PROTECTING OR PUSHING OUT: THE PREVALENCE AND IMPACT OF SCHOOL RESOURCE OFFICERS IN CONNECTICUT

TECHNICAL APPENDIX

SAMAILA ADELAIYE, PH.D., RESEARCH & POLICY FELLOW
LAUREN RUTH, PH.D., RESEARCH & POLICY DIRECTOR

DECEMBER 2021

APPENDIX A

This appendix describes the statistical analyses and results used in our report in greater detail.

DATA SOURCES

The data used in this report come from three sources: the 2017-2018, the 2017-2018 school year reporting from the Connecticut State Department of Education data reporting tool "EdSight,"[1] and District Reference Groups (DRG) designations that group school districts according to similar community characteristics and resources. We used the 2015 SDE DRG designations.[2] Our data set included data from charter schools where possible. Still, we should note that charter schools are their own district, so any analyses that included adjustments for District Reference Groups do not include charter schools.

The CRDC has been collecting key education and civil rights data in US public schools since 1968.[3] The CRDC is a federally mandated reporting of school-level data regarding educational access for protected classes of students (gender, race/ethnicity, nationality, disability status, etc.). All public schools (PreK-12) in the country are required to report to the federal government on issues such as exclusionary discipline, teacher experience, and enrollment in advanced courses.

EdSight is a state repository of school-, state-, and district-level education data taken from all school districts in Connecticut. There is no central public reporting on SRO presence in Connecticut, so we used data from the CRDC website. The data is from the 2017-2018 school year. While this data is from three years ago, it reflects the most current published data and was only published a year ago.[4]

DATA SUPPRESSION METHODOLOGY

Where possible, we disaggregated the data by race/ethnicity to capture the conditional impact of SROs. In some cases, where the population of students is small enough to make them identifiable, federal student privacy laws mandate that access to data on these students be protected. The State Department of Education does this through a practice called data suppression. Data suppression is a process of protecting data on students by displaying an asterisk (*) instead of a numerical value. When the value in a category is more than zero but less than 5, the SDE suppresses the data.[5] With these suppression policies, we were sometimes unable to have complete data on some categories.[6]

We used the missing data imputation model in STATA to estimate the values in such cases where the data was missing, using a multivariate normal distribution (MVN) method.[7] By doing this, we could include schools with suppressed data in our analysis. All analyses were conducted in Stata, release 14.[8]

Data suppression was not a significant issue for analysis that relied on CRDC data solely. Suppressed data was a barrier in the case of Smart Balanced Scores and incidents where we had to rely on Data from EdSight. If up to 45% of cases were missing, we did not run analyses for such groups. This was a significant issue for the Smarter Balanced test, where most schools suppressed ethnic minorities, and as such, the results should be interpreted with extreme caution. We learned

more heavily on CRDC for other demographic variables, so data suppression wasn't an issue for other variables.

Table 1. Descriptive statistics on school Incident data suppression within this data set.

School incidents	*N* schools with incidents data suppressed	*N* schools with reported incident data	Total	Percent of schools with missing or suppressed data
Violence	200	758	958	20.88
Sex-Related	332	626	958	34.66
Property Damage	285	673	958	29.75
Drugs and Alcohol	200	758	958	20.88
School Policy Violations	267	691	958	27.87
Personal Threats	385	573	958	40.19
Theft	330	628	958	34.45
Confrontation	292	666	958	30.48
Fighting and Battery	322	636	958	33.61
Weapons	371	587	958	38.73

Source 2017-2018 School Incidents reported on Connecticut State Department of Education EdSight.

In our analysis of Smarter Balanced test scores, we only included analysis for white and the total number of students seeing that the percentage of missing data for other ethnicities was extensive and may create bias. We used a method of multiple data imputations to predict missing values based on a host of variables and patterns moderated by the available data we had for each school.

Because our research concentrated on a slice in time, we needed to go beyond basic comparisons of the treatment and control groups. Our analysis thus included t-tests, analysis of variance (ANOVA), risk ratio analyses, and regressions. We conducted our analysis using the Stata 14 software. In describing our results, we refer to findings as statistically significant, which indicates our confidence that a result isn't due purely to chance. We used the conventional threshold level of 95% confidence interval for all our analyses in this work. Thus, we do not report it as a statistically significant relationship where the findings do not fall within this confidence interval. In other words, since we cannot confidently say that the results are not likely to be due to chance, we cannot argue that we find evidence of a relationship.

Table 2. Descriptive statistics on race/ethnicity data suppression of students meeting benchmarks on Smarter Balanced Tests within this data set.

Student race/ethnicity reaching Smarter Balanced Test Benchmarks	*N* schools with race/ethnicity data suppressed	N schools with reported race/ethnicity data	Total	Percent of schools with missing or suppressed data
Math total student population	88	744	832	11
ELA total student population	85	747	832	10
Math white	200	632	832	24
ELA white	183	649	832	22
Math Hispanic or Latino/a/x/	405	427	832	49
ELA Hispanic or Latino/a/x/	409	423	832	49
Math Black or African American	615	217	832	74
ELA Black or African American	605	227	832	72.72
Math Asian	731	101	832	87.86
ELA Asian	712	120	832	85.58

Source 2017-2018 Smarter Balanced scores reported on Connecticut State Department of Education EdSight.

RESULTS

Question 1: Are there differences in the presence of SROs across District Reference Groups?

After performing the ANOVA analysis, we found a significant difference in the presence of SROs by DRG, $F_{(8, 1122)} = 14.66$, $p < .001$. This result means SROs were more present within schools in DRGs A to D, and they were less present in DRGs E-I. Schools in DRG E were least likely to report having SROs, and Schools in DRG classification B were most likely to report having SROs. However, A Levene's test indicated a statistically significant difference in the variance of SRO presence between DRG groups. So, we ran an independent group T-test with the assumption of unequal variance and found a statistically significant difference in DRG values between schools with SROs (M = 4.6, SD = 2.7) and those without SROs (M = 5.99, SD = 2.56); $t_{(393.12)} = 7.2692$, $p < 0.001$. This statistic indicates that better-resourced schools (i.e., schools closer to DRG A with lower numerical values) were more likely to have SRO.

Fewer schools across all DRGs had SROs (N=254, or 22.5 percent of schools) than did not have an SRO (N=877). For the complete sample of Connecticut schools in the dataset, including those with no DRG classification, the distribution of SROs is similar. Of the 1214 schools in our dataset, 21.25% reported having an SRO (N=258), 958 schools had no SRO in the 2017-2018 school year.

Table 3. Schools in DRG classifications A-D were more likely to report having SROs than Schools in other DRG Classifications.

DRG Classification	Freq.	Percentage of schools with SRO	Cumulative percentage of schools with SRO
A	46	36.96%	36.96%
B	158	43.67%	40.31%
C	96	31.25%	37.29%
D	141	27.66%	34.88%
E	82	1.22%	28.15%
F	84	8.33%	24.85%
G	144	21.53%	24.37%
H	137	26.28%	24.61%
I	243	9.88%	22.97%
Total	**1,131**	**22.46%**	

Source: 2017-2018 Department of Education Civil Rights Data Collection, 2015 CT DRG Designations

Table 3 shows the different District Reference Groups (DRG), the number of schools from each group in our dataset, and the percentage of schools within that DRG that reported having an SRO present in the 2017-2018 school year. DRG I has the most schools but less than 10% of them reported having an SRO.

Question 2: Are there differences between the characteristics of schools that have SROs versus schools that do not have SROs?

To answer these questions, we look at all schools in Connecticut with data reported in the 2017-2018 CRDC dataset. We thus include charter schools for this analysis. Where it is indicated that DRG was used as a control, charter schools and some special school programs were automatically dropped from the analysis as they do not have DRG classification. While in Table 4, we include all schools in the dataset, in Table 5, we only include DRG classified schools.

GRADES PRESENT

Using data from the 2017-2018 Department of Education's Civil Rights Data Collection, we compare the likelihood of having an SRO present based on the presence of student cohorts by grade. We perform a chi-square test of the relationship for five school grade levels.

Table 4. Schools with cohorts of very young children are significantly more likely not to have SROs than schools without very young children, and schools with cohorts of teens are significantly more likely to have SROs than schools without teens.

Presence of Grade at School	Schools with Grade Present		Schools without Grade Present		χ^2	p-value
	SRO Present	No SRO Present	SRO Present	No SRO Present		
Preschool	42	328	216	628	31.1724	<.001*
Kindergarten	94	511	164	445	23.5358	<.001*
8th Grade	63	267	195	689	1.2648	0.261
9th Grade	97	178	161	778	41.7622	<.001*
12th Grade	98	211	160	745	27.1152	<.001*

Source: 2017-2018 Department of Education Civil Rights Data Collection

Preschool. The relationship between the presence of a preschool in a school and the presence of an SRO in a school was significant, χ^2 (1, N = 1214) = 31.17, p <.001. More schools with preschools did not have an SRO (N=328, 89 percent) than did have an SRO (N=42, 11 percent), and this pattern was also true of schools without preschools. More schools without preschools also did not have an SRO (N=628, 74 percent) than did have an SRO (N=216, 26 percent). However, the difference was significantly smaller than among schools with preschools.

Kindergarten. The relationship between the presence of kindergarten students in a school and the presence of an SRO in a school was significant, χ^2 (1, N = 1214) = 23.54, p <.001. More schools with kindergarten students did not have an SRO (N=511, 84 percent) than did have an SRO (N=94, 16 percent), and this pattern was also true of schools without kindergarten. More schools without kindergarten students also did not have an SRO (N=445, 73 percent) than did have an SRO (N=164, 27 percent). However, the difference was significantly smaller than among schools with kindergarten students.

8th grade. We found no significant relationship between the presence of an 8th grade in a school and the presence of an SRO in a school, χ^2 (1, N = 1214) = 1.26, p = .261. More schools with 8th grade cohorts did not have an SRO present (N=267, 81 percent) than did have an SRO present (N=63, 19 percent), and this pattern is also true of schools without 8th grade cohorts. More schools without 8th grade cohorts did not have an SRO present (N=778, 83 percent) than did have an SRO present (N=195, 22 percent), and the difference was similar to that of schools with 8th grade cohorts.

9th grade. The relationship between the presence of 9th grade students in a school and the presence of an SRO in a school was significant, *X2* (1, N = 1214) = 41.76, *p* <.001. Within schools that had 9th grade cohorts, more schools did not have an SRO (*N*=178, 73 percent) than did have an SRO (*N*=97, 27 percent). Within schools that did not have 9th grade cohorts, far more schools did not have an SRO (*N*=650, 83 percent) than did have an SRO (*N*=161, 17 percent), and the difference was significantly larger than among schools with 9th grade cohorts.

12th grade. The relationship between the presence of 12th grade students in a school and the presence of an SRO in a school was significant, X2 (1, N = 1214) = 27.12, p <.001. More schools

with 12th grade cohorts did not have an SRO (N=211, 68 percent) than did have an SRO (N=98, 32 percent). Within schools that did not have 12th grade cohorts, far more schools did not have an SRO (N=745, 82 percent) than did have an SRO (N=160, 18 percent), and the difference was significantly larger than among schools with 12th grade cohorts.

In the second analysis, we try to include controls to capture the effect of each of the five grades on the likelihood that a school would have an SRO present. Unlike the previous analysis in table 6, we include DRG classification and total enrollment as controls. The first line represents the coefficients for each variable, and the second row indicates the standard errors (SE). Across all models, DRG classification and total enrollment show statistically significant relationships with the odds of having SRO present. Better-resourced school districts and larger schools tend to have higher odds of recording the presence of an SRO.

We run a similar test in models 1-5, holding total enrollment and DRG classification constant. We run each grade variable one after the other. Model 6 includes all grades, as well as DRG classification and total enrollment as covariates. It thus indicates the extent to which the presence of each grade influences the log-odds. The 9th grade stands out as the only grade that predicts a statistically significant relationship.

	SRO presence 1	SRO presence 2	SRO presence 3	SRO presence 4	SRO presence 5	SRO presence 6
Preschool	-0.563*					-0.511
	-0.282					-0.325
Kindergarten		-0.261				0.112
		-0.267				-0.284
8th Grade			-0.147			-0.0229
			-0.203			-0.264
9th Grade				0.626*		1.401*
				-0.296		-0.714
12th grade					0.502	-0.887
					-0.283	-0.7
DRG	-0.202*	-0.209*	-0.209**	-0.222**	-0.219**	-0.212*
	-0.0823	-0.0816	-0.0807	-0.0835	-0.0827	-0.0867
Total Enrollment	0.00239***	0.00241***	0.00255***	0.00221***	0.00231***	0.00215***
	-0.000423	-0.000426	-0.000429	-0.000449	-0.000434	-0.000467
Constant	-0.64	-0.933	-1.204*	-1.929***	-1.849**	-1.295
	-0.553	-0.527	-0.523	-0.555	-0.572	-0.88
AIC	1017.8	1024.2	1026.1	1016.9	1019.8	1018
BIC	1037.9	1044.3	1046.2	1037	1039.9	1058.2
N	1131	1131	1131	1131	1131	1131

* $p<0.05$, ** $p<0.01$, *** $p<0.001$, Showing coefficients and standard errors.
Source: 2017-2018 Department of Education Civil Rights Data Collection

Preschool. The relationship between the presence of preschool in a school and the presence of an SRO is tested in models 1 and 6. In model 1, we find a statistically significant negative relationship. Holding all other variables in the model constant, in model 1, the presence of a Preschool-grade reduces the log-odds of having an SRO present by 0.563 (SE = -0.282), $p <0.05$. In model 6, the relationship is not statistically significant; the coefficient is -0.511 (SE=-0.325)

Kindergarten. The relationship between the presence of kindergarten students in a school and the presence of an SRO is tested in models 2 and 6. In model 2, the relationship is not statistically significant; the coefficient is -0.261 (SE=-0.267). In model 6, the relationship is not statistically significant; the coefficient is -0.112 (SE=-0.284).

8th grade. The relationship between the presence of the 8th grade in a school and the presence of an SRO is tested in models 3 and 6. In model 3, the relationship is not statistically significant; the coefficient is -0.147 (SE=-0.203). In model 6, the relationship is not statistically significant; the coefficient is -0.0229 (SE=-0.264).

9th grade. The relationship between the presence of the 9th grade students in a school and the presence of an SRO is tested in models 4 and 6. In both models, the relationship between the presence of the 9th grade and the presence of an SRO is statistically significant. In model 4, the presence of 9th grade students leads to a 0.626 increase in the log-odds of SRO presence (SE=-0.296), $p < 0.05$. The presence of the 9th grade, while holding all other covariates constant in model 6, leads to an increased log odds of SRO presence by 1.401 (SE=-0.714), $p < 0.05$.

12th grade. The relationship between the presence of the 8th grade in a school and the presence of an SRO is tested in models 5 and 6. In model 5, the relationship is not statistically significant; the coefficient is 0.502 (SE=-0.283). In model 6, the relationship is not statistically significant; the coefficient is 0.887 (SE=-0.7).

DRG classification and Student populations are consistent predictors of the presence of an SRO. On average, the addition of one enrolled student is linked to an increase of 0.002 percentage points in the likelihood that a school will report having an SRO presence. Moving from a better-resourced DRG to a less affluent DRG classification is linked to a 0.2 percentage point decrease in the likelihood of a school having an SRO.

School Characteristics

We performed a series of ANOVAs to determine the relationship between the presence of SROs in schools and the percentage of students of various racial and ethnic backgrounds. The total enrollment and DRG classifications were included as covariates (i.e., control variables). The means reported are thus adjusted for the effects of the student population and DRG classification. We found no significant relationship between the percentage of Black, white, Asian, and Latino/a/x students in schools with and without SROs. For all groups of students, there are negligible differences of one percent or less in their proportions in schools with and without SROs. In looking at the total count of students in the school, DRG was used as a covariate. The mean number of students in schools with an SRO is almost twice the mean total enrollment number in schools that did not report having SRO.

Table 6. School racial/ethnic makeup did not significantly differ between schools with SROs and schools without SROs.

Percentage of students in schools identifying as a race/ethnicity	Schools with an SRO		Schools without an SRO				
	M	SE	M	SE	DF	F	p-value
Asian	4.668	0.395	4.859	0.200	10, 1120	0.17	0.6778
Black or African American	12.176	0.828	12.015	0.420	10, 1120	0.03	0.8673
Hispanic or Latino/a/x	23.265	0.927	23.247	0.470	10, 1120	0	0.9865
White	55.969	1.175	55.901	0.595	10, 1120	0	0.9604
Total number of students (count)	667.037	20.901	381.853	10.944	9, 1121	141.3	<0.001

Source: 2017-2018 Department of Education Civil Rights Data Collection
*The degrees of freedom (DF) and F values are based on ANOVA with controls for DRG Classification and school enrollment size. For the total row, adjustments were made for DRG Classification only. Mean and SE are post estimated, and SE refers to Delta-method Standard Error.

Asian. There was no significant difference in the percentage of Asian students attending schools with SROs and without SROs, $F_{(10, 1120)} = 0.17$, $p = .678$. The percent of Asian students in schools with an SRO ($M = 4.68$, $SE = 0.4$) was slight but not significantly smaller than the percent of Asian students in schools without an SRO ($M = 4.86$, $SE = 0.2$).

Black or African American. There was no significant difference in the percentage of Black or African American students attending schools with SROs and without SROs, $F_{(10, 1120)} = .03$, $p = .867$. The percentage of Black or African American students in schools with an SRO ($M = 12.18$, $SE = 0.83$) was similar to that of Black or African American students in schools without an SRO ($M = 12.02$, $SE = 0.42$).

Hispanic or Latino/a/x. There was no significant difference in the percentage of Hispanic or Latino/a/x students attending schools with SROs and without SROs, $F_{(10, 1120)} = 0$, $p = .987$. The percentage of Hispanic or Latino/a/x students in schools with an SRO ($M = 23.27$, $SE = 0.93$) was similar in schools without an SRO ($M = 23.25$, $SE = 0.47$).

White. There was no significant difference in the percentage of white students attending schools with SROs and without SROs, $F_{(10, 1120)} = 0$, $p = .960$. The percentage of white students in schools with an SRO ($M = 55.97$, $SE = 1.18$) was similar to that of white students in schools without an SRO ($M = 55.9$, $SE = 0.6$).

Total number of students (count). The effect of school size on the presence of SROs in schools was significant, $F_{(9, 1121)} = 141.3$, $p < .001$. The average number of students in schools with an SRO ($M = 667.04$, $SE = 20.9$) was significantly larger than the average number of students in schools without an SRO ($M = 381.85$, $SE = 10.94$).

Question 3: When comparing schools with and without SROs, what is the impact of the presence of SROs on school climate, exclusionary discipline, and achievement?

Exclusionary Discipline

First, we calculate the relative risks of exclusionary discipline using the statistics on the count of students in each of the schools in our dataset. We used the risk ratio calculator from the Stata 14 software package to run the analysis. The results here include schools that did not have DRG classifications, as in calculating the risks, and we did not include any controls.[9]

Table 7. Black, Hispanic, and white students attending schools with an SRO have a higher risk of expulsion than Black, Hispanic, and white students attending schools without an SRO.

Students in schools identifying as a race/ethnicity	Schools with an SRO		Schools without an SRO			95% CI		χ^2	p-value
	N expelled	N not expelled	N expelled	N not expelled	Relative Risk				
Asian	6	10259	5	17096	1.999	0.610	6.549	1.360	0.243
Black or African American	92	15957	162	51531	1.829	1.417	2.361	22.140	<0.001
Hispanic or Latino/a/x	121	36224	136	94764	2.323	1.819	2.967	48.350	<0.001
White	124	103217	151	179804	1.430	1.128	1.813	8.810	0.003
Total number of students (count)	267	171436	353	357311	1.577	1.345	1.849	32.140	<0.001

Source: 2017-2018 Department of Education Civil Rights Data Collection

Asian. Though Asian students attending schools with SROs are estimated to be at a 1.99 times greater risk of being expelled than Asian students attending schools that do not have SROs, this impact is not statistically significant (χ^2=q.36, p=.243, 95% CI: 0.61, 6.549). Asian students attending schools without SROs have a similar risk of expulsion as Asian students attending schools without SROs.

Black or African American. Black or African American students attending schools with SROs are at 1.83 times greater risk of being expelled than Black or African American students attending schools without SROs. This impact is statistically significant (χ^2=22.14, p<.001, 95% CI: 1.417, 2.361).

Hispanic or Latino/a/x. Hispanic or Latino/a/x students attending schools with SROs are at 2.32 times greater risk of being expelled than Hispanic or Latino/a/x students attending schools that do not have SROs. This effect is statistically significant (χ^2=48.35, p<.001, 95% CI: 1.819, 2.967).

White. White students attending schools that have SROs are at 1.43 times greater risk of being expelled than white students attending schools that do not have SROs. This difference is statistically significant (χ^2=8.81, p=.003, 95% CI: 1.128, 1.813).

Total number of students (count). Students in schools with SROs are 1.58 times as likely to be expelled as those without an SRO for the total student population. This association is statistically significant ($\chi 2=32.14$, p<.001, 95% CI: 1.345, 1.849).

Table 8. Black, Hispanic, and white students attending schools with an SRO have a higher risk of being referred to law enforcement (RTL) than Black, Hispanic, and white students attending schools without an SRO.

Students in schools identifying as a race/ethnicity	Schools with an SRO		Schools without an SRO		Relative Risk	95% CI		χ^2	p-value
	N referred	N not referred	N referred	N not referred					
Asian	10	10255	16	17085	1.041	0.473	2.294	0.01	0.9201
Black or African American	258	15791	256	51437	3.246	2.733	3.855	201.24	<0.001
Hispanic or Latino/a/x	330	36015	282	94618	3.056	2.608	3.58	211.25	<0.001
White	342	102999	362	179593	1.645	1.419	1.907	44.6	<0.001
Total number of students (count)	986	170717	960	356704	2.139	1.958	2.338	296.28	<0.001

Source: 2017-2018 Department of Education Civil Rights Data Collection

Asian. Asian students attending schools that have SROs are estimated to be at 1.04 times greater risk of being referred to law enforcement than Asian students attending schools that do not have SROs. This is not a statistically significant association ($\chi^2=0.01$, p=.920, 95% CI: 0.473, 2.294), and it should be interpreted as no difference. This is probably due to such small numbers of Asian students experiencing this form of discipline.

Black or African American. Black or African American students attending schools with SROs are at 3.86 times greater risk of being referred to law enforcement than Black or African American students attending schools that do not have SROs. This impact is statistically significant ($\chi^2=201.24$, p<.001, 95% CI: 2.733, 3.855).

Hispanic or Latino/a/x. Hispanic or Latino/a/x students attending schools with SROs are at 3.06 times greater risk of being referred to law enforcement than Hispanic or Latino/a/x students attending schools without SROs. This impact is statistically significant ($\chi^2=211.25$, p<.001, 95% CI: 2.608, 3.58).

White. White students attending schools that have SROs are at 1.66 times greater risk of being referred to law enforcement than white students attending schools that do not have SROs. This impact is statistically significant ($\chi^2=44.6$, p<.001, 95% CI: 1.419, 1.907).

Total number of students (count). For the total student population, students in schools that have SROs are 2.14 times as likely to be referred to law enforcement as those in schools without an SRO. This association is statistically significant ($\chi^2=296.28$, p<.001, 95% CI: 1.958, 2.338).

Table 9: Black, Hispanic, and white students attending schools with an SRO have a higher risk of being arrested than Black, Hispanic, and white students attending schools without an SRO.

Students in schools identifying as a race/ethnicity	Schools with an SRO		Schools without an SRO		Relative Risk	95% CI		χ2	p-value
	N Arrested	N not Arrested	N Arrested	N not Arrested					
Asian	8	10257	5	17096	2.666	0.872	8.146	3.200	0.0735
Black or African American	271	15778	169	51524	5.165	4.266	6.254	351.870	<0.001
Hispanic or Latino/a/x	366	35979	183	94717	5.222	4.375	6.234	418.220	<0.001
White	235	103106	213	179742	1.921	1.596	2.312	49.430	<0.001
Total number of students (count)	915	170788	597	357067	3.193	2.880	3.539	545.580	<0.001

Source: 2017-2018 Department of Education Civil Rights Data Collection

Asian. Asian students attending schools with SROs are at 2.67 times greater risk of being arrested than Asian students attending schools that do not have SROs. This impact is not statistically significant ($\chi2$=3.2, p=.007, 95% CI: 0.872, 8.146), and it should be interpreted as no difference. The fact that such small numbers of Asian students experience this form of discipline may be a factor.

Black or African American. Black students attending schools with SROs are at 5.17 times greater risk of being arrested than Black students attending schools that do not have SROs. This impact is statistically significant ($\chi2$=351.87, p<.001, 95% CI: 4.266, 6.254).

Hispanic or Latino/a/x. Latino/a/x students attending schools with SROs are at 5.22 times greater risk of being arrested than Latino/a/x students attending schools that do not have SROs. This impact is statistically significant ($\chi2$=418.22, p<.001, 95% CI: 4.375, 6.234).

White. White students attending schools with SROs are at 1.92 times greater risk of being arrested than white students attending schools that do not have SROs. This impact is statistically significant ($\chi2$=49.43, p<.001, 95% CI: 1.596, 2.312).

Total number of students (count). Students in schools with SROs are 3.19 times as likely to be arrested as those without an SRO for the total student population. This association is statistically significant ($\chi2$=545.58, p<.001, 95% CI: 2.88, 3.539).

To ensure that other findings didn't explain the results of our analysis, we ran a more thorough test of the relationship between the presence of SROs and the three forms of exclusionary discipline we have analyzed. Beyond the associations we have already found in the risk ratio analysis, we looked to see how much the presence of SROs explains the differences in expulsion, referrals to law enforcement, and arrests. These relationships may be explained by factors such as the size of the school or school resources. We thus used the student populations enrolled in schools and the

DRG as covariates in our subsequent analysis set. To adequately capture the impact on racial groups, we used the percentages of the students within a racial group who are expelled. This way, we can capture the differences in the impact of SROs on exclusionary discipline for each of the racial groups analyzed. Larger schools may have more discipline incidents. Due to their size, more students are likely to face disciplinary action. DRG classifications were made to group school districts based on socio-economic status and need. The classification ranges for A-I, with I representing urban high-need districts with low socio-economic status households and A representing the very affluent low-need suburban districts.[10] In numerical terms, they are rank-ordered from 1-9, with 1 representing better-resourced school districts and 9 representing school districts with higher levels of need. We ran an ANOVA analysis and reported the predicted mean reflecting the adjustments made for the covariates for a more straightforward interpretation. In other words, the reported means are estimates of the mean if the population and DRG were kept at the same level for all schools.

Table 10. The average percent of students in various racial/ethnic groups expelled did not significantly differ based upon the presence of SROs in schools. These analyses adjust for school population, the percent of students within the specific racial/ethnic group present at the school, and DRG.

Percentage of expelled students in schools identifying as a race/ethnicity	Schools with an SRO		Schools without an SRO					
	M	SE	M	SE	DF	F	p-value	SRO/ No SRO
Asian	0.036	0.047	0.036	0.026	10, 959	0.000	1.000	1.000
Black or African American	0.502	0.265	0.419	0.142	10, 1006	0.070	0.790	1.198
Hispanic or Latino/a/x	0.624	0.285	0.322	0.152	10, 1036	0.820	0.366	1.939
White	0.349	0.190	0.221	0.100	10, 1068	0.330	0.566	1.577

Source: 2017-2018 Department of Education Civil Rights Data Collection

As mentioned earlier, the analysis here includes DRG classification and total school enrollment counts as covariates. From our ANOVA analysis, the presence of SROs did not show any statistically significant impact on the percentage of students of any of the racial grouping expelled. In some cases, a simple comparison showed sizable differences in the estimated mean percentages. However, there was no statistically significant difference between the percentage of students of a racial group expelled in schools with SROs present and those expelled in schools without SRO.

Asian. ANOVA results revealed no statistically significant effect of SROs on the average percent of Asian students expelled in schools, $F_{(10, 959)} = .0$, $p=1$. This indicates no observable difference in the estimated mean. The average percent of Asian students expelled at schools with SROs (M=.036, SE=.047) did not significantly differ from the estimated average percent of Asian students expelled at schools without SROs (M=.036, SE=0.026).

Black or African American. ANOVA revealed no statistically significant effect of SROs on the average percent of Black or African American students expelled in schools, $F_{(10, 1006)} = .007$,

p=.79. The average percent of Black or African American students expelled at schools with SROs (M=.502, SE=0.265) did not significantly differ from the average percent of Black or African American students expelled at schools without SROs (M=.419, SE=0.142).

Hispanic or Latino/a/x. Our ANOVA found no statistically significant effect of SROs on the average percent of Hispanic or Latino/a/x students expelled in schools, F (10, 1036) =.82, p=.366. The average percent of Hispanic or Latino/a/x students expelled at schools with SROs (M=.624, SE=0.285) did not significantly differ from those without SROs (M=.322, SE=0.152). Though the estimated mean percentage of expelled students is almost twice as high in schools with SRO, this isn't a statistically significant finding.

White. The ANOVA registered no statistically significant effect of SROs on the average percent of white students expelled in schools, F (10, 1068) =.33, p=.566. The average percent of white students expelled at schools with SROs (M=.349, SE=.19) did not significantly differ from white students expelled at schools without SROs (M=.221, SD=0.1).

Table 11. The average percent of Black and white students referred to law enforcement differed significantly based on school SROs. These analyses adjust for school population, and DRG.

Percentage of students in schools, referred to law enforcement identifying as a race/ethnicity	Schools with an SRO		Schools without an SRO					
	M	SE	M	SE	DF	F	p-value	SRO/ No SRO
Asian	0.106	0.061	0.066	0.033	10, 959	0.3	0.584	1.594
Black or African American	1.538	0.359	0.672	0.192	10, 1006	4.21	0.041	2.289
Hispanic or Latino/a/x	0.613	0.185	0.443	0.098	10, 1036	0.61	0.434	1.383
White	0.509	0.094	0.203	0.049	10, 1068	7.65	0.006	2.501

Source: 2017-2018 Department of Education Civil Rights Data Collection

Like the previous analysis, all analyses below the average percentage of students in a particular racial/ethnic group referred to law enforcement include total school enrollment count and DRG as covariates. Though we find statistically significant differences in the percentage of Black and white students referred to law enforcement, we do not find a statistically significant relationship between the RTL of Asian or Hispanic students.

Asian. An ANOVA revealed no statistically significant effect of SROs on the average percent of Asian students referred to law enforcement, F (10, 959) =.3, p=.584. The average percent of Asian students referred to law enforcement at schools with SROs (M=.106, SE=0.061) did not significantly differ from the average percent of Asian students referred to law enforcement at schools without SROs (M=.066, SE=0.033).

Black or African American. An ANOVA revealed a statistically significant effect of SROs on the average percent of Black or African American students referred to law enforcement, F (10, 1006)

=4.21, p=.041. This means that the presence of SROs in schools impacted the average percent of Black or African American students in schools being referred to law enforcement over and above any impact due to school size or schools being located in areas with fewer resources. The average percent of Black or African American students referred to law enforcement at schools with SROs (M=1.538, SE=0.359) significantly differs from the average percent of Black or African American students referred to law enforcement at schools without SROs (M=0.672, SE=0.192). The average percentage is 2.3 times as high in schools with SROs than in schools without.

Hispanic or Latino/a/x. The ANOVA revealed no statistically significant effect of SROs on the average percent of Hispanic or Latino/a/x students referred to law enforcement, F (10, 1036) =0.61, p= 0.434. The average percent of Hispanic or Latino/a/x students referred to law enforcement at schools with SROs (M=.613, SE=0.185) was not significantly different from the average percent of Hispanic or Latino/a/x students referred to law enforcement at schools without SROs (M=.443, SD=0.098).

White. The ANOVA revealed a statistically significant effect of SROs on the average percent of white students referred to law enforcement, F (10, 1068) =7.65, p=.006. This implies that the presence of SROs in schools impacted the average percent of white students in schools being referred to law enforcement over and above any impact due to school size or schools being located in areas with fewer resources. The average percentage of white students referred to law enforcement at schools with SROs (M=0.509, SE=0.094) is significantly different from the average percent of white students referred to law enforcement at schools without SROs (M=.203, SD=0.049). The estimated percentage of white students referred to law enforcement is lower than for Hispanic and Black students; the presence of an SRO makes the percentage of students referred to law enforcement 2.5 times as high as the percentage of white students referred to in schools without SRO.

Table 12. The average percent of Black, Hispanic or Latino/a/x, and white students arrested differed significantly based upon the presence of SROs in schools. These analyses adjust for school population, and DRG.

Percentage of students in schools identifying as a race/ethnicity that were arrested	Schools with an SRO		Schools without an SRO					
	M	SE	M	SE	DF	F	p-value	SRO/no SRO
Asian	0.029	0.046	0.034	0.025	10, 959	0.01	0.924	0.847
Black or African American	2.749	0.366	0.158	0.196	10, 1006	36.22	<0.001	17.413
Hispanic or Latino/a/x	1.171	0.155	0.114	0.083	10, 1036	33.66	<0.001	10.298
White	0.587	0.127	0.114	0.067	10, 1068	10.17	0.002	5.163

Source: 2017-2018 Department of Education Civil Rights Data Collection

Like the previous analysis, all analyses below on the average percentage of students in a particular racial/ethnic group arrested include total school enrollment count and DRG as covariates. We find statistically significant differences in the percentage of Black, Latino/a/x, and white students

arrested. We do not find a statistically significant relationship for arrests of Asian students. The relationships are in the expected direction with SROs leading to more arrests.

Asian. An ANOVA revealed no statistically significant effect of SROs on the average percent of Asian students arrested, $F_{(10, 959)} = .01$, $p=.924$. The average percent of Asian students arrested at schools with SROs (M=0.029, SE=0.046) did not significantly differ from the average percent of Asian students arrested at schools without SROs (M=.034, SE=0.025).

Black or African American. An ANOVA revealed a statistically significant effect of SROs on the average percent of Black or African American students arrested, $F_{(10, 1006)} = 36.22$, $p<0.001$. This means that SROs in schools impacted the average percent of Black or African American students arrested in schools over and above any impact due to school size or being located in areas with fewer resources. The average percentage of Black or African American students arrested at schools with SROs (M=2.749, SE=0.366) differs significantly from that of Black or African American students arrested at schools without SROs (M=0.158, SE=0.196). The average percentage of Black or African American students expelled in schools with SROs is 17.4 times that of Black students arrested in schools without SRO.

Hispanic or Latino/a/x. The ANOVA revealed a statistically significant effect of SROs on the average percent of Hispanic or Latino/a/x students arrested $F_{(10, 1036)} = 33.66$, $p<0.001$. The average percent of Hispanic or Latino/a/x students arrested at schools with SROs (M=1.171, SE=0.155) was significantly different from those arrested at schools without SROs (M=.114, SD=0.083). This reflects an impact that is not explained by school size or the impact of being in a school located in less affluent areas. The percentage of a school's Hispanic or Latino/a/x student population arrested is 10.3 times as high in schools with SROs than in schools without SROs.

White. The ANOVA revealed a statistically significant effect of SROs on the average percent of white students arrested, $F_{(10, 1068)} = 10.17$, $p=.002$. This implies that the presence of SROs in schools impacted the average percent of white students being arrested over and above any impact due to school size or schools being located in areas with fewer resources. The average percentage of white students arrested at schools with SROs (M=0.587, SE=0.127) is significantly different from white students arrested at schools without SROs (M=.114, SE=0.067). The estimated percentage of white students arrested is lower than it is for Hispanic and Black students. However, the presence of an SRO makes the percentage of students arrested 5.2 times as high as the percentage of white students arrested in schools without SRO.

To consider the average number of students of different racial/ethnic groupings, we ran an ANOVA that controlled for the size of student enrollment and DRG while also comparing the average count of students based on race/ethnic grouping who experienced the different forms of discipline. This analysis tries to estimate the difference in the predicted average number of students from racial/ethnic groups who may have experienced exclusionary discipline based on the presence of SRO. This doesn't consider the percentage of students who belong to specific ethnic groups present in the school but only looks at average impact while controlling for nonracial covariates.

Table 13. The average number of students in various racial/ethnic groups expelled only showed a statistically significant difference for white and Hispanic students based on SRO presence in schools. These analyses adjust for school population and DRG.

Number of expelled students in schools identifying as a race/ethnicity	Schools with an SRO		Schools without an SRO					
	M	SE	M	SE	DF	F	p-value	SRO/ No SRO
Asian	0.005	0.007	0.012	0.004	10, 1074	0.71	0.398	0.397
Black or African American	0.233	0.070	0.225	0.037	10, 1074	0.01	0.915	1.039
Hispanic or Latino/a/x	0.374	0.063	0.189	0.033	10, 1074	6.26	0.013	1.980
White	0.347	0.053	0.209	0.028	10, 1074	4.85	0.028	1.656
Total number of students (count)	0.764	0.116	0.491	0.061	10, 1074	4.07	0.044	1.557

Source: 2017-2018 Department of Education Civil Rights Data Collection.

In Table 13, the degrees of freedom (DF) and F values are based on ANOVA with controls for DRG classification and school enrollment size. Only adjustments for DRG classifications were made for the total number of students' row. Mean and SE are post estimated, and SE refers to Delta-method Standard Error.

The analyses of the average number of students in a particular racial/ethnic group expelled from a school include total school enrollment count and DRG as covariates. Though we find statistically significant differences for the percentage of Hispanic or Latino/a/x and white students expelled, we do not find a statistically significant relationship for Asian or Black students. Again, the results also show a statistically significant relationship for the total student population.

Asian. An ANOVA revealed no statistically significant effect of SROs on the average number of Asian students expelled, $F (10, 1074) = .071$, $p=.398$. The average number of Asian students expelled from schools with SROs (M=.005, SE=0.007) did not significantly differ from that of Asian students expelled from schools without SROs (M=.012, SE=0.004).

Black or African American. An ANOVA revealed no statistically significant effect of SROs on the average number of Black or African American students expelled, $F (10, 1074) = .01$, $p=.915$. The average number of Black or African American students expelled from schools with SROs (M=.233, SE=0.07) did not significantly differ from the average number of Black or African American students expelled from schools without SROs (M=.225, SE=0.037).

Hispanic or Latino/a/x. The ANOVA revealed a statistically significant effect of SROs on the average number of Hispanic or Latino/a/x students expelled from school, $F (10, 1074) = 6.26$, $p=.013$. The average number of Hispanic or Latino/a/x students expelled from schools with SROs (M=0.374, SE=0.063) is significantly different from the average number of expulsions of Hispanic or Latino/a/x students in schools without SROs (M=0.189, SE=0.033). This impact is not

explained by the size of school enrollment or the socio-economic characteristics of the schools' location. The average number of students expelled in schools with SRO is twice that of Hispanic or Latino/a/x students expelled in schools without SRO.

White. The ANOVA revealed a statistically significant effect of SROs on the average number of white students expelled from school, $F(10, 1074) = 4.85$, $p=.028$. The average number of white students expelled from schools with SROs (M=0.347, SE=0.053) is significantly different from the average number of expulsions of white students in schools without SROs (M=0.209, SE=0.028). This impact is not explained by the size of school enrollment or the socio-economic characteristics of the schools' location. The average number of white students expelled in schools with SROs is 1.7 times the average number of white students expelled in schools without SRO.

Total number of students (count). For the total student population, the ANOVA analysis, which controlled for DRG classification, we find a statistically significant effect of SROs on the average number of expulsions, $F(10, 1074) =4.07$, $p=.044$. The average number of students expelled from schools with SROs (M=.764, SE=.116) is significantly different from those expelled from schools without SROs (M=.491, SE=.061). The average number of students expelled from schools with SROs is 1.6 times that of students expelled from schools without SROs.

Table 14. the average number of Black and Hispanic or Latino/a/x students referred to law enforcement differed significantly based upon the presence of SROs in schools. These analyses adjust for school population and DRG.

Number of students in schools referred identifying as a race/ethnicity	Schools with an SRO		Schools without an SRO					
	M	SE	M	SE	DF	F	p-value	SRO/ No SRO
Asian	-0.003	0.014	0.032	0.007	10, 1074	4.52	0.034	-0.081
Black or African American	0.842	0.105	0.338	0.055	10, 1074	16.8	<.001	2.489
Hispanic or Latino/a/x	0.858	0.166	0.454	0.087	10, 1074	4.32	0.038	1.891
White	0.843	0.138	0.567	0.072	10, 1074	2.93	0.087	1.487
Total number of students (count)	2.646	0.313	1.458	0.164	10, 1074	10.55	0.001	1.815

Source: 2017-2018 Department of Education Civil Rights Data Collection

Like the previous analysis, all analyses of the average number of students in a particular racial/ethnic group referred to law enforcement include total school enrollment count and DRG as covariates. Though we find statistically significant differences for the percentage of Hispanic or Latino/a/x, Black, and Hispanic, we do not find a statistically significant relationship for white students. Again for the total student population, the results also show a statistically significant relationship for Asian students; the relationship is in the opposite direction. These results should be considered with the understanding that the analyses do not consider the number of students enrolled in the school who identify as race or ethnicity. Of schools that didn't have students of the

minority ethnic groups in our analyses, more schools recorded having no Asian students. The predicted number of students expelled in schools with SROs ignores that a school may not even have students of that race/ethnic group.

Asian. An ANOVA revealed a statistically significant effect of SROs on the average number of Asian students referred to law enforcement, $F (10, 1074) =4.52$, $p=.034$. The estimated average number of Asian students referred to law enforcement in schools with SROs (M=-0.003, SE=0.014) differed significantly from the average number of Asian students referred to law enforcement in schools without SROs (M=.032, SE=0.007). This indicates that the estimated number of Asian students referred to police is 0.1 times as low in SRO schools than those without SROs.

Black or African American. An ANOVA revealed no statistically significant effect of SROs on the average number of Black or African American students referred to law enforcement, $F (10, 1074) =16.8$, $p<.001$. The average number of Black or African American students referred to law enforcement in schools with SROs (M=.842, SE=0.105) significantly differs from the average number of Black or African American students from schools without SROs who were referred to law enforcement (M=.338, SE=0.055). This impact is not explained by the size of school enrollment or the socio-economic characteristics of the schools' location. The average number of students referred to law enforcement in schools with SROs is 2.5 times the average number of Black or African American students referred to law enforcement in schools without SRO.

Hispanic or Latino/a/x. The ANOVA revealed a statistically significant effect of SROs on the average number of Hispanic or Latino/a/x students referred to law enforcement, $F (10, 1074) = 4.32$, $p=.038$. The average number of Hispanic or Latino/a/x students referred to law enforcement in schools with SROs (M=0.858, SE=0.166) differs significantly from the average number of Hispanic or Latino/a/x student referrals to law enforcement in schools without SROs (M=0.454, SE=0.087). This impact is not explained by the size of school enrollment or the socio-economic characteristics of the schools' location. The average number of students referred to law enforcement in schools with SROs is 1.9 times the average number of Hispanic or Latino/a/x students referred to law enforcement in schools without SRO.

White. The ANOVA revealed no statistically significant effect of SROs on the average number of white students referred to law enforcement, $F (10, 1074) = 2.93$, $p=.087$. The average number of white students referred to law enforcement in schools with SROs (M=0.843, SE=0.138) is not statistically significantly different from the average number of white students in schools without SROs (M=0.567, SE=0.072).

Total number of students (count). For the total student population, the ANOVA analysis, which controlled for DRG classification, reveals a statistically significant effect of SROs on the average number of referrals, $F (10, 1074) =10.55$, $p=.001$. The average number of students arrested in schools with SROs (M=2.646, SE=.313) is significantly different from the number of students expelled from schools without SROs (M=1.458, SE=.164). The average number of students referred to law enforcement from schools with SROs is 1.8 times that of students referred in schools without an SRO.

Table 15. The average number of Black, Hispanic or Latino/a/x, and white students arrested differed significantly based upon the presence of SROs in schools. These analyses adjust for school population, and DRG.

Number of students in schools arrested identifying as a race/ethnicity	Schools with an SRO		Schools without an SRO					
	M	SE	M	SE	DF	F	p-value	SRO/no SRO
Asian	0.003	0.009	0.015	0.005	10, 1074	1.21	0.272	0.216
Black or African American	0.997	0.100	0.207	0.052	10, 1074	45.46	<0.001	4.828
Hispanic or Latino/a/x	1.086	0.171	0.309	0.089	10, 1074	15.05	<0.001	3.510
White	0.557	0.084	0.353	0.044	10, 1074	4.29	0.039	1.577
Total number of students (count)	2.728	0.280	0.929	0.147	10, 1074	30.13	<0.001	2.937

Source: 2017-2018 Department of Education Civil Rights Data Collection

*The degrees of freedom (DF) and F values are based on ANOVA with controls for DRG Classification and school enrollment size. For the total row, adjustments were made for DRG Classification only. Mean and SE are post estimated, and SE refers to Delta-method Standard Error.

Again, all analyses below of the average number of students in a particular racial/ethnic group arrested include total school enrollment count and DRG as covariates. We observe statistically significant differences for the percentage of Hispanic or Latino/a/x, white and Black or African American students. However, we do not find a statistically significant relationship for Asian students. Again, the results also show a statistically significant difference for the total student population.

Asian. An ANOVA revealed no statistically significant effect of SROs on the average number of Asian students arrested, $F_{(10, 1074)} = 1.21$, $p=.272$. The estimated average number of Asian students arrested in schools with SROs (M=-0.003, SE=0.014) did not significantly differ from the average number of Asian students arrested in schools without SROs (M=.015, SE=0.005).

Black or African American. An ANOVA revealed a statistically significant effect of SROs on the average number of Black or African American students arrested, $F_{(10, 1074)} = 45.46$, $p<.001$. The average number of Black or African American students arrested in schools with SROs (M=.997, SE=0.1) was significantly more than the average number of Black or African American students arrested in schools without SROs (M=207, SE=0.052). This impact is not explained by the size of school enrollment or the socio-economic characteristics of the schools' location. The average number of students arrested in schools with SROs is 4.8 times the average number of Black or African American students arrested in schools without SRO.

Hispanic or Latino/a/x. The ANOVA revealed a statistically significant impact of SROs on the average number of Hispanic or Latino/a/x students arrested in school, $F_{(10, 1074)} = 15.05$, $p<0.001$. The average number of Hispanic or Latino/a/x students arrested in schools with SROs

(M=1.086, SE=0.171) is significantly different from the average number of referrals of Hispanic or Latino/a/x students arrested in schools without SROs (M=0.309, SE=0.089). This impact is not explained by the size of school enrollment or the socio-economic characteristics of the schools' location. The average number of students arrested in schools with SROs is 3.5 times the average number of Hispanic or Latino/a/x students arrested in schools without SROs.

White. The ANOVA revealed a statistically significant effect of SROs on the average number of white students arrested from school, $F_{(10, 1074)} = 4.29$, p=.039. The average number of white students arrested in schools with SROs (M=0.557, SE=0.084) reflects a statistically significant difference from the average number of arrests of white students in schools without SROs (M=0.353, SE=0.044). This effect reflects an estimate not explained by the socio-economics of the schools' location or the school size. The average number of white students arrested in schools with SROs is 1.6 times that of schools without.

Total number of students (count). For the total student population, the ANOVA analysis controlled for DRG classification reveals a statistically significant effect of SROs on the average number of arrests, $F_{(10, 1074)} = 30.13$, p<.001. The average number of students arrested in schools with SROs (M=2.728, SE=.313) is significantly different from the number of students expelled from schools without SROs (M=0.929, SE=.147). The average number of students arrested in schools with SROs is 2.9 times that of students arrested in schools without SROs. This statistically significant relationship is regardless of the socio-economic characteristics of the school district.

Student Achievement and School Climate

To measure the impact of SROs on student achievement and school climate, we had to deal with several data issues. Due to data suppression, as discussed earlier, we had to use predicted data using the Stata 14 software to impute the possible values of suppressed data based on reported values. We then ran regression analysis clustering the standard errors at the school district level to safeguard our analysis against district-specific outliers. Higher values for DRG indicate less-resourced schools. (e.g. A=1, B=2 etc.) and enrollment number is the actual count of students enrolled in the school during a given academic year.

Table 16. The average percent of students scoring at or above proficient on Smarter Balanced test scores did not vary based on SRO presence in schools. These analyses include controls for school population and DRG, which have positive correlations with test scores.

	The average percent of students scoring at or above proficient on Smarter Balanced test scores			
	All Students ELA	White Students ELA	All Students Math	White Students Math
SRO Present	0.9067947	2.771244	-0.0133337	2.246857
	(1.781605)	(2.050826)	(2.784134)	(2.762384)
	0.612	0.179	0.995	0.417
DRG	-5.408067***	-3.626128***	-5.899597***	-4.129266***
	(0.4092124)	(0.3782959)	(0.0046131)	(0.4194045)
	<0.0001	<0.0001	<0.0001	<0.0001
Total Enrollment Count	-0.0097434*	-0.0079062*	-0.0111007*	-0.0100326*
	(0.0038703)	(0.0039629)	(0.4203464)	(0.0047393)
	0.014	0.049	0.019	0.037
Constant	91.85008***	87.63665***	87.94648***	83.93143***
	(2.617145)	(2.666536)	(2.106253)	(2.841762)
	<0.0001	<0.0001	<0.0001	<0.0001
N	776	776	776	776

* $p<0.05$, ** $p<0.01$, *** $p<0.001$, Showing coefficients and standard errors.
Source: 2017-2018 Department of Education Civil Rights Data Collection, 2017-2018 Smarter Balanced Test Scores as Reported on Edsight.ct.gov

All analyses of the average percentage of students meeting Smarter Balanced Test benchmarks below include controls for total school enrollment count and DRG. We used linear regressions to analyze the relationships, and the results for the control variables will be discussed. The standard errors were clustered at the district level. While there are no statistically significant relationships between SROs and student performance, we find consistent statistical significance for DRG classification and Total enrollment count as predictors of performance in Smarter Balanced Tests.

Percentage of all students scoring proficient or above on Smarter Balanced English Language Arts test. The linear regression revealed no statistically significant effect of SROs on the percentage of all students scoring proficient or above on the Smarter Balanced ELA test. The coefficient was positive, with the presence of SROs estimated to lead to an increase of 0.907 (SE=1.782, p=.612) points in the percentage of students meeting or exceeding the Smarter Balanced ELA benchmarks. This, however, is not a statistically significant relationship. Higher ranked DRG are predicted to record higher percentages of students scoring at proficient level with a coefficient of -5.408 (SE=.409, p<.001). This indicates a reduction for every step down the DRG

classifications. It is a statistically significant relationship. Schools with larger enrollments are linked to a lower percentage of students meeting these benchmarks with a coefficient of -0.01 (SE=.004, p=0.014). This indicates a reduction in the percentage of students meeting this threshold with each additional student enrolled. This relationship is statistically significant.

Percentage of all students scoring proficient or above on Smarter Balanced Mathematics test. The linear regression revealed no statistically significant effect of SROs on the percentage of all students scoring proficient or above on the Smarter Balanced Mathematics test. The coefficient was negative, with the presence of SROs estimated to lead to a decrease of 0.013 percentage points (SE=2.784, p=.995) in the percentage of students meeting or exceeding the Smarter Balanced Mathematics benchmarks. This, however, is not a statistically significant relationship. Higher ranked DRG are predicted to have higher percentages of students meeting the benchmarks with a coefficient of -5.9 (SE=.005, p<.001). This is as expected, and the relationship is statistically significant. Schools with larger enrollments are linked to a lower percentage of students meeting these benchmarks with a coefficient of -0.011 (SE=.42, p=0.019). This indicates a reduction in the percentage of students meeting this threshold in Mathematics with each additional student enrolled.

Percentage of white students scoring proficient or above on Smarter Balanced Mathematics test. The linear regression revealed no statistically significant effect of SROs on the percentage of white students scoring proficient or above on the Smarter Balanced Mathematics test. The coefficient was positive, with the presence of SROs estimated to lead to an increase of 2.247 (SE=2.762, p=.417) in the percentage of white students meeting or exceeding the Smarter Balanced Mathematics benchmarks. This, however, is not a statistically significant relationship. Higher ranked DRG are predicted to have higher percentages of proficient students with a coefficient of -4.129 (SE=.419, p<.001). This is as expected. Schools with larger enrollments are linked to a lower percentage of students meeting these benchmarks with a coefficient of -0.01 (SE=.005, p=0.037). This indicates a reduction in the percentage of white students meeting this threshold in Mathematics with each additional student enrolled.

In some cases, the coefficients are positive in schools with SROs, suggesting that they may contribute to higher scores on average. Though this does not represent a pattern, and thus we can't make a causal argument, it raises the question of how the presence of an SRO may contribute to racialized outcomes. For white students, the coefficients are much larger than when we look at the student body as a whole. We have no evidence of a relationship.

Table 16b. The predicted average percentage of students scoring at or above proficient on Smarter Balanced test scores of schools with SROs and those without SROs

	SRO Present	No SRO present
Total Students ELA	57.71816	56.81137
White Students ELA	66.32922	63.55798
Total Students Math	49.50883	49.52216
White Students Math	58.32002	56.07316

Using the results from the regression analysis in table 16, we hold the control variables constant at their means and predict the percentage of students who will meet or exceed the Smarter Balanced benchmarks. As explained earlier, these results for the impact of SROs are not statistically significant. Thus, we do not identify a relationship where the presence of SROs is responsible for the difference in the percentage of students who meet benchmarks in Smarter Balanced tests. First, we can see the estimates for ELA. The estimated percentage meeting the Smarter Balanced benchmarks for all students is 57.7% for students with SROs and 56.8% for students with no SROs. For white students, in schools with an SRO, the estimated percentage of students meeting ELA benchmarks in the Smarter Balanced test is 66.3% versus 63.6% in schools that don't have an SRO. In Math, it is 49.5% for all students where an SRO is present and 49.5% where they are absent. For the performance of white students in Math, 58.3% are estimated to meet Smarter Balanced benchmarks in schools with SROs, while 53.1% in schools without an SRO. Again, these results do not reach conventional levels of statistical significance, and thus, there is no evidence to support a causal link with the presence of SROs.

From observing the score, one may notice that Smarter Balanced ELA and Math scores have a more considerable impact on white students' performance than all student performance. This suggests that within groups of students of color, the presence of SROs may still have a negative impact on academic achievement in a way that this data set does not allow us to measure. There are too many missing and suppressed data to do any solid analysis on any other race/ethnic group, but this is an area that deserves additional research by state agencies.

Table 17. The presence of SROs had no statistically significant relationship with the average count of school incidents of violence, sex related incidents, property damage, or school policy violations. These analyses adjust for school population and DRG.

	Violence	Sex Related	Property Damage	Drugs and Alcohol	School Policy Violations
SRO Present	-0.1397814	-0.219067	-0.2801958	1.302884	33.30486
	(-0.305785)	(0.3823204)	(0.501273)	(1.344383)	(27.98587)
	0.648	0.567	0.577	0.335	0.236
DRG	0.1023363***	0.2984779***	0.4740661***	-0.0198937	14.20631***
	(0.0277583)	(0.0761142)	(0.113351)	(-0.2059893)	(3.679207)
	<.0001	<.0001	<.0001	0.923	<.0001
Total Enrollment	0 .0019414*	0.003045***	0.0034736***	0.0227015***	0.1852243***
	(0.0008105)	(0.0006628)	(0.0007797)	(0.0024212)	(0.0429638)
	0.018	<.0001	<.0001	<.0001	<.0001
Constant	-1.257259**	0.8913569***	-2.896596***	-5.330346 ***	-137.3328***
	(0.4225869)	0.3011674	(0.6805324)	(1.719351)	37.28764
	0.003	<.0001	<.0001	0.003	<.0001
N	899	899	899	899	899

* p<0.05, ** p<0.01, *** p<0.001, Showing coefficients and standard errors.
Source: 2017-2018 Department of Education Civil Rights Data Collection, 2017-2018 School Incidents as Reported on Edsight.ct.gov

We used linear regression to analyze the relationships, and the results for the control variables will be discussed. The regression analyses of the average number of school incidents below include controls for total school enrollment count and DRG. The standard errors were clustered by school district. While there are no statistically significant relationships for SROs and student performance, we find consistent statistical significance for DRG classification and Total enrollment count as predictors of the number of school incidents.

Violence. The linear regression revealed no statistically significant effect of SROs on the number of incidents of violence. The coefficient is negative, with the presence of SROs estimated to lead to a decrease of 0.14 percentage points (SE=-.306, p=.648) in the number of incidents of violence. This, however, is not a statistically significant relationship. Higher ranked DRG are predicted to have fewer such incidents with a coefficient of 0.1 (SE=.028, p<.001). This is as expected, and the relationship is statistically significant. Schools with larger enrollments are linked to more violent incidents with a coefficient of 0.002 (SE=.001, p=0.018). This indicates an increase in the number of violent incidents with each additional student enrolled.

Sex Related. The linear regression revealed no statistically significant effect of SROs on the number of sex related incidents. The coefficient is negative, with the presence of an SRO estimated

to lead to a decrease of 0.22 percentage points (SE=.501, p=.577) in the number of sex related incidents. This, however, is not a statistically significant relationship. Higher ranked DRG are predicted to have fewer such incidents with a coefficient of 0.298 (SE=.076, p<.001). This is as expected, and the relationship is statistically significant. Schools with larger enrollments are linked to more sex related incidents with a coefficient of 0.003 (SE=.001, p<.001). This indicates an increase in the number of sex related incidents with each additional student enrolled.

Property Damage. The linear regression revealed no statistically significant effect of SROs on the number of property damage incidents. The coefficient is negative, with the presence of SROs estimated to lead to a decrease of 0.28 percentage points (SE=.382, p=.567) in the number of incidents of property damage. This relationship is not statistically significant. Higher ranked DRG are predicted to have fewer such incidents with a coefficient of 0.474 (SE=.113, p<.001). This is as expected, and the relationship is statistically significant. As expected, schools with larger enrollments are linked to more incidents of property damage with a coefficient of 0.003 (SE=.001, p<.001). This indicates an increase in the number of incidents of property damage with each additional student enrolled.

Drugs and Alcohol. The regression analysis revealed no statistically significant effect of SROs on the number of Drugs and Alcohol incidents. The coefficient is positive, indicating that the presence of an SRO is estimated to be associated with an increase of 1.3 percentage points (SE=1.344, p=.335) in the number of drugs and alcohol-related incidents. This relationship is not statistically significant. Higher ranked DRG are predicted to have more incidents with a coefficient of -0.02 (SE=-.206, p=.923). However, this relationship is not statistically significant. As expected, schools with larger enrollments are linked to more drugs and alcohol incidents with a coefficient of 0.023 (SE=.002, p<.001). This indicates an increase in the number of drugs and alcohol-related incidents with each additional student enrolled.

School Policy Violations. The regression analysis revealed no statistically significant effect of SROs on the average count of School policy violations reported by the school. The coefficient is positive, indicating that the presence of an SRO is estimated to be associated with an increase of 33.3 percentage points (SE=1.344, p=.335) in the number of incidents of school policy violations. This relationship is not statistically significant. Higher ranked DRG are predicted to have fewer such incidents with a coefficient of 14.21 (SE=3.679, p<.001). This is as expected, and the relationship is statistically significant. As expected, schools with larger enrollments are linked more to school policy violations with a coefficient of 0.019 (SE=.043, p<.001). This indicates an increase in the number of school policy violation-related incidents with each additional student enrolled.

Table 17b. The presence of SROs had no statistically significant relationship with the average count of any school incidents of personally threatening behavior, theft, confrontation, fighting, and battery or weapon-related incidents. These analyses adjust for school population and DRG

	Personal Threats	Theft	Confrontation	Fighting and Battery	Weapons
SRO Present	1.431302	0.1951234	-0.4210178	1.502455	-0.0031209
	(1.818156)	(0.3809671)	(4.019945)	(5.588607)	(0.2066617)
	0.433	0.609	0.917	0.789	0.988
DRG	1.523625***	0.2847296***	4.251402***	4.973467***	0.1469975***
	(0.2933334)	(-0.0666118)	(0.818782)	(1.049755)	(0.0289299)
	<.0001	<.0001	<.0001	<.0001	<.0001
Total Enrollment	0.0122007***	0.0042395***	0.0223326***	0.0233341***	0.0022882***
	(0.0028538)	(0.0005059)	(0.00529)	(0.0061026)	(-0.0004831)
	<.0001	<.0001	<.0001	<.0001	<.0001
Constant	-6.947658**	-2.526683***	-19.08172***	-21.17083**	-1.512151***
	(2.224402)	(0.4003412)	(5.28042)	(6.131404)	(0.3010011)
	0.002	<.0001	<.0001	0.001	<.0001
N	899	899	899	899	899

* p<0.05, ** p<0.01, *** p<0.001, Showing coefficients and standard errors.
Source: 2017-2018 Department of Education Civil Rights Data Collection, 2017-2018 School Incidents as Reported on Edsight.ct.gov

Personal Threats. The regression analysis revealed no statistically significant effect of SROs on the average count of personal threats reported by the school. The coefficient is positive, indicating that the presence of an SRO is estimated to be associated with an increase of 1.431 points (SE=1.818, p=.433) in the number of incidents of personal threats. This relationship is not statistically significant. Higher ranked DRG are predicted to have fewer such incidents with a coefficient of 1.524 (SE=0.294, p<.001). This indicates that schools in lower-income districts are more likely to report more incidents, and the relationship is statistically significant. As expected, schools with larger enrollments are linked to more incidents of personal threats with a coefficient of 0.012 (SE=.003, p<.001). This indicates an increase in the number of personal threat-related incidents with each additional student enrolled.

Theft. The regression analysis revealed no statistically significant effect of SROs on the average count of thefts reported by the school. The coefficient is positive, indicating that the presence of an SRO is estimated to be associated with an increase of 0.195 points (SE=0.381, p=.609) in the number of incidents of theft. This relationship is not statistically significant. Higher ranked DRG are predicted to have fewer such incidents with a coefficient of 0.285 (SE=-0.067, p<.001). This indicates that schools in lower-income districts are more likely to report more incidents, and the

relationship is statistically significant. As expected, schools with larger enrollments are linked to more incidents of theft with a coefficient of 0.004 (SE=.001, p<.001). This indicates an increase in the number of threat-related incidents with each additional student enrolled.

Confrontation. The linear regression revealed no statistically significant effect of SROs on the number of incidents of confrontation. The coefficient is negative, with the presence of an SRO estimated to lead to a decrease of 0.421 percentage points (SE=4.02, p=.917) in the number of incidents of confrontation. This, however, is not a statistically significant relationship. Higher ranked DRG are predicted to have fewer such incidents with a coefficient of 4.251 (SE=.819, p<.001). This statistically significant relationship estimates that schools in less-resourced school districts will report more reports of confrontations. Schools with larger enrollments are linked to more incidents of confrontation with a coefficient of 0.022 (SE=.006, p<.001). This indicates an increase in the number of incidents of confrontation with each additional student enrolled.

Fighting and Battery. The regression analysis revealed no statistically significant effect of SROs on the average count of reported cases of fighting and battery in the school. The coefficient is positive and indicates that the presence of an SRO is estimated to be associated with an increase of 1.502 points (SE=5.589, p=.789) in the number of incidents of fighting and battery. This relationship does not reach conventional levels of statistical significance. Higher-income DRGs are predicted to have fewer such incidents with a coefficient of 4.973 (SE=1.05, p<.001). This indicates that schools in lower-income districts are more likely to report more of these incidents and the relationship is statistically significant. As expected, schools with larger enrollments are linked to more incidents of fighting and battery with a coefficient of 0.023 (SE=.006, p<.001). This indicates an increase in the number of fighting and battery-related incidents with each additional student enrolled.

Weapons. The regression analysis for weapons revealed no statistically significant effect of SROs on the average count of reported cases. The coefficient is negative and indicates that the presence of an SRO is associated with a decrease of 0.003 points (SE=5.589, p=.789) in the number of weapon-related incidents. This relationship does not reach conventional levels of statistical significance. Higher-income DRGs are predicted to have fewer such incidents with a coefficient of 0.145 (SE=0.029, p<.001). This indicates that schools in lower-income districts are more likely to report more of these incidents and the relationship is statistically significant. As expected, schools with larger enrollments are linked to more weapon incidents with a coefficient of 0.003 (SE=-.000, p<.001). This indicates an increase in the number of weapon-related incidents with each additional student enrolled.

Table 17c. The predicted average count of school incidents in schools with SROs present and schools without SROs present.

	SRO present	No SRO present
Violence	0.014616	0.154397
Sex Related	3.674392	3.893459
Property Damage	1.010769	1.290965
Drugs and Alcohol	5.531421	4.228537
School Policy Violations	56.02826	22.7234
Personal Threats	8.383977	6.952675
Theft	1.100966	0.905842
Confrontation	14.29379	14.71481
Fighting and Battery	18.67882	17.17637
Weapons	0.299222	0.302343

We held the control variables at their averages and used those to predict the average number of such incidents. Again, from the regressions, we know that these relationships are not statistically significant even though we may observe sizeable differences in some cases. While the average predicted count of incidents in some cases showed large differences, in others, they didn't. However, I must point out that the results again do not show a statistically significant relationship. The predicted average number of *violence* cases is 0 in schools with SROs and 0.2 in schools without. For *Sex Related* incidents, the predicted average is 3.7 in schools with SROs and 3.9 in schools without SROs. *Property Damage* reflects a predicted average of 1 incident in schools that reported having SROs and 1.3 in schools with no SROs. *Drugs and Alcohol* incidents were predicted to be recorded 5.5 times in schools with SROs and 4.2 times in schools without SROs. For *School Policy Violations*, schools with SROs recorded 56 of such incidents on average, while schools without SROs had 22.7 school policy violations incidents. Schools with SROs reported an adjusted average of 8.4 incidents of *Personal Threats*, schools without SROs had an average of 7 of such incidents. For incidents of *Theft,* there was an average of 1.1 incidents for schools with SROs and 0.9 for schools without SROs. *Confrontation* incidents were recorded an average of 14.3 times in schools with SROs and 14.7 times in schools without SROs. The incidents of *Fighting and Battery* happened an average of 18.7 times in schools with SROs and 17.2 times in schools without SROs. *Weapons*-related incidents were on average recorded 0.3 times in schools with SROs and 0.3 times in schools without SROs.

APPENDIX B

Schools Reporting the Presence of SROs in the 2015-2016 School Year to the US Department of Education Civil Rights Data Collection

District	DRG	School
Ansonia School District	H	Ansonia High School
Ansonia School District	H	P.A.C.E. (Positive And Creative Education)
Avon School District	B	Avon High School
Bethany School District	C	Bethany Community School
Bethel School District	D	Anna H. Rockwell School
Bethel School District	D	Bethel High School
Bethel School District	D	Bethel Middle School
Bethel School District	D	Frank A. Berry School
Bethel School District	D	Ralph M. T. Johnson School
Bristol School District	G	Bristol Central High School
Bristol School District	G	Bristol Early Childhood Center-BECC
Bristol School District	G	Chippens Hill Middle School
Bristol School District	G	Greene-Hills School
Bristol School District	G	West Bristol School
Brookfield School District	B	Brookfield High School
Brookfield School District	B	Whisconier Middle School
Cheshire School District	E	Cheshire High School
Clinton School District	D	The Morgan School
Colchester School District	D	Bacon Academy
Colchester School District	D	Bacon Academy Alternative Education
Colchester School District	D	Colchester Elementary School
Colchester School District	D	Jack Jackter Intermediate School
Colchester School District	D	William J. Johnston Middle School
Connecticut Technical Education and Career System	G	A. I. Prince Technical High School
Connecticut Technical Education and Career System	G	Bullard-Havens Technical High School
Connecticut Technical Education and Career System	G	E. C. Goodwin Technical High School
Connecticut Technical Education and Career System	G	Eli Whitney Technical High School
Connecticut Technical Education and Career System	G	H. C. Wilcox Technical High School
Connecticut Technical Education and Career System	G	Howell Cheney Technical High School
Connecticut Technical Education and Career System	G	Platt Technical High School

Cromwell School District	D	Cromwell High School
Cromwell School District	D	Cromwell Middle School
Cromwell School District	D	Edna C. Stevens School
Cromwell School District	D	Woodside Intermediate School
Darien School District	A	Darien High School
East Hartford School District	H	East Hartford High School
East Hartford School District	H	East Hartford Middle School
East Windsor School District	F	East Windsor High School
Enfield School District	F	Enfield High - Adaptive Learning Program (ALP)
Enfield School District	F	John F. Kennedy Middle School
Fairfield School District	B	Burr Elementary School
Fairfield School District	B	Dwight Elementary School
Fairfield School District	B	Fairfield Ludlowe High School
Fairfield School District	B	Fairfield Warde High School
Fairfield School District	B	Fairfield Woods Middle School
Fairfield School District	B	Holland Hill School
Fairfield School District	B	Jennings School
Fairfield School District	B	McKinley School
Fairfield School District	B	Mill Hill School
Fairfield School District	B	North Stratfield School
Fairfield School District	B	Osborn Hill School
Fairfield School District	B	Riverfield School
Fairfield School District	B	Roger Ludlowe Middle School
Fairfield School District	B	Sherman School
Fairfield School District	B	Stratfield School
Fairfield School District	B	Tomlinson Middle School
Fairfield School District	B	Walter Fitzgerald Campus
Farmington School District	B	East Farms School
Farmington School District	B	Farmington High School
Farmington School District	B	Irving A. Robbins Middle School
Farmington School District	B	Noah Wallace School
Farmington School District	B	Union School
Farmington School District	B	West District School
Farmington School District	B	West Woods Upper Elementary School
Glastonbury School District	B	Glastonbury High School
Glastonbury School District	B	Smith Middle School
Greenwich School District	B	Greenwich High School
Groton School District	G	New Beginnings Alternative Program
Groton School District	G	Robert E. Fitch High School
Groton School District	G	Virtual Learning Academy
Guilford School District	B	Guilford High School
Hamden School District	I	Hamden High School
Hamden School District	I	Hamden Middle School
Learn		Marine Science Magnet High School

Madison School District	B	Daniel Hand High School
Madison School District	B	Dr. Robert H. Brown Intermediate School
Madison School District	B	Island Avenue Elementary School
Madison School District	B	J. Milton Jeffrey Elementary School
Madison School District	B	Kathleen H. Ryerson Elementary School
Madison School District	B	Walter C. Polson Middle School
Meriden School District	H	Francis T. Maloney High School
Meriden School District	H	Lincoln Middle School
Meriden School District	H	Orville H. Platt High School
Meriden School District	H	Washington Middle School
Middletown School District	G	Bielefield School
Middletown School District	G	Farm Hill School
Middletown School District	G	Keigwin Middle School
Middletown School District	G	Lawrence School
Middletown School District	G	MacDonough School
Middletown School District	G	Middletown High School
Middletown School District	G	Moody School
Middletown School District	G	Snow School
Middletown School District	G	Spencer School
Middletown School District	G	Wesley School
Middletown School District	G	Woodrow Wilson Middle School
Milford School District	D	East Shore Middle School
Milford School District	D	Harborside Middle School
Milford School District	D	Jonathan Law High School
Milford School District	D	Joseph A. Foran High School
Milford School District	D	Pumpkin Delight School
Milford School District	D	West Shore Middle School
Monroe School District	B	Fawn Hollow Elementary School
Monroe School District	B	Jockey Hollow School
Monroe School District	B	Masuk High School
Monroe School District	B	Monroe Elementary School
Monroe School District	B	Stepney Elementary School
New Britain School District	I	Brookside School
New Britain School District	I	New Britain High School
New Canaan School District	A	New Canaan High School
New Canaan School District	A	Saxe Middle School
New Fairfield School District	B	Alternative Learning Center
New Fairfield School District	B	Consolidated School
New Fairfield School District	B	Meeting House Hill School
New Fairfield School District	B	New Fairfield High School
New Fairfield School District	B	New Fairfield Middle School
New Haven School District	I	Cooperative High School - Inter-District Magnet

New Haven School District	I	Hill Regional Career High School
New Haven School District	I	James Hillhouse High School
New Haven School District	I	Riverside Education Academy
New Haven School District	I	Wilbur Cross High School
New London School District	I	New London High School
New Milford School District	D	Hill And Plain School
New Milford School District	D	New Milford High School
New Milford School District	D	Northville Elementary School
New Milford School District	D	Sarah Noble Intermediate School
New Milford School District	D	Schaghticoke Middle School
Newington School District	D	Newington High School
Newtown School District	B	Newtown High School
Newtown School District	B	Newtown Middle School
North Haven School District	I	North Haven High School
Norwalk School District	H	Brien McMahon High School
Norwalk School District	H	Brookside Elementary School
Norwalk School District	H	Columbus Magnet School
Norwalk School District	H	Cranbury Elementary School
Norwalk School District	H	Fox Run Elementary School
Norwalk School District	H	Jefferson Magnet School
Norwalk School District	H	Kendall Elementary School
Norwalk School District	H	Marvin Elementary School
Norwalk School District	H	Naramake Elementary School
Norwalk School District	H	Nathan Hale Middle School
Norwalk School District	H	Norwalk High School
Norwalk School District	H	Norwalk Pathways Academy at Briggs
Norwalk School District	H	Ponus Ridge Middle School
Norwalk School District	H	Roton Middle School
Norwalk School District	H	Rowayton School
Norwalk School District	H	Silvermine Dual Language Magnet School
Norwalk School District	H	Tracey Magnet School
Norwalk School District	H	West Rocks Middle School
Norwalk School District	H	Wolfpit School
Old Saybrook School District	D	Kathleen E. Goodwin School
Old Saybrook School District	D	Old Saybrook Middle School
Old Saybrook School District	D	Old Saybrook Senior High School
Redding School District	A	John Read Middle School
Redding School District	A	Redding Elementary School
Regional School District 05	B	Amity Regional High School
Regional School District 07	C	Northwestern Regional High School
Regional School District 07	C	Northwestern Regional Middle School
Regional School District 08	C	RHAM High School
Regional School District 10	C	Lewis S. Mills High School
Regional School District 12	C	Booth Free School

Regional School District 12	C	Shepaug Valley School
Regional School District 12	C	The Burnham School
Regional School District 12	C	Washington Primary School
Regional School District 13	C	Coginchaug Regional High School
Regional School District 13	C	John Lyman School
Regional School District 14	C	Bethlehem Elementary School
Regional School District 14	C	Mitchell Elementary School
Regional School District 14	C	Nonnewaug High School
Regional School District 14	C	Woodbury Middle School
Regional School District 15	B	Pomperaug Regional High School
Ridgefield School District	A	Barlow Mountain Elementary School
Ridgefield School District	A	Branchville Elementary School
Ridgefield School District	A	East Ridge Middle School
Ridgefield School District	A	Farmingville Elementary School
Ridgefield School District	A	Ridgebury Elementary School
Ridgefield School District	A	Ridgefield High School
Ridgefield School District	A	Scotland Elementary School
Ridgefield School District	A	Scotts Ridge Middle School
Ridgefield School District	A	Veterans Park Elementary School
Rocky Hill School District	D	Albert D. Griswold Middle School
Rocky Hill School District	D	Myrtle H. Stevens School
Rocky Hill School District	D	Rocky Hill High School
Rocky Hill School District	D	West Hill School
Seymour School District	F	Seymour High School
Shelton School District	D	Shelton High School
Sherman School District	C	Sherman School
Simsbury School District	C	Central School
Simsbury School District	C	Henry James Memorial School
Simsbury School District	C	Latimer Lane School
Simsbury School District	C	Simsbury High School
Simsbury School District	C	Squadron Line School
Simsbury School District	C	Tariffville School
Simsbury School District	C	Tootin' Hills School
Somers School District	C	Mabelle B. Avery Middle School
Somers School District	C	Somers High School
Stratford School District	G	Bunnell High School
Stratford School District	G	David Wooster Middle School
Stratford School District	G	Stratford High School
Suffield School District	C	Suffield High School
Tolland School District	C	Birch Grove Primary School
Tolland School District	C	Tolland High School
Tolland School District	C	Tolland Intermediate School
Tolland School District	C	Tolland Middle School
Torrington School District	G	Torrington High School
Torrington School District	G	Torrington Middle School

Unified School District #1		Manson Youth Institution
Unified School District #1		York Correctional Institution
Unified School District #2		Walter G. Cady School
Vernon School District	I	Rockville High School
Waterbury School District	I	Crosby High School
Waterbury School District	I	Enlightenment School
Waterbury School District	I	John F. Kennedy High School
Waterbury School District	I	Michael F. Wallace Middle School
Waterbury School District	I	North End Middle School
Waterbury School District	I	State Street School
Waterbury School District	I	West Side Middle School
Waterbury School District	I	Wilby High School
Waterford School District	I	Clark Lane Middle School
Waterford School District	I	Waterford High School
Watertown School District	D	Swift Middle School
Watertown School District	D	Watertown High School
West Hartford School District	B	Aiken School
West Hartford School District	B	Braeburn School
West Hartford School District	B	Bristow Middle School
West Hartford School District	B	Bugbee School
West Hartford School District	B	Charter Oak International Academy
West Hartford School District	B	Conard High School
West Hartford School District	B	Duffy School
West Hartford School District	B	Hall High School
West Hartford School District	B	King Philip Middle School
West Hartford School District	B	Morley School
West Hartford School District	B	Norfeldt School
West Hartford School District	B	Sedgwick Middle School
West Hartford School District	B	Smith School
West Hartford School District	B	Webster Hill School
West Hartford School District	B	Whiting Lane School
West Hartford School District	B	Wolcott School
West Haven School District	H	Alma E. Pagels School
West Haven School District	H	Carrigan 5/6 Intermediate School
West Haven School District	H	Edith E. Mackrille School
West Haven School District	H	Forest School
West Haven School District	H	Harry M. Bailey Middle School
West Haven School District	H	Savin Rock Community School
West Haven School District	H	Seth G. Haley School
West Haven School District	H	Washington School
West Haven School District	H	West Haven High School
Westport School District	B	GFS Intensive Resource
Wethersfield School District	D	Silas Deane Middle School
Wethersfield School District	D	Wethersfield High School
Wilton School District	A	Cider Mill School

Wilton School District	A	Middlebrook School
Wilton School District	A	Wilton High School
Windham School District	I	Windham High School
Windham School District	I	Windham Middle School
Windsor Locks School District	F	Windsor Locks High School
Wolcott School District	F	Phoenix Program
Wolcott School District	F	Wolcott High School
Woodbridge School District	B	Beecher Road School

ENDNOTES

[1] Connecticut State Department of Education. (2018). *Home*. Retrieved from Edsight-Insight into Education: http://edsight.ct.gov/SASPortal/main.do

[2] Connecticut Department of Education. (2015). Appendix A. *District Reference Groups (DRG)*.

[3] United States Department of Education, Office for Civil Rights [USDOE]. (2018). *Data and research: Civil rights data collection (CRDC)*. https://www2.ed.gov/about/offices/list/ocr/data.html.

[4] United States Department of Education, Office for Civil Rights [USDOE]. (2021). *Data and research: Civil rights data collection (CRDC)*. https://www2.ed.gov/about/offices/list/ocr/data.html.

[5] Connecticut State Department of Education. (2015). Data Suppression Guidelines(Rep.). Retrieved from http://edsight.ct.gov/relatedreports/BDCRE Data Suppression Rules.pdf

[6] Stokes Hudson, C., Ruth, L., & Waithe Simmons, W. (2019). Policing Connecticut's Hallways: The Prevalence and Impact of School Resource Officers in Connecticut.

[7] StataCorp, L. P. (2013). Stata multiple-imputation reference manual. *Accessed at*. https://citeseerx.ist.psu.edu/viewdoc/download?doi=10.1.1.450.7174&rep=rep1&type=pdf

[8] StataCorp, L. P. (2015). StataCorp stata statistical software: Release 14. StataCorp LP.: College Station, TX, USA

[9] StataCorp, L. P. (2015). StataCorp stata statistical software: Release 14. StataCorp LP.: College Station, TX, USA

[10] Prowda, P. (June 2006) District Reference Groups, 2006. *Research Bulletin*, School Year 2005-2005, number one. Connecticut State Dept. of Education, Division of Teaching and Learning, Bureau of Research, Evaluation and Student Assessment.