

Exclusionary Discipline Response

**Response to written request of
February 26, 2015 related to S.67.**

REPORT
January 2017

**Report/Recommendations to the
Senate and House Committees on Education; Senate
Committee on Health and Welfare; House Committee on
Human Services**

Submitted by Secretary of Education

Rebecca Holcombe



Table of Contents

Senate Education Request.....	3
Request from Senate Education #1: A Catalog of data collection rules, policies and guidelines regarding exclusionary discipline used by any Vermont public school or district.....	4
Agency Response: Catalog of Data.....	4
Request from Senate Education #2: “Recommendation regarding whether standardization of data collection rules and practices is appropriate”	4
Agency Response: Update on 2016-17 Efforts	4
<i>Recommendation 1- Issue Regulatory Guidance: Update</i>	4
<i>Recommendation 2- Provide Staffing/Resources to Meet Administrator Training Needs: Update</i>	4
Request from Senate Education #3: “An analysis of the available data on exclusionary discipline in Vermont public schools to identify what additional data is needed”	5
Agency Response: Update on 2016-17 Efforts	5
<i>Recommendation 3- Missing Data: Foster Youth: Update</i>	5
<i>Recommendation 4- Missing Data: Educational Services: Update</i>	5
Request from Senate Education #4: “An explanation of the Agency’s current strategies for obtaining quality data on exclusionary discipline and an identification of all barriers to obtaining quality data”	6
Agency Response: Update on 2016-17 Efforts	6
<i>Recommendation 5- Quality Data Efforts: Update</i>	6
Request from Senate Education #5: “Clarification on how Vermont’s small school sizes and student populations interact with data reporting categories and an explanation of any consequent impact on data reliability and usefulness”	6
Agency Response: Update on 2016-17 Efforts	6
<i>Recommendation 6- Data Reporting: Update</i>	6
Request from Senate Education #6: “All readily available data on exclusionary discipline, including data on educational services provided to students during exclusion from the classroom, from each Vermont public school for academic years 2010-2014”	6
Agency Response: Update on Include 2016.....	6
<i>Recommendation 7- Interpreting Discipline Data</i>	6
Summary of Findings	7
<i>Recommendation 8- Fitted Odds Study: Update on 2016-17 Efforts</i>	7
<i>Recommendation 9- Publishing of Data: Update on 2016-17 Efforts</i>	8
PBIS and Restorative Justice Programs.....	8
Conclusions.....	8
Disaggregated Data	31

Senate Education Request

During the 2015 Legislative Session, the Senate Education Committee took testimony on S.67, an act relating to school discipline reform, including detailed testimony from our Director of Analysis & Data Management, Dr. Wendy Geller, and other Agency staff.

Following testimony, the Committee chose to submit a request for data from the Agency of Education in order to inform any further discussions, rather than pass S.67 during the 2015 session.

In any conversation related to school climate and discipline, attention must be paid to the positive impact of the Positive Behavior Interventions and Supports (PBIS) system and similar programs that teach positive social and emotional behaviors and thereby reduce out-of-classroom time for students. Our first priority has to be providing students with the care and support they need so that they are not in conflict with adults or peers. The [Vermont PBIS 2015-16 Annual Report](#) details the progress and positive impact of PBIS in 143 Vermont schools and 52 supervisory unions/supervisory districts as of June 30, 2016.

Funding available, the Agency of Education will continue to expand and support further adoption and high quality implementation of PBIS in the remaining Vermont schools and supervisory unions. Further, the Agency of Education recommends avoiding implementation of statutes which would lead to duplication of effort for the Agency or the school systems.

Request from Senate Education #1: “A Catalog of data collection rules, policies and guidelines regarding exclusionary discipline used by any Vermont public school or district”

Agency Response: Catalog of Data

The following text catalogs the data collection rules, policies, and guidelines of the Agency of Education related to exclusionary discipline which encompasses “suspension and expulsion.” As School Districts are not required to report their rules, policies, or guidelines surrounding suspension and expulsion to the Agency of Education, we are unable to provide a catalog of their local data collection rules, policies or guidelines related to this topic. However, in order to comply with NCLBA, ESSA, Act 120 (Hazing, Harassment and Bullying), IDEA, and 16 V.S.A. §165 (a), (8) (Safe Schools School Quality Standard), schools are required on an annual basis to report to the Agency the following information which is linked to exclusionary discipline practices:

1. All hazing, harassment and bullying complaints.
2. All suspensions and expulsions of students including:
 - a. All suspensions and expulsions for violations of school substance abuse policies.
 - b. All violent crimes that occurred on school grounds or at a school sponsored function.
 - c. All incidents where the victim of a violent crime that occurred on school grounds exercised their school choice option under NCLBA.
 - d. All incidents involving a weapon on school grounds or at a school-sponsored function.
 - e. All incidents of unilateral removal to an alternative setting.

Please see the [Combined Incident Reporting Software \(CIRS\) School Year 2016-2017 Reporting Instructions](#) for more detailed descriptions of specific data elements.

Request from Senate Education #2: “Recommendation regarding whether standardization of data collection rules and practices is appropriate”

Agency Response: Update on 2016-17 Efforts

Recommendation 1- Issue Regulatory Guidance: Update

On November 22, 2016, the Agency of Education distributed regulatory guidance via the Vermont Principals’ Association listserv, and published on the Agency website, three new documents to guide in more accurate data submission: CIRS Letter to Principals, CIRS Essentials, and CIRS Definitions. In addition, the instructions for the CIRS Reporting Software, and CIRS Reporting Instructions were updated.

Recommendation 2- Provide Staffing/Resources to Meet Administrator Training Needs: Update

In lieu of a two-year limited service position to build an anytime, online learning course, at an estimated cost of \$150,000 per year beyond current budget request, the Agency of Education’s Multi-tiered System of Supports Team clarified incident type definitions and made them more coherent to support greater consistency in data submissions. In addition, live interactive-

training webinars, with simulations and applications of knowledge, have been delivered to both current and new administrators in order to increase administrator skill in making similar reporting judgments.

1. At this point the Agency continues to be unable to staff in-person trainings for the existing CIRS data collection and must rely primarily on written training documents. We lack sufficient staffing to provide ongoing training and support to the field to ensure consistency and fidelity and conduct audits of data entry to ensure faithful completion of that duty. In December of 2016 and January of 2017, the Agency and the Vermont Principals' Association partnered in offering three interactive webinars that addressed appropriate coding of incident types, exercising judgment in determining disciplinary consequence, and consideration of alternatives to exclusion, in lieu of in-person training. The webinars were attended by 76 educators. A voice-over recording of the presentation used for the webinar and a Frequently Asked Questions page have been added to the Agency website.
2. Through current staffing, we plan to dedicate 1/10 of a position for this on-going work for data and training support in 2017-2018 by letting go of some other activities.

Request from Senate Education #3: “An analysis of the available data on exclusionary discipline in Vermont public schools to identify what additional data is needed”

Agency Response: Update on 2016-17 Efforts

Recommendation 3- Missing Data: Foster Youth: Update

The Agency of Education finds that data gaps related to foster youth requested by the legislature will soon be available through the State Longitudinal Data System (SLDS) and will be required federal reporting under the new federal education law, ESSA; no new action is recommended at this time.

Recommendation 4- Missing Data: Educational Services: Update

If the legislature wishes to pursue these data, the Agency recommends incorporating this data collection into the existing CIRS data collection and eventually, the work for the SLDS. As this would be a new request, additional funds for development of this field will be required and a contract amendment written to authorize the work. If the legislature so requests, we can pursue our vendor for cost and time estimates to implement this expansion of the current data collection.

Request from Senate Education #4: “An explanation of the Agency’s current strategies for obtaining quality data on exclusionary discipline and an identification of all barriers to obtaining quality data”

Agency Response: Update on 2016-17 Efforts

Recommendation 5- Quality Data Efforts: Update

The Agency does not have a position focused solely on the collection of this data, however this year, the Agency of Education Data Team added additional inspections of data during the collection phase to ensure accurate data. With support of Deputy Fowler, 100% of school systems submitted data for the CIRS collection in full compliance with all aspects of the data collection. Cross divisional meetings with the AOE Multi-tiered System of Supports Team facilitated the improvement in data communication described in Recommendation 2 above.

Request from Senate Education #5: “Clarification on how Vermont’s small school sizes and student populations interact with data reporting categories and an explanation of any consequent impact on data reliability and usefulness”

Agency Response: Update on 2016-17 Efforts

Recommendation 6- Data Reporting: Update

The Agency has included discipline data at the Supervisory Union/Supervisory District Level into this report in alignment with the recommendation made in the last report.

Request from Senate Education #6: “All readily available data on exclusionary discipline, including data on educational services provided to students during exclusion from the classroom, from each Vermont public school for academic years 2010-2014”

Agency Response: Updated to Include 2016

Due to the shift in the top four reported incident types from the SY2015-16, and to allow for the maximum amount of data shared with the public while simultaneously adhering to rules which protect the identify of students, we have only included the Report SY2016 data.

Recommendation 7- Interpreting Discipline Data

Due to the nature of how discipline is reported in the CIRS collection, it is important to understand the different ways in which data can be presented:

1. **Excluded Students:** Student level data – refers to the population of students that have experienced *at least* one exclusionary disciplinary action.

If a student has been excluded on multiple occasions, she would be counted once in these data. For example, if Julia were suspended in October for fighting, in January for cigarette possession, and in March for fighting, she would count as 1 *excluded student*. Or if John, Bill, and Samuel were all excluded for fighting at school, they would be counted as 3 *excluded students*.

- These data allow investigating questions such as: What demographic subgroups are the recipients of exclusionary discipline?
- What proportion of exclusionary discipline was administered to these subgroups?

2. **Exclusionary Incidents** Incident level data – refers to incidents that resulted in an exclusionary disciplinary action.

Incident level data associate *each* incident that resulted in an exclusionary disciplinary action with the demographic characteristics of a student involved in that incident. Each incident could involve more than one student, resulting in more than one record for a single incident, and any student could be involved in more than one incident, resulting in multiple incidents associated with a single student. For example, if Julia were suspended in October for fighting, in January for cigarette possession, and in March for fighting, this would count as 3 *disciplinary incidents*. Or if John, Bill, and Samuel were all excluded for fighting at school, they would be counted as 3 *disciplinary incidents*- 1 record for each student.

These data can answer questions about the *types of incidents being performed by different students* that result in an exclusion. These data allow investigating questions such as:

- Are some student sub groups more likely to be excluded on more than one occasion?
- What is the average number of exclusions per student?

Due to the wide variation in relative size of the demographic groups under consideration, the exclusionary data is always juxtaposed against the population data for the same time period when disaggregation occurs.

Summary of Findings

In addressing the many data questions raised by the legislature, it is first important to examine the comparatively low level of exclusionary discipline that happens in Vermont.

That said, similar to last year, the Agency of Education finds that students who are non-Caucasian, participate in the free and reduced lunch program, have Section 504 or IEP plans, male, or are English Learners are over-represented in terms of the number who experience exclusion and the number of incidents resulting in exclusion. There are no notable patterns of disproportionate assignment of days of exclusion for these same groups.

All data tables are found following the summary report.

Recommendation 8- Fitted Odds Study: Update on 2016-17 Efforts

The Agency of Education did not have the necessary resources or staffing to complete a fitted-odds probability model study by June 2016 that will be published via our web and listservs to describe the ways in which these student characteristics are associated with the likelihood of being suspended and the degree to which these factors interact.

Recommendation 9- Publishing of Data: Update on 2016-17 Efforts

The Agency is recommending one indicator in the Annual Snapshot which will examine the per capita days of lost instruction due to exclusionary discipline and identify over and underrepresentation where it occurs.

PBIS and Restorative Practice

Throughout the course of conducting the update for this report, it remains clear that schools practicing a Positive Behavior Interventions and Supports (PBIS) system have lower rates of exclusionary discipline than schools without a PBIS system in place.

Schools implementing some level of PBIS, in 2016 account for approximately 48% of the total VT K-12 school enrollment. PBIS schools include those that serve elementary, middle, and secondary grades, indicating that a range of Vermont schools have adopted some form of this kind of behavior supports.

While all VT schools have shown a decrease in Out-of-School Suspensions (OSS), the overall rates of OSS in VTPBiS schools is less than in schools not implementing PBIS. VTPBiS Exemplar schools show an even lower rate of OSS with an average of just 2.66% of students receiving OSS (see [PBIS report](#) for further details). Given these findings, the AOE recommends that schools investigate their ability to adopt school-wide interventions like PBIS for elementary, and PBIS or restorative practices for the secondary level, in an effort to further decrease the use of exclusionary discipline in Vermont.

Conclusions

Overall, exclusionary discipline in Vermont remains relatively low compared to [national statistics](#). For example, roughly 13% of students in the nation receive one or more exclusionary disciplinary actions (2011-12). In contrast, in Vermont last year, we saw a rate of 4.7%. However, within this larger success there remains some over-representation of particular historically marginalized students in relation to exclusionary discipline. We find that non-Caucasian, FRL eligible, 504 and IEP plan, male students, and English Learners, are consistently over-represented in the excluded student groups compared with their presence in the enrollment population.

In many cases, these student groups do not represent a majority of our students; however, they are the students historically most at risk of adverse outcomes and limited educational opportunity and the most dependent on their attendance at school to achieve proficiency as students. It is critical that we work to eliminate disparities through proactive strategies for reducing the problem behaviors before they occur, reducing exclusions, and assisting all staff charged with maintaining school climate with the resources to recognize and address issues related to implicit bias.

Virtually all of the recommendations put forth require both political and material support, which the Legislature would have to allocate to achieve these goals. Absent this support, the AOE cannot successfully act on these recommendations.

In addition, we strongly request the Legislature avoid action that leads to duplication of effort, which would further erode our ability to advance goals related to school discipline. Suggested actions could include asking:

1. AOE to continue to provide technical assistance and monitoring of data submission related to exclusionary discipline through the IT Help Desk, FAQ, and follow up CIRS Webinar in early summer. If the legislature were to approve additional AOE staffing resources, audits could be conducted in the future. Absent these resources, current operating procedure will continue.
2. AOE to continue work on the State Longitudinal Data System (SLDS) project. In the long-term, AOE Data Team believes that vertical reporting of the CIRS data collection will improve data quality.
3. When conducting analysis on discipline matters, we will continue to examine the data at a state level and then disaggregate to Supervisory Unions or Supervisory Districts, as applicable.

Due to staffing limitations at VT AOE, additional analyses of these data beyond what is presented here could not be conducted. VT AOE does not have adequate resources to allocate staffing to both training/support for the field *and* data analysis, so VT AOE has focused its efforts toward addressing the shortcomings in training for the field in how to accurately and timely report their data.

The Agency recommends Supervisory Unions and Supervisory Districts continue to provide professional learning in the following areas to develop and support the capabilities of educators and para-educators:

1. Social-emotional development, trauma sensitivity, restorative practices, and responding appropriately to challenging behaviors.
2. Distinguishing behaviors that are inappropriate from those that are developmentally age appropriate.
3. Recognizing behaviors that may be indicators of an underlying disability, so they can address the disability and not punish children for behaviors caused by disabilities.
4. Developing and supporting the self-reflective capabilities teachers need to identify and correct any potential implicit biases they may have, including racial, ethnic and class biases.
5. Culturally competent instruction, including practices and materials that reflect and show value for every student's own experiences and culture.

Data Point 6- The number and percent of Vermont's students excluded for disciplinary reasons on one or more occasions.

Finding 6- Overall, Vermont's rate of exclusionary discipline is low, with 4.7% of students being excluded for one or more days (see Table 1 below), and has been declining slightly over each of the past three years. In addition, the number of exclusions per student excluded has declined during the past three years. It is important that we recognize this decline is the result of ongoing work being done in the field and is not attributable to any new action taken by the Agency as the data represented exclusions that were occurring while we were discussing disciplinary matters last winter.

As is expected, there is variation across Supervisory Unions and Supervisory Districts in their rates of exclusion and the average number of exclusions per student. We caution against using data to compare Supervisory Unions or Supervisory Districts with one another. These organizations include a great number of governance structures- some include high schools, while others do not; some tuition students to independent schools that do not participate in this data collection. Readers are cautioned to avoid comparisons. See Table 1a for full SU/SD breakout.

1. In SY2016, exclusion rates range from a low of 0% of students excluded (Dresden and St. Johnsbury) to a high of 9.8% (Winooski).
2. In SY2016, the number of exclusions per excluded student also ranged widely from a low of 1 (Montpelier) to a high of 4.9 (Essex North).

*** Denotes data suppression where cell sizes are too small and data privacy procedures must be applied.

**Table 1 – Excluded Student Population Data
Students Experiencing at Least One Exclusionary Action
School Years 2014-2016**

School Year	Total Enrollment	Number of Students Excluded	Percentage of Total Enrolled Students Excluded	Incidents Resulting in Exclusion	Average Exclusions per Student
2014	78,867	4,246	5.4%	13,789	3.3
2015	77,763	3,726	4.8%	11,122	3.0
2016	77,145	3,616	4.7%	7,435	2.1

**Table 1a: Excluded Student Population Data
Students Experiencing at Least One Exclusionary Action School Years 2014-2016;
by Supervisory Union or Supervisory District**

Supervisory Union/District and School Year (Table 1a: Excluded Student Population Data)	Percentage of Total Enrolled Students Excluded	Average Exclusions per Student
ADDISON CENTRAL SU		
2013-2014	5.8%	2.3
2014-2015	6.0%	2.4
2015-2016	5.6%	2.4
ADDISON NORTHEAST SU		
2013-2014	8.7%	5.3
2014-2015	7.8%	4.2
2015-2016	6.1%	1.9
ADDISON NORTHWEST SU		
2013-2014	2.8%	2.6
2014-2015	4.2%	2.4
2015-2016	2.7%	1.7
ADDISON RUTLAND SU		
2013-2014	5.1%	3.1
2014-2015	6.8%	2.6
2015-2016	5.7%	2.4
BARRE SU		
2013-2014	5.9%	3.7
2014-2015	4.0%	2.9
2015-2016	7.2%	2.8
BATTENKILL VALLEY SU		
2013-2014	7.5%	2.8
2014-2015	7.5%	2.8
2015-2016	5.9%	1.8
BENNINGTON RUTLAND SU		
2013-2014	2.4%	1.7
2014-2015	5.1%	2.0
2015-2016	0.9%	1.8
BLUE MOUNTAIN SD		
2013-2014	***	***
2014-2015	***	***
2015-2016	5.0%	1.9
BURLINGTON SD		
2013-2014	9.2%	2.0
2014-2015	6.9%	2.0
2015-2016	3.2%	2.0
CALEDONIA CENTRAL SU		
2013-2014	5.2%	2.0
2014-2015	2.2%	2.6
2015-2016	2.1%	1.5

Supervisory Union/District and School Year (Table 1a: Excluded Student Population Data)	Percentage of Total Enrolled Students Excluded	Average Exclusions per Student
CALEDONIA NORTH SU		
2013-2014	***	***
2014-2015	5.9%	2.2
2015-2016	5.5%	2.3
CHITTENDEN CENTRAL SU		
2013-2014	3.6%	2.5
2014-2015	3.7%	2.4
2015-2016	3.6%	2.6
CHITTENDEN EAST SU		
2013-2014	1.7%	2.1
2014-2015	***	***
2015-2016	1.1%	1.3
CHITTENDEN SOUTH SU		
2013-2014	1.4%	2.6
2014-2015	1.6%	2.8
2015-2016	0.9%	1.8
COLCHESTER SD		
2013-2014	4.4%	4.0
2014-2015	3.9%	3.4
2015-2016	2.3%	1.8
ESSEX CALEDONIA SU		
2013-2014	8.1%	3.3
2014-2015	7.8%	3.3
2015-2016	4.7%	1.3
ESSEX NORTH SU		
2013-2014	***	***
2014-2015	6.3%	3.0
2015-2016	8.2%	4.9
ESSEX TOWN SD		
2013-2014	2.2%	3.6
2014-2015	1.9%	3.0
2015-2016	2.5%	2.2
FRANKLIN CENTRAL SU		
2013-2014	4.6%	3.1
2014-2015	5.0%	3.7
2015-2016	4.9%	2.1
FRANKLIN NORTHEAST SU		
2013-2014	5.1%	2.1
2014-2015	5.6%	3.2
2015-2016	6.5%	2.3

Supervisory Union/District and School Year (Table 1a: Excluded Student Population Data)	Percentage of Total Enrolled Students Excluded	Average Exclusions per Student
FRANKLIN NORTHWEST SU		
2013-2014	10.5%	8.1
2014-2015	3.5%	8.5
2015-2016	6.1%	1.8
FRANKLIN WEST SU		
2013-2014	5.0%	3.1
2014-2015	6.0%	2.6
2015-2016	3.4%	2.0
GRAND ISLE SU		
2013-2014	5.9%	3.2
2014-2015	4.7%	2.5
2015-2016	3.3%	1.1
HARTFORD SD		
2013-2014	5.2%	1.7
2014-2015	4.0%	2.1
2015-2016	3.2%	1.6
LAMOILLE NORTH SU		
2013-2014	3.8%	2.2
2014-2015	4.1%	2.2
2015-2016	3.8%	1.1
LAMOILLE SOUTH SU		
2013-2014	***	***
2014-2015	***	***
2015-2016	3.0%	1.0
MILTON SD		
2013-2014	9.0%	3.1
2014-2015	***	***
2015-2016	6.3%	1.9
MONTPELIER SD		
2013-2014	2.8%	3.0
2014-2015	1.9%	2.0
2015-2016	0.4%	1.0
NORTH COUNTRY SU		
2013-2014	5.1%	1.8
2014-2015	5.2%	2.3
2015-2016	4.8%	1.9
ORANGE EAST SU		
2013-2014	5.3%	2.9
2014-2015	4.5%	2.7
2015-2016	2.4%	1.0

Supervisory Union/District and School Year (Table 1a: Excluded Student Population Data)	Percentage of Total Enrolled Students Excluded	Average Exclusions per Student
ORANGE NORTH SU		
2013-2014	6.2%	3.9
2014-2015	8.2%	3.8
2015-2016	8.8%	1.9
ORANGE SOUTHWEST SU		
2013-2014	6.5%	2.6
2014-2015	4.0%	3.1
2015-2016	6.6%	2.1
ORANGE WINDSOR SU		
2013-2014	4.5%	2.1
2014-2015	2.5%	2.1
2015-2016	3.9%	2.3
ORLEANS CENTRAL SU		
2013-2014	3.8%	2.7
2014-2015	4.2%	2.4
2015-2016	4.9%	1.8
ORLEANS SOUTHWEST SU		
2013-2014	6.1%	1.8
2014-2015	7.1%	2.0
2015-2016	5.8%	1.9
RIVENDELL INTERSTATE SD		
2013-2014	5.9%	3.2
2014-2015	3.2%	3.9
2015-2016	3.2%	3.9
RUTLAND CENTRAL SU		
2013-2014	3.4%	2.9
2014-2015	4.1%	2.9
2015-2016	3.2%	2.1
RUTLAND CITY SD		
2013-2014	4.6%	2.5
2014-2015	4.3%	2.3
2015-2016	3.9%	2.0
RUTLAND NORTHEAST SU		
2013-2014	6.7%	7.2
2014-2015	7.3%	3.7
2015-2016	5.6%	2.4
RUTLAND SOUTH SU		
2013-2014	6.8%	2.6
2014-2015	7.9%	3.2
2015-2016	4.8%	1.7

Supervisory Union/District and School Year (Table 1a: Excluded Student Population Data)	Percentage of Total Enrolled Students Excluded	Average Exclusions per Student
RUTLAND SOUTHWEST SU		
2013-2014	6.5%	2.9
2014-2015	5.0%	2.6
2015-2016	1.5%	1.6
SOUTH BURLINGTON SD		
2013-2014	***	***
2014-2015	***	***
2015-2016	2.1%	3.2
SOUTHWEST VERMONT SU		
2013-2014	7.5%	4.4
2014-2015	7.1%	4.5
2015-2016	7.1%	2.2
SPRINGFIELD SD		
2013-2014	15.9%	3.1
2014-2015	11.3%	2.7
2015-2016	8.4%	2.7
ST JOHNSBURY SD		
2013-2014	10.5%	3.5
2014-2015	8.1%	3.3
2015-2016	0.0%	0.0
TWO RIVERS SU (BEGAN 2014-2015)		
2013-2014	N/A	N/A
2014-2015	7.4%	3.6
2015-2016	7.5%	1.8
WASHINGTON CENTRAL SU		
2013-2014	4.8%	2.0
2014-2015	5.6%	1.7
2015-2016	3.8%	1.5
WASHINGTON NORTHEAST SU		
2013-2014	6.1%	4.2
2014-2015	4.0%	4.8
2015-2016	4.3%	1.2
WASHINGTON SOUTH SU		
2013-2014	5.0%	1.7
2014-2015	2.2%	2.0
2015-2016	2.4%	2.0
WASHINGTON WEST SU		
2013-2014	3.9%	4.0
2014-2015	3.2%	3.3
2015-2016	2.9%	1.6

Supervisory Union/District and School Year (Table 1a: Excluded Student Population Data)	Percentage of Total Enrolled Students Excluded	Average Exclusions per Student
WINDHAM CENTRAL SU		
2013-2014	3.0%	1.9
2014-2015	5.5%	2.7
2015-2016	4.3%	2.7
WINDHAM NORTHEAST SU		
2013-2014	9.0%	3.5
2014-2015	5.4%	4.7
2015-2016	9.7%	2.4
WINDHAM SOUTHEAST SU		
2013-2014	6.7%	3.9
2014-2015	5.4%	4.0
2015-2016	5.2%	2.2
WINDHAM SOUTHWEST SU		
2013-2014	6.6%	2.5
2014-2015	6.4%	3.1
2015-2016	5.4%	1.5
WINDSOR CENTRAL SU		
2013-2014	***	***
2014-2015	***	***
2015-2016	3.5%	1.9
WINDSOR NORTHWEST SU		
2013-2014	5.2%	2.8
2014-2015	5.3%	3.1
2015-2016	4.4%	2.1
WINDSOR SOUTHEAST SU		
2013-2014	5.1%	2.0
2014-2015	5.7%	1.9
2015-2016	5.1%	1.7
WINOOSKI SD		
2013-2014	5.0%	3.2
2014-2015	6.5%	2.7
2015-2016	9.8%	1.8

Data Point 6a1- The number of incidents resulting in exclusionary discipline for each type of disciplinary exclusion for the State of Vermont.

Finding 6a1: Exclusionary discipline is most frequently administered as in-school (42.6%) and out-of-school suspensions (56.1%); accounting for roughly 99% of all exclusionary discipline. Expulsions and Alternative School Placements account for a small number of disciplinary actions.

In 2016, suspensions were substantially lower than in previous years-. In-school suspensions reduced by 1,349 and out-of-school suspensions reduced by 2,324 exclusions. In addition, it appears schools selected in-school suspension more frequently as the percentage of exclusions that occurred at school increased slightly. This is a good outcome as in-school suspension provides greater opportunity for students to continue studies and maintain connection to school.

In the Supervisory Union/Supervisory District data we see differences in how each location is using in- and out-of-school suspension. Due to the small number of expulsions and alternative placements, data included here are only for suspensions. Additionally, results can vary dramatically from year to year. The reasons for these changes over time and the differences between school systems are not known at this time.

Table 2: Number of Incidents Resulting in Exclusionary Discipline for the State of Vermont by Type of Exclusion in School Years 2013-2015

School Year	School Year	In-school suspension	Out-of-school suspension	Expulsions	Alternative school placements	Total Exclusions
2014	#	5,975	7,402	17	395	13,789
2014	%	43.3%	53.7%	0.1%	2.9%	
2015	#	4,514	6,501	22	85	11,122
2015	%	40.6%	58.5%	0.2%	0.8%	
2016	#	3,165	4,177	***	***	7,435
2016	%	42.6%	56.1%	***	***	

Table 2a: Number of Incidents Resulting in Exclusionary Discipline for the State of Vermont by Type of Exclusion in School Years 2014-2016; by Supervisory Union or Supervisory District

Supervisory Union/District and School Year (Table 2a: Number of Incidents Resulting in Exclusionary Discipline for the State of Vermont by Type of Exclusion in School Years 2014-2016; by Supervisory Union or Supervisory District)	In-school suspension	Out-of-school suspension
ADDISON CENTRAL SU		
2013-2014	39%	59%
2014-2015	43%	56%
2015-2016	47%	53%
ADDISON NORTHEAST SU		
2013-2014	27%	73%
2014-2015	17%	79%
2015-2016	28%	72%
ADDISON NORTHWEST SU		
2013-2014	73%	27%
2014-2015	67%	33%
2015-2016	62%	38%
ADDISON RUTLAND SU		
2013-2014	82%	18%
2014-2015	80%	19%
2015-2016	80%	20%
BARRE SU		
2013-2014	73%	27%
2014-2015	38%	61%
2015-2016	57%	43%
BATTENKILL VALLEY SU		
2013-2014	60%	40%
2014-2015	65%	33%
2015-2016	70%	30%
BENNINGTON RUTLAND SU		
2013-2014	55%	43%
2014-2015	44%	54%
2015-2016	81%	***
BLUE MOUNTAIN SD		
2013-2014	***	***
2014-2015	***	***
2015-2016	***	84%
BURLINGTON SD		
2013-2014	55%	45%
2014-2015	48%	52%
2015-2016	54%	46%

Supervisory Union/District and School Year (Table 2a: Number of Incidents Resulting in Exclusionary Discipline for the State of Vermont by Type of Exclusion in School Years 2014-2016; by Supervisory Union or Supervisory District)	In-school suspension	Out-of-school suspension
CALEDONIA CENTRAL SU		
2013-2014	78%	22%
2014-2015	***	***
2015-2016	64%	***
CALEDONIA NORTH SU		
2013-2014	***	***
2014-2015	23%	75%
2015-2016	43%	56%
CHITTENDEN CENTRAL SU		
2013-2014	30%	69%
2014-2015	28%	72%
2015-2016	27%	73%
CHITTENDEN EAST SU		
2013-2014	13%	87%
2014-2015	***	***
2015-2016	***	82%
CHITTENDEN SOUTH SU		
2013-2014	48%	52%
2014-2015	45%	55%
2015-2016	67%	26%
COLCHESTER SD		
2013-2014	52%	47%
2014-2015	57%	43%
2015-2016	61%	39%
ESSEX CALEDONIA SU		
2013-2014	61%	36%
2014-2015	59%	40%
2015-2016	54%	46%
ESSEX NORTH SU		
2013-2014	***	***
2014-2015	64%	36%
2015-2016	18%	82%
ESSEX TOWN SD		
2013-2014	53%	41%
2014-2015	43%	50%
2015-2016	70%	25%
FRANKLIN CENTRAL SU		
2013-2014	44%	55%
2014-2015	29%	69%
2015-2016	32%	68%

Supervisory Union/District and School Year (Table 2a: Number of Incidents Resulting in Exclusionary Discipline for the State of Vermont by Type of Exclusion in School Years 2014-2016; by Supervisory Union or Supervisory District)	In-school suspension	Out-of-school suspension
FRANKLIN NORTHEAST SU		
2013-2014	64%	35%
2014-2015	60%	40%
2015-2016	73%	26%
FRANKLIN NORTHWEST SU		
2013-2014	27%	72%
2014-2015	51%	48%
2015-2016	42%	56%
FRANKLIN WEST SU		
2013-2014	75%	24%
2014-2015	80%	20%
2015-2016	61%	38%
GRAND ISLE SU		
2013-2014	62%	34%
2014-2015	43%	40%
2015-2016	74%	***
HARTFORD SD		
2013-2014	52%	48%
2014-2015	49%	51%
2015-2016	50%	46%
LAMOILLE NORTH SU		
2013-2014	47%	50%
2014-2015	61%	38%
2015-2016	49%	51%
LAMOILLE SOUTH SU		
2013-2014	***	***
2014-2015	***	***
2015-2016	***	92%
MILTON SD		
2013-2014	4%	95%
2014-2015	***	***
2015-2016	***	98%
MONTPELIER SD		
2013-2014	38%	59%
2014-2015	65%	35%
2015-2016	***	***
NORTH COUNTRY SU		
2013-2014	27%	70%
2014-2015	19%	81%
2015-2016	24%	74%

Supervisory Union/District and School Year (Table 2a: Number of Incidents Resulting in Exclusionary Discipline for the State of Vermont by Type of Exclusion in School Years 2014-2016; by Supervisory Union or Supervisory District)	In-school suspension	Out-of-school suspension
ORANGE EAST SU		
2013-2014	61%	39%
2014-2015	14%	86%
2015-2016	***	87%
ORANGE NORTH SU		
2013-2014	18%	82%
2014-2015	19%	80%
2015-2016	30%	67%
ORANGE SOUTHWEST SU		
2013-2014	27%	73%
2014-2015	30%	67%
2015-2016	25%	73%
ORANGE WINDSOR SU		
2013-2014	66%	31%
2014-2015	63%	37%
2015-2016	74%	26%
ORLEANS CENTRAL SU		
2013-2014	65%	33%
2014-2015	68%	32%
2015-2016	46%	52%
ORLEANS SOUTHWEST SU		
2013-2014	51%	48%
2014-2015	43%	57%
2015-2016	36%	64%
RIVENDELL INTERSTATE SD		
2013-2014	32%	67%
2014-2015	33%	60%
2015-2016	68%	32%
RUTLAND CENTRAL SU		
2013-2014	60%	40%
2014-2015	72%	28%
2015-2016	72%	27%
RUTLAND CITY SD		
2013-2014	30%	70%
2014-2015	27%	73%
2015-2016	18%	82%
RUTLAND NORTHEAST SU		
2013-2014	27%	25%
2014-2015	37%	63%
2015-2016	41%	58%

Supervisory Union/District and School Year (Table 2a: Number of Incidents Resulting in Exclusionary Discipline for the State of Vermont by Type of Exclusion in School Years 2014-2016; by Supervisory Union or Supervisory District)	In-school suspension	Out-of-school suspension
RUTLAND SOUTH SU		
2013-2014	87%	13%
2014-2015	72%	27%
2015-2016	84%	16%
RUTLAND SOUTHWEST SU		
2013-2014	63%	37%
2014-2015	31%	69%
2015-2016	***	***
SOUTH BURLINGTON SD		
2013-2014	***	***
2014-2015	***	***
2015-2016	***	***
SOUTHWEST VERMONT SU		
2013-2014	40%	60%
2014-2015	36%	64%
2015-2016	14%	84%
SPRINGFIELD SD		
2013-2014	55%	45%
2014-2015	31%	69%
2015-2016	26%	73%
ST JOHNSBURY SD		
2013-2014	56%	44%
2014-2015	62%	38%
2015-2016	24%	67%
TWO RIVERS SU (began 2014-2015)		
2014-2015	22%	78%
2015-2016	***	***
WASHINGTON CENTRAL SU		
2013-2014	66%	33%
2014-2015	45%	48%
2015-2016	27%	71%
WASHINGTON NORTHEAST SU		
2013-2014	64%	36%
2014-2015	40%	60%
2015-2016	72%	24%
WASHINGTON SOUTH SU		
2013-2014	55%	45%
2014-2015	46%	54%
2015-2016	41%	59%

Supervisory Union/District and School Year (Table 2a: Number of Incidents Resulting in Exclusionary Discipline for the State of Vermont by Type of Exclusion in School Years 2014-2016; by Supervisory Union or Supervisory District)	In-school suspension	Out-of-school suspension
WASHINGTON WEST SU		
2013-2014	65%	34%
2014-2015	46%	54%
2015-2016	***	70%
WINDHAM CENTRAL SU		
2013-2014	45%	55%
2014-2015	39%	55%
2015-2016	60%	34%
WINDHAM NORTHEAST SU		
2013-2014	69%	27%
2014-2015	59%	41%
2015-2016	69%	30%
WINDHAM SOUTHEAST SU		
2013-2014	19%	81%
2014-2015	19%	80%
2015-2016	77%	23%
WINDHAM SOUTHWEST SU		
2013-2014	77%	22%
2014-2015	58%	40%
2015-2016	17%	83%
WINDSOR CENTRAL SU		
2013-2014	***	***
2014-2015	***	***
2015-2016	60%	40%
WINDSOR NORTHWEST SU		
2013-2014	64%	36%
2014-2015	53%	47%
2015-2016	78%	22%
WINDSOR SOUTHEAST SU		
2013-2014	***	***
2014-2015	33%	64%
2015-2016	86%	***
WINOOSKI SD		
2013-2014	44%	54%
2014-2015	20%	80%
2015-2016	42%	58%

Data Point 6-2b- Total number of days for which students were excluded from the classroom due to exclusionary discipline, broken down in the State of Vermont

Finding 6-2b: Table 3 below shows total days of exclusion as measured for suspension (in-school and out-of-school). This table shows the number of suspensions, the average number of days out per suspension, and the total days missed due to suspension. Current statute limits suspensions to 10 academic days.

1. In-school suspensions have typically been assigned for a bit over 1 day (average of 1.2 days in SY2016) of suspension and have remained constant over the past number of years; a decrease of 52% fewer lost instructional days since 2014.
2. In SY2016, out-of-school suspensions have shown a slight drop, to an average of 2.1 days per suspension; a decrease of 49% fewer lost instructional days since 2014.
3. The number of days of exclusion in Vermont during SY2016 was approximately 13,000 days. This represents roughly 0.1% of all school days offered to the full enrollment of K-12 students in a given year; in 2014, nearly 25,000 days of instruction were lost representing a decrease of 50% since 2014.

There is great variability with average days out due to suspension across Supervisory Unions/Supervisor Districts.

1. Eighty percent (80%) of all Supervisory Unions/Supervisory Districts have an average of fewer than 2 days of out-of-school suspension.
2. In 2016, no Supervisory Unions/Districts have an out-of-school suspension average that exceeds 5 days.

Table 3: Statewide Exclusions and Average Days Missed Per Exclusion

Exclusion Type	School Year	Number of Exclusions	Average Days Out	Total Days Out
In-School Suspension	2014	5,956	1.2	7,407.1
In-School Suspension	2015	4,513	1.2	5,836.9
In-School Suspension	2016	3,165	1.2	3,868.9
Out-of-School Suspension	2014	7,246	2.3	17,987.4
Out-of-School Suspension	2015	6,495	2.3	15,482.0
Out-of-School Suspension	2016	4,177	2.1	8,796.3
Expulsions	2014	17	**	**
Expulsions	2015	22	**	**
Expulsions	2016	***	**	**
Alternative school placements	2014	395	**	**
Alternative school placements	2015	83	**	**
Alternative school placements	2016	***	**	**
Missing Data	2014	175	**	**
Missing Data	2015	31	**	**
Missing Data	2016	NO missing Data	**	**

**Table 3a: Statewide Exclusions and Average Days Missed Per Exclusion;
by Supervisory Union or Supervisory District**

Supervisory Union/District and School Year (Table 3a: Statewide Exclusions and Average Days Missed Per Exclusion; by Supervisory Union or Supervisory District)	Average Days Out
ADDISON CENTRAL SU	
2013-2014	1.6
2014-2015	1.6
2015-2016	1.7
ADDISON NORTHEAST SU	
2013-2014	1.4
2014-2015	1.4
2015-2016	1.4
ADDISON NORTHWEST SU	
2013-2014	1.6
2014-2015	1.7
2015-2016	2.2
ADDISON RUTLAND SU	
2013-2014	1.8
2014-2015	2.3
2015-2016	1.3
BARRE SU	
2013-2014	2.3
2014-2015	5.2
2015-2016	1.8
BATTENKILL VALLEY SU	
2013-2014	1.8
2014-2015	2.2
2015-2016	1.8
BENNINGTON RUTLAND SU	
2013-2014	1.7
2014-2015	1.1
2015-2016	1.2
BLUE MOUNTAIN SD	
2013-2014	***
2014-2015	***
2015-2016	2.2
BURLINGTON SD	
2013-2014	1.9
2014-2015	1.8
2015-2016	1.2
CALEDONIA CENTRAL SU	
2013-2014	1.5
2014-2015	1.8
2015-2016	1.5

Supervisory Union/District and School Year (Table 3a: Statewide Exclusions and Average Days Missed Per Exclusion; by Supervisory Union or Supervisory District)	Average Days Out
CALEDONIA NORTH SU	
2013-2014	***
2014-2015	1.4
2015-2016	1.4
CHITTENDEN CENTRAL SU	
2013-2014	2.5
2014-2015	2.8
2015-2016	3.0
CHITTENDEN EAST SU	
2013-2014	2.8
2014-2015	***
2015-2016	2.2
CHITTENDEN SOUTH SU	
2013-2014	1.2
2014-2015	1.5
2015-2016	1.5
COLCHESTER SD	
2013-2014	2.3
2014-2015	1.6
2015-2016	1.5
ESSEX CALEDONIA SU	
2013-2014	2.2
2014-2015	1.3
2015-2016	1.7
ESSEX NORTH SU	
2013-2014	***
2014-2015	1.0
2015-2016	1.0
ESSEX TOWN SD	
2013-2014	2.2
2014-2015	2.0
2015-2016	1.0
FRANKLIN CENTRAL SU	
2013-2014	1.7
2014-2015	1.9
2015-2016	1.9
FRANKLIN NORTHEAST SU	
2013-2014	2.2
2014-2015	1.4
2015-2016	1.8

Supervisory Union/District and School Year (Table 3a: Statewide Exclusions and Average Days Missed Per Exclusion; by Supervisory Union or Supervisory District)	Average Days Out
FRANKLIN NORTHWEST SU	
2013-2014	2.6
2014-2015	1.7
2015-2016	1.8
FRANKLIN WEST SU	
2013-2014	1.7
2014-2015	1.4
2015-2016	1.2
GRAND ISLE SU	
2013-2014	1.4
2014-2015	0.9
2015-2016	1.1
HARTFORD SD	
2013-2014	1.8
2014-2015	1.7
2015-2016	1.6
LAMOILLE NORTH SU	
2013-2014	4.2
2014-2015	2.9
2015-2016	2.4
LAMOILLE SOUTH SU	
2013-2014	***
2014-2015	***
2015-2016	1.3
MILTON SD	
2013-2014	1.9
2014-2015	***
2015-2016	1.6
MONTPELIER SD	
2013-2014	3.6
2014-2015	1.4
2015-2016	1.0
NORTH COUNTRY SU	
2013-2014	4.3
2014-2015	2.2
2015-2016	2.0
ORANGE EAST SU	
2013-2014	1.8
2014-2015	2.6
2015-2016	2.2

Supervisory Union/District and School Year (Table 3a: Statewide Exclusions and Average Days Missed Per Exclusion; by Supervisory Union or Supervisory District)	Average Days Out
ORANGE NORTH SU	
2013-2014	1.8
2014-2015	1.4
2015-2016	1.4
ORANGE SOUTHWEST SU	
2013-2014	3.2
2014-2015	1.5
2015-2016	1.6
ORANGE WINDSOR SU	
2013-2014	2.6
2014-2015	1.8
2015-2016	1.2
ORLEANS CENTRAL SU	
2013-2014	12.9
2014-2015	1.6
2015-2016	2.1
ORLEANS SOUTHWEST SU	
2013-2014	5.2
2014-2015	1.6
2015-2016	1.4
RIVENDELL INTERSTATE SD	
2013-2014	1.8
2014-2015	1.3
2015-2016	1.1
RUTLAND CENTRAL SU	
2013-2014	1.2
2014-2015	1.2
2015-2016	2.0
RUTLAND CITY SD	
2013-2014	1.6
2014-2015	1.5
2015-2016	1.4
RUTLAND NORTHEAST SU	
2013-2014	0.7
2014-2015	1.7
2015-2016	1.9
RUTLAND SOUTH SU	
2013-2014	2.2
2014-2015	2.4
2015-2016	2.3

Supervisory Union/District and School Year (Table 3a: Statewide Exclusions and Average Days Missed Per Exclusion; by Supervisory Union or Supervisory District)	Average Days Out
RUTLAND SOUTHWEST SU	
2013-2014	1.6
2014-2015	2.0
2015-2016	1.5
SOUTH BURLINGTON SD	
2013-2014	***
2014-2015	***
2015-2016	2.4
SOUTHWEST VERMONT SU	
2013-2014	1.6
2014-2015	1.6
2015-2016	1.6
SPRINGFIELD SD	
2013-2014	1.5
2014-2015	1.9
2015-2016	1.4
ST JOHNSBURY SD	
2013-2014	0.9
2014-2015	1.1
2015-2016	0.0
TWO RIVERS SU (BEGAN 2014-2015)	
2014-2015	3.0
2015-2016	1.8
WASHINGTON CENTRAL SU	
2013-2014	3.7
2014-2015	2.3
2015-2016	1.5
WASHINGTON NORTHEAST SU	
2013-2014	1.1
2014-2015	1.3
2015-2016	1.0
WASHINGTON SOUTH SU	
2013-2014	3.7
2014-2015	1.3
2015-2016	1.7
WASHINGTON WEST SU	
2013-2014	1.2
2014-2015	1.7
2015-2016	1.4
WINDHAM CENTRAL SU	
2013-2014	3.6
2014-2015	1.9
2015-2016	2.0

Supervisory Union/District and School Year (Table 3a: Statewide Exclusions and Average Days Missed Per Exclusion; by Supervisory Union or Supervisory District)	Average Days Out
WINDHAM NORTHEAST SU	
2013-2014	1.3
2014-2015	1.9
2015-2016	1.3
WINDHAM SOUTHEAST SU	
2013-2014	2.2
2014-2015	2.2
2015-2016	2.3
WINDHAM SOUTHWEST SU	
2013-2014	1.2
2014-2015	1.7
2015-2016	1.8
WINDSOR CENTRAL SU	
2013-2014	***
2014-2015	***
2015-2016	1.2
WINDSOR NORTHWEST SU	
2013-2014	1.3
2014-2015	1.7
2015-2016	1.2
WINDSOR SOUTHEAST SU	
2013-2014	4.4
2014-2015	1.7
2015-2016	1.4
WINOOSKI SD	
2013-2014	2.2
2014-2015	1.7
2015-2016	2.4

Disaggregated Data

The legislature has also requested data be disaggregated by key characteristics. Due to Vermont's uniquely small size conditions, these data, especially when cross-tabulated, become personally identifiable and therefore not publicly reportable due to federal student data privacy law. When we compiled these data and ran the analyses at the school-level, nearly all these data had to be suppressed. As a result, large amounts of data in this report required suppression in order for VT AOE to comply with federal student data privacy law.

The data presented in the following tables are organized by student sub-group so as to show any disproportionate representation evident in the experience of exclusionary actions. As noted above, this can present problems for publicly reporting sensitive data like these. To provide the most data possible here while still protecting student privacy and providing comparable measures across each K-12 student sub-group presented, the type of exclusionary action (in-school school suspension, out-of-school suspension, unilateral removal to interim alternative placement [IEP only] and expulsion) has been collapsed to reflect all exclusionary actions at the state level to facilitate meaningful analysis.

To aid in interpretation, we have compared the percentage of excluded students to the population of each student group in the K-12 student population. We have further examined the proportional relationship between these two percentages to identify the degree to which students are disproportionately underrepresented or overrepresented in terms of exclusionary discipline. The following scale is used to make determinations:

Table 4 – Scale for Determining Relative Underrepresentation or Overrepresentation in Exclusionary Discipline

Lower Value	Higher Value	Determination
0%	49%	Large Underrepresentation
50%	74%	Moderate Underrepresentation
75 %	89 %	Slight Underrepresentation
90%	110%	Neutral
111%	125%	Slight Overrepresentation
126%	150%	Moderate Overrepresentation
151%	No limit	Large Overrepresentation

Thus in systems where students of color or students in poverty represent the overwhelming majority of students, we expect them also to represent the majority of exclusions, and little disproportionality will be evident. Inversely, systems with very few students of color or students in poverty are likely to have higher disproportionality, as a single incident for a single student in poverty may represent a very large proportion of that subgroup (e.g., if a system has only 5 students living in poverty, and very low exclusion rates, a single student who lives in poverty who is excluded may yield a very high disproportionality statistic.).

Data Point 6- 4.xi- Number of exclusions for students in Vermont by ethnic/racial background

Finding 6-4.xi: In SY2016 Caucasian students were excluded from school in proportion to their population. Conversely, students who are not Caucasian were excluded from school at rates that resulted in a slight overrepresentation in terms of exclusion.

This represents shows a fairly substantial improvement from SY2014’s disproportionality of 143% to SY2016 rate of 112%.

Due to student data privacy law, there are virtually no data that can be publicly reported by SU/SD in examining the exclusion of students of color compared to Caucasian students. This is primarily a result of two factors:

1. The relatively low level of exclusion in Vermont in total and;
2. The relatively small size of the population of students of color in Vermont.

Only the largest and most ethnically/racially diverse Supervisory Unions/Supervisory Districts meet the minimum standards for reporting data.

**Table 5 – Excluded Student Population Data by Racial Group
Students Experiencing at Least One Exclusionary Action School Years 2014-2016**

School Year	Total	Caucasian	Caucasian	Non-Caucasian	Non-Caucasian
Enrollment	Enrollment	Enrollment	Percent of Enrollment	Enrollment	Percent of Enrollment
2014	78,867	72,789	92.3%	6,078	7.7%
2015	77,763	71,407	91.8%	6,356	8.2%
2016	77,145	70,279	91.1%	6,866	8.9%
Exclusions	Exclusions	Exclusions	Percent of Students Excluded	Excluded	Percent of Students Excluded
2014	4,246	3,778	89.0%	468	11.0%
2015	3,726	3,354	90.0%	372	10.0%
2016	3,616	3,253	90.0%	363	10.0%
	Comparison of Excluded Students	Proportional Difference in representation between general and excluded population: (percent of Exclusions/percent of Enrollment)	Proportional Difference in representation between general and excluded population: (percent of Exclusions/percent of Enrollment)	Proportional Difference in representation between general and excluded population: (percent of Exclusions/percent of Enrollment)	Proportional Difference in representation between general and excluded population: (percent of Exclusions/percent of Enrollment)
2014	Comparison of Excluded Students	96.4%	Neutral	142.9%	Moderate Overrepresentation
2015	Comparison of Excluded Students	98.0%	Neutral	122.2%	Moderate Overrepresentation
2016	Comparison of Excluded Students	98.9%	Neutral	112.4%	Slight Overrepresentation

**Table 5a: Excluded Student Population Data by Racial Group
Students Experiencing at Least One Exclusionary Action School Years 2014-2016;
by Supervisory Union or Supervisory District**

Supervisory Union/District and School Year (Table 5a: Excluded Student Population Data by Racial Group)	Percent of Enrollment-Non-Caucasian	Percent of Students Excluded-Non-Caucasian	Proportional Difference in representation between general and excluded population	Proportional Difference in representation between general and excluded population
ADDISON CENTRAL SU				
2013-2014	7%	***	***	***
2014-2015	8%	***	***	***
2015-2016	8%	***	***	***
ADDISON NORTHEAST SU				
2013-2014	3%	***	***	***
2014-2015	5%	***	***	***
2015-2016	5%	***	***	***
ADDISON NORTHWEST SU				
2013-2014	5%	***	***	***
2014-2015	5%	***	***	***
2015-2016	6%	***	***	***
ADDISON RUTLAND SU				
2013-2014	2%	***	***	***
2014-2015	2%	***	***	***
2015-2016	3%	***	***	***
BARRE SU				
2013-2014	7%	***	***	***
2014-2015	8%	***	***	***
2015-2016	8%	8%	103%	Neutral
BATTENKILL VALLEY SU				
2013-2014	5%	***	***	***
2014-2015	3%	***	***	***
2015-2016	3%	***	***	***
BENNINGTON RUTLAND SU				
2013-2014	4%	***	***	***
2014-2015	5%	***	***	***
2015-2016	5%	***	***	***
BLUE MOUNTAIN SD				
2013-2014	3%	***	***	***
2014-2015	3%	***	***	***
2015-2016	3%	***	***	***

Supervisory Union/District and School Year (Table 5a: Excluded Student Population Data by Racial Group)	Percent of Enrollment-Non-Caucasian	Percent of Students Excluded-Non-Caucasian	Proportional Difference in representation between general and excluded population	Proportional Difference in representation between general and excluded population
BURLINGTON SD				
2013-2014	33%	47%	144%	Moderate Overrepresentation
2014-2015	34%	46%	135%	Moderate Overrepresentation
2015-2016	35%	50%	144%	Moderate Overrepresentation
CALEDONIA CENTRAL SU				
2013-2014	4%	***	***	***
2014-2015	4%	***	***	***
2015-2016	4%	***	***	***
CALEDONIA NORTH SU				
2013-2014	2%	***	***	***
2014-2015	2%	***	***	***
2015-2016	2%	***	***	***
CHITTENDEN CENTRAL SU				
2013-2014	14%	***	***	***
2014-2015	14%	***	***	***
2015-2016	15%	***	***	***
CHITTENDEN EAST SU				
2013-2014	5%	***	***	***
2014-2015	6%	***	***	***
2015-2016	6%	***	***	***
CHITTENDEN SOUTH SU				
2013-2014	8%	***	***	***
2014-2015	8%	***	***	***
2015-2016	9%	***	***	***
COLCHESTER SD				
2013-2014	9%	***	***	***
2014-2015	8%	***	***	***
2015-2016	10%	***	***	***
ESSEX CALEDONIA SU				
2013-2014	2%	***	***	***
2014-2015	3%	***	***	***
2015-2016	5%	***	***	***
ESSEX NORTH SU				
2013-2014	***	***	***	***
2014-2015	***	***	***	***
2015-2016	6%	***	***	***

Supervisory Union/District and School Year (Table 5a: Excluded Student Population Data by Racial Group)	Percent of Enrollment-Non-Caucasian	Percent of Students Excluded-Non-Caucasian	Proportional Difference in representation between general and excluded population	Proportional Difference in representation between general and excluded population
ESSEX TOWN SD				
2013-2014	7%	***	***	***
2014-2015	6%	***	***	***
2015-2016	7%	***	***	***
FRANKLIN CENTRAL SU				
2013-2014	11%	14%	124%	Moderate Overrepresentation
2014-2015	11%	15%	132%	Moderate Overrepresentation
2015-2016	9%	10%	110%	Slight Overrepresentation
FRANKLIN NORTHEAST SU				
2013-2014	6%	***	***	***
2014-2015	6%	***	***	***
2015-2016	7%	***	***	***
FRANKLIN NORTHWEST SU				
2013-2014	22%	34%	158%	Large Overrepresentation
2014-2015	22%	37%	171%	Large Overrepresentation
2015-2016	20%	30%	148%	Moderate Overrepresentation
FRANKLIN WEST SU				
2013-2014	3%	***	***	***
2014-2015	3%	***	***	***
2015-2016	2%	***	***	***
GRAND ISLE SU				
2013-2014	6%	***	***	***
2014-2015	8%	***	***	***
2015-2016	8%	***	***	***
HARTFORD SD				
2013-2014	7%	***	***	***
2014-2015	8%	***	***	***
2015-2016	8%	***	***	***
LAMOILLE NORTH SU				
2013-2014	3%	***	***	***
2014-2015	3%	***	***	***
2015-2016	3%	***	***	***

Supervisory Union/District and School Year (Table 5a: Excluded Student Population Data by Racial Group)	Percent of Enrollment-Non-Caucasian	Percent of Students Excluded-Non-Caucasian	Proportional Difference in representation between general and excluded population	Proportional Difference in representation between general and excluded population
LAMOILLE SOUTH SU				
2013-2014	9%	***	***	***
2014-2015	9%	***	***	***
2015-2016	9%	***	***	***
MILTON SD				
2013-2014	4%	***	***	***
2014-2015	4%	***	***	***
2015-2016	5%	***	***	***
MONTPELIER SD				
2013-2014	12%	***	***	***
2014-2015	14%	***	***	***
2015-2016	14%	***	***	***
NORTH COUNTRY SU				
2013-2014	5%	***	***	***
2014-2015	5%	***	***	***
2015-2016	5%	***	***	***
ORANGE EAST SU				
2013-2014	5%	***	***	***
2014-2015	4%	***	***	***
2015-2016	3%	***	***	***
ORANGE NORTH SU				
2013-2014	***	***	***	***
2014-2015	2%	***	***	***
2015-2016	1%	***	***	***
ORANGE SOUTHWEST SU				
2013-2014	5%	***	***	***
2014-2015	7%	***	***	***
2015-2016	6%	***	***	***
ORANGE WINDSOR SU				
2013-2014	3%	***	***	***
2014-2015	3%	***	***	***
2015-2016	4%	***	***	***
ORLEANS CENTRAL SU				
2013-2014	5%	***	***	***
2014-2015	5%	***	***	***
2015-2016	5%	***	***	***

Supervisory Union/District and School Year (Table 5a: Excluded Student Population Data by Racial Group)	Percent of Enrollment-Non-Caucasian	Percent of Students Excluded-Non-Caucasian	Proportional Difference in representation between general and excluded population	Proportional Difference in representation between general and excluded population
ORLEANS SOUTHWEST SU				
2013-2014	6%	***	***	***
2014-2015	6%	***	***	***
2015-2016	7%	***	***	***
RIVENDELL INTERSTATE SD				
2013-2014	5%	***	***	***
2014-2015	5%	***	***	***
2015-2016	5%	***	***	***
RUTLAND CENTRAL SU				
2013-2014	3%	***	***	***
2014-2015	4%	***	***	***
2015-2016	4%	***	***	***
RUTLAND CITY SD				
2013-2014	8%	***	***	***
2014-2015	8%	***	***	***
2015-2016	10%	***	***	***
RUTLAND NORTHEAST SU				
2013-2014	5%	***	***	***
2014-2015	5%	***	***	***
2015-2016	6%	***	***	***
RUTLAND SOUTH SU				
2013-2014	4%	***	***	***
2014-2015	4%	***	***	***
2015-2016	4%	***	***	***
RUTLAND SOUTHWEST SU				
2013-2014	4%	***	***	***
2014-2015	4%	***	***	***
2015-2016	4%	***	***	***
SOUTH BURLINGTON SD				
2013-2014	19%	***	***	***
2014-2015	21%	***	***	***
2015-2016	20%	22%	112%	Slight Overrepresentation
SOUTHWEST VERMONT SU				
2013-2014	4%	***	***	***
2014-2015	4%	***	***	***
2015-2016	5%	7%	157%	Large Overrepresentation

Supervisory Union/District and School Year (Table 5a: Excluded Student Population Data by Racial Group)	Percent of Enrollment-Non-Caucasian	Percent of Students Excluded-Non-Caucasian	Proportional Difference in representation between general and excluded population	Proportional Difference in representation between general and excluded population
SPRINGFIELD SD				
2013-2014	6%	8%	127%	Moderate Overrepresentation
2014-2015	7%	***	***	***
2015-2016	7%	***	***	***
ST JOHNSBURY SD**				
2013-2014	5%	***	***	***
2014-2015	8%	***	***	***
2015-2016	8%	***	***	***
TWO RIVERS SU (BEGAN 2014-2015)				
2014-2015	2%	***	***	***
2015-2016	2%	***	***	***
WASHINGTON CENTRAL SU				
2013-2014	6%	***	***	***
2014-2015	6%	***	***	***
2015-2016	6%	***	***	***
WASHINGTON NORTHEAST SU				
2013-2014	11%	***	***	***
2014-2015	8%	***	***	***
2015-2016	11%	***	***	***
WASHINGTON SOUTH SU				
2013-2014	5%	***	***	***
2014-2015	5%	***	***	***
2015-2016	6%	***	***	***
WASHINGTON WEST SU				
2013-2014	4%	***	***	***
2014-2015	4%	***	***	***
2015-2016	4%	***	***	***
WINDHAM CENTRAL SU				
2013-2014	3%	***	***	***
2014-2015	4%	***	***	***
2015-2016	3%	***	***	***
WINDHAM NORTHEAST SU				
2013-2014	7%	***	***	***
2014-2015	7%	***	***	***
2015-2016	6%	10%	157%	Large Overrepresentation

Supervisory Union/District and School Year (Table 5a: Excluded Student Population Data by Racial Group)	Percent of Enrollment-Non-Caucasian	Percent of Students Excluded-Non-Caucasian	Proportional Difference in representation between general and excluded population	Proportional Difference in representation between general and excluded population
WINDHAM SOUTHEAST SU				
2013-2014	12%	15%	122%	Slight Overrepresentation
2014-2015	13%	12%	92%	Neutral
2015-2016	14%	18%	128%	Moderate Overrepresentation
WINDHAM SOUTHWEST SU				
2013-2014	4%	***	***	***
2014-2015	4%	***	***	***
2015-2016	4%	***	***	***
WINDSOR CENTRAL SU				
2013-2014	6%	***	***	***
2014-2015	6%	***	***	***
2015-2016	6%	***	***	***
WINDSOR NORTHWEST SU				
2013-2014	4%	***	***	***
2014-2015	5%	***	***	***
2015-2016	6%	***	***	***
WINDSOR SOUTHEAST SU				
2013-2014	3%	***	***	***
2014-2015	4%	***	***	***
2015-2016	4%	***	***	***
WINOOSKI SD				
2013-2014	46%	46%	100%	Neutral
2014-2015	48%	43%	91%	Neutral
2015-2016	52%	39%	75%	Slight Underrepresentation

**SU011 St. Johnsbury SD and SU055 Dresden SD did not report any exclusions in 2016.

Data Point 6- 4.xii- Number of exclusions and length of exclusions for students in Vermont by free and reduced lunch (FRL) status

Finding 6-4.xii: In SY2016, students who are not eligible for free and reduced price lunch experienced a moderate underrepresentation in that they are excluded from school in much smaller percentage than their enrollment in the K-12 student population would suggest. Conversely, students who do qualify for free and reduced price lunch are excluded at rates that result in a large overrepresentation in terms of exclusion. This overrepresentation has been consistent over the last number of years.

Virtually all school systems have reportable data for students who benefit from the free and reduced price lunch program, a proxy for indicating family poverty.

The vast majority of SU/SD, although not all, show overrepresentation in suspension rates for students who are eligible for free and reduced price lunch.

**Table 6 – Excluded Student Population Data by Free and Reduced Lunch Status
Students Experiencing at Least One Exclusionary Action School Years 2014-2016**

School Year	Total	Not Eligible for Free and Reduced Lunch	Not Eligible for Free and Reduced Lunch	Free and Reduced Lunch Eligible	Free and Reduced Lunch Eligible
Enrollment	Enrollment	Enrollment	Percent of Enrollment	Enrollment	Percent of Enrollment
2014	78,867	47,524	60.3%	31,343	39.7%
2015	77,763	46,610	59.9%	31,153	40.1%
2016	77,145	46,981	60.9%	30,164	39.1%
Exclusions	Exclusions	Exclusions	Percent of Students Excluded	Excluded	Percent of Students Excluded
2014	4,246	1,491	35.1%	2,755	64.9%
2015	3,726	1,285	34.5%	2,441	65.5%
2016	3,616	1,373	38.0%	2,243	62.0%
	Comparison of Excluded Students	Proportional Difference in representation between general and excluded population: (percent of Exclusions/percent of Enrollment)	Proportional Difference in representation between general and excluded population: (percent of Exclusions/percent of Enrollment)	Proportional Difference in representation between general and excluded population: (percent of Exclusions/percent of Enrollment)	Proportional Difference in representation between general and excluded population: (percent of Exclusions/percent of Enrollment)
2014	Comparison of Excluded Students	58.3%	Moderate Underrepresentation	163.3%	Large Overrepresentation
2015	Comparison of Excluded Students	57.5%	Moderate Underrepresentation	163.5%	Large Overrepresentation
2016	Comparison of Excluded Students	62.4%	Moderate Underrepresentation	158.6%	Large Overrepresentation

**Table 6a: Excluded Student Population Data by Free and Reduced Lunch Status
Students Experiencing at Least One Exclusionary Action School Years 2014-2016;
by Supervisory Union or Supervisory District**

Supervisory Union/District and School Year (Table 6a: Excluded Student Population Data by Free and Reduced Lunch Status)	Percent of Enrollment - FRL Eligible	Percent of Students Excluded-FRL Eligible	Proportional Difference in representation between general and excluded population	Proportional Difference in representation between general and excluded population
ADDISON CENTRAL SU				
2013-2014	35%	70%	200%	Large Overrepresentation
2014-2015	35%	71%	205%	Large Overrepresentation
2015-2016	34%	55%	160%	Large Overrepresentation
ADDISON NORTHEAST SU				
2013-2014	40%	75%	185%	Large Overrepresentation
2014-2015	38%	57%	151%	Large Overrepresentation
2015-2016	33%	59%	178%	Large Overrepresentation
ADDISON NORTHWEST SU				
2013-2014	38%	55%	146%	Moderate Overrepresentation
2014-2015	38%	55%	146%	Moderate Overrepresentation
2015-2016	37%	75%	200%	Large Overrepresentation
ADDISON RUTLAND SU				
2013-2014	50%	74%	147%	Moderate Overrepresentation
2014-2015	51%	79%	155%	Large Overrepresentation
2015-2016	46%	70%	152%	Large Overrepresentation
BARRE SU				
2013-2014	47%	59%	125%	Moderate Overrepresentation
2014-2015	47%	69%	148%	Moderate Overrepresentation
2015-2016	46%	66%	143%	Moderate Overrepresentation
BATTENKILL VALLEY SU				
2013-2014	50%	***	***	***
2014-2015	50%	***	***	***
2015-2016	47%	63%	133%	Moderate Overrepresentation

Supervisory Union/District and School Year (Table 6a: Excluded Student Population Data by Free and Reduced Lunch Status)	Percent of Enrollment - FRL Eligible	Percent of Students Excluded-FRL Eligible	Proportional Difference in representation between general and excluded population	Proportional Difference in representation between general and excluded population
BENNINGTON RUTLAND SU				
2013-2014	35%	44%	126%	Moderate Overrepresentation
2014-2015	37%	56%	152%	Large Overrepresentation
2015-2016	37%	36%	100%	Neutral
BLUE MOUNTAIN SD				
2013-2014	57%	***	***	***
2014-2015	73%	***	***	***
2015-2016	50%	60%	119%	Slight Overrepresentation
BURLINGTON SD				
2013-2014	44%	79%	178%	Large Overrepresentation
2014-2015	48%	80%	169%	Large Overrepresentation
2015-2016	45%	73%	163%	Large Overrepresentation
CALEDONIA CENTRAL SU				
2013-2014	40%	68%	168%	Large Overrepresentation
2014-2015	40%	***	***	***
2015-2016	41%	47%	114%	Slight Overrepresentation
CALEDONIA NORTH SU				
2013-2014	58%	***	***	***
2014-2015	58%	72%	125%	Slight Overrepresentation
2015-2016	51%	74%	144%	Moderate Overrepresentation
CHITTENDEN CENTRAL SU				
2013-2014	21%	47%	225%	Large Overrepresentation
2014-2015	20%	49%	239%	Large Overrepresentation
2015-2016	22%	45%	198%	Large Overrepresentation
CHITTENDEN EAST SU				
2013-2014	19%	43%	233%	Large Overrepresentation
2014-2015	17%	***	***	***
2015-2016	15%	14%	89%	Slight Underrepresentation

Supervisory Union/District and School Year (Table 6a: Excluded Student Population Data by Free and Reduced Lunch Status)	Percent of Enrollment - FRL Eligible	Percent of Students Excluded-FRL Eligible	Proportional Difference in representation between general and excluded population	Proportional Difference in representation between general and excluded population
CHITTENDEN SOUTH SU				
2013-2014	15%	50%	342%	Large Overrepresentation
2014-2015	14%	45%	334%	Large Overrepresentation
2015-2016	14%	43%	299%	Large Overrepresentation
COLCHESTER SD				
2013-2014	29%	52%	180%	Large Overrepresentation
2014-2015	28%	46%	163%	Large Overrepresentation
2015-2016	29%	60%	208%	Large Overrepresentation
ESSEX CALEDONIA SU				
2013-2014	54%	64%	119%	Slight Overrepresentation
2014-2015	57%	***	***	***
2015-2016	66%	81%	122%	Slight Overrepresentation
ESSEX NORTH SU				
2013-2014	43%	***	***	***
2014-2015	46%	***	***	***
2015-2016	45%	56%	126%	Moderate Overrepresentation
ESSEX TOWN SD				
2013-2014	24%	48%	199%	Large Overrepresentation
2014-2015	22%	***	***	***
2015-2016	19%	29%	154%	Large Overrepresentation
FRANKLIN CENTRAL SU				
2013-2014	37%	66%	175%	Large Overrepresentation
2014-2015	41%	67%	165%	Large Overrepresentation
2015-2016	37%	57%	153%	Large Overrepresentation
FRANKLIN NORTHEAST SU				
2013-2014	55%	70%	128%	Moderate Overrepresentation
2014-2015	62%	81%	131%	Moderate Overrepresentation
2015-2016	61%	75%	122%	Slight Overrepresentation

Supervisory Union/District and School Year (Table 6a: Excluded Student Population Data by Free and Reduced Lunch Status)	Percent of Enrollment - FRL Eligible	Percent of Students Excluded-FRL Eligible	Proportional Difference in representation between general and excluded population	Proportional Difference in representation between general and excluded population
FRANKLIN NORTHWEST SU				
2013-2014	48%	70%	145%	Moderate Overrepresentation
2014-2015	48%	60%	124%	Slight Overrepresentation
2015-2016	47%	67%	141%	Moderate Overrepresentation
FRANKLIN WEST SU				
2013-2014	24%	41%	171%	Large Overrepresentation
2014-2015	25%	51%	203%	Large Overrepresentation
2015-2016	24%	59%	243%	Large Overrepresentation
GRAND ISLE SU				
2013-2014	43%	***	***	***
2014-2015	48%	***	***	***
2015-2016	46%	67%	146%	Moderate Overrepresentation
HARTFORD SD				
2013-2014	31%	49%	160%	Large Overrepresentation
2014-2015	33%	49%	148%	Moderate Overrepresentation
2015-2016	32%	46%	142%	Moderate Overrepresentation
LAMOILLE NORTH SU				
2013-2014	48%	74%	154%	Large Overrepresentation
2014-2015	48%	70%	144%	Moderate Overrepresentation
2015-2016	46%	72%	157%	Large Overrepresentation
LAMOILLE SOUTH SU				
2013-2014	32%	***	***	***
2014-2015	30%	***	***	***
2015-2016	29%	61%	210%	Large Overrepresentation
MILTON SD				
2013-2014	36%	61%	169%	Large Overrepresentation
2014-2015	38%	***	***	***
2015-2016	33%	58%	178%	Large Overrepresentation

Supervisory Union/District and School Year (Table 6a: Excluded Student Population Data by Free and Reduced Lunch Status)	Percent of Enrollment - FRL Eligible	Percent of Students Excluded-FRL Eligible	Proportional Difference in representation between general and excluded population	Proportional Difference in representation between general and excluded population
MONTPELIER SD				
2013-2014	26%	50%	195%	Large Overrepresentation
2014-2015	23%	***	***	***
2015-2016	22%	60%	275%	Large Overrepresentation
NORTH COUNTRY SU				
2013-2014	55%	75%	136%	Moderate Overrepresentation
2014-2015	58%	71%	123%	Slight Overrepresentation
2015-2016	55%	83%	153%	Large Overrepresentation
ORANGE EAST SU				
2013-2014	50%	67%	134%	Moderate Overrepresentation
2014-2015	46%	65%	141%	Moderate Overrepresentation
2015-2016	45%	55%	122%	Slight Overrepresentation
ORANGE NORTH SU				
2013-2014	48%	70%	145%	Moderate Overrepresentation
2014-2015	48%	79%	162%	Large Overrepresentation
2015-2016	48%	62%	128%	Moderate Overrepresentation
ORANGE SOUTHWEST SU				
2013-2014	48%	55%	114%	Slight Overrepresentation
2014-2015	48%	54%	112%	Slight Overrepresentation
2015-2016	46%	53%	117%	Slight Overrepresentation
ORANGE WINDSOR SU				
2013-2014	48%	68%	142%	Moderate Overrepresentation
2014-2015	48%	***	***	***
2015-2016	45%	72%	158%	Large Overrepresentation
ORLEANS CENTRAL SU				
2013-2014	62%	***	***	***
2014-2015	61%	***	***	***
2015-2016	62%	73%	117%	Slight Overrepresentation

Supervisory Union/District and School Year (Table 6a: Excluded Student Population Data by Free and Reduced Lunch Status)	Percent of Enrollment - FRL Eligible	Percent of Students Excluded-FRL Eligible	Proportional Difference in representation between general and excluded population	Proportional Difference in representation between general and excluded population
ORLEANS SOUTHWEST SU				
2013-2014	55%	70%	127%	Moderate Overrepresentation
2014-2015	54%	70%	130%	Moderate Overrepresentation
2015-2016	56%	79%	141%	Moderate Overrepresentation
RIVENDELL INTERSTATE SD				
2013-2014	42%	***	***	***
2014-2015	34%	***	***	***
2015-2016	34%	***	***	***
RUTLAND CENTRAL SU				
2013-2014	41%	48%	118%	Slight Overrepresentation
2014-2015	46%	53%	116%	Slight Overrepresentation
2015-2016	42%	65%	155%	Large Overrepresentation
RUTLAND CITY SD				
2013-2014	50%	77%	156%	Large Overrepresentation
2014-2015	40%	71%	178%	Large Overrepresentation
2015-2016	42%	71%	169%	Large Overrepresentation
RUTLAND NORTHEAST SU				
2013-2014	42%	66%	157%	Moderate Overrepresentation
2014-2015	44%	70%	158%	Large Overrepresentation
2015-2016	44%	65%	147%	Moderate Overrepresentation
RUTLAND SOUTH SU				
2013-2014	37%	44%	118%	Slight Overrepresentation
2014-2015	38%	44%	115%	Slight Overrepresentation
2015-2016	38%	33%	88%	Slight Underrepresentation

Supervisory Union/District and School Year (Table 6a: Excluded Student Population Data by Free and Reduced Lunch Status)	Percent of Enrollment - FRL Eligible	Percent of Students Excluded-FRL Eligible	Proportional Difference in representation between general and excluded population	Proportional Difference in representation between general and excluded population
RUTLAND SOUTHWEST SU				
2013-2014	46%	64%	139%	Moderate Overrepresentation
2014-2015	44%	***	***	***
2015-2016	41%	67%	162%	Large Overrepresentation
SOUTH BURLINGTON SD				
2013-2014	20%	***	***	***
2014-2015	21%	***	***	***
2015-2016	16%	41%	253%	Large Overrepresentation
SOUTHWEST VERMONT SU				
2013-2014	55%	73%	132%	Moderate Overrepresentation
2014-2015	58%	76%	132%	Moderate Overrepresentation
2015-2016	59%	74%	125%	
SPRINGFIELD SD				
2013-2014	52%	66%	127%	Moderate Overrepresentation
2014-2015	52%	69%	131%	Moderate Overrepresentation
2015-2016	45%	69%	154%	Large Overrepresentation
ST JOHNSBURY SD				
2013-2014	68%	***	***	***
2014-2015	67%	69%	102%	Neutral
2015-2016	64%	NA	NA	0
TWO RIVERS SU (BEGAN SY1415)				
2014-2015	50%	67%	134%	Moderate Overrepresentation
2015-2016	48%	54%	111%	Slight Overrepresentation
WASHINGTON CENTRAL SU				
2013-2014	30%	58%	191%	Large Overrepresentation
2014-2015	34%	56%	165%	Large Overrepresentation
2015-2016	29%	43%	148%	Moderate Overrepresentation

Supervisory Union/District and School Year (Table 6a: Excluded Student Population Data by Free and Reduced Lunch Status)	Percent of Enrollment - FRL Eligible	Percent of Students Excluded-FRL Eligible	Proportional Difference in representation between general and excluded population	Proportional Difference in representation between general and excluded population
WASHINGTON NORTHEAST SU				
2013-2014	50%	***	***	***
2014-2015	48%	***	***	***
2015-2016	38%	50%	130%	Moderate Overrepresentation
WASHINGTON SOUTH SU				
2013-2014	42%	43%	102%	Neutral
2014-2015	40%	***	***	***
2015-2016	40%	87%	217%	Large Overrepresentation
WASHINGTON WEST SU				
2013-2014	24%	41%	169%	Large Overrepresentation
2014-2015	24%	33%	141%	Moderate Overrepresentation
2015-2016	22%	39%	178%	Large Overrepresentation
WINDHAM CENTRAL SU				
2013-2014	46%	***	***	***
2014-2015	45%	70%	155%	Large Overrepresentation
2015-2016	45%	74%	165%	Large Overrepresentation
WINDHAM NORTHEAST SU				
2013-2014	53%	76%	144%	Moderate Overrepresentation
2014-2015	53%	78%	148%	Moderate Overrepresentation
2015-2016	50%	64%	128%	Moderate Overrepresentation
WINDHAM SOUTHEAST SU				
2013-2014	46%	65%	143%	Moderate Overrepresentation
2014-2015	45%	67%	148%	Moderate Overrepresentation
2015-2016	44%	57%	128%	Moderate Overrepresentation
WINDHAM SOUTHWEST SU				
2013-2014	50%	69%	139%	Moderate Overrepresentation
2014-2015	48%	***	***	***
2015-2016	48%	48%	101%	Neutral

Supervisory Union/District and School Year (Table 6a: Excluded Student Population Data by Free and Reduced Lunch Status)	Percent of Enrollment - FRL Eligible	Percent of Students Excluded-FRL Eligible	Proportional Difference in representation between general and excluded population	Proportional Difference in representation between general and excluded population
WINDSOR CENTRAL SU				
2013-2014	26%	***	***	***
2014-2015	25%	***	***	***
2015-2016	27%	50%	187%	Large Overrepresentation
WINDSOR NORTHWEST SU				
2013-2014	52%	***	***	***
2014-2015	52%	52%	100%	Neutral
2015-2016	47%	71%	151%	Large Overrepresentation
WINDSOR SOUTHEAST SU				
2013-2014	44%	71%	162%	Large Overrepresentation
2014-2015	45%	70%	156%	Large Overrepresentation
2015-2016	40%	53%	130%	Moderate Overrepresentation
WINOOSKI SD				
2013-2014	82%	***	***	***
2014-2015	76%	70%	92%	Neutral
2015-2016	55%	70%	127%	Moderate Overrepresentation

Data Point 6- 4.xiii- Number of exclusions and length of exclusions for students in Vermont by section 504 status

Finding 6-4.xiii: In SY2016, students who are not eligible for 504 Plans were excluded from school in proportion to their population. Conversely, students who are eligible for 504 Plans were excluded from school at rates that resulted in a large overrepresentation in terms of exclusion. This dichotomy is largely reflective of the very small number of students who are 504 Plan eligible in Vermont.

**Table 7 – Excluded Student Population Data by 504 Status
Students Experiencing at Least One Exclusionary Action School Years 2014-2016**

School Year	Total	Not Eligible for 504	Not Eligible for 504	Eligible for 504	Eligible for 504
Enrollment	Enrollment	Enrollment	Percent of Enrollment	Enrollment	Percent of Enrollment
2014	78,867	75,281	95.5%	3,586	4.6%
2015	77,763	74,227	95.5%	3,536	4.6%
2016	77,145	73,904	95.8%	3,241	4.2%
Exclusions	Exclusions	Exclusions	Percent of Student Excluded	Excluded	Percent of Students Excluded
2014	4,246	3,849	90.7%	397	9.3%
2015	3,726	3,416	91.7%	310	8.3%
2016	3,616	3,245	89.7%	371	10.3%
	Comparison of Excluded Students	Proportional Difference in representation between general and excluded population: (percent of Exclusions/percent of Enrollment)	Proportional Difference in representation between general and excluded population: (percent of Exclusions/percent of Enrollment)	Proportional Difference in representation between general and excluded population: (percent of Exclusions/percent of Enrollment)	Proportional Difference in representation between general and excluded population: (percent of Exclusions/percent of Enrollment)
2014	Comparison of Excluded Students	95.0%	Neutral	204.4%	Large Overrepresentation
2015	Comparison of Excluded Students	96.1%	Neutral	182.4%	Large Overrepresentation
2016	Comparison of Excluded Students	94.8%	Neutral	200.0%	Large Overrepresentation

Due to the relatively small numbers of students with 504 plans, this data cannot be disaggregated to Supervisory Unions or Districts.

Data Point 6- 4.xiv- Number of exclusions and length of exclusions for students in Vermont by IEP status

Finding 6-4.xiv: In SY2016, students who do not have an IEP experienced slight underrepresentation in that they are excluded from school in smaller percentage than their enrollment in the wider K-12 population would suggest. Conversely, students who do have IEPs were excluded at rates that result in a large overrepresentation in terms of exclusion. This overrepresentation has been consistent over the last three years.

Virtually all school systems have reportable data for students who have Individualized Education Plans (IEPs). The majority of SU/SDs show overrepresentation of exclusion among their IEP populations.

**Table 8 – Excluded Student Population Data by IEP Status
Students Experiencing at Least One Exclusionary Action school years 2014-2016**

School Year	Total	Not Active IEP	Not Active IEP	Active IEP	Active IEP
Enrollment	Enrollment	Enrollment	Percent of Enrollment	Enrollment	Percent of Enrollment
2014	78,867	64,876	82.3%	12,110	15.4%
2015	77,763	63,681	81.9%	12,176	15.7%
2016	77,145	64,879	84.1%	12,266	15.9%
Exclusions		Exclusions	Percent of Students Excluded	Excluded	Percent of Students Excluded
2014	4,246	2,966	69.9%	1,280	30.0%
2015	3,726	2,476	66.5%	1,250	33.5%
2016	3,616	2,432	67.3%	1,184	32.7%
	Comparison of Excluded Students	Proportional Difference in representation between general and excluded population: (percent of Exclusions/ percent of Enrollment)	Proportional Difference in representation between general and excluded population: (percent of Exclusions/ percent of Enrollment)	Proportional Difference in representation between general and excluded population: (percent of Exclusions/ percent of Enrollment)	Proportional Difference in representation between general and excluded population: (percent of Exclusions/ percent of Enrollment)
2014	Comparison of Excluded Students	84.9%	Slight Underrepresentation	195.4%	Large Overrepresentation
2015	Comparison of Excluded Students	81.2%	Slight Underrepresentation	213.9%	Large Overrepresentation
2016	Comparison of Excluded Students	81.9%	Slight Underrepresentation	247.4%	Large Overrepresentation

**Table 8a: Excluded Student Population Data by IEP Status
Students Experiencing at Least One Exclusionary Action School Years 2014-2016;
by Supervisory Union or Supervisory District**

Supervisory Union/District and School Year (Table 8a: Excluded Student Population Data by IEP Status)	Percent of Enrollment-IEP Eligible	Percent of Students Excluded- IEP Eligible	Proportional Difference in representation between general and excluded population	Proportional Difference in representation between general and excluded population
ADDISON CENTRAL SU				
2013-2014	15%	32%	216%	Large Overrepresentation
2014-2015	14%	35%	242%	Large Overrepresentation
2015-2016	12%	29%	242%	Large Overrepresentation
ADDISON NORTHEAST SU				
2013-2014	15%	30%	199%	Large Overrepresentation
2014-2015	15%	35%	244%	Large Overrepresentation
2015-2016	11%	27%	231%	Large Overrepresentation
ADDISON NORTHWEST SU				
2013-2014	17%	***	***	***
2014-2015	18%	48%	263%	Large Overrepresentation
2015-2016	14%	46%	323%	Large Overrepresentation
ADDISON RUTLAND SU				
2013-2014	19%	31%	165%	Large Overrepresentation
2014-2015	21%	26%	126%	Moderate Overrepresentation
2015-2016	16%	27%	165%	Large Overrepresentation
BARRE SU				
2013-2014	24%	35%	145%	Moderate Overrepresentation
2014-2015	25%	52%	208%	Large Overrepresentation
2015-2016	20%	38%	187%	Large Overrepresentation
BATTENKILL VALLEY SU				
2013-2014	23%	***	***	***
2014-2015	20%	***	***	***
2015-2016	18%	21%	115%	Slight Overrepresentation

Supervisory Union/District and School Year (Table 8a: Excluded Student Population Data by IEP Status)	Percent of Enrollment-IEP Eligible	Percent of Students Excluded- IEP Eligible	Proportional Difference in representation between general and excluded population	Proportional Difference in representation between general and excluded population
BENNINGTON RUTLAND SU				
2013-2014	36%	44%	125%	Slight Overrepresentation
2014-2015	34%	44%	129%	Moderate Overrepresentation
2015-2016	15%	18%	125%	Slight Overrepresentation
BLUE MOUNTAIN SD				
2013-2014	25%	***	***	***
2014-2015	23%	***	***	***
2015-2016	16%	30%	184%	Large Overrepresentation
BURLINGTON SD				
2013-2014	19%	28%	145%	Moderate Overrepresentation
2014-2015	13%	29%	221%	Large Overrepresentation
2015-2016	11%	28%	264%	Large Overrepresentation
CALEDONIA CENTRAL SU				
2013-2014	19%	***	***	***
2014-2015	19%	***	***	***
2015-2016	13%	33%	258%	Large Overrepresentation
CALEDONIA NORTH SU				
2013-2014	32%	***	***	***
2014-2015	33%	26%	79%	Slight Underrepresentation
2015-2016	18%	47%	264%	Large Overrepresentation
CHITTENDEN CENTRAL SU				
2013-2014	13%	36%	279%	Large Overrepresentation
2014-2015	13%	49%	365%	Large Overrepresentation
2015-2016	12%	38%	309%	Large Overrepresentation
CHITTENDEN EAST SU				
2013-2014	15%	27%	182%	Large Overrepresentation
2014-2015	16%	***	***	***
2015-2016	12%	21%	168%	Large Overrepresentation

Supervisory Union/District and School Year (Table 8a: Excluded Student Population Data by IEP Status)	Percent of Enrollment-IEP Eligible	Percent of Students Excluded- IEP Eligible	Proportional Difference in representation between general and excluded population	Proportional Difference in representation between general and excluded population
CHITTENDEN SOUTH SU				
2013-2014	14%	20%	149%	Moderate Overrepresentation
2014-2015	14%	48%	349%	Large Overrepresentation
2015-2016	11%	45%	415%	Large Overrepresentation
COLCHESTER SD				
2013-2014	15%	34%	226%	Large Overrepresentation
2014-2015	16%	41%	256%	Large Overrepresentation
2015-2016	13%	27%	204%	Large Overrepresentation
ESSEX CALEDONIA SU				
2013-2014	26%	***	***	***
2014-2015	25%	31%	125%	Slight Overrepresentation
2015-2016	14%	29%	204%	Large Overrepresentation
ESSEX NORTH SU				
2013-2014	18%	***	***	***
2014-2015	14%	***	***	***
2015-2016	12%	13%	102%	Neutral
ESSEX TOWN SD				
2013-2014	19%	41%	214%	Large Overrepresentation
2014-2015	20%	48%	239%	Large Overrepresentation
2015-2016	16%	53%	333%	Large Overrepresentation
FRANKLIN CENTRAL SU				
2013-2014	19%	37%	192%	Large Overrepresentation
2014-2015	20%	44%	217%	Large Overrepresentation
2015-2016	17%	43%	258%	Large Overrepresentation

Supervisory Union/District and School Year (Table 8a: Excluded Student Population Data by IEP Status)	Percent of Enrollment-IEP Eligible	Percent of Students Excluded- IEP Eligible	Proportional Difference in representation between general and excluded population	Proportional Difference in representation between general and excluded population
FRANKLIN NORTHEAST SU				
2013-2014	19%	26%	137%	Large Overrepresentation
2014-2015	19%	29%	156%	Large Overrepresentation
2015-2016	15%	21%	140%	Moderate Overrepresentation
FRANKLIN NORTHWEST SU				
2013-2014	20%	26%	135%	Moderate Overrepresentation
2014-2015	21%	31%	150%	Moderate Overrepresentation
2015-2016	16%	31%	195%	Large Overrepresentation
FRANKLIN WEST SU				
2013-2014	20%	36%	178%	Large Overrepresentation
2014-2015	21%	41%	197%	Large Overrepresentation
2015-2016	16%	22%	141%	Moderate Overrepresentation
GRAND ISLE SU				
2013-2014	32%	42%	130%	Moderate Overrepresentation
2014-2015	27%	***	***	***
2015-2016	14%	14%	100%	Neutral
HARTFORD SD				
2013-2014	24%	31%	131%	Moderate Overrepresentation
2014-2015	24%	32%	133%	Moderate Overrepresentation
2015-2016	21%	36%	173%	Large Overrepresentation
LAMOILLE NORTH SU				
2013-2014	20%	35%	176%	Large Overrepresentation
2014-2015	20%	23%	116%	Slight Overrepresentation
2015-2016	15%	41%	270%	Large Overrepresentation

Supervisory Union/District and School Year (Table 8a: Excluded Student Population Data by IEP Status)	Percent of Enrollment- IEP Eligible	Percent of Students Excluded- IEP Eligible	Proportional Difference in representation between general and excluded population	Proportional Difference in representation between general and excluded population
LAMOILLE SOUTH SU				
2013-2014	14%	***	***	***
2014-2015	15%	***	***	***
2015-2016	13%	29%	228%	Large Overrepresentation
MILTON SD				
2013-2014	17%	***	***	***
2014-2015	20%	***	***	***
2015-2016	15%	34%	224%	Large Overrepresentation
MONTPELIER SD				
2013-2014	15%	46%	300%	Large Overrepresentation
2014-2015	14%	***	***	***
2015-2016	11%	0%	0%	Large Underrepresentation
NORTH COUNTRY SU				
2013-2014	26%	48%	184%	Large Overrepresentation
2014-2015	27%	38%	142%	Moderate Overrepresentation
2015-2016	21%	44%	206%	Large Overrepresentation
ORANGE EAST SU				
2013-2014	24%	***	***	***
2014-2015	25%	***	***	***
2015-2016	17%	14%	83%	Slight Underrepresentation
ORANGE NORTH SU				
2013-2014	26%	33%	125%	Slight Overrepresentation
2014-2015	24%	38%	159%	Large Overrepresentation
2015-2016	17%	31%	183%	Large Overrepresentation
ORANGE SOUTHWEST SU				
2013-2014	18%	18%	105%	Neutral
2014-2015	18%	37%	201%	Large Overrepresentation
2015-2016	16%	24%	149%	Moderate Overrepresentation

Supervisory Union/District and School Year (Table 8a: Excluded Student Population Data by IEP Status)	Percent of Enrollment-IEP Eligible	Percent of Students Excluded- IEP Eligible	Proportional Difference in representation between general and excluded population	Proportional Difference in representation between general and excluded population
ORANGE WINDSOR SU				
2013-2014	23%	38%	162%	Large Overrepresentation
2014-2015	25%	***	***	***
2015-2016	16%	31%	187%	Large Overrepresentation
ORLEANS CENTRAL SU				
2013-2014	20%	33%	162%	Large Overrepresentation
2014-2015	22%	43%	194%	Large Overrepresentation
2015-2016	19%	31%	160%	Large Overrepresentation
ORLEANS SOUTHWEST SU				
2013-2014	19%	25%	132%	Moderate Overrepresentation
2014-2015	21%	42%	197%	Large Overrepresentation
2015-2016	16%	42%	267%	Large Overrepresentation
RIVENDELL INTERSTATE SD				
2013-2014	17%	42%	248%	Large Overrepresentation
2014-2015	16%	***	***	***
2015-2016	16%	***	***	***
RUTLAND CENTRAL SU				
2013-2014	20%	***	***	***
2014-2015	20%	42%	209%	Large Overrepresentation
2015-2016	15%	29%	189%	Large Overrepresentation
RUTLAND CITY SD				
2013-2014	19%	28%	151%	Large Overrepresentation
2014-2015	19%	37%	194%	Large Overrepresentation
2015-2016	16%	24%	150%	Moderate Overrepresentation

Supervisory Union/District and School Year (Table 8a: Excluded Student Population Data by IEP Status)	Percent of Enrollment-IEP Eligible	Percent of Students Excluded- IEP Eligible	Proportional Difference in representation between general and excluded population	Proportional Difference in representation between general and excluded population
RUTLAND NORTHEAST SU				
2013-2014	18%	47%	262%	Large Overrepresentation
2014-2015	21%	36%	166%	Large Overrepresentation
2015-2016	14%	29%	206%	Large Overrepresentation
RUTLAND SOUTH SU				
2013-2014	14%	25%	178%	Large Overrepresentation
2014-2015	14%	29%	210%	Large Overrepresentation
2015-2016	14%	29%	200%	Large Overrepresentation
RUTLAND SOUTHWEST SU				
2013-2014	25%	31%	121%	Slight Overrepresentation
2014-2015	28%	***	***	***
2015-2016	20%	44%	227%	Large Overrepresentation
SOUTH BURLINGTON SD				
2013-2014	12%	***	***	***
2014-2015	13%	***	***	***
2015-2016	9%	76%	828%	Large Overrepresentation
SOUTHWEST VERMONT SU				
2013-2014	24%	36%	150%	Moderate Overrepresentation
2014-2015	25%	42%	166%	Large Overrepresentation
2015-2016	20%	38%	191%	Large Overrepresentation
SPRINGFIELD SD				
2013-2014	19%	17%	85%	Slight Underrepresentation
2014-2015	21%	10%	48%	Large Underrepresentation
2015-2016	17%	17%	96%	Neutral

Supervisory Union/District and School Year (Table 8a: Excluded Student Population Data by IEP Status)	Percent of Enrollment-IEP Eligible	Percent of Students Excluded- IEP Eligible	Proportional Difference in representation between general and excluded population	Proportional Difference in representation between general and excluded population
ST JOHNSBURY SD				
2013-2014	36%	27%	76%	Slight Underrepresentation
2014-2015	34%	27%	80%	Slight Underrepresentation
2015-2016	20%	***	***	***
TWO RIVERS SU (BEGAN 2014-2015)				
2014-2015	25%	41%	164%	Large Overrepresentation
2015-2016	19%	33%	174%	Large Overrepresentation
WASHINGTON CENTRAL SU				
2013-2014	15%	19%	130%	Moderate Overrepresentation
2014-2015	16%	26%	162%	Large Overrepresentation
2015-2016	13%	42%	321%	Large Overrepresentation
WASHINGTON NORTHEAST SU				
2013-2014	16%	***	***	***
2014-2015	17%	***	***	***
2015-2016	14%	25%	183%	Large Overrepresentation
WASHINGTON SOUTH SU				
2013-2014	27%	***	***	***
2014-2015	25%	***	***	***
2015-2016	18%	20%	112%	Slight Overrepresentation
WASHINGTON WEST SU				
2013-2014	16%	28%	176%	Large Overrepresentation
2014-2015	16%	31%	191%	Large Overrepresentation
2015-2016	13%	43%	335%	Large Overrepresentation
WINDHAM CENTRAL SU				
2013-2014	20%	***	***	***
2014-2015	22%	46%	210%	Large Overrepresentation
2015-2016	15%	42%	280%	Large Overrepresentation

Supervisory Union/District and School Year (Table 8a: Excluded Student Population Data by IEP Status)	Percent of Enrollment-IEP Eligible	Percent of Students Excluded- IEP Eligible	Proportional Difference in representation between general and excluded population	Proportional Difference in representation between general and excluded population
WINDHAM NORTHEAST SU				
2013-2014	27%	20%	74%	Moderate Underrepresentation
2014-2015	25%	25%	99%	Neutral
2015-2016	18%	25%	138%	Moderate Overrepresentation
WINDHAM SOUTHEAST SU				
2013-2014	21%	33%	155%	Large Overrepresentation
2014-2015	20%	36%	178%	Large Overrepresentation
2015-2016	16%	38%	240%	Large Overrepresentation
WINDHAM SOUTHWEST SU				
2013-2014	19%	31%	159%	Large Overrepresentation
2014-2015	19%	28%	149%	Moderate Overrepresentation
2015-2016	14%	12%	89%	Slight Underrepresentation
WINDSOR CENTRAL SU				
2013-2014	12%	***	***	***
2014-2015	13%	***	***	***
2015-2016	14%	26%	195%	Large Overrepresentation
WINDSOR NORTHWEST SU				
2013-2014	21%	***	***	***
2014-2015	20%	***	***	***
2015-2016	13%	24%	182%	Large Overrepresentation
WINDSOR SOUTHEAST SU				
2013-2014	18%	27%	149%	Moderate Overrepresentation
2014-2015	18%	27%	148%	Moderate Overrepresentation
2015-2016	12%	19%	152%	Large Overrepresentation
WINOOSKI SD				
2013-2014	23%	46%	198%	Large Overrepresentation
2014-2015	26%	37%	143%	Moderate Overrepresentation
2015-2016	18%	37%	210%	Large Overrepresentation

Data Point 6- 4.xv- Number of exclusions and length of exclusions for students in Vermont by gender

Finding 6-4.xv: in SY2016, female students were excluded from school in lower proportion to their population which means they are moderately underrepresented in terms of exclusionary discipline. Conversely, male students were excluded from school at rates that resulted in a moderate overrepresentation in terms of exclusion. The rates of exclusion and relative overrepresentation have been consistent over the last number of years.

Virtually all school systems have reportable data for students who are male and in every system with reportable data males are suspended in proportionally greater numbers than their percent of the enrollment.

**Table 9 – Excluded Student Population Data by Gender
Students Experiencing at Least One Exclusionary Action School Years 2014-2016**

School Year	Total	Female	Female	Male	Male
Enrollment	Enrollment	Enrollment	Percent of Enrollment	Enrollment	Percent of Enrollment
2014	78,867	38,202	48.4%	40665	51.6%
2015	77,763	37,693	48.5%	40070	51.5%
2016	77,145	37,415	48.5%	39730	51.5%
Exclusions	Exclusions	Exclusions	Percent of Students Excluded	Excluded	Percent of Student Excluded
2014	4,246	1,149	27.1%	3101	73.0%
2015	3,726	993	26.7%	2,736	73.4%
2016	3,616	874	24.2%	2,742	75.8%
	Comparison of Excluded Students	Proportional Difference in representation between general and excluded population: (percent of Exclusions/ percent of Enrollment)	Proportional Difference in representation between general and excluded population: (percent of Exclusions/ percent of Enrollment)	Proportional Difference in representation between general and excluded population: (percent of Exclusions/ percent of Enrollment)	Proportional Difference in representation between general and excluded population: (percent of Exclusions/ percent of Enrollment)
2014	Comparison of Excluded Students	55.9%	Moderate Underrepresentation	141.6%	Moderate Overrepresentation
2015	Comparison of Excluded Students	55.0%	Moderate Underrepresentation	142.5%	Moderate Overrepresentation
2016	Comparison of Excluded Students	49.9%	Moderate Underrepresentation	147.1%	Moderate Overrepresentation

**Table 9a: Excluded Student Population Data by Males
Students Experiencing at Least One Exclusionary Action School Years 2014-2016;
by Supervisory Union or Supervisory District**

Supervisory Union/District and School Year (Table 9a: Excluded Student Population Data by Males)	Percent of Enrollment-Males	Percent of Students Excluded-Males	Proportional Difference in representation between general and excluded population	Proportional Difference in representation between general and excluded population
ADDISON CENTRAL SU				
2013-2014	53%	70%	132%	Moderate Overrepresentation
2014-2015	51%	66%	130%	Moderate Overrepresentation
2015-2016	51%	78%	154%	Large Overrepresentation
ADDISON NORTHEAST SU				
2013-2014	53%	71%	134%	Moderate Overrepresentation
2014-2015	54%	80%	149%	Moderate Overrepresentation
2015-2016	53%	77%	144%	Moderate Overrepresentation
ADDISON NORTHWEST SU				
2013-2014	51%	***	***	***
2014-2015	51%	71%	139%	Moderate Overrepresentation
2015-2016	51%	68%	134%	Moderate Overrepresentation
ADDISON RUTLAND SU				
2013-2014	51%	72%	142%	Moderate Overrepresentation
2014-2015	51%	76%	149%	Moderate Overrepresentation
2015-2016	51%	77%	149%	Moderate Overrepresentation
BARRE SU				
2013-2014	51%	73%	144%	Moderate Overrepresentation
2014-2015	51%	71%	141%	Moderate Overrepresentation
2015-2016	51%	65%	129%	Moderate Overrepresentation
BATTENKILL VALLEY SU				
2013-2014	55%	***	***	***
2014-2015	58%	***	***	***
2015-2016	59%	75%	127%	Moderate Overrepresentation

Supervisory Union/District and School Year (Table 9a: Excluded Student Population Data by Males)	Percent of Enrollment-Males	Percent of Students Excluded-Males	Proportional Difference in representation between general and excluded population	Proportional Difference in representation between general and excluded population
BENNINGTON RUTLAND SU				
2013-2014	52%	***	***	***
2014-2015	52%	***	***	***
2015-2016	54%	100%	184%	Large Overrepresentation
BLUE MOUNTAIN SD				
2013-2014	52%	***	***	***
2014-2015	54%	***	***	***
2015-2016	50%	90%	180%	Large Overrepresentation
BURLINGTON SD				
2013-2014	52%	73%	140%	Moderate Overrepresentation
2014-2015	53%	76%	145%	Moderate Overrepresentation
2015-2016	53%	77%	147%	Moderate Overrepresentation
CALEDONIA CENTRAL SU				
2013-2014	52%	***	***	***
2014-2015	50%	***	***	***
2015-2016	49%	80%	165%	Large Overrepresentation
CALEDONIA NORTH SU				
2013-2014	50%	***	***	***
2014-2015	51%	***	***	***
2015-2016	52%	85%	163%	Large Overrepresentation
CHITTENDEN CENTRAL SU				
2013-2014	51%	66%	128%	Moderate Overrepresentation
2014-2015	52%	67%	129%	Moderate Overrepresentation
2015-2016	52%	70%	135%	Moderate Overrepresentation
CHITTENDEN EAST SU				
2013-2014	53%	68%	129%	Moderate Overrepresentation
2014-2015	52%	***	***	***
2015-2016	52%	86%	165%	Large Overrepresentation

Supervisory Union/District and School Year (Table 9a: Excluded Student Population Data by Males)	Percent of Enrollment-Males	Percent of Students Excluded-Males	Proportional Difference in representation between general and excluded population	Proportional Difference in representation between general and excluded population
CHITTENDEN SOUTH SU				
2013-2014	52%	***	***	***
2014-2015	52%	83%	159%	Large Overrepresentation
2015-2016	52%	80%	154%	Large Overrepresentation
COLCHESTER SD				
2013-2014	53%	70%	132%	Moderate Overrepresentation
2014-2015	51%	77%	150%	Moderate Overrepresentation
2015-2016	51%	85%	166%	Large Overrepresentation
ESSEX CALEDONIA SU				
2013-2014	53%	61%	115%	Slight Overrepresentation
2014-2015	53%	***	***	***
2015-2016	54%	71%	133%	Moderate Overrepresentation
ESSEX NORTH SU				
2013-2014	53%	***	***	***
2014-2015	52%	***	***	***
2015-2016	54%	56%	104%	Neutral
ESSEX TOWN SD				
2013-2014	52%	***	***	***
2014-2015	52%	***	***	***
2015-2016	51%	76%	150%	Moderate Overrepresentation
FRANKLIN CENTRAL SU				
2013-2014	52%	75%	142%	Moderate Overrepresentation
2014-2015	53%	71%	135%	Moderate Overrepresentation
2015-2016	53%	72%	136%	Moderate Overrepresentation
FRANKLIN NORTHEAST SU				
2013-2014	52%	73%	139%	Moderate Overrepresentation
2014-2015	51%	68%	135%	Moderate Overrepresentation
2015-2016	50%	83%	165%	Large Overrepresentation

Supervisory Union/District and School Year (Table 9a: Excluded Student Population Data by Males)	Percent of Enrollment-Males	Percent of Students Excluded-Males	Proportional Difference in representation between general and excluded population	Proportional Difference in representation between general and excluded population
FRANKLIN NORTHWEST SU				
2013-2014	51%	67%	132%	Moderate Overrepresentation
2014-2015	51%	76%	148%	Moderate Overrepresentation
2015-2016	52%	85%	164%	Large Overrepresentation
FRANKLIN WEST SU				
2013-2014	50%	74%	149%	Moderate Overrepresentation
2014-2015	51%	76%	150%	Moderate Overrepresentation
2015-2016	52%	86%	166%	Large Overrepresentation
GRAND ISLE SU				
2013-2014	48%	***	***	***
2014-2015	47%	***	***	***
2015-2016	49%	71%	146%	Moderate Overrepresentation
HARTFORD SD				
2013-2014	56%	66%	119%	Slight Overrepresentation
2014-2015	55%	68%	124%	Slight Overrepresentation
2015-2016	55%	66%	120%	Slight Overrepresentation
LAMOILLE NORTH SU				
2013-2014	51%	78%	154%	Large Overrepresentation
2014-2015	50%	68%	137%	Moderate Overrepresentation
2015-2016	49%	70%	141%	Moderate Overrepresentation
LAMOILLE SOUTH SU				
2013-2014	53%	***	***	***
2014-2015	53%	***	***	***
2015-2016	52%	80%	155%	Large Overrepresentation
MILTON SD				
2013-2014	50%	76%	154%	Large Overrepresentation
2014-2015	49%	77%	155%	Large Overrepresentation
2015-2016	49%	71%	144%	Moderate Overrepresentation

Supervisory Union/District and School Year (Table 9a: Excluded Student Population Data by Males)	Percent of Enrollment-Males	Percent of Students Excluded-Males	Proportional Difference in representation between general and excluded population	Proportional Difference in representation between general and excluded population
MONTPELIER SD				
2013-2014	47%	54%	114%	Slight Overrepresentation
2014-2015	48%	***	***	***
2015-2016	49%	100%	205%	Large Overrepresentation
NORTH COUNTRY SU				
2013-2014	51%	84%	165%	Large Overrepresentation
2014-2015	50%	81%	161%	Large Overrepresentation
2015-2016	51%	85%	168%	Large Overrepresentation
ORANGE EAST SU				
2013-2014	51%	70%	138%	Moderate Overrepresentation
2014-2015	51%	73%	143%	Moderate Overrepresentation
2015-2016	51%	79%	156%	Large Overrepresentation
ORANGE NORTH SU				
2013-2014	53%	***	***	***
2014-2015	53%	66%	124%	Slight Overrepresentation
2015-2016	53%	89%	169%	Large Overrepresentation
ORANGE SOUTHWEST SU				
2013-2014	49%	72%	146%	Moderate Overrepresentation
2014-2015	50%	69%	136%	Moderate Overrepresentation
2015-2016	52%	69%	133%	Moderate Overrepresentation
ORANGE WINDSOR SU				
2013-2014	50%	***	***	***
2014-2015	50%	***	***	***
2015-2016	51%	77%	150%	Moderate Overrepresentation
ORLEANS CENTRAL SU				
2013-2014	52%	***	***	***
2014-2015	53%	***	***	***
2015-2016	53%	75%	141%	Moderate Overrepresentation

Supervisory Union/District and School Year (Table 9a: Excluded Student Population Data by Males)	Percent of Enrollment-Males	Percent of Students Excluded-Males	Proportional Difference in representation between general and excluded population	Proportional Difference in representation between general and excluded population
ORLEANS SOUTHWEST SU				
2013-2014	54%	***	***	***
2014-2015	53%	79%	149%	Moderate Overrepresentation
2015-2016	53%	77%	147%	Moderate Overrepresentation
RIVENDELL INTERSTATE SD				
2013-2014	51%	***	***	***
2014-2015	52%	***	***	***
2015-2016	52%	***	***	***
RUTLAND CENTRAL SU				
2013-2014	53%	***	***	***
2014-2015	53%	***	***	***
2015-2016	52%	87%	168%	Large Overrepresentation
RUTLAND CITY SD				
2013-2014	51%	73%	142%	Moderate Overrepresentation
2014-2015	51%	73%	142%	Moderate Overrepresentation
2015-2016	52%	73%	141%	Moderate Overrepresentation
RUTLAND NORTHEAST SU				
2013-2014	52%	69%	131%	Moderate Overrepresentation
2014-2015	53%	61%	115%	Slight Overrepresentation
2015-2016	53%	73%	137%	Moderate Overrepresentation
RUTLAND SOUTH SU				
2013-2014	50%	81%	161%	Large Overrepresentation
2014-2015	51%	66%	131%	Moderate Overrepresentation
2015-2016	51%	87%	171%	Large Overrepresentation
RUTLAND SOUTHWEST SU				
2013-2014	56%	***	***	***
2014-2015	54%	***	***	***
2015-2016	54%	89%	164%	Large Overrepresentation

Supervisory Union/District and School Year (Table 9a: Excluded Student Population Data by Males)	Percent of Enrollment-Males	Percent of Students Excluded-Males	Proportional Difference in representation between general and excluded population	Proportional Difference in representation between general and excluded population
SOUTH BURLINGTON SD				
2013-2014	51%	***	***	***
2014-2015	51%	***	***	***
2015-2016	50%	78%	154%	Large Overrepresentation
SOUTHWEST VERMONT SU				
2013-2014	53%	75%	141%	Moderate Overrepresentation
2014-2015	53%	73%	138%	Moderate Overrepresentation
2015-2016	53%	77%	145%	Moderate Overrepresentation
SPRINGFIELD SD				
2013-2014	50%	63%	125%	Slight Overrepresentation
2014-2015	50%	65%	131%	Moderate Overrepresentation
2015-2016	49%	63%	127%	Moderate Overrepresentation
ST JOHNSBURY SD**				
2013-2014	52%	65%	126%	Moderate Overrepresentation
2014-2015	56%	76%	138%	Moderate Overrepresentation
2015-2016	53%	***	***	***
TWO RIVERS SU (BEGAN 2014-2015)				
2014-2015	47%	70%	150%	Moderate Overrepresentation
2015-2016	48%	76%	159%	Large Overrepresentation
WASHINGTON CENTRAL SU				
2013-2014	50%	61%	122%	Slight Overrepresentation
2014-2015	50%	64%	129%	Moderate Overrepresentation
2015-2016	50%	80%	161%	Large Overrepresentation
WASHINGTON NORTHEAST SU				
2013-2014	52%	***	***	***
2014-2015	51%	***	***	***
2015-2016	51%	83%	163%	Large Overrepresentation

Supervisory Union/District and School Year (Table 9a: Excluded Student Population Data by Males)	Percent of Enrollment-Males	Percent of Students Excluded-Males	Proportional Difference in representation between general and excluded population	Proportional Difference in representation between general and excluded population
WASHINGTON SOUTH SU				
2013-2014	49%	***	***	***
2014-2015	50%	***	***	***
2015-2016	50%	67%	134%	Moderate Overrepresentation
WASHINGTON WEST SU				
2013-2014	51%	***	***	***
2014-2015	51%	70%	139%	Moderate Overrepresentation
2015-2016	49%	84%	170%	Large Overrepresentation
WINDHAM CENTRAL SU				
2013-2014	51%	***	***	***
2014-2015	50%	76%	152%	Large Overrepresentation
2015-2016	51%	82%	161%	Large Overrepresentation
WINDHAM NORTHEAST SU				
2013-2014	51%	65%	129%	Moderate Overrepresentation
2014-2015	50%	73%	147%	Moderate Overrepresentation
2015-2016	51%	69%	137%	Moderate Overrepresentation
WINDHAM SOUTHEAST SU				
2013-2014	52%	76%	148%	Moderate Overrepresentation
2014-2015	52%	71%	137%	Moderate Overrepresentation
2015-2016	52%	68%	132%	Moderate Overrepresentation
WINDHAM SOUTHWEST SU				
2013-2014	53%	69%	131%	Moderate Overrepresentation
2014-2015	53%	72%	136%	Moderate Overrepresentation
2015-2016	52%	76%	145%	Moderate Overrepresentation
WINDSOR CENTRAL SU				
2013-2014	50%	***	***	***
2014-2015	50%	***	***	***
2015-2016	50%	79%	159%	Large Overrepresentation

Supervisory Union/District and School Year (Table 9a: Excluded Student Population Data by Males)	Percent of Enrollment-Males	Percent of Students Excluded-Males	Proportional Difference in representation between general and excluded population	Proportional Difference in representation between general and excluded population
WINDSOR NORTHWEST SU				
2013-2014	54%	***	***	***
2014-2015	53%	***	***	***
2015-2016	53%	67%	126%	Moderate Overrepresentation
WINDSOR SOUTHEAST SU				
2013-2014	50%	59%	117%	Slight Overrepresentation
2014-2015	51%	67%	131%	Moderate Overrepresentation
2015-2016	52%	83%	161%	Large Overrepresentation
WINOOSKI SD				
2013-2014	53%	***	***	***
2014-2015	51%	57%	111%	Slight Overrepresentation
2015-2016	52%	69%	134%	Moderate Overrepresentation

**SU011 St. Johnsbury SD and SU055 Dresden SD did not report any exclusions in 2016.

Data Point 6- 4.xvii- Number of exclusions and length of exclusions for students in Vermont by foster care status

Response 6-4.xvii: As previously stated, the Agency does not have access to this data.

Data Point 6- 4.xviii- Number of exclusions and length of exclusions for students in Vermont by Limited English Proficiency Status

Finding 6-4.xviii: In most years, both students who are not English Learners and English Learners are excluded from school in rates that mirror their populations. The rates of exclusion for these groups have been fairly consistent over the last three years.

**Table 10– Excluded Student Population Data by ELL Status
Students Experiencing at Least One Exclusionary Action School Years 2014-2016**

School Year	Total	Not English Learner	Not English Learner	English Learner	English Learner
Enrollment	Enrollment	Enrollment	Percent of Enrollment	Enrollment	Percent of Enrollment
2014	78,867	76,770	97.3%	2,097	2.7%
2015	77,763	75,697	97.3%	2,066	2.7%
2016**	77,145	75,911	98.4%	1,234**	1.6%
Exclusions	Exclusions	Exclusions	Percent of Student Excluded	Excluded	Percent of Student Excluded
2014	4,246	4,128	97.2%	118	2.8%
2015	3,726	3,624	97.3%	102	2.7%
2016**	3,616	3,501	96.8%	115	3.2%
	Comparison of Excluded Students	Proportional Difference in representation between general and excluded population: (percent of Exclusions/ percent of Enrollment)	Proportional Difference in representation between general and excluded population: (percent of Exclusions/ percent of Enrollment)	Proportional Difference in representation between general and excluded population: (percent of Exclusions/percent of Enrollment)	Proportional Difference in representation between general and excluded population: (percent of Exclusions/ percent of Enrollment)
2014	Comparison of Excluded Students	99.9%	Neutral	104.5%	Neutral
2015	Comparison of Excluded Students	99.9%	Neutral	103.0%	Neutral
2016**	Comparison of Excluded Students	98.4%	Neutral	200%	Large Overrepresentation

** In 2016, AOE reporting standards for English Learners changed. In 2014 and 2015, EL Students included current EL students and those who had been EL students within the past 2 years. In 2016, EL students includes only those students who are current EL students.

Due to the relatively small numbers of students learning English in Vermont, these data cannot be disaggregated to Supervisory Union/Supervisory District level.

Data Point 6- 4.xvi- Number of exclusions and length of exclusions for students in Vermont by grade level

Finding 6-4.xvi: Suspensions and expulsions are unevenly distributed across grades; approximately 53% of exclusionary incidents occur between 7th and 10th grades, with the highest number occurring in 9th grade. Numbers of exclusionary incidents fall to the late elementary level by grade 12 (see Table 11 below).

**Table 11– Incident-level Data – Exclusionary Actions by Grade Level
School Year 2016**

Grade	Number of Incidents	Percentage of Total Exclusions School Year 2016	Average Length of Exclusion (Days)
K	177	2.4%	1.0
01	285	3.9%	1.0
02	262	3.6%	1.1
03	352	4.8%	1.3
04	333	4.6%	1.3
05	545	7.4%	1.3
06	506	6.9%	1.4
07	770	10.5%	1.6
08	952	13.0%	1.6
09	976	13.3%	2.2
10	963	13.2%	2.1
11	681	9.3%	2.3
12	523	7.1%	2.3
Total	7,325	100.0%	1.7

110 incidents did not have a length associated with the incidents

Finding 6-4a.xvi: Due to extremely small N sizes for this criteria, this data was not generated for individual Supervisory Unions or Supervisory Districts.

Data Point 6- 4.xviii- Number of exclusions and length of exclusions for students in Vermont by Infraction Status

As noted above, in fulfilling this request for a second year, the Agency has again needed to make some discretionary decisions to meet data reporting privacy guidelines due to Vermont’s unusually small size conditions. The legislative committee has asked for data by infraction status; the CIRS data collection refers to these as incidents but essentially it addresses the reasons that students are being excluded from school.

For some incidents, schools do not have discretion when suspending or removing a student. However, in the case of possession of a firearm at school, there is opportunity for discretion in determining if expulsion or suspension is warranted depending on the specifics of the case, the

danger to others and prior disciplinary action. Disciplinary action in other types of cases is guided by individual school policy.

Findings 6-4.xix: Slightly less than half of incidents resulting in an exclusionary action in 2015-16 fall into the category of “School Policy/Conduct Violation.” The second and third most prevalent incident categories are fighting and disorderly conduct. Approximately 17% of all exclusionary actions are imposed as a result of these types of infractions. The remaining incidents fall into various categories of infraction including weapons, drugs, and other incidents involving infliction of harm on the student him or herself and or others (see Table 12)

**Table 12 – Incident level data – Type of Incidents Contributing to an Exclusionary Action
School Years 2016**

Incident Type	Incident Count	Percent of all Incidents
School Policy/Conduct Violation	3,536	47.6%
Fighting	1,032	13.9%
Disorderly conduct	525	7.1%
Harassment	394	5.3%
Assault/Battery/Maiming	317	4.3%
Threat/Intimidation	315	4.2%
Drugs	308	4.1%
Bullying	266	3.6%
Tobacco	198	2.7%
Alcohol	146	2.0%
Weapons possession	138	1.9%
Property Damage	55	0.7%
Danger to self	51	0.7%
Vandalism	51	0.7%
Burglary/B&E/Theft/Larceny	39	0.5%
Lewd or Lascivious conduct	26	0.3%
Robbery	14	0.2%
School Threat--Bomb, Fire, Other	***	***
Stalking	***	***
Domestic assault	***	***
Suicide/ Harm self	***	***
Unlawful Restraint	***	***
Total	7,435	100.0%
***Suppressed data as fewer than 11 incidents		

It is important to place actions leading to exclusion in a broader context. When violations are broken down by type of weapon (see Table 13) we find that almost 97% of all incidents *did not* involve a weapon. Of the 3% of all actions that do involve a weapon, a knife is the most common weapon followed by other sharp object or “other,” while the remaining 5% of incidents involving weapons (fewer than 1% of all incidents) involve some type of gun.

Table 13– Incident-Level data – Type of Weapons Involved in Incidents Resulting in an Exclusionary Action School Years 2016

Type of Weapon	Number of Incidents	Percentage of Total Incidents
No Weapon	7,225	97.2%
Knife or Other Sharp Object	139	1.9%
Other	55	0.7%
BB Gun	***	0.1%
Handgun	***	0.1%
Multiple Firearms	***	0
Shotgun/Rifle	***	0
Destructive Device	***	0
Other Firearm	***	0
Total	7,435	100%

***Suppressed data as fewer than 11 incidents

Similarly, over 90% of all incidents *did not* involve drugs (see Table 14). Of those incidents that did involve drugs, almost half involved cannabis and almost one third involved tobacco – considered a drug for school age youth in Vermont. However, as a proportion of all incidents resulting in exclusionary action, drug-related incidents remain a small percentage.

Table 14 – Incident-Level Data - Types of Drugs Involved in Incidents Resulting in Exclusionary Actions School Years 2016

Type of Drug	Number of Actions	Percentage of Total Exclusionary Actions
No Drug Involved	6,757	90.9%
Cannabis (Marijuana)	281	3.8%
Tobacco	207	2.8%
Alcohol	150	2%
Other - Needs Description entry	28	0.4%
Over-the-counter medication	12	0.2%
Total	7,435	100%

*Data are suppressed to preserve data privacy

Due to extremely small N sizes for most infraction types, the Agency leveraged existing resources to highlight the four most significant infractions.

Findings 6-4.xix: For the four violation types that account for the greatest number of exclusions in 2016 (School Policy/ Conduct Violation, Fighting, disorderly conduct, and Harassment), we have disaggregated by all sub groups as in previous analyses (see Table 15).

For each of the four violations, Caucasian students are proportionally represented in their exclusions. Female students experience slight underrepresentation in exclusions for all categories as they are excluded in lower rates than their presence in the wider K-12 population would suggest.

For students who are non-Caucasian, FRL eligible, IEP eligible, 504 eligible, English Learners, or male, they are excluded at disproportionate rates for all violations. These disproportional rates are most pronounced for students who have a known disability (IEP and 504) for all areas.

**Table 15 – Incident-Level Data - Types of Incidents Resulting in Exclusionary Actions by Student Characteristics
School Year 2016**

			Incidents	Incidents	Incidents	Incidents	Proportionality	Proportionality	Proportionality	Proportionality
		2016 Percent Enroll- ment	School Policy/ Conduct Violation	Fighting	Disorderly conduct	Harassment	School Policy/ Conduct Violation	Fighting	Disorderly conduct	Harassment
Incident Count							Proportional Difference in representation between general and excluded population: (percent of Exclusions/percent of Enrollment)	Proportional Difference in representation between general and excluded population: (percent of Exclusions/percent of Enrollment)	Proportional Difference in representation between general and excluded population: (percent of Exclusions/percent of Enrollment)	Proportional Difference in representation between general and excluded population: (percent of Exclusions/percent of Enrollment)
% of all Incidents		7,435	3,536	1,032	525	394				
Student Characteristics	Caucasian	3,274 92.6%	3,274 92.6%	918 89%	507 96.6%	352 89.3%	102% Neutral	98% Neutral	106% Neutral	98% Neutral
Student Characteristic	Non- Caucasian	262 7.4%	262 7.4%	114 11.0%	18 3.4%	42 10.7%	83% Slight Underrepresentation	124% Moderate Overrepresentation	38% Large Underrepresentation	120% Moderate Overrepresentation
Student Characteristic	FRL	2,431 68.8%	2,431 68.8%	716 69.4%	371 70.7%	198 50.3%	176% Large Overrepresentation	177% Large Overrepresentation	181% Large Overrepresentation	129% Moderate Overrepresentation
Student Characteristic	IEP	1,395 39.5%	1395 39.5%	269 26.1%	227 43.2%	110 27.9%	248% Large Overrepresentation	164% Large Overrepresentation	272% Large Overrepresentation	175% Large Overrepresentation
Student Characteristic	504	359 10.2%	359 10.2%	114 11.%	42 8%	41 10.4%	243% Large Overrepresentation	262% Large Overrepresentation	190% Large Overrepresentation	248% Large Overrepresentation
Student Characteristic	Female	1,005 28.4%	1005 28.4%	145 14.1%	86 16.4%	42 10.7%	59% Moderate Underrepresentation	29% Large Underrepresentation	34% Large Underrepresentation	22% Large Underrepresentation
Student Characteristic	Male	2,531 71.6%	2,531 71.6%	887 85.9%	439 83.6%	352 71.6%	139% Moderate Overrepresentation	167% Large Overrepresentation	162% Large Overrepresentation	139% Moderate Overrepresentation
Student Characteristic	ELL	80 2.3%	80 2.3%	45 4.4%	24 4.6%	14 3.6%	144% Moderate Overrepresentation	275% Large Overrepresentation	288% Large Overrepresentation	225% Large Overrepresentation

Data Point 6- 4.xx- Number of exclusions and length of exclusions for students in Vermont by type of exclusion

Finding 6-4.xx: For the vast majority of student groups, the length of their exclusion from school is very similar to the state length of exclusion. Notably, female students have much longer in-school suspensions length, by nearly a full day compared to the state and all other groups. No other noticeable patterns emerge relative to the length of suspension by incident count.

Table 16- Vermont Exclusionary Discipline by type of Exclusion and Average Length of Exclusion for School Years 2013-2015.

Exclusion Type	All Students	All Students	Caucasian	Caucasian	Non-Caucasian	Non-Caucasian	FRL	FRL	IEP	IEP	504	504	Female	Female	Male	Male	ELL	ELL
	Exclusions	Exclusions	Exclusions	Exclusions	Exclusions	Exclusions	Exclusions	Exclusions	Exclusions	Exclusions	Exclusions	Exclusions	Exclusions	Exclusions	Exclusions	Exclusions	Exclusions	Exclusions
	#	Avg. Days	#	Avg. Days	#	Avg. Days	#	Avg. Days	#	Avg. Days	#	Avg. Days	#	Avg. Days	#	Avg. Days	#	Avg. Days
2016																		
In school	3,148	1.2	2,865	1.2	283	1.3	2,061	1.2	1,001	1.2	322	1.2	690	1.3	2,458	1.2	138	1.2
Out of school	4,177	2.1	3,770	2.1	403	2.3	2,817	2.0	1,573	2.0	409	2.2	1,045	2.1	3,128	2.1	97	1.5
Expulsions**	***	***	***	***	***	***	***	***	***	***	***	***	***	***	***	***	***	***
Alternative school placements**	***	***	***	***	***	***	***	***	***	***	***	***	***	***	***	***	***	***
Missing Data	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
2015																		
In school	4,513	1.2	4,033	1.2	480	1.3	3,118	1.2	1,532	1.1	524	1.3	1,139	1.3	3,374	1.2	224	1.1
Out of school	6,495	2.3	5,913	2.3	582	2.4	4,458	2.3	2,303	2.1	675	2.3	1,804	2.1	4,691	2.4	163	2.4
Expulsions**	22	***	***	***	***	***	***	***	***	***	***	***	***	***	***	***	***	***
Alternative school placements**	83	***	79	***	***	***	55	***	56	***	***	***	***	***	68	***	***	***
Missing Data	31	not reported	not reported	not reported	not reported	not reported	not reported	not reported	not reported	not reported	not reported	not reported	not reported	not reported	not reported	not reported	not reported	not reported
2014																		
In school	5,956	1.2	5,238	1.2	718	1.2	3,903	1.2	1,849	1.2	552	1.2	1,495	1.1	4,461	1.2	268	1.3
Out of school	7,246	2.3	6,336	2.3	910	2.3	5,003	2.3	2,595	2.3	797	2.0	1,911	2.3	5,355	2.3	232	2.3
Expulsions**	17	***	***	***	***	***	***	***	***	***	***	***	***	***	***	***	***	***
Alternative school placements**	395	***	390	***	***	***	279	***	357	***	16	***	100	***	295	***	***	***
Missing Data	175	not reported	not reported	Not reported	not reported	not reported	not reported	not reported	not reported	not reported	not reported	not reported	not reported	not reported	not reported	not reported	not reported	not reported

Students infrequently return to the same school in the same year of an expulsion, sometimes resulting in missing and unreliable data. The CIRS collection does not require LEAS to report the number of days for Expulsions and Interim Alternative Placements. For full details on this see the CIRS reporting instructions. *Suppressed data as fewer than 11 incidents.