



**The author(s) shown below used Federal funding provided by the U.S. Department of Justice to prepare the following resource:**

**Document Title:** Evaluation of the Philadelphia Police School Diversion Program: Long-Term Outcomes and Sustained Impact, Final Technical Report

**Author(s):** Naomi Goldstein, Amanda NeMoyer, Rena Kreimer, TuQuynh Le, Angela Pollard, Alexei Taylor, Fengqing Zhang

**Document Number:** 309104

**Date Received:** June 2024

**Award Number:** 2017-JF-FX-0055

**This resource has not been published by the U.S. Department of Justice. This resource is being made publicly available through the Office of Justice Programs' National Criminal Justice Reference Service.**

**Opinions or points of view expressed are those of the author(s) and do not necessarily reflect the official position or policies of the U.S. Department of Justice.**





































































































## *Discipline Outcomes*

In addition to its primary goal of reducing school-based arrests, the Diversion Program was designed to “keep youth in school” (Goldstein, NeMoyer, et al., 2021). We hypothesized that diverted youth would be less likely than arrested youth to experience exclusionary school discipline in the short term (i.e., directly for the incident that led to diversion or arrest), in the moderate term (i.e., in the year following a referring incident), and in the long term (i.e., in the four years following a referring incident). Given that the Diversion Program represents a change to *police* policy—with schools maintaining their discretionary autonomy for school-related discipline—it may not be surprising that diverted and arrested youth did not differ significantly in their rates of incident-related suspension. School personnel who call police in response to a student’s behavior may be inclined to impose additional discipline on that student, such as an out-of-school suspension, regardless of whether the police referral resulted in diversion or arrest. Of note, during development of the Diversion Program, stakeholders wondered whether school staff would potentially utilize *more* exclusionary discipline with diverted students in an effort to ensure accountability without an arrest. This concern did not come to fruition; diverted youth demonstrated a descriptively, though not significantly, lower rate of incident-related suspension.

Although likelihood of incident-related suspension did not differ significantly between diverted and arrested youth, the strength of the relationship between youths’ diversion/arrest and likelihood of incident-related suspension depended on youths’ age at the time of incident and on youths’ gender. Specifically, diversion in lieu of arrest appears to be most beneficial for older youth and for female students. It may be that elementary and middle schools employ more consistent discipline approaches, regardless of whether students’ behaviors result in diversion or arrest, whereas personnel at the high school level have greater discretion and may be more

inclined to remove arrested students from school for their misbehaviors, perhaps because school decision makers view older, arrested students as greater risks of danger to others in the school environment (Curran et al., 2019; Watson & Stevenson, 2020). Additionally, girls may disproportionately benefit from diversion with respect to incident-related suspension because being arrested violates perceived gender norms, a phenomenon that results in particularly harsh punishments (Moore & Padavic, 2010; Spivak et al., 2014). Although our sample size distribution precluded the ability to examine gender and race as simultaneous moderators, Black girls are most frequently punished for these types of norm-violating behaviors (Annamma et al., 2019; Morris & Perry, 2017)—an important disparity given that Philadelphia public schools, and public schools in many other urban districts, consist of predominantly Black students.

Diverted youth were significantly less likely than matched arrested youth to be suspended in the one year following their referring school-based incident. By avoiding an arrest, diverted youth may have been better able to stay in school and maintain prosocial relationships within their educational environment, as peers, teachers, and school administrators may have been less likely to perceive youth as troublemakers (Bernburg et al., 2006; Kirk & Sampson, 2013), and school personnel may subsequently have been more lenient in response to future misbehavior (Wolf & Kupchik, 2017). Importantly, though diversion/arrest was *initially* significantly linked to post-incident suspension over the four-year follow-up period, once we compared the matched samples of diverted and arrested youth, we no longer observed a significant relationship. This change may reflect the nuanced nature of the relationships between and among youths' demographic factors and IEP status, police contact, and exclusionary school discipline experiences. Additionally, it may reflect the smaller sample size (i.e., the quasi-control sample and only one cohort of diverted youth) included in our long-term analyses, given the need for



four years of follow-up data. Additional longitudinal Diversion Program data collection and analysis may be able to provide a larger sample to investigate the Diversion Program’s ability to keep youth in prosocial environments over time and serve not only as a “second chance” for justice system involvement but also as a “second chance” to stay on typical trajectories in school settings.

Other factors linked to youths’ moderate- and long-term suspension included age at incident, race/ethnicity, and history of pre-incident suspension. Older youth at the time of a referring incident were more likely to experience future suspension, perhaps reflecting perceptions among school personnel that certain behaviors (e.g., marijuana possession, disorderly conduct) are normative for older youth, but more concerning for younger youth; norm violations for other demographic characteristics have historically been associated with more punitive responses in a variety of contexts (e.g., Moore & Padavic, 2010; Spivak et al., 2014). Additionally, racial/ethnic differences in suspension outcomes over time may reflect some combination of differential rates of *referral* for discipline and differential administrator *responses* to discipline referrals, likely stemming from implicit biases (e.g., Skiba et al., 2011). Finally, the link between previous suspension history and subsequent suspensions aligns with extant research highlighting that any instance of suspension increases the likelihood of future exclusionary discipline (Heitzeg, 2014; Mittleman, 2018). Youth with a history of suspensions—especially more than one—may receive a “troublemaker” label from school personnel, regardless of whether they were diverted or arrested, which likely decreases the chances that teachers or other school personnel will offer leniency for future misbehavior.

### ***Academic Achievement***

Although we initially found significantly higher rates of school dropout among diverted youth than quasi-control arrested youth, we did not observe a significant relationship between the *matched* diverted and arrested samples and either school dropout or on-time graduation during a four-year follow-up period. It is possible that some youth in the quasi-control arrested sample who were not included in the matched arrested sample were disproportionately at risk for confinement following their school-based arrest. Given that confined youth typically attend school in their long-term placement facilities—most of which are outside of Philadelphia—such youth would likely be listed in SDP records as having been transferred from the district rather than having dropped out. Future research that includes court data would help to refine arrested youth samples to better examine these long-term academic achievement outcomes.

Despite this sampling nuance, the *graduation rate* among diverted and arrested students did not differ significantly. Importantly, the 40% graduation rate for *both* diverted and arrested students was dramatically lower than the graduation rate for the general SDP population, which averages approximately 69% when including students attending alternative schools, and 78% when not including alternative school students (Erden-Akcay, 2020). It may be that youth in both the diverted and arrested samples already had similarly elevated risks for school dropout and not graduating on time, given similarities in factors such as academic performance, residence in disadvantaged neighborhoods, history of behavioral health disorders, challenges with familial relationships, and tendency to engage in delinquent behavior (Gubbels et al., 2019; Pharris-Ciurej et al., 2012; Wodtke et al., 2011). Thus, these youths' diversion or arrest experiences may not play a major incremental role in their long-term school enrollment and academic achievement. Perhaps, rather than serving as a protective factor against school dropout and/or a facilitator of on-time graduation, school-based diversion might serve as a potential indicator for

school personnel about youth who could benefit from additional, school-based supports aimed at preventing dropout and promoting on-time graduation. Importantly, although the Diversion Program was developed to link diverted students and their families to relevant and helpful services, those services are *community-based*, offered through the Philadelphia Department of Human Services, and identified based on a broad assessment of youth and family needs, which may or may not include youths' risk for school dropout and academic challenges that interfere with on-time graduation.

### ***Addressing Disparities***

Given consistently observed racial/ethnic and IEP-based disparities in justice system, school discipline, and academic achievement outcomes, Diversion Program developers expressed hope that diverting youth in lieu of arrest for school-based offenses in a predominantly Black school district might help reduce those disparities. Results of our moderation analyses did not suggest that the Diversion Program disproportionately *improved* police and school outcomes for Black youth or youth enrolled in special education. However, the program appears to substantially reduce the rates of arrest, recidivism, and exclusionary discipline for all youth. In that way, the Philadelphia Police School Diversion Program sits apart from many other diversion initiatives, which often disproportionately benefit White youth (Annie E. Casey Foundation, 2020). We also recognize that moderation effects of race/ethnicity may have been obscured by our need to dichotomize the potential moderator into Black and non-Black labels to preserve power. Collapsing several different racial/ethnic categories (e.g., White, Hispanic, Asian/Asian American, more than one race/ethnicity) into one likely increased variability and limited our ability to observe significant effects. Future work in this and other jurisdictions may be better

able to investigate the ways in which the Diversion Program—or a similar initiative—may work to reduce existing racial/ethnic disparities in justice system and school-related outcomes.

### **Policy and Practice Recommendations**

Results of our evaluation of the Philadelphia Police School Diversion Program can inform policy and practice recommendations in two areas: 1) quality improvement and sustainability of the existing initiative and 2) potential program replication in new jurisdictions. First, given overall findings that the Diversion Program accomplished its primary goals of safely reducing rates of school-based arrests and linking youth and families with community-based services, program administrators may leverage study findings to engender support for their continued efforts. Second, based on the results of this evaluation, stakeholders from the police department and school district might work collaboratively to identify new avenues for accomplishing Diversion Program goals. For example, given that diverted youth were not significantly less likely than arrested youth to be suspended for the incident that led to police referral, school administrators may wish to focus training efforts and policy changes on encouraging school staff to use alternatives to suspension (e.g., restorative justice practices) in response to diversion-eligible behaviors. This suggestion may be particularly timely, as the use of restorative justice practices has considerably increased across the SDP in recent years. Additionally, given that diverted youth demonstrated poorer on-time graduation outcomes than the general SDP student population, Diversion Program administrators might work with school leadership and personnel to develop procedures for linking youth to school-based academic supports as part of the diversion process. In this way, though diversion itself may not serve as a protective factor against dropout and for on-time graduation, it *could* serve as a meaningful intervention point to foster students' progress toward academic success.

Additionally, results of this evaluation can provide critical information for jurisdictions seeking to replicate the Diversion Program in their own schools and communities. For example, among the many U.S. jurisdictions that have inquired about the Diversion Program, replication efforts have been limited. It may be that some localities have reservations about instituting widespread diversion in lieu of school-based arrest for fear of potentially compromising school and/or community safety. However, results of the current evaluation suggest that, after Diversion Program implementation in Philadelphia, district-wide metrics of school safety and exclusionary discipline improved, as did several individual youth outcomes. Further, the fact that diverted youth demonstrated a significantly *lower* rate of recidivism arrest than similar arrested youth in the five years following an initial school-based incident indicates that community safety was not compromised—and may have been improved—in the aftermath of Diversion Program implementation. Thus, these empirical findings should promote the diffusion of this innovation to new areas of the country.

Importantly, though jurisdictions seeking to replicate the Diversion Program will likely adapt it to best fit their local contexts, there are several critical components of the program that should be retained. First, similar school-based diversion programs should prescribe the automatic diversion of all youth that meet established eligibility criteria—this program element removes the opportunity for implicit bias to influence police decisions about which youth to divert. Second, a *true diversion* model (Wilson & Hoge, 2013) should be used; once youth are diverted, their cases should be closed and they should not be expected to complete any requirements as part of the diversion process. Although an important component of the Philadelphia Police Diversion Program involves connecting youth and their families to community-based services for identified needs, any replication efforts that include similar services should offer them on a

strictly voluntary basis—youth should not be sanctioned in any way if they choose not to participate. The true diversion approach of Philadelphia’s Diversion Program avoids noncompliance via *legal* behaviors (e.g., not attending counseling sessions)—or technical violations, in juvenile justice terms—leading to unnecessary justice involvement and its accompanying collateral consequences. Third, given the interdisciplinary nature of the Diversion Program, it will be crucial for stakeholders from multiple public agencies (e.g., police departments, school districts, social service providers) within a given jurisdiction to work collaboratively to develop and implement a local iteration of the Police School Diversion Program. See Goldstein and colleagues (2019) for a detailed description of the development process of the Philadelphia Police School Diversion Program.

### **Limitations**

We recognize several study limitations. For example, because the Diversion Program was implemented across all Philadelphia schools simultaneously, we were unable to conduct a randomized controlled trial (RCT), often considered the gold standard for assessing intervention effectiveness. However, given current understanding of the negative consequences of arrest, randomly assigning youth and/or schools to “diversion” or “arrest” conditions would raise serious ethical concerns. Instead, we developed a quasi-control sample of youth arrested in the year before the Diversion Program who would have been eligible for diversion if it had been available. We also utilized statistical techniques to further equalize our samples to improve the accuracy and meaningfulness of comparisons, and we examined cohort-based differences to distinguish between effects of diversion/arrest status from period effects in outcomes over time. Additionally, this evaluation focused on a diversion program developed and implemented within one city, in conjunction with one police department and one school district—a fact which may

raise concerns about generalizability of findings. However, Philadelphia is the country's sixth largest city, and the SDP is the eighth largest urban school district in the United States (School District of Philadelphia, 2019), both of which have populations similar to those of other major cities and school districts in the country.

Additional limitations include the broad categories we used to distinguish youths' offense type and race/ethnicity, which we did to preserve power for our analyses, and the absence of data we would have liked to incorporate into the analyses, including potentially relevant covariates (e.g., socioeconomic status) and related outcomes (e.g., incident-related referral for permanent school removal, self-reported future offending behaviors). Although we were somewhat restricted by a reliance on administrative data, typically, the same can be said for police and school stakeholders who might wish to implement and evaluate the Diversion Program in their own jurisdictions, increasing the external validity of our procedures.

### **Future Research**

Beyond addressing identified limitations, future work related to our evaluation of the Philadelphia Police School Diversion Program might include examining additional, potentially relevant youth outcomes that could be influenced by diversion in lieu of arrest. For example, poor health outcomes have frequently been observed among justice-involved youth; however, it is unclear whether diversion at such an early stage of juvenile justice processing, compared to arrest, could contribute to improved health-related outcomes for youth. Additionally, if diverted or arrested students experience a recidivism arrest after their referring incident, examining court processing outcomes for those future arrests may allow investigators to determine whether diversion reduces the effects of cumulative disadvantage for Black youth in the justice system.

Further, longitudinal tracking of youth in our diverted and arrested samples over even longer periods of time would allow us to map out and compare trajectories of offending behavior and arrest, identifying whether true diversion acts as a turning point *away* from future delinquency and possibly illuminating malleable risk and protective factors that may influence the effects of diversion in lieu of arrest. Finally, although results of the current evaluation suggest that diverted youth are less likely than arrested youth to be suspended from school in years following their referring incident, it will be important to elicit feedback directly from diverted students about how they perceive their school climate and whether their perceptions are impacted by their interactions with school personnel during and after the incident that led to their diversion.

## **Conclusions**

Over the course of four years, our evaluation of the Philadelphia Police School Diversion Program has produced several important findings. First, the Diversion Program appears to be meeting its primary goals, reducing the number of school-based arrests in Philadelphia without increasing the number of serious behavioral incidents in city schools, and referring diverted youth and their families to voluntary, community-based services. Additional findings indicated that school-based diversion appears to help students avoid subsequent out-of-school suspensions and recidivism arrests over the long term; further, diversion does not appear to change—for better or for worse—youths’ risks for school dropout or on-time graduation compared to school-based arrest. However, by protecting diverted youth from incurring an arrest record, the Diversion Program protects diverted youth from the considerable negative collateral consequences of such a record. Results of this evaluation can be used to improve and sustain the



Diversion Program in Philadelphia and to lay the foundation for replication efforts in other jurisdictions across the country.

## References

- Allen, K., Kern, M. L., Vella-Brodrick, D., Hattie, J., & Waters, L. (2018). What schools need to know about fostering school belonging: A meta-analysis. *Educational Psychology Review, 30*(1), 1-34. doi: 10.1007/s10648-016-9389-8
- American Psychological Association Zero Tolerance Task Force (2008). Are zero tolerance policies effective in the schools?: An evidentiary review and recommendations. *The American Psychologist, 63*(9), 852–862. doi: 10.1037/0003-066X.63.9.852
- Annamma, S. A., Anyon, Y., Joseph, N. M., Farrar, J., Greer, E., Downing, B., & Simmons, J. (2019). Black girls and school discipline: The complexities of being overrepresented and understudied. *Urban Education, 54*(2), 211-242. doi: 10.1177/0042085916646610
- Bahena, S., Cooc, N., Currie-Rubin, R., Kuttner, P., & Ng, M. (2012). *Disrupting the school-to-prison pipeline*. Harvard Education Press.
- Bernburg, J. & Krohn, M. (2003). Labeling, life chances, and adult crime: The direct and indirect effects of official intervention in adolescence on crime in early adulthood. *Criminology, 41*(4), 1287-1318. doi: 10.1111/j.1745-9125.2003.tb01020.x
- Boucai, M. (2007). Balancing your strengths against your felonies: Considerations for military recruitment of ex-offenders. *University of Miami Law Review, 61*, 997-1032.
- Cauffman, E., Beardslee, J., Fine, A., Frick, P. J., & Steinberg, L. (2021). Crossroads in juvenile justice: The impact of initial processing decision on youth 5 years after first arrest. *Development and Psychopathology, 33*(2), 700-713. doi: 10.1017/S095457942000200X

- Costenbader, V., & Markson, S. (1998). School suspension: A study with secondary school students. *Journal of School Psychology, 36*(1), 59–82. doi: 10.1016/S0022-4405(97)00050-2
- Cox, A. (2012). New visions of social control? Young people’s perceptions of community penalties. *Journal of Youth Studies, 16*(1), 135-150. doi: 10.1080/13676261.2012.697136
- Curran, F. C. (2019). The Law, Policy, and Portrayal of Zero Tolerance School Discipline: Examining Prevalence and Characteristics Across Levels of Governance and School Districts. *Educational Policy, 33*(2), 319-349. doi: 10.1177/0895904817691840
- Curran, F. C., Fisher, B. W., Viano, S., & Kupchik, A. (2019). Why and when do school resource officers engage in school discipline? The role of context in shaping disciplinary involvement. *American Journal of Education, 126*(1), 33-63. doi: 10.1086/705499
- District Performance Office. (2020, November). District enrollment & demographics. [Data set]. School District of Philadelphia.  
[https://www.philasd.org/performance/programsservices/open-data/school-information/#district\\_enrollment](https://www.philasd.org/performance/programsservices/open-data/school-information/#district_enrollment)
- Erdem-Akcaay, E. (2020). School District of Philadelphia graduation rates: Definitions and trends.
- Goldstein, N. E. S., Cole, L. M., Houck, M., Haney-Caron, E., Brooks Holliday, S., Kreimer, R., & Bethel, K. (2019). Dismantling the school-to-prison pipeline: The Philadelphia police school diversion program. *Children and Youth Services Review, 101*, 61-69. doi: 10.1016/j.childyouth.2019.03.022
- Goldstein, N. E. S., Kreimer, R., Guo, S., Le, T., Cole, L. M., NeMoyer, A., Burke, S., Kikuchi, G., Thomas, K. & Zhang, F. (2021). Preventing school-based arrest and recidivism

- through pre-arrest diversion: The Philadelphia Police School Diversion Program. *Law and Human Behavior*, 45(2), 165-178. doi: 10.1037/lhb0000440
- Goldstein, N. E. S., NeMoyer, A., Le, T., Guo, S., Cole, L. M., Pollard, A., Kreimer, R., & Zhang, Z. (2021). Keeping kids in school through pre-arrest diversion: School disciplinary outcomes of the Philadelphia Police School Diversion Program. *Law and Human Behavior*.
- Gregory, A., Skiba, R. J., & Mediratta, K. (2017). Eliminating disparities in school discipline: A framework for intervention. *Review of Research in Education*, 41(1), 253-278. doi: 10.3102/0091732X17690499
- Gubbels, J., van der Put, C.E. & Assink, M. (2019). Risk factors for school absenteeism and dropout: A meta-analytic review. *Journal of Youth Adolescence*, 48, 1637–1667. doi: 10.1007/s10964-019-01072-5
- Hardy, D. (2014, December 9). *Philadelphia's shift in discipline policy*. Chalkbeat Philadelphia. <https://philadelphia.chalkbeat.org/2014/12/9/22183090/philadelphia-s-shift-in-discipline-policy>
- Heitzeg, N. A. (2014). Criminalizing education: Zero tolerance policies, police in the hallways, and the school to prison pipeline. In A. J. Nocella II, P. Parmar, & D. Stovall (Eds.), *From education to incarceration: Dismantling the school-to-prison pipeline*. (2nd ed., pp. 11-36). Peter Lang.
- Hirschfield, P. J., & Gasper, J. (2011). The relationship between school engagement and delinquency in late childhood and early adolescence. *Journal of Youth and Adolescence*, 40(1), 3-22. doi: 10.1007/s10964-010-9579-5

- Hoffman, S. (2014). Zero benefit: Estimating the effect of zero tolerance discipline policies on racial disparities in school discipline. *Educational Policy*, 28(1), 69-95. doi: 10.1177/0895904812453999
- Johnson, R. M. (2015). Measuring the influence of juvenile arrest on the odds of four-year college enrollment for Black males: An NLSY analysis. *Spectrum: A Journal on Black Men*, 4(1), 49-72. doi: 10.2979/spectrum.4.1.04
- Jordan, H. (2015). *Beyond zero tolerance: Discipline and policing in Pennsylvania*. American Civil Liberties Union of Pennsylvania.  
[https://aclupa.org/sites/default/files/field\\_documents/10497b\\_56b2ce93961c47eda1db0fb6b3b3b58.pdf](https://aclupa.org/sites/default/files/field_documents/10497b_56b2ce93961c47eda1db0fb6b3b3b58.pdf)
- Kim, B.-K. E., Johnson, J., Rhinehart, L., Logan-Greene, P., Lomeli, J., & Nurius, P. S. (2021). The school-to-prison pipeline for probation youth with special education needs. *American Journal of Orthopsychiatry*, 91(3), 375-385. doi: 10.1037/ort0000538
- Kirk, D. S. & Sampson, R. J. (2013). Juvenile arrest and collateral educational damage in the transition to adulthood. *Sociology of Education*, 86(1), 36-62. doi: 10.1177/0038040712448862
- Langberg, J. B. & Fedders, B. A. (2013). How juvenile defenders can help dismantle the school-to-prison pipeline: A primer on educational advocacy and incorporating clients' education histories and records into delinquency representation. *Journal of Law & Education*, 42, 653-690.
- Lehr, C. A., Tan, C. S., & Ysseldyke, J. (2009). Alternative schools: A synthesis of state-level policy and research. *Remedial and Special Education*, 30(1), 19-32. doi: 10.1177/0741932508315645

- Liberman, A. M., Kirk, D. S., & Kim, K. (2014). Labeling effects of first juvenile arrests: Secondary deviance and secondary sanctioning. *Criminology*, 52(3), 345-370. doi: 10.1111/1745-9125.12039
- Mahoney, J. L. (2014). School extracurricular activity participation and early school dropout: A mixed-method study of the role of peer social networks. *Journal of Educational and Developmental Psychology*, 4(1), 143-154. doi: 10.5539/jedp.v4n1p143
- Mears, D. P., Kuch, J. J., Lindsey, A. M., Siennick, S. E., Pesta, G. B., Greenwald, M. A., & Blomberg, T. G. (2016). Juvenile court and contemporary diversion: Helpful, harmful, or both? *Criminology & Public Policy*, 15(3), 953-981. doi: 10.1111/1745-9133.12223
- Mittleman, J. (2018). A downward spiral? Childhood suspension and the path to juvenile arrest. *Sociology of Education*, 91(3), 183-204. doi: 10.1177/0038040718784603
- Monahan, K. C., VanDerhei, S., Bechtold, J., & Cauffman, E. (2014). From the school yard to the squad car: School discipline, truancy, and arrest. *Journal of Youth and Adolescence*, 43(7), 1110–1122. doi: 10.1007/s10964-014-0103-1
- Moore, L. D. & Padavic, I. (2010). Racial and ethnic disparities in girls' sentencing in the juvenile justice system. *Feminist Criminology*, 5(3), 263-285. doi: 10.1177/1557085110380583
- Morris, E. W. & Perry, B. L. (2017). Girls behaving badly? Race, gender, and subjective evaluation in the discipline of African American girls. *Sociology of Education*, 90(2), 127-148. doi: 10.1177/0038040717694876
- National Center for Education Statistics. (2021, May). *Students with disabilities*. <https://nces.ed.gov/programs/coe/indicator/cgg>

- NeMoyer, A., Goldstein, N. E. S., McKitten, R. L., Prelic, A., Ebbecke, J., Foster, E., & Burkard, C. (2014). Predictors of juveniles' noncompliance with probation requirements. *Law and Human Behavior, 38*(6), 580–591. doi: 10.1037/lhb0000083
- Pharris-Ciurej, N., Hirschman, C., & Willhoft, J. (2012). The 9th grade shock and the high school dropout crisis. *Social Science Research, 41*(3), 709–730. doi: 10.1016/j.ssresearch.2011.11.014
- Quin, D. (2017). Longitudinal and contextual associations between teacher–student relationships and student engagement: A systematic review. *Review of Educational Research, 87*(2), 345–387. doi: 10.3102/0034654316669434
- Raffaele-Mendez, L. M. (2003). Predictors of suspension and negative school outcomes: A longitudinal investigation. *New Directions for Youth Development, 2003*(99), 17–34.
- Reyes, A. (2006). The criminalization of student discipline programs and adolescent behavior. *Journal of Civil Rights and Economic Development, 21*(1), 73–110.
- School District of Philadelphia. (2019). *About us*. <https://www.philasd.org/about/>
- School District of Philadelphia. (2021, February 19). *Fast facts*. <https://www.philasd.org/fast-facts/>
- Spivak, A. L., Wagner, B. M., Whitmer, J. M., & Charish, C. L. (2014). Gender and status offending: Judicial paternalism in juvenile justice processing. *Feminist Criminology, 9*(3), 224–248. doi: 10.1177/1557085114531318
- Sullivan, C. J., Dollard, N., Sellers, B., & Mayo, J. (2010). Rebalancing response to school-based offenses: A civil citation program. *Youth Violence and Juvenile Justice, 8*(4), 279–294. doi: 10.1177/1541204009358656

- Tallon, J. A., Spadafore, J. C., & Labriola, M. (2017). Creating off-ramps: Lessons learned from police-led diversion programmes. *Policing: A Journal of Policy and Practice*, 11(2), 214-228. doi: 10.1093/police/paw041
- Teske, S. C. (2011). A study of zero tolerance policies in schools: A multi-integrated systems approach to improve outcomes for adolescents. *Journal of Child and Adolescent Psychiatric Nursing*, 24(2), 88-97. doi: 10.1111/j.1744-6171.2011.00273.x
- Teske, S. C. & Huff, J. B. (2011, Winter). The court's role in dismantling the school-to-prison pipeline. *Juvenile and Family Justice Today*, 14-17.
- Theriot, M. T. (2009). School resource officers and the criminalization of student behavior. *Journal of Criminal Justice*, 37(3), 280–287. doi: 10.1016/j.jcrimjus.2009.04.008
- U.S. Department of Education (2018). Civil Rights Data Collection (CRDC) for the 2015-16 school year. [Data file]. <https://www2.ed.gov/about/offices/list/ocr/docs/crdc-2015-16.html>
- U.S. Department of Education. (2019). *2015-16 Civil rights data collection: School climate and safety*. U.S. Department of Education Office for Civil Rights. <https://www2.ed.gov/about/offices/list/ocr/docs/school-climate-and-safety.pdf>
- U.S. Department of Education Office for Civil Rights. (2014). *Civil rights data collection data snapshot: School discipline*. <https://ocrdata.ed.gov/assets/downloads/CRDC-School-Discipline-Snapshot.pdf>
- U.S. Department of Education Office for Civil Rights. (2018). *2015-16 Discipline estimations by discipline type* [Data set]. Author. [https://ocrdata.ed.gov/StateNationalEstimations/Estimations\\_2015\\_16](https://ocrdata.ed.gov/StateNationalEstimations/Estimations_2015_16)



- Vidal, S. & Woolard, J. (2017). Youth's perceptions of parental support and parental knowledge of moderators of the association between youth-probation officer relationship and probation non-compliance. *Journal of Youth and Adolescence*, 46, 1452-1471. doi: 10.1007/s10964-015-0368-z
- Vogell, H. (2017, December 6). *The failure track: How students get banished to alternative schools*. ProPublica. <https://www.propublica.org/article/how-students-get-banished-to-alternative-schools>
- Wald, J. & Losen, D. J. (2003). Defining and redirecting a school-to-prison pipeline. *New Directions for Youth Development*, 2003(99), 9-15. doi: 10.1002/yd.51
- Watson, A. A. & Stevenson, M. C. (2020). Teachers' and administrators' perceptions of police-to-student encounters: The impact of student race, police legitimacy, and legal authoritarianism. *Race and Justice*. Advance online publication. doi: 10.1177/2153368720922286
- Weber, N. M., Somers, C. L., Day, A., & Baroni, B. A. (2016). Predictors and outcomes of school attachment and school involvement in a sample of girls in residential treatment. *Residential Treatment for Children & Youth*, 33(2), 155-174. doi: 10.1080/0886571X.2016.1188034
- Whitaker, A., Torres-Guillen, S., Morton, M., Jordan, H., Coyle, S., Mann, A., & Sun, W.-L. (2019). *Cops and no counselors: How the lack of school mental health staff is harming students*. American Civil Liberties Union.
- Wiley, S. & Esbensen, F.-A. (2016). The effect of police contact: Does official intervention result in deviance amplification? *Crime & Delinquency*, 62(3), 283-307. doi: 10.1177/0011128713492496

Wiley, S., Slocum, L. A., & Esbensen, F.-A. (2013). The unintended consequences of being stopped or arrested: An exploration of the labeling mechanisms through which police contact leads to subsequent delinquency. *Criminology*, *51*(4), 927-966. doi: 10.1111/1745-9125.12024

Wilson, H. A. & Hoge, R. D. (2013). The effect of youth diversion programs on rates of recidivism: A meta-analytic review. *Criminal Justice and Behavior*, *40*(5), 497-518. doi: 10.1177/0093854812451089

Wodtke, G. T., Harding, D. J., & Elwert, F. (2011). Neighborhood effects in temporal perspective. *American Sociological Review*, *76*(5), 713–736. doi: 10.1177/0003122411420816