusion of language within the Code of Conduct that any disciplinary consequences that are imposed by the athletic or activity director will be subject to review and a final decision by the school principal. This was put in place to define the school official that was ultimately responsible for the final decision regarding the imposition of consequences if so desired by the student or the student’s parent or guardian. Category I extra-curricular code violations were further defined as offenses not listed in Category II or Category III, such as, but not limited to cheating, fighting, verbal abuse, theft, vandalism, unsportsmanlike behavior, or now including the language of any conduct that would constitute a misdemeanor under Federal or Illinois criminal law while in school, on school property, or as a representative of a school sport or activity. The third category of violations was added in response to more severe offenses such as but not limited to hate crimes, bullying, hazing, criminal assault, sexual assault, or such conduct that would constitute a felony under Federal of Illinois criminal law. All categories of violations would be administered as separate categories and each situation will be managed on an individual basis. Previously the extra-curricular code had stated that penalties would be cumulative starting with the student’s signing of the student handbook and continuing throughout the students’ career both in and out of school. The new language also stated that while school officials are not expected to monitor students off campus behavior, violations of category I and II behaviors any time would be subject to
the consequences of the code whether or not school was in session. Also added to the section regarding violations that occur away from the school was that as long as there were a reasonable amount of facts confirming a violation of the code had occurred then consequences would be applied to any non-school related violations (School Board A meeting minutes, April 26, 2004).

Changes were also made to the list of consequences for a Category I first violations that dealt with those offenses that occurred during school or school related activities. While the school officials were not responsible or expected to supervise off campus or non-school activities, a violation that was apparent and proven to the school district would result in a Code of Conduct violation. The student offender would be subject to the consequences listed in the extra-curricular code for that proven offense. Added to the list of consequences for a first offense of a Category I violation was a loss of parking privileges at that student’s school. If the student had a parking permit and was allowed to drive to school during the school day they could possibly lose that privilege of driving to school according to the consequences determined by the athletic and/or activity director.

Change were also made to the behavioral requirements for a Category II violation regarding alcohol, inhalants, tobacco, and other drugs to in response to concerns regarding student behaviors in the community, and to better define the expectations of the students as representatives of the school. Added to the behavioral requirements of the students in the Category II violations were:

1. Students must abstain from attending any party/gathering or driving/riding in a vehicle where tobacco, alcohol, and/or other drugs are present.
2. In-Season and Out of Season is defined by the active participation dates of the sport or activity.

3. All coaches and/or sponsors of the student’s extra-curricular activities will be notified by the athletic and/or activities director of an extra-curricular Code of Conduct violation for the health and safety of the student.

4. Category II offenses include student behavior at school, school related and non-school related activities at all times throughout the calendar year.

In response to the newly added behavioral requirements for Category II violations the School Board decided to add a number of consequences that could be utilized when a student was found to be in violation of the extra-curricular code. Added to the first offense consequences for an in-season Category II violation that involved alcohol, inhalants, tobacco and other drugs included the following:

1. The student found in violation will prepare and share a statement of individual responsibility and reflection regarding his or her behavior to activity or team members. The student in violation will also have to share this statement with any Out of Season sponsors and/or coaches.

2. Attendance at a party or gathering or in a vehicle where alcohol, tobacco, or other drugs are present will result in a conference and parent notification.

3. The student, if applicable, will lose parking privileges for 20 school days.

For an out of season Category II violation that involved alcohol, inhalants, tobacco and other drugs the consequences now included the following:

1. Attendance at a party or gathering or in a vehicle where alcohol, tobacco, or other drugs are present will result in a conference and parent notification.
2. The student, if applicable, will lose parking privileges for 20 school days.

Changes were also made to the student admission policy that outlined the process for a student to admit to a Category II violation that was unsolicited or unreported to school officials by judicial or law enforcement agencies. The first change was that if a student admitted to a violation of a Category II offense the two week suspension from activity or athletics or the 15 hours of approved community service would be waived, along with a waiver of the newly instituted loss of parking privileges. The violation would still count as first offense for the student even with accepting the voluntary admission option (School Board A meeting minutes, April 26, 2004).

The Student Discipline Policy Committee determined that there needed to be language added to the student admission policy that would allow parents or guardians to seek help for their student that was involved in extra-curricular activities without incurring a penalty for a violation. Added to the language of the voluntary student admission policy was that if parents or guardians were looking to help their student that was involved with alcohol, inhalants, tobacco or other drugs from the school or a school official they would be required to complete the school district substance abuse program or receive an assessment from an outside agency or professional as determined and approved by the school district student/employee assistance director. The student and parents or guardians would have to complete the recommendations from the student assistance director or the outside assessment program to result in a waiver of the first offense consequences contained in the extra-curricular Code of Conduct. This would be a one-time opportunity for the student and any further contacts or violations that occur
would result in a first offense and corresponding consequences (School Board A meeting minutes, April 26, 2004).

Additional consequences were also added to second offenses in response to further issues affecting the students and their repeated violations involving tobacco, drugs, and alcohol. If a student violated the Category II behaviors of the extra-curricular code and was in their athletic or activity season they would lose parking privileges at that student’s school for forty days. If the student had a parking permit and was allowed to drive to and park at school during the school day they could possibly lose that privilege according to the consequences determined by the athletic and/or activity director. Also added to the list of consequences for a second offense of a Category II violation was inclusion of the language regarding a student’s attendance at a party or gathering or driving or riding in a vehicle where alcohol, inhalants, tobacco, and/or other drugs were available. If a student violated this behavior for a second time it would result in In-Season, first offense consequences which included the following:

1. Conference with the athletic and/or activity director.
2. Conference with the coordinator of student assistance programs.
3. Successful completion of the school district student assistance program with the student and parents or guardians.
4. A two week or twenty percent of season, whichever is less, suspension form the activity or sport.
5. If necessary the local police may be notified.
6. Student Admission.
7. Student preparation and sharing of a statement of individual responsibility and reflection regarding his/her behavior to activity/team members. The student in violation will also have to share the statement with any out of season sponsors and/or coaches.

8. Loss of parking privileges at school for twenty school days.

If the student was out of their season and in violation a second time for a Category II offense that included alcohol, inhalants, tobacco or other drugs they would be subject to new consequences that included a loss of parking privileges for forty school days. If the violation involved attendance at a party or gathering or driving or riding in a vehicle where alcohol, tobacco, and/or other drugs were available for a second time the student would be subject to out of season first offense consequences which included the following:

1. Conference with the athletic and/or activity director.
2. Conference with the coordinator of student assistance programs.
3. Successful completion of the school district student assistance program with student and parents or guardians.
4. Fifteen hours or approved service within the school within twenty days. Failure to complete this service within the twenty days will result in a two week or twenty percent of the season, whichever is less, suspension from the activity or sport.
5. Service hour arrangements must be made by the students and they must be approved by the athletic and/activity director.
6. If necessary the local police may be notified.
7. Loss of parking privileges at school for twenty days.

8. Student Admission.

If a student committed a Category II violation that included alcohol, inhalants, tobacco, or other drugs for a third or subsequent time, in addition to previously listed consequences, they would lose parking privileges for the entire school year. The student involved in attendance at a party or gathering or driving or riding in a vehicle where alcohol, tobacco, and/or other drugs were available for a third time, the student would be subject to the appropriate in-season or out of season third offense consequences which included the following:

1. In-Season
   a. Conference with the athletic and/or activity director.
   b. Conference with the coordinator of student assistance programs.
   c. Assessment from an approved outside agency/hospital and successful completion of the recommendations from the assessment at the parents/guardians expense.
   d. A second tobacco violation will require mandatory completion of an approved smoking cessation program at the parents/guardians expense. If the student fails to complete the program as determined by the athletic or activities director they will be ineligible from the sport or activity until the approved program has been completed.
   e. A four week or forty percent of the season suspension (whichever is less) from the activity or the sport.
   f. If necessary the local police may be notified.
g. If the third offense occurs during the same season in the same school year, the student shall lose eligibility for all practices and contests for the remainder of the season.

2. Out of Season
   
a. Conference with the athletic and/or activity director.

b. Conference with the coordinator of student assistance programs.

c. Assessment from an approved outside agency/hospital and successful completion of the recommendations from the assessment at the parents/guardians expense.

d. A second tobacco violation will require mandatory completion of an approved smoking cessation program at the parents/guardians expense. If the student fails to complete the program as determined by the athletic or activities director they will be ineligible from the sport or activity until the approved program has been completed.

e. Thirty hours or approved service within the school within forty days. Failure to complete this service within the forty days will result in a four week or forty percent of season, whichever is less, suspension from the activity or sport.

f. Service hour arrangements must be made by the students and they must be approved by the athletic and/activity director.

g. If necessary the local police may be notified (School Board A meeting minutes, April 26, 2004).
A fourth violation of the offense of attendance at a party or gathering or driving or riding in a vehicle where alcohol, tobacco, and/or other drugs were available would result in the loss of eligibility from participation in activities and/or sports for the student for one full calendar year.

A significant change recommended by the Student Discipline Review Committee focused on the development of a new category of violations that defined hate crimes, bullying, hazing, harassment, and other criminal acts. This was done in response to the increase of events occurring in and out of the school that involved the acts of hate crimes, bullying, hazing, harassment, and other criminal acts. Since they were occurring in increasing numbers and that the previous extra-curricular code did not explicitly define the behavioral requirements of the students and the possible consequences for violations of these acts, the committee felt that a new category of behavioral requirements that dealt with hate crimes, bullying, hazing, harassment, and other criminal acts was needed. Category III Behavioral requirements of the students involved in the athletics and activities now included the following language:

Students involved in extra-curricular athletics and activities were required to abstain from committing, participating in, assisting other persons in committing or participating in, or being a party to any of the following acts:

1. Hate crimes is defined as any threat, intimidation, harassment, physical touching, vandalism, property damage, or any act which would constitute a violation of Federal or Illinois criminal laws, committed by reason of the actual or perceived race, color, creed, religion, ancestry, gender, sexual
orientation, physical or mental disability or national origin of another individual or a group of individuals;

2. Bullying, defined as conduct involving physical or psychological violence, threats or intimidation, directed against any person or group of persons:

3. Hazing of any person or group of persons as defined in the district policy as to be any hazing and inappropriate initiation activity to be any act whether physical, mental, emotional, or psychological which subjects a student to any situation or expectation that may potentially abuse, mistreat, degrade, humiliate, harass, harm, intimidate a student, denigrate either an individual or another group or compromise a student’s inherent dignity as a person. This includes any hazing or inappropriate initiation activity including; actions directed toward any student whether or not the student may be joining or affiliating with a student organization, a situation in which an older student subjects a younger student to a rite of initiation, and the fact that a student participates voluntarily in a hazing or in appropriate in initiation activity does not alter the District’s prohibition of such conduct.

4. Harassment (including, but not limited to harassment over the internet) against any person or group of persons, or directed against any person or group of persons;

5. Any act committed with the intent to cause significant physical harm to persons or significant damage (exceeding $500) to property;

6. Any act which would constitute a felony under Federal or Illinois criminal laws.
The consequences for those students who violate the Category III behaviors and expectations shall be subjected to the following consequences and any other consequences that were deemed appropriate by the principal:

1. When there is a confirmation of a violation, the student athlete/activity participant shall lose eligibility for participation in activities and/or sports for one full calendar year, starting upon the confirmation of the violation.

2. The principal or a principal’s designee shall notify applicable law enforcement officials as warranted.

3. After the student has served the one year suspension for the participation in the sport or activity, the student offender may request reinstatement in the sport or activity by attending a conference with the principal or the principal’s designed and the student’s parent and/or guardian. After the conference has been held, the principal may, but shall not be obligated to reinstate the student’s eligibility (School Board A meeting minutes, April 26, 2004).

School Board members were given copies of the recommend changes and additions to the student discipline policy and extra-curricular Code of Conduct prior to the board meeting for time to review the policy and to have any questions answered by the policy review committee. The school district Director of Student and Employee Assistance reviewed the recommended policy changes and additions line by line and discussed the reason for the changes. The superintendent explained that the Category III behaviors and consequences was a new category of expected student behaviors and thanked the members of the School Board and the Student Discipline Policy Committee for the writing of the new category. The District Director of Student and Employee
Assistance programs and the committee were also thanked by the Superintendent and the School Board, and a letter was sent out to the committee members on behalf of the board. It was moved and seconded by the School Board that they approve changes and additions to the student discipline policy and extra-curricular Code of Conduct, and the School Board unanimously approved the recommendation (School Board A meeting minutes, April 26, 2004).

In May of 2005 the Student Discipline Committee brought recommended changes to the Board of Education response to concerns compiled throughout the school year from the administration, faculty, staff, and community. It was explained during the board meeting that the recommended changes were to improve and better clarify the student discipline policy and the extra-curricular Code of Conduct; there was the belief that the entire policy needed a thorough and complete review. Statistics regarding alcohol, inhalants, tobacco, and drug violations within the school district were being compiled by the District Director of Employee and Student Assistance to be reported to the board for further changes to the student discipline policy and the extra-curricular Code of Conduct. Any suggestions and areas of concern regarding this policy were to be collected for further review by board members identified at the July 20, 2005 School Board meeting. These suggestions were to be then forwarded to the student discipline committee for further review throughout the school year (School Board A meeting minutes, May 23, 2005).

Changes made to the extra-curricular Code of Conduct in May of 2005 included the addition of language that further defined what is considered to be drug paraphernalia. The previous Code of Conduct did not specifically outline what was included in the
category of drug paraphernalia, just that the student must abstain from any act, attempt or intent to possess, use, obtain, manufacture, sell, or distribute any illegal, controlled, or intoxicating substance, including alcohol, inhalants, and other drugs, anabolic steroids, or any substance purported or presented as an illegal, controlled or intoxicating substance, or drug paraphernalia (School Board meeting minutes, May 23, 2005). What items that were considered to be drug paraphernalia was not previously defined or described.

Added to the Code of Conduct was that drug paraphernalia was defined as items “such as, but not limited to pipes, bongs, rolling papers, etc.” (School Board A meeting minutes, May 23, 2005).

While additions were made to the extra-curricular Code of Conduct in May of 2005, more important was the elimination of the behavioral requirement of the students in sports and activities to abstain from attending any party/gathering or driving/riding in a vehicle where tobacco, alcohol, and/or other drugs were present. This was removed from all Category II violations: alcohol, inhalants, tobacco, or other drugs, in-season and out of season behavioral requirements, violations and consequences, including first, second, third, and subsequent occurrences. There was no reference in the School Board minutes as to why this behavioral requirement and consequences were removed from the extra-curricular Code of Conduct only one year after it was added as a recommendation by the Student Discipline Committee and a unanimous vote of the School Board (School Board A meeting minutes, May 23, 2005).

Also eliminated from language in the extra-curricular Code of Conduct after discussion by the School Board was the use of egregious acts of bullying and hazing behavioral requirements in Category III violations of hate crimes, bullying, hazing,
harassment, and criminal acts. Any act of bullying or hazing did not have to be flagrant or conspicuous, if any bullying or hazing occurred at all while the student was an athlete or part of an activity, that student was in violation of the Code of Conduct. They would be then subject to the consequences outlined in the code and any other consequence that were deemed appropriate by the principal including the following:

1. When there is a confirmation of a violation, the student athlete/activity participant shall lose eligibility for participation in activities and/or sports for one full calendar year, starting upon the confirmation of the violation.

2. The principal or a principal’s designee shall notify applicable law enforcement officials as warranted.

3. After the student has served the one year suspension for the participation in the sport or activity, the student offender may request reinstatement in the sport or activity by attending a conference with the principal or the principal’s designed and the student’s parent and/or guardian. After the conference has been held, the principal may, but shall not be obligated to reinstate the student’s eligibility.

The changes outlining the elimination of the behavioral requirement of the students in sports and activities to abstain from attending any party/gathering or driving/riding in a vehicle where tobacco, alcohol, and/or other drugs are present in all cases, and the decision to remove egregious acts of to the bullying and hazing behavioral requirements in Category III violations of hate crimes, bullying, hazing, harassment, and criminal acts were presented, recommended for approval, and approved by a unanimous
vote of the School Board in May of 2005 (School Board A meeting minutes, May 23, 2005).

In June of 2006 the School Board discussed that while the student discipline policy was a flawed document, there had been continual work to correct any concerns and inaccuracies, specifically with hard drugs and narcotics, prescription and non-prescription medications, and associated consequences for those violations. The School Board discussed reviewing and simplifying the entire policy in the future (School Board A meeting minutes, June 12, 2006).

The removal of specific language from the extra-curricular Code of Conduct was prevalent in June of 2006. In the previous extra-curricular code a student who had committed multiple violations would have served the consequences consecutively depending on the violation, if they were suspended from competition for a Category II violation first offense, and then committed another violation, they would then serve the consequences for that violation immediately after the first offense suspension or consequences expired. If the suspension from contests or performances occurred at the end of a season and did not satisfy the requirements of the suspension, that said suspension could be carried over from one sport or activity season into the other, or from one academic year to the next. Also the student in violation must have completed the season during which the penalty was being served; the student could not quit the team after the suspension was served and be in compliance with the extra-curricular code. The language that stated students must complete the season during which the penalty is served was omitted from the required behaviors of the students (School Board A meeting minutes, June 12, 2006). No explanation in the School Board meeting minutes was given
as to why this change was made to the extra-curricular Code of Conduct so that students serving the consequences for a violation did not have to finish out their respective sport season or activity.

Also removed from the consequences of a Category I violation was the statement that school officials are not expected to supervise off-campus, non-school activities, however, a proven violation may result in disciplinary consequences. The statement regarding this issue was moved to the general behavioral expectations and procedures for the extra-curricular Code of Conduct. Due to this change only Category II and III violations of the extra-curricular Code of Conduct would be subject to the consequences in the code regardless of the place or time of a violation throughout the year, it would not matter if the violation occurred at school, school related functions, or non-school related activities as long as the violations are reasonably confirmed by a preponderance of facts. There was no explanation as to why the recommendation was made to remove this language from the Category I behavioral requirements of the students that included the following:

1. Demonstrate respect for staff and students by interacting with others appropriately, exhibit sportsmanlike behavior, use acceptable, non-offensive language, and refrain from verbal abuse.

2. Refrain from engaging in or being a party to acts of theft or vandalism at any time.

3. Demonstrate respect for the environment in which they work by leaving all facilities and the equipment in good condition.

4. Abide by the rules and responsibilities of membership in that group or sport.
5. Maintain academic responsibilities as defined by the IHSA.

6. Conduct oneself in an appropriate and responsible manner.

7. Refrain from engaging in or being party to any act of gambling.

Changes were also made to the behavioral requirements of Category II violations that dealt with alcohol, inhalants, tobacco, and drug issues affecting the students involved in athletics and activities. Removed from the prohibited behaviors was the statement that students must abstain from any act, attempt to or intent to possess, use, obtain, manufacture, sell, or distribute any illegal, controlled, or intoxicating substances including: all prescription/on prescription drugs when such a prescription drugs is sold, distributed, possessed, and/or consumed by the student in a manner inconsistent with the prescription, and/or the prescribed or directed purpose when not under the direct supervision of the school nurse/representative (School Board A meeting minutes, June 12, 2006).

As with the language removing school official expectations of supervision of non-school activities involving a Category I offense, there is no explanation in the School Board minutes explaining the removal of the language dealing with violations of the extra-curricular Code of Conduct policy on the improper use of prescription drugs. The minutes state that the School Board has been working to correct flaws in the student discipline policy regarding prescription and non-prescription medications and consequences for violations of the policy regarding these substances (School Board A meeting minutes, June 12, 2006).

Additional language clarifying the consequences for an in-season first offense of the Category II behaviors that include alcohol, inhalants, tobacco, and other drugs was
added in June of 2006. It was now required that a student committing a first offense violation that involved alcohol, inhalants, tobacco, and other drugs must complete the in-house school district substance abuse program, it had previously been allowed for a student and their parent or guardian to obtain an assessment from an approved outside agency or hospital. If the school district’s in-house substance abuse program had been previously completed due to a previous violation, the student must then complete an assessment from an approved outside agency or hospital, and successfully complete the recommendations from that assessment at the parents expense. The student must show proof of the completed program to the school district’s Director of Student and Employee Assistance. If the student in violation does not complete the assessment and the recommendations they will lose eligibility to participate in their sport or activity until the assessment and recommendations are completed.

As a result of increased tobacco use by the students, especially smokeless tobacco, the school district developed an in-house smoking cessation/information program that dealt specifically with tobacco use and abuse by teenagers. This program was then required to be completed by students who had committed tobacco violations of the extra-curricular Code of Conduct. An in or out of season first tobacco related violation by a student involved in athletics or activities required the offender to successfully complete the school district’s smoking cessation and information program. If this was an in-season offense the student would also be suspended from participating in their sport or activity for either two weeks or twenty percent of their sport season, whichever was less. If the violation occurred outside the season then the student would be required to complete 15 hours of community service within 20 school days, failure to
complete this requirement would result in a two week or 20% of their season suspension from their next sport.

If a student committed a second violation, in or out of season, of the extra-curricular Code of Conduct that involved tobacco or tobacco products as defined in the code, they would be required to complete the school district in-house substance abuse program that dealt with tobacco, alcohol, inhalants, and other drugs. If the student fails to complete the in-house school district program as determined by the athletic or activity director, the student will result in a loss of eligibility from athletics and activities until the approved program had been completed.

The School Board took into consideration all of these changes and additions during the June of 2006 board meeting, and discussed the simplification of the entire student discipline policy in the future. It was moved to approve all of the changes and amendments to the student discipline policy; it was approved with one board member abstaining (School Board A meeting minutes, June 12, 2006).

The School Board held a regular meeting in May of 2007 that included discussion on the revisions to the student discipline policy that were recommended to the Board of Education from the Student Discipline Policy Committee. The assistant superintendent reported to the School Board that the proposed rule and policy changes being recommended to the board at the meeting were the result of constant dialogue between the many constituents on the policy committee which included parents, students, building/administrative personnel, and School Board members. It was brought up at the board meeting that there should be a review and/or reconsideration of the extra-curricular Code of Conduct that relates to student attendance at gatherings/parties where alcohol is
available, even though the student is not consuming. There was an attempt to deal with this issues a few years ago and they committee felt that is was time to look at this again and reconsider what was in the policy at this time (School Board A meeting minutes, May 7, 2007).

An addition to the student discipline policy was in response to the increased use of computers, social networking websites, and blogs by the students not only in the school but also outside of school by those involved in extra-curricular activities and athletics. The school district decided to address the issues that were now facing the building administrators regarding the use and abuse of computers in and outside of the school. Language was added to the general student discipline policy that also addressed students in violation of the extra-curricular Code of Conduct. The policy stated that if the school becomes aware of the postings on websites outside of the school that cause students or staff members to feel threatened or compromised, or that show students to be in violation of the school rules or in violation of the extra-curricular code, the students will be assigned consequences for those postings. Such actions may be taken in response to postings that contain threats, bullying, inappropriate pictures, allegations of/or inappropriate behavior, or such other content as is likely to cause disruption of the school. It was also stated that if school computers were used for these postings the students would be given consequences under the school district computer use policy along with consequences from the extra-curricular Code of Conduct.

The recommended changes and additions were presented to the Board of Education after discussion regarding the review and reconsideration of the student discipline policy and extra-curricular Code of Conduct which related to student
attendance at gatherings/parties where alcohol is available even if that student is not consuming. The recommended changes were passed unanimously by the Board of Education (School Board A meeting minutes, May 7, 2007).

The June of 2008 School Board meeting resulted in the student discipline committee recommending significant changes to the extra-curricular Code of Conduct based on months of meetings, discussion, and dialogue between the members of the committee. The committee members included school district parents, students, building and administrative personnel, and Board of Education members that spent many months meeting to develop recommendations to present to the board of education. A parent of a student in the school district also attended the board meeting and during the citizen comment section of the board meeting stressed his support of the proposed changes and improvements to the student discipline policy and extra-curricular Code of Conduct. He also stressed the importance of being supportive of the Code of Conduct changes and communicating to the students of the school district that there were penalties for violating the behaviors outlined in the extra-curricular Code of Conduct (School Board A meeting minutes, June 16, 2008).

The major changes to the extra-curricular Code of Conduct presented to the Board of Education were the removal of separate consequences for in-season and out of season violations. In the previous extra-curricular codes for the school district there were different consequences according to when the violation of the code occurred, if the student was in-season when the violation occurred then there was a suspension from the sport or activity. If the violation occurred outside of that student’s sport or activity season then there was not any suspension from a sport or activity season, the student in violation
was to complete either fifteen or thirty hours of approved school or community service approved by the activity or athletic director. In the new guidelines recommended to the Board of Education students violating the extra-curricular code that involves offenses related to alcohol, inhalants, tobacco, and other drug violations for a first offense would be suspended from all extra-curricular involvement for 20% of the season. If this requirement couldn’t be fulfilled during the current season the consequences would carry over to the next season in which the student participates. If the student commits a second violation, in or out of their respective sport or season, that is related to alcohol, inhalants, tobacco, and or other drug violations the student would be suspended from extra-curricular involvement for 40% of the season. If the suspension could not be fulfilled during the current season the consequences and suspension would carry over to the next season in which the student participates. Previously the suspensions were for either a defined length of time, two weeks for a first violation and four weeks for a second violation, or for a percentage of the season, 20% for a first violation and 40% for a second violation, the new extra-curricular code only recommended a percentage of the season suspension for violations that were related to alcohol, inhalants, tobacco, or drugs. Also removed from the list of consequences for an in-season Category II violation was the requirement of the student in violation to prepare and share a statement of individual responsibility and reflection regarding their behavior to their activity or team members. The student in violation would also not have to share this statement with any other out of season coaches or activity sponsors (School Board A meeting minutes, June 16, 2008).

Numerous other additions, changes, and omissions to the extra-curricular Code of Conduct were recommended to the Board of Education at the June 2008 meeting. The
first of these was the removal of language regarding the general implementation and
description of the extra-curricular code that divided the violations into the different
categories of offenses and consequences. The committee felt that the descriptions and
outline of each category of behaviors, violations, and consequences listed later in the
document adequately explained each category and the language listed at the beginning of
the extra-curricular code led to more confusion on the part of the parent and students.
Language that was added to the general implementation of the extra-curricular code
included:

1. The code applies to all activities/athletics in which a student participates, and
   as a result consequences will be assigned to every extra-curricular activity violation.

2. A student in a leadership role will be evaluated upon each offense with the
   possibility of removal at any time.

3. Student eligibility for participants in activities shall remain consistent with
   policies and regulations adopted by the IHSA and conferences or associations
   of which its participants are members.

4. Unsubstantiated information, rumors and/or hearsay, will be reported and
   shared with parents of the student.

5. A student that is charged with any illegal activity by the police will face
   immediate consequences as outlined in the student extra-curricular code.

Clarifications of what were considered to be Category I offenses were moved in
the extra-curricular Code of Conduct document and were now listed under the Category I
heading which improved the clarity of the document. Category I offenses were offenses
not listed in Category II and III offense such as but were not limited to cheating, gambling, bullying, fighting, verbal abuse, theft, vandalism, unsportsmanlike behavior, or conduct that would constitute a misdemeanor under Federal or Illinois criminal law, while in school, or on school property, or as a representative of the school.

Specific language was added to the extra-curricular Code of Conduct Category II behavioral requirements to better define the procedures that would take place when a violation occurred that were related to alcohol, tobacco, and other drug violations. This language included the following:

1. The extra-curricular code applies to all activities/athletics in which the student participates, and as a result consequences will be assigned to every extra-curricular activity violation.

2. When, in the judgment of the principal or the principal’s designate, it has not been established there was a violation, but there is a reasonable basis to believe that a prohibited tobacco, alcohol, or other drug use and/or possession may have occurred the following will take place:
   a. All information available will be given to the student’s counselor and the District Director of Student and Employee Assistance or a designee.
   b. Based on the counselor’s knowledge of the student and in consultation with the counselor’s supervisor, the counselor may set in motion a program that is deemed appropriate for the student and inform the principal and the parents/guardians of the program that will be taken.
   c. The principal or principal’s designee will notify law enforcement personal as warranted.
d. Students who do not meet these expectations regardless of place or time will be subject to the following consequences listed for those students with a confirmed extra-curricular Code of Conduct violation.

Changes were also made to the consequences for a third and subsequent violation of the Category II offenses that involve alcohol, tobacco, and any drug violations. When a student did commit a third or subsequent violation of Category II behaviors they had previously lost driving and parking privileges at the school for a the school year, the language was changed in the new code to a loss of parking privileges for 180 school days. The student in violation for a third time would now also have to obtain a drug and alcohol assessment for an approved agency/hospital and successfully complete the recommendations made from that assessment at the parents/students expense. Removed from the consequences for a third Category II offense was the language that if the principal ruled that there was not an established code violation but there was a reasonable basis to believe that the student in question may have an issue with alcohol, tobacco, or drug use and/or possession the information would be turned over to the student’s counselor and the District Director of Student and Employee Assistance programs or an outside agency. In conjunction with the elimination of the information regarding a possible substance abuse issue with a student being sent to their counselor, the language stating that the counselor would set in motion a program appropriate for the issue affecting the student and informing the principal and the student’s parents was also removed from the list of third and subsequent Category II consequences.

The list of proposed additions, omissions, changes, and amendments to the student discipline policy was taken to the board of education, open discussion was held
on the recommended changes, and the board unanimously approved the proposed student
discipline policy and extra-curricular Code of Conduct (School Board A meeting minutes,
June 16, 2008).

The School Board meeting in July of 2009 included a significant amount of
discussion regarding the student discipline policy and specifically the issue of harassment
and where it fit into the extra-curricular Code of Conduct. A member of the school felt
that the word “harassment” should be deleted from the first paragraph describing the
prohibited conducts and violations and that the following should be added: A student’s
first report and confirmed harassment may, at the discretion of the principal and/or the
principal’s designee, be considered as a Category I violation. Any and all subsequent acts
of harassment shall be considered as Category III activity code violations subjecting the
student to the Category III activity consequences. The rationale for this amendment was
explained that harassment was listed in both Category I and Category III and that the
mandatory consequences under Category II might be too severe. The new amendment
would give the principal and/or the principal’s designee the option of providing students
with counseling and not impose severe consequences for first offenses but would reserve
them with the right to do so for an egregious first offense. Discussion was held among
the School Board members that the way the policy was written was to allow for
flexibility to put a harassment violation in either Category I or Category III. The concern
by other School Board members was that the new proposed amendment was not studied
and/or discussed among the board members. The superintendent recommended that the
proposed change should state that harassment “can be considered a Category I or
Category II violation to the extra-curricular Code of Conduct.” After further discussion
among the Board of Education the member recommending the change to the language regarding harassment agreed to the revision to the proposal. The new proposed revised amendment was unanimously approved by the Board of Education (School Board A meeting minutes, July 20, 2009).

The new amendment read as follows:

A student’s first report and confirmed act of harassment may, at the discretion of the principal and/or the principal’s designee, be considered as a Category I or Category III activity code violation. Any and all subsequent acts of harassment shall be considered as Category II activity code violations subjecting the student to the Category III consequences.

(School Board A meeting minutes, July 20, 2009)

Other changes to the extra-curricular code included language that defined the action the school district would take if presented with information from social websites or blogs that showed the student engaging in illegal, unsafe, or inappropriate behaviors. In addition to applying consequences under the extra-curricular Code of Conduct guidelines, the principal or the principal’s designee will now notify legal authorities of all evidence and reports of all illegal activity if warranted by the circumstances. Category I consequences were further defined to include offenses that occurred due to the student’s affiliation with a school-sponsored athletic program or activity, and the consequences were amended to state that nothing in the extra-curricular Code of Conduct policy or guidelines limits the authority of any school staff member to remove a student immediately from a class or school property or activity.
An addition to the consequences for a Category II violation that involves alcohol, tobacco, and other drug violations was made in response to the suspension of the regular season contests for athletes, there was not a suspension of activities for other students involved in non-competing activities and sports. Due to this fact added to the consequences for a first offense of a Category II violation was that those students participating in extra-curricular activities such as special interest groups, multicultural groups, class boards, student government, communications, honor societies, and others not deemed competitive or performance in nature would receive two six-hour Saturday detentions as a possible consequence for a first offense, and four six-hour Saturday detentions for a second offense. Also added to the list of consequences for a Category II first and second offense was that the principal or the principal’s designee would notify the legal authorities of all evidence and reports of all illegal activity if warranted.

Modifications to the consequences for a Category III violation were also made at the July of 2009 School Board meeting. If a student was found to have committed a Category III violation includes but is not limited to hate crimes, hazing, inappropriate initiations, criminal assault, sexual assault, harassment, or such conduct which would constitute a felony under Federal or Illinois Criminal Law would now lose their parking privileges at school for 180 days (School Board A meeting minutes, July 20, 2009).

Added to the general guidelines regarding an extra-curricular Code of Conduct violation were the proper procedures for an appeal to the consequences that were handed down for a violation. The language addressing this addition outlined the procedures in steps how a parent or guardian could request a review of any disciplinary action. During the process of the review, the student would continue to serve the consequences of the
violation unless and until it is overturned at one of the steps in the process. The steps in the review were listed in order:

1. The assistant principal.
2. The principal or designee.
3. The superintendent or designee (for a long term suspension, expulsion, or Category III violation and discipline).
4. The Board of Education (for a long term suspension, expulsion, or Category III violation and discipline).

A written request for a review of the disciplinary action must be submitted for each step within two days of the administrator’s decision at each level. All requests for review must state the reason for the review and the adjustments in discipline being requested. Reasons for review might include but not limited to:

1. Due process was not followed.
2. Discipline contradicts procedures/policies in place.
3. Additional evidence has surfaced.
4. Evidence/issues/mitigating factors not considered.

Only Category III extra-curricular Code of Conduct violations may be appealed beyond the principal’s level to the superintendent and the board of education. An appeal to the Board of Education must be submitted in writing to the superintendent’s office within five calendar days of the superintendent or their designee’s decision. If the parent or guardian requests the Board of Education to review their case, the board will determine whether or not to hear the appeal. The board may also request an outside, independent hearing officer to review the case, and they may limit the jurisdiction of the
hearing officer to the determination of whether due process had been afforded and/or policies and procedure were properly followed by the administrator. When a decision by the Board of Education has been made, the decision will be communicated in writing to all parties involved by the board secretary (School Board A meeting minutes, July 20, 2009).

The School Board members thanked all of the persons involved in the discussions and for the amount of time it took to reach a consensus on all of the changes to the student discipline policy and the extra-curricular Code of Conduct. The motion to approve the changes and modifications, with the revised approved amendment, to the student discipline policy and the extra-curricular Code of Conduct was affirmed and approved with one no vote on the board (School Board A meeting minutes, July 20, 2009).

The School Board met in July of 2010 to review the district policy manual and to better organize the sections regarding student discipline and the extra-curricular Code of Conduct. The Code of Conduct was now identified as the Student Extra-Curricular Code of Conduct and was a separate policy number and section outside of the student discipline policy that defined the discipline of students during the school day. Due to this change language was added to the students extra-curricular Code of Conduct that stated the student discipline policy is not exclusive of the student extra-curricular code, if a student violates a rule in the school and is given consequences, that student can still be given other or additional extra-curricular, athletic, and/or parking consequences. The school consequences were also separate and distinct from police and law enforcement agency consequences. Additional recommended changes included the use of the term
Cyberbullying and a definition what it was included under prohibited behaviors. It is defined as the use of electronic information and communication devices, including but not limited to email messages, instant messages, text messaging, cellular telephone communications, internet blogs, internet chat rooms, internet postings, and social networks or other websites to bully another student or students. Students who engage in cyberbullying may be subject to discipline if the conduct has the effect of substantially disrupting the orderly operation of the school, or otherwise has a nexus to school activity (School Board A meeting minutes, July 12, 2010).

The recommended changes regarding the structure and numbering of the student discipline policy and the Conduct Code for Participants in Extra-Curricular Activities were presented to the Board of Education and approved unanimously in July of 2010 (School Board A meeting minutes, July 12, 2010).

In July of 2011 the Board of Education discussed recommended changes to the student extra-curricular Code of Conduct that were brought forward by the student discipline policy committee. The initial change was the elimination of the school district sponsored substance abuse program, due to the elimination of the program the students committing a Category II violation involving alcohol, tobacco, and other drug violations would now be required to attend an outside school district approved program. A first offense consequence would require the successful completion of an approved student/parent educational program by involving the student and the parent or guardian. If the approved program had already been completed due to a previous violation, the student and parent or guardian must complete an assessment from an approved agency/hospital and complete the recommendations from that assessment at the parent’s expense. The
removal of the school district sponsored substance abuse program was also applied to the voluntary admission statement that outlined the procedures for the student admitting to an extra-curricular Code of Conduct violation before the school district was aware of the violation. Instead of the student admitting to the violation having to complete the in-house school district sponsored substance abuse program, they would now have to complete an approved student/parent educational program from an outside source. This would also be true for a second tobacco offense if they had not already completed a program for a previous offense. If the student fails to complete the program as determined by the athletic/activities director they will be suspended from participation until the approved outside program had been completed (School Board A meeting minutes, July 18, 2011).

A separate category was added to the extra-curricular Code of Conduct in July of 2011 to address the issue of appeals brought forth by the parents of the students in violation of the code and challenging the disciplinary consequences that were assigned. Previously the language outlining the review/appeal process was scattered throughout the document and added to the end of the various categories and offenses. Now all of the procedures to initiate a school administration review of a student extra-curricular code violation were listed in a specific category including steps outlining the review process. The category was named: Disciplinary Consequence/Review/Appeal Process. A parent, guardian or student (if 18 years or older) would be able request a review of any disciplinary action that was taken. However during the process of the review the student would continue to serve the disciplinary consequences outlined for the violation unless
and until it is overturned by the school or district administration, or by the board of education. The steps for the review process would be in the following manner:

1. Assistant Principal (for Categories 1 & 2 only).
2. The Principal or designee.
3. The Superintendent or designee (for Category III violations and discipline).
4. The Board of Education (Category III violations and discipline).

A written request for a review of the discipline must be submitted for each step within two days of the administrator’s decision at each level stating the reason for the review and the changes to the discipline being requested. The reasons for review are limited to the following:

1. Due process was not followed.
2. Discipline contradicts policies and procedures.
3. Additional evidence has surfaced.
4. Evidence/issues/mitigating factors not considered.

Only Category III violations can be appealed to the superintendent and to the board of education, and an appeal to the board must be submitted in writing to the superintendent within five calendar days of the superintendent’s decision. The Board of Education will then determine if they will hear the appeal, and they may refer the matter to an independent hearing officer. The board may limit the jurisdiction of the hearing officer to the determination of:

1. Whether due process had been afforded.
2. If policies and procedures were followed.
The decision of the Board of Education will be communicated in writing to all parties involved in the review process by the board secretary.

The changes and modifications to the extra-curricular Code of Conduct were presented to the Board of Education and unanimously passed in July of 2011 (School Board A meeting minutes, July 18, 2011).

High School District B

Subject #1. From High School District B, this participant served as an Athletic Director, but had previously held the positions of Dean of Students and teacher.

Subject #1 has been in the school district in various roles for 32 years; as a teacher for the entire time frame, as a dean of students for 17 years, and the last six years as the director of athletics. During his time he has been involved with the discipline of the students in the school for his entire career. Initially it was as a dean in the main office dealing with all students, and then as the athletic director and working with the student-athletes.

The athletic Code of Conduct was implemented in the mid-1980’s, around 1985-86, as a supplement to the student handbook to have increased consequences for increased issues with gangs in the school. Subject #1 stated, “Most of the coaches and teachers were very leery of the new athletic Code of Conduct that was being implemented to help the school district deal with the increased number of students getting involved with the gangs” (Subject #1, interview, January 2014). The school district and School Board felt that having an athletic Code of Conduct with consequences that would take away participation in athletics it may help to deal with the increased number of students becoming involved in gangs. The school district was near its maximum number of
students in the mid-80’s and the number of students starting to become involved in gangs was increasing year by year. The school district thought they could get involved with issue by assigning extra consequences to the students involved in extra-curricular activities, while still letting the students participate. The coaches were not sure how the athletic code was going to be implemented and applied to violations of the policy.

Subject #1 explained, “When the code was first implemented there was some push back from the coaches, they were afraid to not have any control of the discipline of their team” (Subject #1, interview, January 2014). Other coaches thought the code would help by bringing consistency to the disciplining of the student-athletes; it empowered the coaches to talk their students about their behavior in and out of season. The teachers within the school district welcomed the newly formed athletic Code of Conduct as they felt that the athletes were always getting away with offenses in and out of the school due to the fact they were athletes. The classroom teachers were very supportive of the development and implementation of the athletic Code of Conduct.

The athletic Code of Conduct was developed by the school district administration in charge at that time, there were no committees developed or input from any other stakeholders in the school or community. Subject #1 stated, “Once the athletic code was developed it was put in the student handbook and the parents and students had to sign a participation permit that contained the athletic code before they were able to participate” (Subject #1, interview, January 2014). Subject #1 remembers minimal responses from the parents when the code was implemented, they might put up a small fight if their student-athlete was going to be removed from their respective sport but there wasn’t too much parent involvement at the time.
The language contained within the athletic Code of Conduct has stayed fairly consistent over the years. Any changes made were in response to the needs of the students, staff, or administration that were brought forward during the school year. It was usually the school district administration that recommended changes from feedback from the deans of students and the athletic directors from the multiple schools in the district. Most of the changes were in response to the changes in the students, the community, and what they were experiencing in their daily lives in and out of school. There was always a significant amount of coordination with the local police departments within the school district, and the athletic code was occasionally changed in response to the issues the police departments were seeing in the community that was affecting the students in the school. If changes were made to the prohibited behaviors or consequences it was usually for the better and was made for the benefit of the students. “The athletic Code of Conduct was developed as a safety net for the students, and any changes were made to close up any loopholes that were found so that safety net caught every student that needed help” (Subject #1, interview, January 2014).

Subject #1 believed that one of the strong points of the athletic Code of Conduct in the district was that nothing is set in stone and if the consequences needed to be adapted or changed the athletic director or the deans had the ability to adjust the penalty. If the offense occurred within the school, the student could still be suspended from their sport. Even if the student-athletes were out of their respective seasons, they still could be held accountable for their conduct. That has seemed to help the behavior of the student-athletes during the school day. The suspensions that did occur would usually fit the offenses that were committed, and the consequences were dependent on if it was the
student’s first or second violation. Subject #1 feels that there has been a positive move to help more of the students, they are moving toward keeping the students involved in activities and athletics and not just suspend and “throw the students away.” The development of a program called social probation was implemented to deal with misbehavior or discipline referral of the students and student-athletes. If the student-athletes are given social probation, in or out of season, due to inappropriate behavior they are not able to attend any school functions or participate in athletics until they are cleared by the dean of students.

One of the new issues facing the school district today is the increased use of social media by the students, and the amount of cyber bullying that occurs that affects the school environment. The athletic code needs to be a document in process that is always changing and adapting to the new issues facing the school district and the students. Many of the problems that occur in schools and during athletic events begin outside the school and involve some sort of social media issue that can cause problems not only with your own students but also with students from outside your school. There needs to be more discussion and collaboration with all parties involved before punishment is just handed out without thinking of the student or students that are involved. “I feel that the collaboration of the people involved with the students and their discipline has become better over the years, we have moved away from zero-tolerance and become more creative with our penalties for inappropriate behavior” (Subject #1, interview, January 2014). The parents need to get more involved in the disciplining of their students and their inappropriate behavior, there has to be some give and take to determine what is best for that student.
A program in place to help the students and parents is the implementation of a drug and alcohol screening that can identify any substance abuse issues facing the student. If the screen comes back positive then a substance abuse counseling session is implemented that can shorten the penalty and consequences that come from an athletic code violation. If the student violates the terms of the counseling or does not show up for the sessions the penalty goes back to the initial consequences that were outlined to the students and the parents. A significant issue affecting the students in the district is the cost of the substance abuse programs and counseling, many of the parents and students in the district cannot afford to pay for these services. Most of the time the school district, individual school, and parents have to look for and utilize those substance abuse counseling programs that are free to the participants that are involved. Subject #1 stated that

The schools and athletics need to be safe havens for our students; we shouldn’t chase them away when they make mistakes. Where are they going to go? Not all situations are black and white, and most of the solutions to the problems facing the students are grey. We have to find new ways to do things to help the students, if they receive a penalty for violating a rule, we need to revisit that penalty go be sure that we are helping the student. (Subject #1, interview, January 2014)

Subject #2. From High School District B, this participant was an Athletic Director, but had previously served as teacher and coach. Subject #2 had been in the school district for 35 years, from student teaching to classroom teacher and coach, and finishing as athletic director for eleven years. He recalls the Athletic Discipline Code
coming into existence when he was a coach around 1985, the athletic department started to include the code in the paperwork the parents had to sign for when the students tried out for a sport. He felt that it was just a progression of discipline in the school as there were more incidents inside and outside of the school that involved the students that were in athletics. The administration was trying to find ways to control the behavior of the students that were involved in athletics and when they did get into trouble it was more likely to be in the public eye as the local newspapers started to report more of the incidents. Even though there were multiple schools in the school district under the direction of a central office each of the separate schools had their own Athletic Discipline Code that was enforced in various ways depending on the school.

The coaches felt that they were losing a little control of the discipline of their team; “but if the discipline was kept in the athletic department and not in the dean’s office then it was ok to have a code just for the athletes” (Subject #2, interview, January 2014). The coaches tried to keep the discipline issues out of the deans/discipline office by having control of the issue and developing their own rules and regulations. If the student-athlete violated one of the rules the consequences were taken care of by the coach. When the Athletic Discipline Code came into effect there was a level of trust in the athletic department between the coaches and the athletic director that the consequences would be fair to the students that violated the code and that it would be handled appropriately in the best interest of the students. The parents were not really aware of the implementation of the new Athletic Discipline Code; they were just signing another piece of paper along with all the others when their students were going out for a sport. “As with any type of discipline, the parents and students were not sure of the discipline code until their student
violated the code and had to face consequences and then it was unfair” (Subject #2, interview, January 2014).

The Athletic Discipline Code was developed by the district administration without initial input from any of the school administrations, athletic directors, coaches, parents or students. It just appeared to the athletic departments as a document that was to be read by the parents and signed off on stating that they have read it and agree to follow the rules. Each head coach had to have a pre-season meeting to review the Athletic Discipline Code and their own rules for each sport. As with most of the meetings there were not very many questions regarding the Athletic Discipline Code, as long as their student wasn’t involved or in trouble the parents did not question the code or the contents of the code.

There were some minor revisions in the late 1980’s and 90’s depending on how each school interpreted the enforcement of the discipline code. Subject #2 explained, “Each school had their own separate identity back then and they were able to interpret the Athletic Discipline Code and enforce it as they thought was best for their student-athletes” (Subject #2, interview, January 2014). While the Athletic Discipline Code that came from the district office remained the same, each of the schools enforced it in different ways that tried to keep the discipline of the student-athletes in the athletic department. The coaches did not want the discipline of the athletes to go up to the dean’s office where they would not have control over the consequences that would be dealt to the students. However, over the last four or five years of the subject’s career the discipline of the athletes was starting to move up into the discipline office at the school. Subject #2 stated, “The last couple years of my career we were fighting a losing battle in
trying to keep the disciplining of the athletes in the athletic office, and not letting it get to the deans in the discipline office” (Subject #2, interview, January 2014).

The subject felt that the key to the consequences and penalties for a violation of the discipline code was to be fair to the students. The penalty should fit the violation, not one size fits all and he felt that the flexibility within their code left room for discretion when handing out penalties and discipline for a violation. Occasionally when the violation and the student were handled by the dean’s office they didn’t take into account the variables that always accompanied an Athletic Discipline Code violation. The ability to be flexible with the consequences and penalties while working with the coaches to be fair to the student in violation and the team was one of the strong points of keeping the discipline in the athletic office and of the Athletic Discipline Code in effect in the schools. The ability to keep the penalties consistent and fair were the keys to keep the parents from trying to appeal a code violation to the principal, even though there was not an official appeal process for a code violation to the principal or the board of education.

As with most parents when their student violated the Athletic Discipline Code and was going to be disciplined for their involvement, there was a sense of disbelief and anger. Many of the parents attempted to blame others when they found out that the student was going to be suspended from practices, games, or contests. However, if the penalty was fair and consistent to all the people involved in the violation the parents were usually satisfied with the result. They did not want the violation to go up the school discipline office since they realized the penalty and consequences would be worse. Subject #2 stated, “If the parents continued to complain regarding a violation of the Athletic Discipline Code the issue was then referred up to the dean’s office at the school,
and it was then handled by the school and the penalties were usually more severe” (Subject #2, interview, January 2014).

Due to the flexibility given the athletic department at each school the Athletic Discipline Code has not changed very much over the years in substance or language. One of the most important resources the athletic department had was the local police department, and the deployment of a resource office within the school in the mid-1990’s. The local police were able to keep any eye on the student-athletes in the community and in the school, if there were any issues affecting the students the police would communicate with the athletic department before it went to the school discipline office and became out of control. The coordination and communication between the athletic department and the local police kept many students out of trouble as the athletic department and the coaches were able to address any issues that were observed by the police in and out of the school.

The key point that came across to the parents and the students involved in athletics were that the people involved in their life at school were trying to help them navigate the issues they were going to face at school and in life. The flexibility that the athletic department had when handing out penalties and consequences for violations helped them look out for the students and do what was right for them at that time.

One of the main issues affecting students today were the use of cell phones and texting that involves bullying and harassment. The Athletic Discipline Code does not specifically address those issues and it may be one of the subjects that the administration needs to review and implement guidelines to deal with the problems with social media. Unfortunately there was not an outside program to help the students who violated the
Athletic Discipline Code involving drugs or alcohol, they were suspended from school and athletics, but there was not any type of substance abuse program offered to them. There was a parent, student, and administration conference before the students were allowed back into school or to participate in athletics.

Zero tolerance for our kids was not good, if we lost kids we wouldn’t be able to get them back, we had to look out for them. Everyone needs to be on the same page to help the students, not look for ways to eliminate them from playing sports and competing. If we suspend the students from everything, we will not have any kids left to play, and they will go on their own path and not come back to athletics or school. We need to be proactive and be on the same page to work with and help the kids with a lack of family structure.  (Subject #2, interview, January 2014)

Subject #3. From High School District B, this participant served as an Assistant Superintendent for Student Services, but had previously held the positions of Principal, Assistant Principal, dean, and teacher. Subject #3 stated his leadership style changed over time, drawing on the strengths of school administrators and leaders he worked with in the many areas of school administration and leadership. He tried to draw upon the many experiences in education that he saw to constantly evolve as a leader and how he dealt not only with people but the many tasks that school administrators encountered throughout their careers. In a leadership role, Subject #3 tried to utilize his strengths of honesty, organization, and trust to develop positive relationships with other professionals that understood decisions that are made should be based on what is best for students. He believed it was a constantly changing and evolving process that should never stop; a
professional in educational administration should be able to reflect on the decisions that were made and the interactions with parents, faculty, staff, and students to constantly evaluate their growth and advancement as a leader.

Subject #3 stated, “I have a unique vision and experience with the Code of Conduct due to my roles as a parent with students under the guidelines of the code, as a coach, and a building and district administrator” (Subject #3, interview, May 2013). He felt that coaches got frustrated with the Code of Conduct due to their misunderstanding of what the code was supposed to accomplish; they saw a document that only took student-athletes away from their teams for a period of time while they were trying to be successful. The parents saw a document they felt was taking the decision making process of disciplining their son or daughter out of their hands and infringed on the aspect of confidentiality. Most of the administrative staff viewed the Code of Conduct as a necessary document to have a structured and defined policy that would ensure consistency when a student violated the prescribed behaviors.

It takes great leadership from the administrative team to inform all the stakeholders in the community and the school, including School Board members, parents, coaches, faculty, and staff what the Code of Conduct is trying to accomplish. It is a document that identifies prohibited behaviors and it is trying to assist the students in making quality and safe decisions that could affect their health and well-being for the rest of their lives. The document is in place to help and protect the students and to give them an “out” or excuse to make quality decisions about their health and safety.
when put in tenuous situations that occur during their school years.

(Subject #3, interview, May 2013)

He felt this message must be conveyed in meetings that are held to explain and describe the Code of Conduct; the document was not in place of what the parents are doing in terms of disciplining their student, but it was there to help and guide the students in their decision making process. Some school districts hold seasonal parent meetings that were established to deliver the Code of Conduct and to make the point that the code was developed to help students and that the school cared about them. The use of a video explaining the Code of Conduct should put on the school district’s website that went into depth about the concern the school and the administration had for students and their safety. This answered many of the questions parents had concerning the code and its application to students involved in athletics and activities, and that the school district cared about their student. “The feeling of the school administration was that just putting the Code of Conduct in the parent-student handbook could not fully inform the parents or the students the care and concern that the school had for each individual student”

(Subject #3, interview, May 2013). The Code of Conduct was a guideline that parents could utilize to help direct their students and it was only a piece of paper unless the schools received support and buy-in from the community and parents.

Subject #3 stated that the Code of Conduct should be a document that was always being reviewed and revised according to issues that were brought forward by many sources, including, but not limited to, feedback from school administration and staff, community law enforcement agencies, parents, media, emerging social media, and other sources that showed the code needed to be reviewed by the committee. Initially, school
administration would review the code and decide if there were any changes that needed to be discussed and brought forward, then the policy could be reviewed and compared to other districts utilizing the Policy Reference Education Subscription Service. The service would review any changes that were requested with proper language and resources supporting the policy, then the policy change would be presented in an open board meeting. The proposed changes would then be voted on by the School Board; if the changes were passed, then the document was adapted with the changes and put into the parent-student handbook for the opening of the new school year.

At a school district the subject worked at later in his career a change that was implemented in the investigation process was the development of an Activity Board that consisted of the athletic director, assistant principal, dean, and a counselor. They would be presented with the evidence that a violation had occurred, investigate the circumstances, interview the student or students involved, and then come to a decision on the results of their findings.

It appealed to the parents and students that more than one person was making the decision and that their voice was being heard before a penalty was imposed that would affect their ability to participate in athletics or activities. The move to the Activity Board took the appeal process to the principal for a student committing a violation out of the original Code of Conduct due to the fact the inclusion of the various members of the school community ensured that more than one person was determining if there was a violation. (Subject #3, interview, May 2013)
Changes to the consequences and penalties for students resulted in a more uniform system that was progressive and followed defined categories according to policies from other school districts. Specific categories were developed that included consequences and penalties for the various violations and substances such as tobacco, alcohol, and drugs. Violations that dealt with other illegal activities such as vandalism, criminal damage to property, and other actions punishable by a court of law were also defined and categorized according to the experiences of those within the district and other schools in the state.

Another change that was implemented at a different school district that worked well was the inclusion of a four-year violation program which defined how many violations could occur over the student’s four-year high school career and how those violations would be handled. Initially the student could violate the code one year and then the new school year would begin and the number of code violations would reset to zero. A change made to this policy made the violations remain with that student for four years: if they violated the code one time as a freshman, then the next violation would count as a second no matter when it occurred during their high school years. The penalties and consequences for a violation would also be progressive according the number of violations: the first violation would have set prescribed consequences that included a suspension from games, contests, or performances, the second violation would have increased penalties and consequences including game and contest suspension, and then the third offense would be an extensive penalty that could conclude with a permanent suspension from athletics and activities.
According to Subject #3, changes to the Code of Conduct that came about every year were generated by school and district administration, as well as challenges from outside sources to the code. Even though parents may have challenged the Code of Conduct throughout the school year, the district administration decided what issues were going to be addressed each year.

A committee of district and school administrators and personnel that dealt with the Code of Conduct during the school year would be developed and given the specific challenges that were presented throughout the year; an initial draft of proposed changes would be developed and presented to a School Board subcommittee that would be reviewing school district policies. Any proposed changes to the code conduct coming out of the School Board subcommittee were presented to the full board of education.

(Subject #3, interview, May 2013)

Most of the changes dealt with the issue of confidentiality and who can and will find out about Code of Conduct violations; much of this was due to student-athletes attempting to secure lucrative athletic and activity scholarships. Subject #3 believed parents and students were concerned that if a university or college found out about a Code of Conduct violation, the scholarship would be taken away and the parents would be responsible for the ever-growing cost of a college education. A genuine concern was why students involved in extra-curricular and co-curricular activities were being held to a higher standard of conduct than students that were not involved, and that code violations could be on the student’s permanent school record. This concern would be addressed at the seasonal Code of Conduct meetings which informed students and parents that the
code was not in place to keep them from moving on to college and that the information regarding Code of Conduct violations was private and that it would not be provided to college recruiters.

Subject #3 explained that changes at many school districts were made to the severity of the consequences and penalties contained in the initial codes. He found many stakeholders felt that the “death penalty or permanent disqualification from high school athletics and activities” were applied too fast depending on the number of violations (Subject #3, interview, May 2013). Consequently, he found that some felt the penalties were considered too punitive and made students and parents try to hide any dangerous behaviors and substance abuse problems; they felt there should be a rehabilitative component to the code that reduced the amount of game, contest, or performance suspensions. Concerns were taken to the committee established at the end of each school year and discussed; the result was that the number of game or contest suspensions was reduced to a defined percentage if the student and parents agreed to attend a substance abuse counseling session at their own cost. If the student failed to attend or denied the opportunity to attend the substance abuse counseling session, then the reduction in the game or contest suspension was nullified and the full suspension was implemented. This put part of the responsibility on the student and parent to fulfill the requirements of the Code of Conduct before they were allowed to resume participation, plus it made those students with possible substance abuse issues get evaluated by a professional trained in adolescent substance abuse. Subject #3 felt;

The school districts could always do more to help the students that violate the Code of Conduct, and that the needs of all the students are not addressed under
the Code of Conduct. That is not due to anything the school district is doing wrong: it is a by-product of new issues affecting students that need to be addressed by changes and adaptations to the Code of Conduct. (Subject #3, interview, May 2013)

The new issues affecting students at the time of the interview included heroin abuse, improper use and abuse of social media, including, but not limited to, Facebook, My Space, Twitter, Vine, and other forms of media that popped up daily, bullying, and hazing. Subject #3 felt the Code of Conduct had to be a fluid: every changing policy that was constantly adapting to the issues facing students with the main core belief that the code was there to help the students, not just there to take something away from them. The use of video and social media could be utilized to get the message across to the parents and students that the Code of Conduct was a tool to help them; the school utilized the avenues of communication that the students used so they felt that the school district, administrators, teachers, and coaches were trying to connect with them.

The schools need to sell the fact that the school district is trying to help the students and parents during a turbulent time in their lives, and the school is giving them tools and strategies to be successful. The resources of psychologists, counselors, and transition programs developed to address the needs of the students of today are available. As usual, the bottom line becomes who is going to pay for these resources? The school and administration need to continually explore and search for those programs that are cost effective or free. They also need to utilize those resources that are available in your community. Many times those community-based
resources will be cost effective due to grants, state or federal aid that is
directed to them to implement programs that address the needs of
teenagers and students in their own community. Unfortunately, sometimes
the issues are time and the manpower available to follow up on the good
programs that are implemented, or to follow the recommendations that are
given to each individual student. (Subject #3, interview, May 2013)

**School Board Reports: High School District B.** The development of a parent-
teacher student disciplinary policy committee was initially discussed in the High School
District B School Board reports at the September 11, 1985 School Board meeting. The
district administration and School Board members discussed new state legislation that
required a school district to develop a parent-teacher advisory committee that would
oversee all policies regarding student discipline. Originally the school district student
discipline policy was reviewed by the administration on a regular basis with input from
School Board members, faculty, parents, and students. While the Illinois State Board of
Education was satisfied with the policy that was in place, the school district must
establish the parent-teacher advisory committee to be in full compliance (School Board B
meeting minutes, September 11, 1985). There was no mention in the board reports if the
parent-teacher advisory committee was ever developed or implemented to oversee
policies regarding student discipline. There was also no mention of the development of a
specific extra-curricular Code of Conduct at this time.

In July of 1986 the school district administration brought forth recommendations
for changes and additions to the student discipline policy. The recommendations were
brought to the Board of Education from a committee that met to review the policies of the
district and to recommend changes that if adopted would be communicated to parents, staff, and students before school started that fall. The committee felt that student discipline policy item #7 should be rewritten and clarified. The recommended changes were tabled for a 30 day review and presented at the August meeting for possible adoption.

The recommend changes included the following:

1. Added to offenses was to include “look alike weapons.”

2. Added to offenses was to include “use of tobacco products.”

3. Added to offenses was the “possession of book bags/duffel bags and large briefcases in the classroom or cafeteria would result in a dean warning for a first offense and a conference and suspension of 1-10 days for a second offense.

4. Changes to offenses were: the use of obscene or abusive/profane language and gestures, or ethnic slurs including obscene gestures in school photographs. This behavior would lead to suspension of 1-3 days for a first offense, and 3-10 days for a second offense.

The general discipline policy stated that any conduct which may lead to suspension or expulsion of a student pursuant to the provisions of Section 10-22.6 of the Illinois School Code shall include any activity or behavior which might reasonably lead school officials to forecast a substantial disruption or material interference with school activities or which in fact is a substantial disruption or material interference with school activities whether these activities take place in the school, on school property, on a school bus, or a school sponsored function. Violation of rules leading to a suspension may also
subject a student to being prohibited from participation and/or attending activities taking place after school, parking his/her car on campus during or after the school day, usage of school lounges and/or common areas for a period of time longer than the actual suspension from school (School Board B meeting minutes July 9, 1986). The district discipline policy contained the guidelines for the determination of discipline that was applied not only to students that were involved in extra-curricular activities during this time, but were applied to all the students in the district. The only policy at this time that addressed extra-curricular activities and the students that were involved in them was the Extra-Curricular Attendance Policy that defined what school where the students were to participate in extra-curricular activities (School Board B meeting minutes July 9, 1986).

At the School Board meeting on August 13, 1986 the recommended changes that were presented at the July 9th meeting were unanimously approved by the Board of Education. The recommend changes included the following:

1. Added to offenses was to include “look alike weapons.”

2. Added to offenses was to include “use of tobacco products.”

3. Added to offenses was the “possession of book bags/duffel bags and large briefcases in the classroom or cafeteria would result in a dean warning for a first offense and a conference and suspension of 1-10 days for a second offense.

4. Changes to offenses were: the use of obscene or abusive/profane language and gestures, or ethnic slurs including obscene gestures in school photographs. This behavior would lead to suspension of 1-3 days for a first offense, and 3-10 days for a second offense.
5. Also added during the August School Board meeting was the offense of Trespassing without permission on school property. A violation led to a suspension, suspension (1-10 days) and possible referral to an alternative program and/or recommendation for expulsion. (School Board B meeting minutes, August 13, 1986)

In September of 1986 the school administration presented a district wide handbook to the Board of Education that for the first time contained all of the information concerning discipline, and other items pertaining to student activities. Included in the handbook was the entire discipline code that pertained to all the students in the district and those that were participating in extra-curricular activities (Special School Board B meeting minutes September 4, 1986).

The school district administration presented the School Board with an Alternative to Expulsion/Suspension Program for Chemical Abuse violations by a student at the October 8, 1986 School Board meeting. The proposal came from detailed discussions with the district Discipline Policy Committee. The basis of the recommended changes was that such revisions would increase the chances for families to seek assistance from outside resources to address chemical abuse issues affecting students in the school district. The Discipline Policy Committee felt that the student and family would benefit from the alternate expulsion/suspension program due to the following factors;

1. The parents will become aware of the extent that their child is involved with substance use or abuse.

2. The decision to take the alternative option becomes the responsibility of the parents.
3. The burden of the problem is placed with the parents, yet, the option gives the parents the opportunity to seek help for their child.

The discipline committee stated that the school district had a role to play in offering first-time substance abuse offenders the opportunity for outside diagnostic screening. If needed, the student and family may obtain medical help at their expense, rather than expelling or suspending the student and involving the student with members of a law enforcement agency (School Board B meeting minutes, October 8, 1986). The objectives of the Alternative to Expulsion/Suspension Program would include the following:

1. To offer the *first-time* substance abuse offender and his/her parents the option to seek a diagnostic screening to ascertain the exact involvement of the student with chemical substances.

2. To demonstrate how the welfare of the student and parents can be served without overlooking the necessity for disciplinary activities.

3. To develop a policy statement for the student and her/her parents who is found under the influence and/or possession of a controlled substance or alcohol.

4. To develop a system of referral and school staff interaction.

5. To develop forms to be used in the referral/options procedures.

6. To identify team members to serve on the Alternative Expulsion/Suspension program in the event the student needs hospitalization and aftercare.

The existing policy for the possession of, sale of, distribution of, or use of drugs, drug paraphernalia, look-alike drugs, and/or alcohol called for disciplinary action of a student/parent conference, suspension of 3-10 days, possible transfer to an Alternative
Program or recommendation for expulsion. Inform the local police department. The proposed policy would include the following disciplinary action:

1. First offence - conference, suspension (5-10 days) and possible referral to an alternative program and/or recommendation for expulsion. Depending upon the nature of the substance, the local police will be informed.

2. Second offence – 10 day suspension. Possible recommendation for expulsion. Depending upon the nature of the substance, the local police will be informed.

Under the new Alternative to Expulsion/Suspension Program, the student targeted for consideration in a chemical substance abuse offense is a first-time offender of the district substance abuse policy.

1. Upon finding the student in possession of/or using a substance (drugs, alcohol, look-alike drugs) and/or have drug paraphernalia, the following will occur:
   a. Parents are notified.
   b. The student is suspended pending:
      i. Parent conference.
      ii. The parent is informed of the offense and given the option of a diagnostic screening for the student.
      iii. If the diagnostic screening suggests that this was indeed a first-time offense and the student has no abuse problem, the student continues with regular school attendance, after the student has served a minimum of two days on suspension and the parent provides documentation that the student has had the diagnostic screening.
iv. If the diagnostic screening proves that the student needs medical care, the school district will follow suggested procedures by the referral agency.

v. If a parent decides not to take the diagnostic screening option, the proposed revision to the original policy goes into effect.

2. Second Time Offender
   
a. The student is suspended and possible recommendation for expulsion.

b. Where is appropriate and consistent with municipal ordinances, the student is referred to the local police.

3. If the student is in possession of a chemical substance or alcohol for the purpose of sale or distribution the Alternative to Expulsion/Suspension program does not apply and regular District Policy will be put in effect. The decision for determining whether a student has a substance for personal use or sale is at the discretion of the Assistant Principal in charge of discipline or their designee.

4. The sale or distribution of drugs, alcohol or look-alike drugs and/or drug paraphernalia will result in a 10-day suspension and recommendation to the Board of Education for expulsion. Inform the local police department. (School Board B meeting minutes, October 8, 1986).

The recommend approval of the revisions to the student discipline code policy, Alternative to Expulsion/Suspension Program for Chemical Abuse violations by a student, was place on the table for a 30 day review. The policy change was to be presented at the November School Board meeting for approval. The School Board was
presented with a recommendation to use the Alternative Expulsion/Suspension Program
option for first time offenders during this 30 day review period was unanimously
approved (School Board B meeting minutes, October 8, 1986).

The School Board met on November 12, 1986 and on the recommendation of the
district administration voted to approve the Alternative to Expulsion/Suspension Program
as part of the Student Discipline Policy. The School Board saw the benefit of the policy
as a way to increase parental involvement and give the parents an opportunity to look for
and find help with disciplinary problems. The School Board passed the recommendation
unanimously with the following recommended procedures to be followed by school
personnel for first time offenders of the policy (School Board B meeting minutes,
November 12, 1986).

1. The school dean is notified when a student is found in possession or using a
chemical substance, alcohol, and/or drug paraphernalia.

2. The school dean notifies the parents, suspends the students, and sets the
meeting with the parents, students, and other school personnel

3. The school dean notifies the appropriate personnel to be present at the
meeting.

   a. The person who observed the student in possession of or using chemical
      substance (drugs, alcohol look-alike drugs) and/or in possession of drug
      paraphernalia. (Optional)

   b. A building administrator.

   c. The student’s counselor.
4. The student’s counselor also would notify the school district’s student substance abuse and guidance coordinator.

5. The school dean would conduct the meeting with all the stakeholders and describe the incident that involved the student.
   
a. The person who observed the student in violation of the discipline policy is available to provide details of the violation if needed.

b. The school administrator will review and interpret the district policy.

c. The district substance abuse and guidance counselor provides information regarding the option of the Alternative to Expulsion/Suspension Program, information about diagnostic screening, and various referral agencies.

d. The school dean explains the length of the suspension depending on the screening date and will also point out the repercussions if the offense occurs again. The parent is informed that the suspension will be reduced to a minimum of two days and the students may return after the parent has documentation that the student has had the diagnostic screening.

e. The student’s counselor will discuss the school’s responsibility regarding the education portion if the student is hospitalized and that support will be available when the student returns. (School Board B meeting minutes, November 12, 1986)

To be considered for the Alternative to Expulsion/Suspension Program the parents would be required to sign a form agreeing to the diagnostic screening, and a general consent to release information from the referral agency with the results of the screening process. The student offender would also need a release signed by the referral agency
confirming that they did attend the required program and that they are able to return to
school. The parents were also given the option of refusing the Alternative to
Expulsion/Suspension Program and would be required to sign off on the acceptance of
the original discipline policy (School Board B meeting minutes, November 12, 1986).

The district wide substance abuse and guidance program was implemented to help
all students, including those involved in extra-curricular activities, at the start of the
1986-87 school year. The program was developed to assist students who are troubled by
the following issues: substance abuse, suicide/violence/stress, child abuse, divorce, death,
severe illness, teen parents, pregnancy, and potential dropouts from school. The team
members involved in the program included counselors, school nurses, social workers,
parents and students at each school to assist the students. In the first year eighty-one
students were referred to the program by staff, parents, and also by some students. The
school administration felt that the program had achieved outstanding success in
counseling and assisting the troubled students in the district (School Board B meeting
minutes, December 10, 1986).

In the April of 1988 the district administration discussed with the School Board a
recommendation that the board appoint a committee that would develop a district wide
policy regarding communication with the parents, ethics, and responsibilities of coaches,
sponsors, and chaperones who are involved in extra-curricular programs. The School
Board appointed members of the board to serve on the committee; they would look to
receive input from parents in the community regarding the guidelines that school officials
must follow (School Board B meeting minutes, April 15, 1988). While this committee
was developed and assigned members, it was not mentioned again in any School Board
reports who comprised the rest of the committee or if they ever came together to review any policies or procedures.

The July 12th meeting in 1989 had the School Board once again recommend an athletic committee consisting of parents, athletic directors, and school administrators being formed to monitor revised policies affecting student-athletes within the district, and present recommendations to the board at the end of the 1989-90 school year (School Board B meeting minutes, July 12, 1989). The School Board was split on voting for this recommendation and the motion carried with five members voting for the recommendation and two members voting against (School Board B meeting minutes, July 12, 1989). While this recommendation to develop a new athletic committee was approved in 1989, there was no other mention of the committee, who was appointed, or anything they accomplished or recommended to the School Board in any School Board reports or minutes.

The school district Board of Education and administration continued to try and increase community and stakeholder involvement in the schools as the school district developed their goals for the 1993-94 school year at the July 1993 board meeting. The goals were identified as the following:

1. Family involvement
2. Align curriculum outcomes with instructional delivery and assessment processes
3. Continue fiscal management
4. Monitor performance at all levels
5. Community involvement
The School Board directed the administration to communicate these goals to the all the school personnel and encourage everyone to work toward the achievement of these goals. The School Board voted unanimously to approve the recommended board expectations and goals (School Board B meeting minutes, special meeting, July 12, 1993).

Ideas presented at the board meeting to increase community involvement included:

1. School representatives going into the homes to meet with families.
2. Some school meetings will be held outside of the school building in settings less intimidating.
3. Development of a Citizens Advisory Committee
4. Free lectures for senior citizens to discuss important topics
5. Principals news letter
6. Progress reports from school to home
7. Parent visiting classrooms
8. Parent workshops planned cooperatively by parents and school administrators.

(School Board B meeting minutes, special meeting, July 31, 1993)

While the importance of community involvement was discussed again in July of 1993 and the development of community involvement was a specific board goal, there appears to not be any follow through on the actual development of the committees or the outcomes of any committees that were developed. If they were developed and implemented with specific results the information or outcomes were not conveyed through any reports to the board of education.
In August of 1996 the superintendent proposed new co-curricular guidelines that addressed items that affected the student-athletes within the district. The guidelines covered:

1. Student eligibility
2. Participation checklist that included
   a. Residency verification
   b. Code of ethics for sponsors and coaches
   c. Discipline code for students

The guidelines as presented to the Board of Education were tabled for thirty days to be presented at the September School Board meeting for adoption (School Board B meeting minutes, August 14, 1996.) The district administration recommended that the discussion and adoption of the co-curricular guidelines be postponed until the October School Board meeting due to several areas that still needed to be modified and clarified. The School Board voted unanimously to approve the recommendation (School Board B meeting minutes, September 11, 1996). At the October School Board meeting the district administration once again recommended to postpone the discussion and adoption of the co-curricular guidelines until the November School Board meeting. The administration felt that continued discussion was needed to review and possibly modify areas within the guidelines. The School Board voted unanimously to table the issue for another thirty days (School Board B meeting minutes, October 9, 1996). The issue was again brought up at the November 13th School Board meeting in 1996. The recommendation to adopt the co-curricular guidelines as presented was unanimously passed by the School Board, and the superintendent commended the athletic directors and the entire committee for a
successful conclusion to the project (School Board B meeting minutes, November 13, 1996).

In the February 11th School Board meeting in 1998 the principal of one of the district high schools presented an Off Campus Misconduct Policy for the School Board to review that would have the students responsible for their behavior off of school grounds and/or out of school hours which could have an effect on the student-athletes (School Board B meeting minutes, February 11, 1998). The official policy was implemented and approved at the March 11, 1998 School Board by a unanimous vote and was listed as follows:

“Off-Campus Misconduct”

Acts of gross disobedience or misconduct, infractions of the law or anti-social behavior occurring off school grounds and/or out of school hours which could have an effect on the general welfare of the school district, its students, teacher or other personnel may be subject to disciplinary action, including but not limited to suspension and/or expulsion. (High School District B Parent-Student Handbook, March 11, 1998)

The School Board in 1999-2000 listed specific goals that they wanted to implement not only in the schools but also with the parents and in the community. The specific goal that outlined their area of improvement was: “to promote parent and community involvement, volunteerism, and partnerships in order to support the education of all students” (School Board B meeting minutes, July 12, 2000). While these goals were presented and adopted by the School Board there were not any strategies or action plans developed by the board to accomplish the listed goals. The goals were not
referenced again during the 2000 school year or at the end of the year School Board meeting.

The Athletic Discipline Code was not specifically referenced for the next couple years in the School Board minutes while the student discipline guidelines, which was the foundation of the athletic code, was changed and amended numerous times. At the 2002 May 8th School Board meeting the proposed changes to the discipline policy included items dealing with gross obedience, cheating, plagiarism, attacks on school personnel, bullying and transfer student expulsions. The proposed changes were presented to the School Board and reviewed for 30 days, they were then to be presented to the Board of Education at the June 2002 board meeting (School Board B meeting minutes, May 8, 2002). At the June 12, 2002 School Board meeting the recommended changes to the school discipline policy listed above were voted on and passed unanimously (School Board B meeting minutes, June 12, 2002).

At the May 11, 2005 School Board meeting the board discussed various changes to the student discipline policy that would affect students and their off campus behavior (School Board B meeting minutes, May 11, 2005). However, those changes to the policy and a student’s off campus behavior and how it would affect school discipline were not listed or explained in the School Board meeting minutes. The board asked questions of the presenter of the proposed changes and then decided that the changes would be reviewed for 30 days and then presented for approval at the June 2005 board meeting. The board extended the review process until the August 10, 2005 School Board meeting in which they decided that the changes were procedural, not policy, therefore no action was taken by the School Board (School Board B meeting minutes, August 10, 2005).
While no changes to the school district discipline policy or the Athletic Discipline Code were brought to the School Board in March of 2007, the administration felt that the policies in place only needed to be improved upon in the future not totally revised. This could be accomplished by implementing future town hall meetings to get more input from the community, while making the current policies more “user friendly” and easier to understand (School Board B meeting minutes, March, 14, 2007).

At the November 2009 School Board meeting the administration noted that discipline issues have decreased significantly at the district high schools while communications with parents, attendance at Parent Nights, and extra-curricular opportunities for students have increased. Other strategies implemented by the schools and School Board to involve and empower the community in the educational process included the development of Parent Academy Programs that focus on various topics that involve the students and parents (School Board B meeting minutes, November 12, 2009).

In another move to increase community involvement and transparency by the school district, at the June 9, 2010 School Board meeting the board approved that district School Board policies would now be available to the public online. The School Board unanimously passed the recommendation to put School Board policies on the school district website for increased community access (School Board B meeting minutes, June 9, 2010).

The proposed discipline policy changes presented at the May 11, 2011 School Board meeting included additions to the bullying, intimidation, and harassment section. Added to the policy would be new language prohibiting cyberbullying and sexting. Feedback regarding the policies was obtained from the administration and community
members at the previous board meetings. The superintendent of the district was planning on presenting the proposed changes to the developed Parent Advisory Committees at each of the schools. The recommended changes would be displayed for 30 days prior to approval by the board (School Board B meeting minutes, May 11, 2011).

The School Board met on June 8, 2011 and approved the recommended changes to the discipline policy as presented which included language that addressed the new issues of cyber bullying and sexting. The consequences for the students violating this policy would be based on the frequency and severity of the actions as determined by the administration at each school (School Board B meeting minutes, June 8, 2011).
CHAPTER V
DISCUSSION

This study examined two high school districts in the state of Illinois and the events, evolution, and rationale for changes made to the consequences of the violations outlined in their extra-curricular Codes of Conduct. It also reviewed the evolution of each Code of Conduct from development to current state to determine if implemented changes in consequences and rehabilitative procedures were what were best for students in violation. The study continued to examine the groups of stakeholders in each school community who were advocates and leaders that brought about changes in consequences in the Code of Conduct at each high school district.

Research Questions

Research Question #1

What was the evolution of the Code of Conduct for the students from two separate high school districts in Illinois?

School District A. In School District A, the Code of Conduct began as a general set of rules and guidelines for each individual sport or activity that was developed and implemented by the head coach or sponsor of each activity. The violations and consequences for a violation of the prohibited behaviors were left up to the coaches and sponsors, which led to uncoordinated and inconsistent enforcement depending on the sport and/or student involved. The different rules and consequences caused problems within the school, district, and community when certain students or sports were treated
differently, even though they may have violated the same rule or rules. This could be caused by what sport a student was involved in, if a student was an important part of the team or the school, and how much influence parents had in the school and community. Due to the inequities inherent in this procedure, which put a lot of pressure on school administrators to make decisions on student discipline without specific guidelines, the district administration decided that there needed to be a clear and consistent set of guidelines and rules to address inappropriate behaviors of students involved in extracurricular activities. The increased involvement of lawyers in the school environment, and resulting instances of litigation, further highlighted the need for a set of clear and consistent guidelines for addressing student-athlete behaviors. The school district attorneys advised that the district develop a clear and consistent set of guidelines, a list of inappropriate behaviors, and detailed consequences for those behaviors the school district determined to be inappropriate.

The district formed a committee of stakeholders that included principals, assistant principals, deans, athletic directors, faculty, and coaches from selected sports to develop a document, or Code of Conduct, that defined the equitable treatment of those students involved in extracurricular activities in the school. The school district also included in the development of the Code of Conduct an outside source trained in the area of teenage substance abuse that would assist in developing a set of guidelines that were educational based. The core belief was that students that violated the behaviors outlined in the Code of Conduct needed to change their decision-making skills and should be taught strategies to deal with inappropriate behaviors. “The consequences for violating the required behaviors outlined in the Code of Conduct were to be instructionally based and not
punitive in nature that denied the student the opportunity to participate in athletics or
activities” (School District A, Subject 2 interview, May 2013). The original committees
believed that the Code of Conduct should include an educational program or component
that would force students in violation of the listed behaviors to have dialogue with their
parents and other professionals trained to deal with teenage substance abuse and other
issues affecting teenagers.

The original committees given the task of developing and implementing the Code
of Conduct saw the policy as a document that would be refined, evolve, and change over
time in response to issues affecting students and their needs. It was to be a constantly
evolving document that could be adapted to address any new issues that would affect the
student-athletes and the community in the future. Originally the Code of Conduct
addressed primarily substance abuse issues dealing with drugs, tobacco, and alcohol; it
transformed into policies that included bullying, hazing, and social media etiquette.

**School District B.** School District B had a Code of Conduct that was more
general in nature that did not change or undergo alterations as much over the years. Once
the code was designed and implemented in its original form in 1986, it did not have many
changes or challenges to the prohibited behaviors and consequences for violating those
behaviors. The code contained the basic required behaviors and consequences for
violations in the following areas: school attendance, smoking, drinking, possession, sale,
or use of drugs, stealing, fighting or assault, destruction or damage of property, and team
rule violations. The consequences ranged from suspension from practices and
competitions for school infractions, five day suspensions for fighting during practices or
contests and damage to property, ten day suspensions for stealing and smoking or
drinking violations, to a full year suspension from athletics for the possession, use, or selling of drugs. The changes in the Code of Conduct came from the interpretation of the violation by the person in charge of assigning the penalties and consequences for a violation, as they were given the flexibility to adjust the penalties depending on the circumstances of each student and violation.

Many of the newest changes to the Code of Conduct were in response to societal issues that students were facing in society at that time, such as social media, hazing, bullying, and violence in their communities. The official written Code of Conduct had not been adapted or changed, the people dealing with these new issues were able to adjust and adapt the penalties and consequences to help students and parents deal with these new problems.

**Research Question #1a**

What was the evolution of the consequences for the student when in violation of the Code of Conduct for each of the districts?

**School District A.** In School District A, consequences for a violation of the Code of Conduct were constantly evolving and changing over time as committees charged with developing and reviewing the policy were presented with new challenges and opportunities to positively affect students involved in extra-curricular activities. The basis of the code when it was initially developed was that it should not be punitive in nature and it should be instructional and in place to assist students. The philosophy was that students should be given tools and strategies to help during a tough time in their lives, and to develop strategies to address all of the issues of being a teenager. Initially the Code of Conduct was very punitive in nature and the initial consequence from a
violation of the required behaviors resulted in a suspension for the whole sport season or for the remainder of the sport season if it was in progress. The committees in charge of reviewing the Code of Conduct realized that the “Zero Tolerance Policy” for a violation was not in the best interest of students and implemented a guideline of progressive game/contest suspension dependent on the severity and number of violations by each student. When first implemented, the number of games/contests a student was suspended for a violation was the same for every sport, no matter the number of games that sport was scheduled to play. This caused issues among the coaches and parents due to the difference in number of contests a sport was able to play in a season. An example was that a football team was limited to nine regular season games, while a softball team would be able to play up to 35 games in a season. The argument was that the suspension from one football game was more punitive in nature than the suspension from one softball game, due to the number of games or contests that were able to be played in a season. In response to the apparent inequity, the policy was changed by suspending the student in violation of the Code of Conduct for a specific amount of time instead of the same amount of games or contests. A first time violation would result in a one-week suspension for a student, while a second violation would result in a suspension for half of the season, depending on how many weeks were in the season. This was also found to be inherently inequitable due to the variable amount of contests that could be played in a week: the argument of the coaches and parents was that the number of contests students would be suspended for a Code of Conduct violation should be based on a multitude of factors, not just a specified time frame.
Through the research of other Codes of Conduct in place at other schools and meeting with school administrators, coaches, parents, counselors, and faculty, the decision was made to implement a system of contest suspensions based on the number of contests that each sport could schedule according to limits outlined by the IHSA. The number of contests for which a student could be suspended for a first time violation could vary from 10 to 20% of the scheduled contests, depending on severity of violation; a second violation would result in a possible suspension of 40 to 50% of the scheduled contests from the season; a third violation would result in a suspension from the sport for a full calendar year.

Included with any suspension from sports or activities, either by week or a percentage of contests, was the stipulation that if the Code of Conduct violation involved drugs or alcohol a mandatory meeting with a substance abuse counselor, athletic director, and a parent or guardian was required before a student could resume participation in their sport or activity. Initially there was resistance to this requirement from administration and coaches, while parents and students were all for the educational program. Parents believed that part of the program should educate their students, not just suspend them from their sport or activity. Once the educational program was implemented into the Code of Conduct, the suspensions and penalties could be reduced up to half if parents and students agreed to attend the assigned programs and complete the recommendations.

As the Code of Conduct evolved, more programs were added to benefit the student-athlete in violation: a tobacco cessation program was added to address the issue of teenage tobacco use if the violation included any type of tobacco. This included the
possession and/or use of tobacco and tobacco products including smokeless tobacco, pipes, and cigarettes.

Changes were also made to differentiate between in-season and out of season violations. Whereas the Code was in effect from the time the policy was signed, the committee felt that students who were in violation of the behavioral requirement while outside of their season should have different consequences than those students in the midst of their season. The student in-season would receive a game suspension, depending on the severity and number of violations, along with substance abuse counseling, while the student out of their season would receive substance abuse counseling, community service, and meetings with the athletic or activities director. This guideline was later changed: the consequences for all violations, whether in or out of their competitive season, were ultimately the same.

Through discussions, initially within schools, then with those directly involved with the students on a daily basis, and eventually reaching the school board, decisions were made on how to address the changing behavior of students. Decisions were based on how to best help students involved in the school and not to just punitively punish students without giving them some feedback and tools to address the issues that were facing teenagers during that time. The Codes of Conduct were fluid in nature, able to be adapted to address the changing times, and were to be discussed among the stakeholders within the school and the community.

The consequences assigned to a student in violation of the Code of Conduct were able to be reviewed and adjusted time and again, according to the changing issues that students were facing each year. The inclusion of a rehabilitation/counseling component
of the required consequences in response to increased tobacco, drug, and alcohol use among teenagers highlighted the fact that the school and administration were concerned about each student’s well-being. The requirement of each student and parent/guardian to attend a counseling or rehabilitation program could open the lines of communication with the student, parent, and school personnel to determine what would best help the student be successful in not only the designated sport, but also in the school.

While a game or contest suspension was almost always included as a consequence to a violation, the progression from a “Zero Tolerance One and Done” policy to one of progressive discipline that outlined the consequences of repeated violations from a minimal suspension from contests to a significant suspension from contests depending on the severity and number of violations had encouraged student-athletes to remain as participants on teams and in activities. This may have been the most important and valued part of the student’s high school experience and could keep them enrolled in school and encourage them to further their education.

**School District B.** The athletic discipline code at School District B was more general in nature and did not go into detail for prohibited behaviors and consequences. The code was developed in response to the increased number of students becoming involved in gangs, and the administration believed that they could solve the issue by assigning extra consequences to those students involved in extra-curricular activities. While the original language stayed consistent from the original Code of Conduct, changes were made in response to changes in students and experiences they faced in and out of school, the school environment itself, and changes in the community and society. The changes and adaptations to the prohibited behaviors and consequences were mainly
done by the people in charge of determining if a violation had occurred and what the penalty would be – the athletic directors and deans in the school. They had the flexibility to make changes and adjust the penalty to what worked for the student and the situation; if the parents or guardians did not agree with the consequences for the violation, the issue was referred to the school discipline office and deans. While the Code of Conduct had certain consequences and penalties for prohibited behaviors that stayed consistent throughout its existence, changes came about due to the flexibility given to leaders in the school. If any changes to the Code of Conduct were suggested to the school board, they mainly came from the school administrators in response to concerns by faculty, staff, and parents of students who had violated the code.

**Research Question #2**

Who were the advocates and leaders for change in the evolution of the consequences of Codes of Conduct for each school district?

**School District A.** The initial advocates and leaders for change in School District A were members of the original advisory committee formed to develop the foundation for the new Code of Conduct. This included principals, assistant principals, faculty, coaches, parents, and a substance abuse counselor hired specifically to be part of the development of the Code of Conduct. The driving force behind the development of the code was the school administration and some of the coaches that had to deal with disciplining their student-athletes with no hard and firm rules or consequences to ensure fairness to all students. The advisory committee encompassed so many stakeholders from the school and community that there were no major obstacles that had to be overcome to develop a
quality document that was focused on helping students. All the people that mattered were
given a voice in the decision making process.

Any changes to the Code of Conduct suggested on a yearly basis were brought to
the advisory committee to be reviewed and addressed before the suggested changes were
brought to the school board. Changes were suggested to the school administration from
different groups, depending on the year and what new issues were affecting the students.
Suggestions for changes came from coaches in the school, school administration,
counselors, substance abuse counselors, local law enforcement, and parents of students
that usually had been in violation of behaviors listed in the Code of Conduct. Many
times the changes were in response to new issues facing students in their lives, such as
social media concerns, new drugs and additive substances, bullying, and hazing.

**School District B.** The Code of Conduct from School District B was developed
by the school district administration in charge at the time without any input from
stakeholders in the community or the schools. There were not any committees developed
or utilized to construct the Code of Conduct that addressed the needs of the students in
the district: the administration felt that they had a handle of what was going on in their
school district. There was not any input from parents in the district, the code was
developed, put into the parent-student handbook, and then parents and students involved
in athletics were required to sign for the handbook to be eligible to participate. There was
also minimal response from parents when they were required to sign the Code of Conduct
to have their student eligible to participate in athletics.

The changes made to the Code of Conduct over the years were in response to
recommendations and feedback from athletic directors, deans in charge of discipline at
the schools, and local police authorities. The athletic directors and deans were the greatest advocates for changes due to the issues they saw on a daily basis that negatively affected the students. While the school district wanted parents to become more involved in the discipline process, the changes that were made were due to changes in students and the issues they were facing in their communities, schools, and lives, such as community violence, social media issues, gangs, drugs, bullying, and increased school truancy.

**Research Question #2a**

What were the arguments, impetus, and rationale for the change for the advocates and the leaders?

**School District A.** The changes made to the Code of Code in School District A were due to many issues that arose in response to concerns voiced by stakeholders involved in the education of students in the school and community. The main focus of the changes was that the code needed to be a tool to help students deal with issues facing them in life and not just be a punitive punishment for mistakes students would invariably make. They believed consequences needed to be instructional in nature and include a rehabilitative component to help students deal with societal issues they were facing at the time. Changes were also made to the code due to the issue of confidentiality of a student’s name when a violation did occur: the parents did not want the student’s permanent record affected by a violation that may have occurred outside of school when they were trying to get into college. Due to this issue, a set of guidelines were developed to address the issue of confidentiality when a student violated the code of conduct, and the violation was not included as part of their permanent school record available to colleges and employers. Occasionally, changes were in response to concerns of parents
that the penalties for a violation were too harsh and that it occurred outside of the sports season or in the summer. Changes to the penalties and consequences were made for a short time, separating the penalties for an in-season and out of season violation, but the changes were rescinded after arguments were brought up that student-athletes should be held accountable for their actions when representing the school in and out of season.

**School District B.** In School District B, the main argument for changes to the Code of Conduct were in response to changes in students, outside forces coming into the schools, and changes in the communities. The influence of gangs in the community and the associated issues, such as an increase in violence and drug abuse, resulted in a working relationship with local law enforcement agencies to coordinate and give feedback to athletic directors and deans in the school. They would communicate to the school district the outside influences on students that they would see in the community and collaborate on how best to adapt the consequences for violating the Code of Conduct to best help the students. Occasionally, minor revisions were made to the code according to what each individual school or athletic department was dealing with in their own community and school. One of the schools could have been having problems with gang influence, and the other schools may have been dealing more with social media issues from outside influencing the behavior and conduct of students inside the school. While one of the schools offered a substance abuse program for a code violation, not all of the schools offered the same program, mainly due to the cost of implementing the program.
Research Question #2b

What were the obstacles that the leaders faced in trying to effect the changes and what were the strategies utilized to overcome those obstacles? Was there evidence of change being made to the Code of Conduct as a result of recognizing the obstacles?

School District A. In the beginning, a couple of obstacles leaders faced in School District A were the inconsistent and uncoordinated efforts of coaches and staff to fairly discipline student-athletes in the school. This brought about the formation of the original Code of Conduct by the Student Advisory Committee, and led to the continued review of behaviors and consequences contained in the original document. Once the code was developed, one of the main issues that were continually discussed was determining what were considered “fair” penalties in terms of suspensions from the sport. Many of the coaches and parents thought that the penalties were too harsh and punitive; there was no room for kids to be kids and make mistakes. Coaches and parents wanted to control the discipline of their students and have the flexibility to hand out punishment when it was convenient. This was determined by who the student was in the community and school, and who the team was playing that week and if the team needed them to participate. Both coaches within the school and parents in the community felt the school district was overstepping their bounds when punishing students for behavior that occurred outside of school and when school was not in session. Coaches felt that they were the best resource available to maintain the discipline of their students and to make the decisions on how to best control their behavior. They did not see the inequalities and inconsistency of leaving decisions to individual coaches and the dissension it caused among staff and students that were not disciplined for prohibited behaviors. Parents, students, and coaches initially felt
that athletes were being singled out and held to a higher standard than other activities in the school; this caused tension between athletes and other students involved in activities.

A significant issue with the parents was confidentiality when a violation of the Code of Conduct occurred. They were concerned about who was going to be informed of the name of the student and the nature of the offense. Parents were worried that if the names of students violating the Code of Conduct were made public, it would affect their opportunity to make a team, how much they would play, and that it would be included on their permanent record at the school. This could affect what college they would be able to attend and the opportunities they could have in the future after high school. Faculty and staff within the school were also concerned with confidentiality; specifically the counselors, social workers, and school psychologists felt that in their role of advising students they would be violating confidentiality laws if they divulged any information regarding Code of Conduct violations.

The initial Code of Conduct did not contain any educational or rehabilitative component for a student who violated the behaviors outlined in the code. The coaches, parents, and students believed that there should have been an educational component to force students in violation of prohibited behaviors in terms of substance abuse to involve the parents and deal directly with the true issues. The only resistance to the educational component came from the school administration, who were concerned about the cost of a program, requiring parents to attend outside of the school sessions, and who was going to hold the students and parents accountable for attending and following through on the requirements and recommendations of the required program.
The strategy utilized to overcome all of the obstacles listed was the inclusion of all stakeholders involved in the education of students in the community in discussions on what could be done to properly address any important issues that came about. The committees developed to address concerns brought forward included district and school administrators, faculty, staff, parents, substance abuse counselors, and students that were involved with the education of the students in the community. The committees understood that the Code of Conduct would not address all the needs of students and situations that could come about, and the document would need to be fluid and ever-changing to adapt to variable situations then and in the future.

**School District B.** In School District B, the obstacles to the Code of Conduct mirrored the issues affecting School District A. When the document was first implemented, many of the obstacles came from within the school district, the coaches and teachers were very leery of the code since they were not sure how it was going to be applied and by whom. They were worried that they would also lose control of the disciplining their team, which in turn could develop a lack of trust between coaches and students on their teams. The coaches initially misunderstood what the mission of the Code of Conduct was to accomplish, to have fair and consistent prohibited behaviors and consequences that would hold the students accountable for their actions; they believed that the school administration was trying to take the students away from their teams. The consequences for a violation were initially too severe and the students were dismissed from their teams at an alarming rate. The coaches and parents believed that penalties were too severe and punitive in nature, and did not allow for a rehabilitative process to
take place. This caused parents and students to hide the more severe issues, such as
substance abuse, from the resources in the school that would have been able to help them.

As most of the problems were occurring outside of school and sports seasons,
parents and coaches could not understand how the school could hold students accountable
for their actions when it did not happen under their guidance. The issue of confidentiality
became an issue as more students were caught in violation of the code outside of school.
Local law enforcement agencies shared information regarding students in violation with
the school district and parents were then afraid that it would affect them in the future.
The colleges and/or possible employers would find out about violations and then students
could lose opportunities to attend the school of their choice or the chance for a well-
paying job in the community.

An obstacle to implementing further strategies to help students that violates the
substance abuse policies in the Code of Conduct were anticipated costs of substance
abuse counseling programs required of a person in violation. While the school
administration and most of the parents in the community wanted the extra programs and
resources to help students that committed violations, those outside resources were
expensive and not many parents would be able to pay for those services. Those parents
who could pay for counseling services would have a better opportunity to help their
student, while those parents who were unable to pay would be required to keep their
student out of athletics until they were able to meet the requirements of the Code of
Conduct.

Strategies utilized in School District B to overcome these obstacles were
accomplished at the school level by administrators in charge of the athletic department
and the school discipline office. They had more of an opportunity to alter and adapt the Code of Conduct dependent on each situation that would best help each student that had committed a violation. Changes were made according to the individual issues facing each student and each school; the school administrators had a separate identity and had the flexibility to interpret the guidelines of the code as they saw fit. Only if the parents of a student in violation challenged the application of the penalties and consequences by the athletic director would the issue be referred to the school discipline office for further review.

In both school districts there was evidence of change: in the written consequences contained in the Code of Conduct in School District A and in the application of consequences by the school administrators in School District B. As concerns regarding the Code of Conduct arose in School District A, those were brought to the advisory committee of stakeholders in the school and community that dealt with student behavior. Once the concerns were brought forth and discussed with the best interests of students at the forefront of their thinking, changes and recommendations regarding behaviors, penalties, and consequences were brought to the school board for discussion. The initial consequences for a violation were severe and required the removal of a student from their team for a first time violation with no chance for reinstatement at a later date at the end of their suspension. As the Code of Conduct was altered over time, the suspension from an athletic team was based on the number of violations, amount of time required to be away from a team, and the number of contests the team had scheduled. The code also took into account the severity of the violation to determine the applied penalty, including if the student voluntarily admitted to the violation, and if the student and parents agreed to
attend a substance abuse program. The change to allow students in violation of the code to attend and participate in scheduled practices was a significant change in thinking from the initial document; the committee realized that students needed to remain part of their teams and the support from their teammates and friends assisted in the recovery of substance abuse issues. Sending the students home after school and eliminating them from the positive influence of their coaches and peers sometimes led to an increase in the initial issues leading to the Code of Conduct violation.

In School District B, changes to the Code of Conduct were put in place by administrators in charge of evaluating the behaviors and applying the consequences for violations. While the written document contained in the student-parent handbook was minimally changed over the years, the athletic directors were able to adapt the code according to situations that came about in their specific schools. As new issues affected students, such as gangs, social media, family problems, violence, and others, the consequences and penalties were adapted to best help the student who had violated the behaviors outlined in the code. The athletic directors had the best interest of all the students as the basis of their thinking whenever they had to deal with a situation that may have changed according to each student and their individual situation. Due to the flexibility and opportunity to adapt the penalties and consequences for a code violation, there was a significant amount of trust developed between the coaching staff, students, and parents with the athletic department that the best interest of each student was at the basis of their thinking when a violation did occur.
Research Question #2c

Which advocacy groups had a voice and utilized their influence to determine if the student is treated with dignity and respect, and was there evidence of the utilization of the ethic of care and the ethic of critique while examining, reviewing, and implementing the Codes of Conduct?

School District A. The groups that had a voice in School District A to utilize their influence were the stakeholders on the Student Discipline Advisory Committee that included district and school administrators, faculty, staff, parents, substance abuse counselors, and students. Due to the fact that so many groups that were involved in the education and support of students were represented on the committee each year, many views regarding the ethical treatment of students were taken into account. The inclusion and influence of the committee was testament to the importance of trying to help all students get through challenging times in their lives. The changes and adaptations made over the years to the behaviors, consequences, and resources made available to students and parents were evidence that the committee took into account that all students should be treated with dignity and respect, and that they should have the opportunity to have a quality experience in school. The inclusion of students from the school on the advisory committees each year the code was revised and changed enabled the committee to see how the Code of Conduct was viewed through a student’s eyes, and to ensure their voices were being heard on the policies and procedures that would affect their participation in school athletics and activities. The stakeholders on the advisory committee would look at the Code of Conduct each year to ensure that all students were being treated equitably,
and if any items needed to be changed to ensure that all voices were being heard within the policies and procedures.

**School District B.** School District B valued their students and attempted to ensure that they were being treated with dignity and respect through the individual actions of school administrators and athletic directors charged with applying the required behaviors and consequences of the Code of Conduct. They had the best interests of the students at heart and a level of trust between the administration and the students developed with the understanding that the consequences would be applied fairly and consistently to all students. While school administrators and athletic directors did what they believed was right for the students, there was not a committee of stakeholders from the school or community to be sure that the voices of all those concerned with the disciplining of student-athletes were being heard. Without all the voices available to be heard, the school district lacked the process to properly critique the Code of Conduct and the prohibited behaviors and consequences to determine if any groups had an advantage over others and to determine who was controlling and benefitting from the situations and policies as they were developed and applied. The school district would be unable to determine who really had the power and who were the unrecognized and silenced voices, since so few people were involved in the development, implementation, and changes to the Code of Conduct.
**Research Question #3**

What programs were developed to meet the needs of the students who violated the Code of Conduct?

**School District A.** The programs developed to meet the needs of students in violation of the Code of Conduct in school District A began with the development of the Student Discipline Advisory Committee that was comprised of stakeholders from the school and community. It included school district administrators, faculty members, athletic directors, coaches, the school district substance abuse counselor, and parents from the community. The committee developed policies that defined students’ rights and responsibilities for proper behavior, student attendance policies, and procedures for proper student conduct. The committee continued to hear concerns regarding the Code of Conduct and would review the policies, procedures, and consequences on a yearly basis to ensure that all voices of those concerned and involved with student conduct were being heard and that student rights were taken into account.

The Advisory Committee developed and reviewed the guidelines for game and contest suspensions that were applied for a violation of the Code of Conduct. They ensured that the suspensions were not left up to chance or subjective issues that would cause the length of a suspension to change according to who had the “power” in the conversation of penalties. The committee developed specific guidelines that defined the length of game suspension according to the nature of the violation and the number of previous violations that had been committed by a student. The guidelines, protocols, and suspensions were reviewed on an annual basis by the committee to ensure that they were
as fair and equitable as possible, and that all the voices of those concerned in the Code of Conduct were being taken into account.

A program of progressive discipline was also implemented in response to the development of the Code of Conduct. The number of violations did not reset to zero each year a student was in school, there was a progressive number of penalties and consequences for each violation. If the student had a first violation of the Code of Conduct as a freshman, the next time the student was in violation would be a second violation no matter when it occurred. It might not have been until a year or two later, but it would still continue to be the next number violation, depending on if the student had a previous violation. It could progress to a second or third offense until the student could be suspended from athletics up to a year, or for the student’s career.

Another program developed for those students that had violated the Code of Conduct was the in-house counseling and evaluation program developed by the school district’s teenage Substance Abuse Counselor that was hired in response to the growing problems in the school district regarding drugs, alcohol, and tobacco. The program was for those students who violated the Code of Conduct for behaviors involving tobacco, alcohol, and drugs; they were given the option of attending an in-house substance abuse counseling program that involved their parents and the school district counselor. If students and parents completed the program, the number of contest and game suspensions was reduced, dependent on the nature and the number of previous violations. If the student or parents denied attending the counseling program, the suspension from games and contests would increase to the original number listed in the Code of Conduct. Within the counseling program was a tobacco use and abuse cessation program that was
implemented in response to the increased use of tobacco and tobacco products. Specifically, the use of smokeless tobacco and tobacco products was increasing at the time, and the committee felt that a separate program that dealt with this problem was needed, as they felt that the penalties and suspension for the use of these products should be less than those involving drug and alcohol use.

The counseling program for a student in violation of the substance abuse section of the code consisted of four meetings with the Substance Abuse Counselor and the Athletic Director. The first meeting consisted of just the student in violation, one meeting with just the parents of the student in violation, and then two meetings together with the student, parents, Athletic Director, and the Substance Abuse Counselor. The educational counseling component was to open the lines of communication between the student and parents, and to determine what was at the heart of the substance abuse violation.

**School District B.** In High School District B, the programs that came about due to the implementation of the Code of Conduct were more school-centered than over the entire district. In each individual school, the support system for individual students increased in response to the general guidelines that were put in place as part of the Code of Conduct. At all of the schools, the individual athletic directors were now empowered by the guidelines in the code to seek out programs that would best support their students and the problems those students were facing in the school and their respective neighborhoods and communities.

The coordination and cooperation between the school district’s athletic departments and local authorities increased to the point that a symbiotic relationship was formed to share information regarding the problems and issues facing students. Local
law enforcement personnel developed relationships not only with the schools and athletic
directors, but also with the students, so that they were constantly looking out for them in
the community. If they saw problems with specific students and knew of issues that
could possibly involve them, there were lines of communication already open with the
school and students to best address these problems before they occurred.

Another program developed to assist students in violation of the Code of Conduct
were free or low-cost drug and alcohol screening programs utilizing local resources
outside of the school. As many students and their parents could not afford the programs
that were available to assist with substance abuse problems, the school administration had
to search out and develop relationships with those outside resources that offered
programs that were free or of minimal cost to students and parents. If the drug and
alcohol screens came back positive, students and parents were required to attend
counseling sessions as a requirement to participate in school athletics and activities.

**Research Question #3a**

Who were the leaders in defining the problem and their impetus for change when
examining the development of strategies for the rehabilitative procedures?

**School District A.** The leader in School District A driving the changes to the
rehabilitative procedures contained in the Code of Conduct was the school district
teenage substance abuse counselor that was hired to specifically address the issues facing
the students in the district and the athletic directors. The counselor was brought in to
help develop the Code of Conduct and understood that it was a document that at its core
was to help students deal with issues facing them in life. The counselor was told the code
should have a rehabilitative/counseling component included to truly help the students
realize the dangers of substance abuse and find the real reasons for the substance use, not just a policy to eliminate a student from participating in athletics. Other leaders in the school district driving the changes included the athletic directors who had a pulse on the students and what they were facing in the school and the community. They understood that they needed to support the students and develop policies and programs that assisted them in dealing with issues that they encountered, and not to just suspend them from games and contests to change their behaviors.

**School District B.** In School District B, the driving force behind the programs implemented to develop rehabilitative procedures in the Code of Conduct was the athletic directors in the school district. They knew the students better than anyone, and understood what the students had to deal with in their lives and communities. They developed relationships with local law enforcement authorities to understand and help students deal with the issues affecting them out in the neighborhoods and communities by opening lines of communication to share information. The athletic directors worked in conjunction with the dean’s offices at the schools to find resources available at local hospitals and clinics to offer free drug screenings and counseling programs to assist those students and families dealing with substance abuse problems. The school district’s athletic directors understood better than anyone in the school that if the Code of Conduct penalties were used to suspend and punish students in violation and eliminate them from sports, the students might not have returned to school. The athletic directors understood that the sports students were involved in may have been the only thing keeping them in school, and if they took that away from them, they could turn to the gangs in the neighborhood to be involved and valued.
Research Question #3b

What were the obstacles faced by the leaders when developing the rehabilitative procedures and what strategies were developed to overcome the obstacles?

School District A. In School District A, the main obstacle facing leaders were a few of the stakeholders in their schools and community who they believed would have been their greatest advocates. Some of the school administrators, coaches, and parents didn’t believe in the rehabilitative component and voiced that it should not be included in the Code of Conduct. They felt that it was a waste of time and money trying to rehabilitate those students who violated the substance abuse behaviors contained in the code; they believed that if students violated those behaviors, they had issues outside of what the school should be involved in. Due to school funding issues and limited resources facing most Illinois schools, some school administrators questioned the money being spent on the rehabilitative programs being implemented, and the money spent on hiring, training, and paying a designated substance abuse counselor within the school.

In High School District A, another obstacle facing school leaders were school counselors in the district who were concerned about confidentiality laws with those students who violated the Code of Conduct. These counselors felt that all their conversations with students should be kept confidential and no information concerning substance abuse issues should be shared with parents, the school Substance Abuse Counselor, or the athletic department. Also concerned with the issue of confidentiality in regards to the rehabilitation and counseling component of the Code of Conduct were some of the parents of students. They were concerned that anything regarding substance abuse and a Code of Conduct violation would show up on their permanent school record
and affect their ability to attend the college of their choice, or impact their ability to find a job once they graduated. The people involved in the development of the Code of Conduct believed that some parents were afraid to really discover the truth regarding students and their substance abuse issues. While most of the parents in the community supported the Code of Conduct and its purpose in defining accepted behaviors and consequences for those in violation, their support for the code almost always changed to the negative if their son or daughter involved in athletics or activities was found to be in violation.

The strategies developed to overcome the obstacles facing the leaders in School District A included the development of the Student Discipline Advisory Committee that utilized stakeholders from all the groups involved in the development of the Code of Conduct ensuring that all voices were being heard. The committee was utilized not only to develop and change the code according to issues facing students in life, school, and community, but also to communicate the importance of the rehabilitative and counseling component to the school and community. Since the committee included members from all areas of the school and community that involved students, they were able to reach out to those people that were the obstacles facing the inclusion of rehabilitative and counseling policies and procedures. Those school administrators, school leaders, and community advocates for the rehabilitation procedures to be included in the Code of Conduct held in-services and meetings to properly inform administrators, coaches, and parents about the importance of the counseling programs to the overall well-being of students and parents in the school and community.
The district school board was also proactive in understanding the importance of the inclusion of the rehabilitation and counseling of students that had violated the substance abuse behaviors in the Code of Conduct. Due to an understanding of the issues facing students and the advocacy of the programs to address these issues by the stakeholders on the Student Discipline Advisory Committee, the school board allocated the necessary funds to employ a teenage Substance Abuse Counselor and to develop and implement programs that addressed teenage substance abuse issues.

School District B. School District B administrators faced a few different obstacles which included a lack of family involvement by those in their communities. They were not as involved in the process of disciplining their students or being involved in a rehabilitative process for violations that involved substance abuse issues. If a student in violation of the Code of Conduct was prescribed rehabilitative and counseling procedures, most of the time parents or guardians would not attend the sessions and students would then not satisfy the requirements of the code and not return to school.

Another obstacle was the limited amount of financial resources available not only to the school, but also to the families in the communities that they served. As with School District A, the issues with school funding in the State of Illinois, and the decline in the amount of state aid money designated to schools, meant that there was not enough money available to fund a school district based rehabilitation and counseling program for students involved in substance abuse Code of Conduct violations. The school district was having problems funding the proper education of the all students, much less designating money for programs outside the basic education of students in the district.
The school administrators in School District B were also faced with the influence of outside groups in the community, including gangs that gave a student excluded from school or their sport a place to be accepted and valued for improper behavior. These outside influences ostracized and made a negative example of students who wanted to attend and utilize the rehabilitative and counseling resources to the point that they were afraid to attend any sessions or attempts to deal with their substance abuse issues.

Strategies developed in High School District B to overcome the obstacles facing their leaders included finding and utilizing local hospitals and clinics that offered free substance abuse screenings and free substance abuse counseling for students in violation of the Code of Conduct. The school district also increased the amount of communication between the schools and local law enforcement authorities by meeting two to three times a month to discuss issues going on in the neighborhoods and communities that were affecting the students in the school. They discussed strategies, how to best deal with the specific issues facing the students, and how to keep the schools informed about specific students that might be involved in problems in the community.

The school district also attempted to get the parents more involved in their students’ lives by keeping them informed about issues students were facing, and that their main purpose was to keep students involved in sports and their schools. The school did not want students only to be suspended from their sport if they did violate the Code of Conduct; they wanted to keep the students involved and in school to stay away from the negative outside influences. The administration also attempted to use role models from their schools and communities to act as mentors for students to educate them on the negative influences that could affect their success in life.
Research Question #3c

Who were the leaders in determining the benefits for students when reviewing the strategies for the rehabilitative procedures, and was there evidence of the utilization of the ethic of care and the ethic of critique while examining, reviewing, and implementing the rehabilitative procedures?

School District A. To determine the benefits for students when reviewing the strategies for the rehabilitative procedures, school leaders utilized the Student Discipline Advisory Committee. The evidence showing the utilization of the ethic of care was demonstrated in that the committee contained stakeholders from the school district and community that were concerned that all students were treated fairly and equitably on a consistent basis. The committee met three times per year to look not only at the Code of Conduct, but also at all of the district student discipline policies and procedures. They were constantly reviewing the policies and procedures contained in the Code of Conduct to adjust and adapt the consequences and rehabilitative procedures according to what students were facing in school and society. The committee developed and recommended changes in the consequences and penalties for a code violation from a punitive-only penalty of suspension and elimination from sports and activities to progressive discipline that included specific rehabilitation and counseling procedures that would benefit students and families before returning to sports or activities.

Further evidence of the ethic of care included the development of a tobacco/smoking prevention and cessation program to assist students with overcoming tobacco related issues and violations. The development and implementation of a substance abuse counseling program for a student involved in a violation that involved drugs and/or
alcohol included an education component that required meeting with the administration, student Substance Abuse Counselor, the student in violation, and the parents of the student in violation. They would meet independently, and then as a group, to open the lines of communication to the true heart of the problem.

In School District A, evidence of the ethic of critique being utilized while examining, reviewing, and implementing the rehabilitative procedures in the Code of Conduct was shown by the Student Discipline Advisory Committee intently looking at and reviewing how discipline for violations was handed out before the code was developed. The disciplinary consequences for students were left up to those who had the power and who could change and adapt the rules, depending upon who students were and what influence they had. The committee saw that students with influential coaches, parents, or friends would be able to get into trouble without any penalty or suspension, while those students without any advocate for them, or power, would absorb the majority of the consequences without any say or recourse of action. They looked at the initial structure of the extra-curricular discipline policies and realized that there needed to be a more equitable policy to determine discipline and consequences for those in violation of required behaviors. The Student Discipline Advisory Committee exposed the problems with the discipline policies in place and, with the input of all the stakeholders involved, developed a progressive discipline policy that was fluid and adaptable to the ever-changing issues facing students in the school, community, and society. They realized and saw who benefitted from the old rules and procedures, and with students and parents involved in the Code of Conduct development, the committee involved voices not usually heard or recognized in the development of school policies and procedures. The new
Code of Conduct was able to adapt and adjust to new issues facing students due to a yearly review process by the Student Discipline Advisory Committee, according to concerns and problems brought forth to them by school administrators, coaches, faculty, staff, parents, and students.

**School District B.** The leaders in School District B that determined the benefits for students when reviewing the strategies for the rehabilitative procedures were the athletic directors and student discipline administrators in each of the schools. The evidence showing the utilization of the ethic of care was that the athletic directors, who were the front line people helping students with any issues they were facing, were at the forefront in the development of procedures to assist students in any way possible. They were able to adapt the penalties, consequences, and suspensions for Code of Conduct violations to fit the situation that they felt best helped each student and each situation.

The athletic directors worked with local law enforcement agencies and the school student discipline administrators to keep students and parents aware of community and societal issues affecting their lives, and to educate them on the consequences of these issues and how it could affect students for the rest of their lives. The athletic administrators understood that suspending students from athletics and activities was not the answer to the problem of Code of Conduct violations; students might not come back and would be lost to the streets and the gangs. With this knowledge, as the people responsible for the consequences applied to a student in violation of the Code of Conduct, they were able to look at each individual person and develop a strategy that would best help that student depending upon the violation. They ensured that the student was treated
with dignity and respect throughout the discipline process, and that the student was given every opportunity to stay involved in the school and in the respective sport or activity.

The athletic directors and student discipline administrators would seek out and utilize local hospitals and clinics that offered free or reduced rates on drug and alcohol screenings and counseling programs. With assistance from local law enforcement authorities, community service activities were often prescribed as consequences for those students in violation of the Code of Conduct, so that they could see the benefits of helping others in need and to realize the positive impact they could have on the children within their own community.

While the stakeholders involved in the Code of Conduct in High School District B exhibited the ethic of care by valuing each individual person, there was no process in place to critically examine the policies and procedures contained in the district’s Code of Conduct. There were no other people or committees of stakeholders in the school and community to review the code to see who was benefitting from the rules and policies in place, and to determine if the consequences, penalties, and rehabilitative procedures were equitable and just. There was also no evidence of a process in place to determine who was defining the issues facing the students, who was truly in control of the punishment or rehabilitative process, or who was truly benefitting from the policies within the Code of Conduct or the procedures utilized by the school district to enforce the code. The issue of who had the power in the accepted policies and procedures was never examined or reviewed by a committee of stakeholders from the school or community, as the voices not heard or recognized were never taken into account, nor was it ever asked who those
people or students might be when reviewing or revising the consequences and rehabilitative procedures in the Code of Conduct.

**Research Question #4**

What are the implications for today’s educational leaders?

There were many lessons to be learned from researching what two very different school districts had done to develop, implement, and adapt an extra-curricular Code of Conduct. All schools, school districts, and communities have their own unique characteristics and needs that have to be taken into account when developing a Code of Conduct. The school leaders involved in developing, implementing, and changing the Code of Conduct for their school must make decisions for their students that are morally and ethically sound and that value all students involved in the process. As learned, it can be a very emotional process that needs input from a group of stakeholders from the school and the community that should include both students and parents to ensure that all voices that could be affected will be heard in the process. The individual school administrator leading the process will need to put their own thoughts and beliefs to the side in order to see the big picture, so that others’ wants and needs are recognized and valued. The people put in charge of the development and change process must understand that what they are doing is just and right, and realize that it might not be popular at that time.

As learned through this study, the writing of the Code of Conduct should be done by a committee of stakeholders in the educational process at the school or in the school district. The committee should be comprised of school administrators, athletic directors, school counselors, coaches, faculty, staff, parents, and even students that are invested in
the school and the community. The committee of stakeholders charged with developing and changing the Code of Conduct must first look at the philosophical role of athletics or activities in their school or school district. Many high schools will run their athletic program as an educationally based model that has student learning, personal growth, and the total welfare of the student at its core. This philosophy should guide the development of the Code of Conduct as an educationally based tool that is developed as a deterrent to help students make proper decisions in the face of peer pressure, societal pressures, and social media issues.

Also evidenced by the findings of this study is that the committee charged with developing or changing the Code of Conduct should study and review other school districts’ codes to get a good idea of what other districts are dealing with and including in their codes to regulate the behaviors of their student athletes. The committees must also look at their own school district and community to understand what issues they are dealing with and to maintain the core values of the district. When writing the actual code, the committee must take into account the best interests of the students in their community and ensure that all voices that need to be heard are being valued. Many school administrators feel that the wording of the code should be general in nature, both in describing acceptable behaviors and the penalties and consequences for violations. While this may appear to the committee to be contradictory to the application of the Code of Conduct, this can actually assist school administrators in charge of applying penalties for code violations by giving them the flexibility to look at each violation in a case-by-case manner and look at what is best to help each student.
When deciding the penalties that come into play when a student violates the behaviors contained in the Code of Conduct, the committee should be sure that each disciplinary action is educationally based and takes into account the individual student. The code should cover a wide range of penalties and rehabilitative outcomes that can be adapted for each situation and violation. The penalty for a code violation that involves drugs, alcohol, or performance enhancing drugs should include educational and counseling resources to assist students in dealing with today’s peer pressure and societal messages, as well as to understand the dangers of the use and abuse of drugs and alcohol and to get to the core of what is really affecting students and their families. The inclusion of a substance abuse counseling and assistance program should be an integral part of the Code of Conduct that demonstrates to students that they are truly valued as individuals and that the penalties are not simply punitive in nature to take them out of sports and activities.

As found in this study, the Code of Conduct should be adapted and updated to match the climate in the individual school, community, and society. The designated committee of stakeholders should meet at least once per year to review the Code of Conduct from top to bottom to ensure that it is current with any new societal issues that have come about, and also to address any questions or concerns that have come up during the school year from other stakeholders in the school and community. The policy itself should be fluid and ever changing to constantly and consistently address the needs of students in the school and community, and it should be one that truly takes into account input from all the stakeholders on the committee.
Further, the code and its policies and procedures should not be a secret to any of the faculty, staff, coaches, parents, or students. All of the stakeholders should see the policy in the publications and resources available to them coming from the school, including the school’s parent-student handbook, the athletic department student-parent handbook, and the school athletic department website.

The school administration must communicate the code and its policies and procedures to all of their faculty, staff, coaches, parents, and students involved in the school and programs. All of these groups should read, question, understand, and sign the Code of Conduct at general seasonal informational meetings held by the athletic department, which should also be an open forum for questions and answers. The coaches of each individual sport should also host a student and parent pre-season meeting that explains the policies and procedures contained in the policy and reserve time for questions in a smaller group environment. The Code of Conduct should be a policy that reflects the values and beliefs of the school district and community, and it should be presented in a positive manner that describes the policy as a tool to assist students in dealing with the challenges and pressures they face in society. Parents should be included in all discussions regarding the code, and they should be valued as an integral part of the process to help students navigate life as a teenager. After the Code of Conduct is presented, students and parents should read, review, and sign the code, agreeing to abide by all the policies and procedures in the code and any changes or adaptations that occur during the student’s high school career.

Based upon the experiences found in this study, the Code of Conduct should clearly communicate procedures for determining if a violation has occurred and how the
penalties and consequences will be applied according to the rule or behavior that has been broken. It should also include an explanation of students’ rights, that they will be treated with dignity and respect, and that they have a right to due process. Students that have committed a violation and their parents should be given the opportunity to tell their side of the story regarding the Code of Conduct violation to the person or committee in charge of determining if a violation has actually occurred. In addition to allowing students to tell their side of the story regarding the code violation, an appeal process should be included in the language of the code policy. The appeal process can be made to a school or district administrator, or to an appeals committee comprised of a designated school administrator, athletic director, a designated coach from any sport, and a faculty member that will hear the appeal of the student and render a decision regarding the violation.

Finally, and most importantly, as found through this study, the Code of Conduct should not be only punitive in nature; it needs to provide for the education, support, and resources for students in violation to deal with issues facing them in today’s society. This should include resources that not only address the use and abuse of drugs, alcohol, and performance enhancing substances, but also with new societal issues affecting students such as bullying, hazing, sexual assault, violence, and social media concerns. The school district and administration need to constantly review the policies and procedures contained in the Code of Conduct, address new issues brought forth to them, and constantly seek out resources in the school and community that will assist students in dealing with problems they are facing in today’s society. The school must ensure that all students in their programs are treated with the dignity and respect that they deserve, and offer the best possible resources to help all students.
Recommendations for Further Research

The scope of this study was limited to two Illinois high school districts in the Chicago suburban area and the historical events, evolution, and rationale for change in the consequences for violations outlined in their Codes of Conduct. Additional research could be done in a variety of areas. A researcher could:

- Review Codes of Conduct from those school districts outside the Chicago suburban area;
- Review Codes of Conduct from those school districts outside the state of Illinois;
- Study the success of school district based counseling and rehabilitation programs for Code of Conduct violations;
- Document the levels of success of seasonal and yearly informational meetings held by the school district to describe and discuss the Code of Conduct and the strategies to prevent and treat teenage substance abuse issues;
- Compare the success and outcomes of a committee of school and community based stakeholder developed Codes of Conduct versus one developed without stakeholder input;
- Document the processes to implement changes to the Codes of Conduct by school districts outside of the Chicago suburban area and outside of Illinois; or
- Research and catalogue the legal challenges to the penalties and consequences of Codes of Conduct outside of the Chicago suburban area and outside of Illinois.
The educational leader in the school district must act to ensure that all policies and procedures in the school district are critically examined on a consistent basis. Even though some stakeholders from the home, community or school may not be individually involved with the raising and disciplining of the students, the educational leader must take the responsibility of ensuring that the voices of all students are being heard. The educational leader of the school district is ultimately responsible for all of the district and school administrators’ actions or lack of action. They must ensure that all policies and procedures are reviewed, analyzed, and the necessary changes and adaptations are made to be sure that all students are given the chance to be cared for and succeed.
APPENDIX A

PARTICIPANT CONSENT FORM
CONSENT TO PARTICIPATE IN RESEARCH

(Oral History)

Project Title: “A Comparison of Extra-Curricular Codes of Conduct at Two Suburban Illinois High School Districts (1986-2011).”

Researcher(s): Ted Robbins

Faculty Sponsor: Dr. Janis Fine

Introduction:
You are being asked to take part in a research study being conducted by Ted Robbins for a dissertation under the supervision of Dr. Janis Fine in the Department of Administration and Supervision at Loyola University of Chicago.

You are being asked to participate because you have been identified as being involved in the process of developing, implementing, and making adaptations to the extra-curricular code of conduct at your respective high school.

The Projected number of schools in this study will be two suburban Chicago high school districts.

Please read this form carefully and ask any questions you may have before deciding whether to participate in the study.

Purpose:
This is a study of two high school districts in the state of Illinois that were chosen based on their differences in standardized test scores and the percentage of low income students in the district. The research will examine the historical events, evolution, and rationale for change in the consequences of the violations outlined in their codes of conduct. The research will also examine which group of stakeholders in the school community were the advocates and leaders to bring about change in the consequences. It will also review the evolution of the codes of conduct from their beginning stages to what they have become to determine if the implemented changes in the consequences and rehabilitative procedures are what is best for the students. For the purpose of this dissertation “best” is defined as the development and implementation of a process for counseling, education, rehabilitation, and change if a violation does occurs.

Procedures:
If you agree to be in the study, you will be asked to:

• Participate in a 60-minute oral history interview regarding your experiences as an advocate and leader for change in the evolution of the consequences of code of conducts for each school district, and to inform the researcher on the programs that were developed to meet the needs of the students who violated the code of conduct.
You will be asked to respond to a series of questions that inquire about the development and implementation of the code of conduct at the high school. The process will be taped and transcribed. The transcriber hired for this purpose has also signed a confidentiality agreement. Once the transcript is in a final stage, all identifiers will be removed.

**Risks/Benefits:**
There are no foreseeable risks involved in participating in this research beyond those experienced in everyday life.

There are no direct benefits to you from participation, but it is hoped that the research will add to the body of knowledge in leadership, education, and appropriate discipline policies and procedures.

**Confidentiality:**
- Your identity will not be revealed in this study, and your responses to the questions will be kept confidential. Your name and school will be assigned an alias that will be used to maintain confidentiality throughout the study. You will have the right to remove any quotes or comments you do not want on record or you may clarify any statement as desired.
- All documentation including consent forms, audio tape recordings of the oral history, and primary sources will be kept in a locked cabinet in the researcher’s home and will be destroyed one year after the research has been completed.

**Voluntary Participation:**
Participation in this study is voluntary. If you do not want to be in this study, you do not have to participate. Even if you decide to participate, you are free not to answer any question or to withdraw from participation at any time without penalty.

**Contacts and Questions:**
If you have questions about this research study, please feel free to contact Ted Robbins at tedwrobbins@comcast.net or faculty sponsor Dr. Janis Fine at jfine@luc.edu

If you have questions about your rights as a research participant, you may contact the Loyola University Office of Research Services at (773) 508-2689.

**Statement of Consent:**
Your signature below indicates that you have read the information provided above, have had an opportunity to ask questions, and agree to participate in this research study. You will be given a copy of this form to keep for your records.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Participant’s Signature</th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Researcher’s Signature</th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX B

ORAL HISTORY PROTOCOL
Oral History Protocol

1. Your role in the school district

2. Number of years as a teacher in this district

3. Number of years as an administrator in this district

4. Total number of years as a teacher

5. Total number of years as an administrator

6. Describe your leadership style.

7. What are your thoughts and feelings on the extra-curricular code of conduct in your districts and how it is applied to apparent violations?

8. How do the administrators in your district feel the code of conduct is written and applied to apparent violations?

9. How do the coaches and sponsors in the extra-curricular program feel about the code of conduct and how it is applied to apparent violations?

10. How do the parents in the community feel about the code of conduct and how it is applied to the apparent violations?

11. How do the students involved in the extra-curricular program feel about the code of conduct and how it is applied to the apparent violations?
12. What was the evolution of the code of conduct at your high school? When and how was it implemented and communicated to the community, parents, teachers, coaches, and students?

13. Who were the leaders in the school and community to bring about the development and implementation of the extra-curricular code of conduct? What were your thoughts and feelings when the code first came to be implemented in the school?

14. What were your thoughts and feelings regarding the consequences and penalties for students violating the code of conduct when it was first implemented in the district? How would you describe the parents and students reaction when being caught in violation of the code of conduct and being disciplined according to the code?

15. When dealing with a code of conduct violation did you experience negative feeling toward the prohibited conducts, violations, or penalties that were handed out from the community, parents, coaches, or students?

16. Have the consequences and penalties for a violation of the code of conduct changed in your high school district, and if so what were the reasons for the changes? Have they continued to change over your time and what are your thoughts and feelings to the changes or lack of changes?

17. What groups and leaders in the community, district, and school were responsible for the changes to the code of conduct? What were the reasons, arguments, impetus, and rationale for making changes to the code of conduct?

18. What were the issues or obstacles the leaders in the community and school faces when trying to implement changes to the code of conduct? Was there pressure from
any of the groups trying to institute change that was not warranted or needed? How did the leaders overcome any of the obstacles or issues that were presented?

19. In your role in the district do you feel that the code of conduct addresses all the needs of all students that are under the rules of the prohibited conducts, the consequences, and the penalties that are administered? Is there anything you would have done differently when developing the consequences and penalties for a violation of the prohibited behaviors?

20. What programs and strategies are in place in your district to meet the needs of the students that violate the code of conduct?
APPENDIX C

TRANSCRIPTOR CONFIDENTIALITY AGREEMENT
TRANSCRIBER CONFIDENTIALITY AGREEMENT

I, ____________________________________________, agree to transcribe (Inserted Printed Name) the oral histories for the doctoral research of Ted Robbins entitled, “A Comparison of Extra-Curricular Codes of Conduct at Two Suburban Illinois High School Districts (1986-2011).” I will maintain strict confidentiality of the data files and the transcripts. This includes, but is not limited to the following:

- I will not discuss them with anyone except the researcher.
- I will not share copies with anyone except the researcher.
- I agree to turn over all copies of the transcripts to the researcher at conclusion of the contract.
- I will destroy the audio file I receive upon conclusion of the contract.

I have read and understood the information provided above.

______________________________    ________________________
Transcriber’s Signature  Date

______________________________    ________________________
Researcher’s Signature  Date
APPENDIX D

LETTER OF COOPERATION TO PARTICIPATE
LETTER OF COOPERATION TO PARTICIPATE IN RESEARCH

Project Title: “A Comparison of Extra-Curricular Codes of Conduct at Two Suburban Illinois High School Districts (1986-2011).”
Researcher: Ted Robbins
Faculty Sponsor: Dr. Janis Fine

Introduction:
You are being asked to take part in an oral history research study being conducted by Ted Robbins for a dissertation under the supervision of Dr. Janis Fine in the School of Education, Department of Administration and Supervision at Loyola University of Chicago.

According to the Oral History Association, “oral history is a method of gathering and preserving historical information through recorded interviews with participants in past events and ways of life.” You have been approached as a participant because you have been identified as being involved in the process of developing, implementing, and making adaptations to the extra-curricular code of conduct at your respective high school.

Purpose:
The goal of this oral history project is to will examine the historical events, evolution, and rationale for change in the consequences of the violations outlined in the codes of conduct of two Illinois high school districts. The research will also examine which group of stakeholders in the school community were the advocates and leaders to bring about change in the consequences. It will also review the evolution of the code of conducts from their beginning stages to what they have become to determine if the implemented changes in the consequences and rehabilitative procedures are what is best for the students. For the purpose of this dissertation “best” is defined as the development and implementation of a process for counseling, education, rehabilitation, and change if a violation does occurs.

This interview will supplement written records about the evolution and changes to the extra-curricular code of conducts within the two Illinois high school districts.

Procedures:
If you agree to be in the study, you will be asked to:
- Sign and return the “Letter of Informed Consent” indicating your agreement to participate in the research study. Please return the signed informed consent letter to the researcher in the enclosed, stamped, self-addressed envelope.
- Participate in a 60-minute oral history interview regarding your experiences as an advocate and leader for change in the evolution of the consequences of the codes of conduct for each school district, and to inform the researcher on the programs that were developed to meet the needs of the students who violated the code of conduct. You will be asked to respond to about a dozen questions. The process will be taped and transcribed. The transcriber hired for this purpose has also
signed a confidentiality agreement. Once the transcript is in a final stage, all identifiers will be removed. You will be sent a copy of the transcription of your oral history after the process is completed for your review and correction. The interviewee will have the right to remove any quotes or comments they do not want on record or can clarify any statement as needed without consequences.

**Risks/Benefits:**
The risks associated with participation in this interview are minimal. There are no direct benefits to you from participation, but your willingness to share your knowledge and experiences will contribute to research that will add to the body of knowledge in leadership, education, and appropriate extra-curricular discipline policies and procedures.

**Confidentiality:**
- The identity of the participants will not be revealed in this study. The responses to the questions will be kept confidential. The respondent’s name and school will be assigned an alias that will be used to identify subjects throughout the study. The respondent will have the right to remove any quotes or comments they do not want on record or can clarify any statement as needed without consequences.
- All documentation including consent forms, audio tape recordings of the oral history, and primary sources will be kept in a locked cabinet in the researcher’s home and will be destroyed one year after the research has been completed.

**Voluntary Participation:**
Your participation in this interview is voluntary. Even if you decide to participate, you may withdraw from the interview without penalty, or request confidentiality, at any point during the interview. You may also choose not to answer specific questions or discuss certain subjects during the interview or to ask that portions of our discussion or your responses not be recorded on tape.

A consent form is enclosed for your review.

**Contacts and Questions:**
If you have questions about this research study, please feel free to contact Ted Robbins at tedwrobbins@comcast.net or faculty sponsor Dr. Janis Fine at jfine@luc.edu.

If you have questions about your rights as a research participant, please feel free to contact the Compliance Manager in Loyola’s Office of Research Services at (773) 508-2689.

Sincerely,

Ted Robbins
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